



doi:10.1016/j.jenymen.2010.11.007

Due to its naturally limited distribution in the cloud belt of tropical mountains, TCMF distribution is often considered

analogous to an archipelago, with deforestation enhancing the isolation of remaining TMCF fragments (Hamilton et al., 1995). Elevated human population densities and the consequent demand for forest products and land for alternative uses are the most important pressures for TMCF maintenance (Dourmengué et al., 1995). In Mexico, a number of estimates indicate that more than over 50% of the original TMCF area has been replaced by other forms of land use; mainly pasture for cattle grazing, annual crops, and coffee plantations (Challenger, 1998; Cayuela et al., 2006; Muñoz-Villers and López-Blanco, 2008).

An accurate diagnosis of the main threats and opportunities for TMCF conservation and sustainable use can play a central role in its maintenance, and is crucial to the development of ecologically sound public policies. In this paper, we focus on TMCF in Mexico and, while our premise is that all areas of TMCF are equally important, we acknowledge a need to prioritise them due to the variety and complexity of their biophysical and socioeconomic attributes, and the contingent financial and human resources for their conservation. Although methods for biodiversity conservation planning have previously been established (Kuusipalo and Kangas, 1994; Groves et al., 2002; Bonn and Gaston, 2005; Regan et al., 2007), the prioritisation of ecological systems for conservation and management may benefit from considering both the environmental and social conditions for implementation of actions. Such approaches require a practical yet science-based planning framework (Groves et al., 2002). Here, we present a prioritisation analysis of TMCF in Mexico, examining its present condition, the main current threats to its permanence and integrity, the existing opportunities for its maintenance, and the social characteristics of the local human communities in and around TMCF as drivers of either conservation or increased forest loss.

2. Methods

2.1. Study region

TMCF in Mexico (“bosque mesófilo de montaña” *sensu* Rzedowski, 2006) occupies only 0.5–1% of the national territory (~10 000–20,000 km²; Challenger, 1998), with less than 25% located in currently protected natural areas (Table 1). It is the terrestrial ecosystem with the highest concentration of floral and faunal diversity in the country; it hosts at least 3000 species of vascular plants, ~12% of the country’s plant richness. Among the plant species in Mexican TMCF, endemics account for ~30% of the flora (Rzedowski, 1996), but for amphibians and reptiles the endemism may be as high as 33% and 39%, respectively (Flores-Villela and Gerez, 1988). Some of the most emblematic species of these forests include the quetzal (*Pharomachrus mocinno*), horned guan (*Oreophaps derbianus*), and tree ferns (*Alsophila firma*, *Cyathea fulva*,

Dicksonia gigantea). Most people who inhabit TMCF areas in Mexico live in highly marginalized conditions (CONABIO 2010), with more than 55% of TMCF under communal ownership (Boege, 2008).

In order to conduct the prioritisation analysis, 13 regions of TMCF were identified and within these, subregions were further defined (Fig. 1). TMCF cover was based on the map of land use and vegetation series III (2002–2005), of the National Institute for Statistics, Geography and Informatics (INEGI) and regions were delimited based on physiographic provinces derived from the cartographic information provided by INEGI. Subregions were delimited according to forest cover, geomorphology, isolation, watershed margins, rivers, and presence of indigenous groups.

2.2. Team assessment

Two workshops were organized in 2007 and 2008 by the Mexican Biodiversity Commission (CONABIO) in Mexico City. Forty participants, including researchers, members of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and government officials dedicated a total of 2000 h to evaluation and analyses. Based on their expertise, groups of 5–7 participants were allocated to the evaluation of each region, and various participants evaluated more than one region. The main areas of expertise represented in this group included TMCF plant ecology and taxonomy, biodiversity conservation, vegetation cartography, forest restoration, community forestry and action research.

2.3. Criteria and indicators

A set of nationally applicable criteria and indicators was constructed in order to prioritise subregions within each region. Each criterion includes a set of indicators used in its measurement or qualitative assessment (Fig. 2) (for criteria and indicator definitions see appendix 1).

2.4. Evaluation of indicators

The analytic hierarchy process (AHP) is a multicriteria decision-making technique (Saaty, 2006), and was the method used for the prioritisation analysis. With AHP, both quantitative and qualitative decision criteria can be analytically managed (Kuusipalo and Kangas, 1994). This technique employs numerical pairwise comparisons of the relative importance (weight) of one indicator over another, and is used to evaluate alternatives (in this case, subregions) with respect to each indicator (Kuusipalo and Kangas, 1994; Regan et al., 2007). The weight and value for each indicator are different aspects of the analysis; the ranking is the result of a combination of the weight and the value assigned to the indicator for a particular subregion. AHP prioritises alternatives according to the pre-weighted criteria. The number of pairwise comparisons depends on the number of elements (subregions) to be compared. The mathematical foundations of AHP can be found in Saaty (2006).

The assessment team defined the weight of each indicator towards the criterion. The weight was defined as the relative contribution of the indicator to the assessment of the corresponding criterion, i.e. the importance of its input to the model. The weights assigned to each indicator were: (0) non-existent or minimal, (1) low, (2) medium, (3) high, and (4) very high. Prioritisation analysis was conducted for each region separately due to the existence of large differences across the country related to biodiversity, forest management history, landscape and socioeconomic features. Thus, the team assigned scores to indicate the value of the indicator for each subregion within the region. The scale used to assign the indicator value for each subregion was the same as that used for the weights. Indicator weight and

Table 1
Extent of tropical montane cloud forest (TMCF) in protected areas in Mexico (CONANP-CONABIO, 2005; Bezaury-Creel et al., 2007).

TMCF	Extent (ha)	Included in protected natural areas (ha)	Proportion included in protected natural areas (%)	No. of protected natural areas
Old-growth	869 419	157 838	18.2	32
Secondary vegetation ^a	955 613	56 233	5.9	24
Total	1 825 032	214 071	24.1	56

^a Includes other vegetation types commonly associated with TMCF.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10505565>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10505565>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)