



PART 2

Read the text below and answer questions 14–26.

STRATEGIES FOR FOREST CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

A

Forest conservation has moved beyond the idea of locking nature away as untouched “wilderness”. In many regions, forests are mosaics of protected zones, farms, plantations, roads, and settlements, all shaped by markets and politics as much as by rainfall and soils. As a result, modern policy tends to combine regulation with incentives and technical support, aiming to slow forest loss while sustaining livelihoods. However, there is no universal solution: strategies that reduce clearing in one context may fail in another if they ignore the local drivers of deforestation, the strength of institutions, or the ability of authorities to enforce rules. The most durable outcomes usually come from aligning economic incentives with long-term stewardship, while making illegal clearing risky and unprofitable.

B

Protected areas remain a cornerstone of conservation, but their effectiveness depends on governance and design. Some reserves exist largely in official paperwork, with limited budgets, few rangers, weak boundary demarcation, and little community support. These “paper parks” may not prevent encroachment because illegal loggers and land-grabbers learn that patrols are rare and penalties are inconsistent. By contrast, well-managed protected areas with clear boundaries, trained staff, and stable funding can significantly reduce clearing within their borders. Yet even successful parks may trigger displacement of deforestation (leakage). When restrictions are tightened inside a reserve, agricultural expansion and timber extraction can shift into adjacent unprotected zones, especially where land markets are active and enforcement outside the park is minimal. This means protected areas can lower local loss while leaving national forest decline unchanged unless surrounding landscapes are also governed.

C

Community forestry has expanded as research and practice have shown that local stewardship can protect forests while supporting incomes. When communities hold secure land tenure, they are more likely to invest in long-term management, establish rules for harvesting, monitor illegal logging, and organise fire control. Secure tenure can also strengthen bargaining power with buyers and government agencies, enabling communities to benefit from legal markets rather than being pushed into informal trade. Nevertheless, community forestry is not automatically successful. Outcomes depend on local



institutions, the capacity to resolve disputes, access to markets, and whether community rights are recognised and enforced by the state. In some places, overlapping claims, unclear boundaries, or political interference weaken collective action. Even where tenure is granted, communities may still face pressures from migrants, commercial interests, or infrastructure projects that raise land values and intensify conflict.

D

Market-based tools aim to reshape incentives by rewarding sustainable practices and penalising destructive supply chains. Timber certification schemes, for example, attempt to verify that harvesting follows legal and ecological standards, while corporate “deforestation-free” commitments seek to exclude suppliers linked to illegal clearing. In theory, such measures shift demand toward responsibly produced commodities and make forest destruction less profitable. In practice, critics note several limitations. Certification can be expensive and administratively complex, particularly for small producers who lack the resources to pay auditors or reorganise production. Meanwhile, supply-chain pledges vary widely in quality: some rely heavily on self-reporting, indirect sourcing remains difficult to trace, and compliance can be uneven across subsidiaries and contractors. Without credible verification and transparent reporting, market standards may create the appearance of progress while allowing high-risk production to continue through loopholes.

E

Monitoring technology has become a major enabler of conservation, largely because it can reveal forest change quickly and at scale. Satellite telemetry can detect new clearings within days, allowing agencies to prioritise hotspots rather than relying on occasional field patrols. Drones can document encroachment in remote areas, and public dashboards can increase transparency by showing where and when tree cover loss occurs. Yet monitoring is not the same as enforcement. Data must trigger action through punitive measures, such as targeted inspections, fines, asset seizure, or prosecutions, otherwise illegal operators learn that detection carries little consequence. In settings where courts are slow or corruption is entrenched, alerts may simply accumulate without meaningful response. Effective systems therefore link detection to rapid-response teams, clear legal procedures, and consistent penalties, so that the probability of punishment rises sharply once clearing is identified.

F

Restoration and sustainable management are increasingly framed around climate adaptation and agro-ecological resilience. Instead of planting a single fast-growing species, many programmes now emphasise mixed-species planting, assisted natural regeneration, and protecting seed sources so that forests recover with greater structural



diversity. In fire-prone landscapes, fuel-load reduction and controlled burning may lower the risk of catastrophic events, while maintaining ecological functions. Restoration can also support water regulation and reduce erosion, which benefits downstream agriculture and infrastructure. However, restoration is not a substitute for protection. Planting trees while allowing large-scale clearing elsewhere can produce impressive headline figures without changing net forest loss. Moreover, poorly designed projects may fail if they ignore local soils, rainfall patterns, or land-use pressures. The most credible restoration strategies therefore complement protection by stabilising degraded areas, strengthening resilience, and reducing the likelihood that recovering forests will be cleared again.

G

Financing and policy coherence often determine whether conservation succeeds over decades rather than years. Protected areas need stable budgets for staff, equipment, and maintenance; community forestry requires training and support; monitoring systems need analysts and legal follow-through; and restoration depends on long-term care. Funding sources include public budgets, climate finance, and payments for ecosystem services, yet many donors favour short projects with measurable outputs even though forest outcomes require continuity. Policy alignment is equally important. A government may publicly fund conservation while subsidising road building, agricultural inputs, or cattle expansion that increases pressure on forests. When incentives conflict, conservation agencies can be undermined by other arms of the state. Strong results are most likely when multiple strategies reinforce one another: protected areas backed by enforcement, legal recognition of land tenure, market rules with credible verification, and restoration designed for local ecology—supported by long-term finance and consistent cross-sector policy.

Questions 14–18

Choose the correct heading for each paragraph.

List of Headings

- i** Why monitoring systems fail when punishment is uncertain
- ii** The limits of restoration when overall clearing continues
- iii** Why forest loss inevitably disappears once a reserve is established
- iv** When local control works best and why it sometimes fails
- v** Market standards that risk excluding smaller participants
- vi** Why protected areas need strong governance beyond official status



vii How financial continuity shapes conservation outcomes

viii Why technology can replace on-the-ground enforcement

ix When mixed planting improves soil productivity on farms

14 Paragraph **B**

15 Paragraph **C**

16 Paragraph **D**

17 Paragraph **E**

18 Paragraph **F**

Questions 19–22

Choose **TRUE** if the statement agrees with the information given in the text, choose **FALSE** if the statement contradicts the information, or choose **NOT GIVEN** if there is no information on this.

19 The passage states that some protected areas have weak staffing and budgets, which can make them ineffective against encroachment.

20 Community forestry is described as being 20% more profitable than commercial logging in regions with secure land tenure.

21 The passage suggests that certification may be difficult for small producers because it can involve high costs and complex administration.

22 The passage argues that tree-planting programmes can reduce net forest loss even if large-scale clearing continues elsewhere.

Questions 23–26

Complete the sentences below. Choose **NO MORE THAN TWO WORDS** from the text for each answer.

23 Restricting clearing inside protected areas may cause displacement of deforestation, also called

24 Critics say certification can be costly and complex for

25 Effective monitoring systems require rapid-response teams, clear legal procedures, and consistent

26 Conservation efforts may be undermined when governments subsidise cattle



Answer Key

14. vi

15. iv

16. v

17. i

18. ii

19. TRUE

20. NOT GIVEN

21. TRUE

22. FALSE

23. leakage

24. small producers

25. penalties

26. expansion