

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Earth System Dynamics (ESD). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in ESD if available.

Establishment and maintenance of regulating ecosystem services in a dryland area of Central Asia: the Kökyar Protection Forest, Aksu, NW China, as an example

S. Missall¹, M. Welp¹, N. Thevs², A. Abliz^{1,3,4}, and Ü. Halik^{3,4}

¹Faculty of Forest and Environment, Eberswalde University for Sustainable Development, Eberswalde, Germany

²Institute of Botany and Landscape Ecology, University of Greifswald, Greifswald, Germany

³Key Laboratory of Oasis Ecology, College of Resources and Environmental Sciences, Xinjiang University, Urumqi, China

⁴Faculty of Mathematics and Geography, Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Eichstätt, Germany

1673

Received: 1 September 2014 – Accepted: 26 September 2014 – Published: 8 December 2014

Correspondence to: S. Missall (siegmond.missall@posteo.de)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

1674

Abstract

The city of Aksu, situated at the northern fringe of the Taklimakan Desert in the north-west of China, is exposed to periodic severe dust and sand storms. In 1986, local authorities decided to establish a peri-urban shelterbelt plantation, the so-called Kökyar Protection Forest. It was realised as a patchwork of poplar shelterbelts and orchards. The total area of the plantation reached 3800 ha in 2005. This endeavour was made possible by the annual mass mobilisation of Aksu citizens, based on the Chinese regulation of the “National Compulsory Afforestation Campaigns”. Establishment costs amounted to ca. CNY 60 000 ha⁻¹ (ca. USD 10 000 ha⁻¹). The regulating ecosystem services provided by Kökyar Protection Forest clearly reduce dust and sand storm impacts on Aksu City. Permanent maintenance of the plantation is facilitated by leasing orchard plots to private fruit farmers. This system ensures forest tending, reduces government expenses, and provides incomes to farmers. From the perspective of the local economy, annual farming net benefits generated by Kökyar fruit farmers more than compensate annual government grants for maintenance, resulting in an overall monetary net benefit of at least CNY 10 500 ha⁻¹ (ca. USD 1600 ha⁻¹) on the long-term average. The intended regulating ecosystem services can thus be provided to the citizens of Aksu without payments for ecosystem services or other financial burdens. For a more complete understanding of Kökyar Protection Forest, future research should be directed towards quantifying the effect of its regulating ecosystem services, and on investigating the negative downstream consequences of its water consumption.

1 Introduction

Aksu is a city of about 570 000 inhabitants (Intercontinental Pan-Chinese Network Information Co. Ltd., 2008). It is the capital of Aksu Prefecture, lying in the west of China’s northwestern Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, close to the border of Kyrgyzstan. At a geographical position of 41°10′ N and 80°15′ E and at an altitude of 1100 m a.s.l.,

1675

it is situated on a long, slightly inclined slope between the Tian Shan Mountains in the north and the Taklimakan Desert in the south (cf. Fig. 1). An annual evaporation rate of 1868 mm and annual precipitation of merely 75 mm indicate an extremely arid climate (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 2006). However, due to its location at the Aksu River, Aksu receives sufficient water to ensure agriculture, which places the city at the very centre of a huge river oasis (ca. 1000 km², including Awat and Onsu County; Halik, 2003). The water of the Aksu River stems from snow and glacier melt water as well as rainfall from the nearby Tian Shan Mountains as introduced in Rumbaer et al. (2014).

In the years between 1954 and 1986, the city annually experienced an average of 11 to 12 “sand storm events” (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). The storms were severe, darkening the sky, making respiration difficult, covering everything outside and inside houses with brown dust, inhibiting traffic, and disrupting public life (Aksu Prefectural Forestry Department and Kuqa Television Station, 2006; Aksu Prefectural Greening Committee, 2006; Aksu citizen interviews 2011).

In the same period, fast socio-economic changes took place in the city: the composition of the population shifted from a nearly pure autochthonous Uyghur society to a majority of foreign Han-Chinese settlers, and the city was transforming from a small rural oasis town into a regional industrial and service centre (Halik, 2003; Intercontinental Pan-Chinese Network Information Co. Ltd., 2008). As a result of these changes, dust and sand storms were increasingly perceived as a major problem to the city.

As a response to the dust problems, in the 1980s the local authorities decided to lay out a peri-urban shelterbelt plantation, called Kökyar Protection Forest. Work began in 1986 and was completed in 1990, the plantation then covering an area of 1308 ha (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). From 1990 onward, the project was enlarged by three more project periods, each of which converted more patches of desert land into forest plantations (cf. Fig. 2). The four project periods and their corresponding areas were then chronologically labeled from Kökyar I to IV, while the complete title, Kökyar Protection Forest, usually refers to the sum of the four project areas. According

fork canal from the existent northern Great Revolution Canal leading southward to the planned greening site (cf. Fig. 2). The terrain to be crossed by the canal was a 20 m high saline desert plateau traversed by deep erosion gullies. Because of this unfavourable environment, it was decided to protect the canal with poplar shelterbelts on each side. A year later, in 1986, the original plan was enlarged to cover the whole barren plateau with a protection forest, and the evocative title “Kökyar Greening Project” was suggested (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). “Kökyar” means “green cliff” in Uyghur language.

3.2 Design

The plantation was then established as a raster of shelterbelt strips consisting mainly of white poplar (*Populus alba* “Pyramidalis”), i.e. the so called “ecological forest”, with fruit tree plantations between, i.e. the so called “economic forest”. In the five years between 1986 and 1990, 686 ha of poplar shelterbelts and 623 ha of orchards were planted, totalling 1308 ha and 1 085 000 trees (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996).

The infrastructure backbone of the plantation is formed by a vertical main canal and a parallel main asphalt road which interlink the Great Revolution Canal in the north with the city of Aksu in the south, providing the area with water and making it accessible. This main axis has a length of 15.8 km and is protected by a shelterbelt strip of 100 m width at each side. The areas east and west of it are criss-crossed by a regular grid of in total about 125 km earth roads and a hierarchical system of subordinate irrigation canals. Shelterbelts, planted in single or double rows, protect the earth roads and subordinate canals, forming a checkered pattern over the area (cf. Fig. 3). The rectangular fields in between are filled with orchards, with apple and pear being the major crops and jujube, walnut and others being minor crops (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; socio-economic household survey 2012). Hundreds of small farm houses are scattered all over the orchards. Furthermore, the area is equipped with all

1679

necessary technical infrastructure, such as water gates, waterlocks, overflows, bridges, sewer canals, water tabs, power lines, telephone lines and administrative buildings.

Today, the shelterbelts of Kökyar I consist mainly of white poplar (*Populus alba* “Pyramidalis”) in dense rows, partly mixed with Euphrates poplar (*Populus euphratica*), and some oleaster (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), tamarisks (*Tamarix*) and willows (*Salix*) in the understory. Most white poplars have reached breast diameters of 20–30 cm, with some reaching up to 60 cm (field observations 2012).

The later project periods of Kökyar II, III and IV are not located in the direct vicinity of Kökyar I. They are scattered over the most problematic dust fields to the north and east of Aksu City (cf. Fig. 2). Their lay-out follows the basic design of Kökyar I, but they tend to have smaller shelterbelt areas compared to total area (cf. Table 1; Aksu Prefectural Greening Committee, 2006). For the latest scheduled project period, Kökyar IV, data have yet to be published.

3.3 Key actors

In 1986, the Prefectural Party Committee authorised two important governmental organisations, the Aksu River Drainage Area Management Department and the Prefectural Forestry Department to run the project jointly. Each of them founded an on-the-ground working station especially for the purpose of establishing and managing the plantation: the Kökyar Greening Project Water Management Station (from here on referred to as Water Management Station) and the Kökyar Greening Project Protection Forest Management Station (from here on referred to as Forest Management Station) with a staff of about 50 persons each (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; interview 1). The main task of the River Management Department and its local Water Management Station lay in preparing the planting ground through spatial planning, bulldozing the terrain, establishing a road network, building irrigation canals and providing water resources (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; interview 1), while the main task of the Forestry Department and its local Forest Management Station lay in

1680

fee of CNY 30 people had to pay in case they were unable to attend to compulsory labour (interview 1; value not adjusted for inflation. Multiplying the value of this fee by 346 000 performed man-days, and further adding tool and transportation costs, reveals that compulsory labour, in fact, was the largest single expense of Kökyar I (interview 1; Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). Adjusted for inflation and calculated per area, the overall establishment costs of Kökyar I amount to CNY 61 245 ha⁻¹ or, if compulsory labour is excluded from the calculation, CNY 38 700 ha⁻¹ (cf. Table 2).

The validity of this cost calculation for Kökyar I, as it is given in the Kökyar Annals, can be cross-checked by comparison to the costs given for Kökyar III in another publication: a 2006 publication of the title “Green Kökyar” indicates the establishment costs of Kökyar III based on the examples of one single investor commanding over 333 ha and a group of 13 investors commanding over 1200 ha (Aksu Prefectural Greening Committee, 2006). Adjusting their costs from inflation and calculating them per area allows a comparison between the establishment costs of Kökyar I and Kökyar III (cf. Table 3).

The comparison shows that installation costs of both project periods are, roughly speaking, of the same magnitude. The coherence between those numbers can be taken as evidence that the cost calculation of Kökyar I is realistic, and that the costs of the past are transferrable to the present. The fact that per-area costs of Kökyar III appear to be slightly lower than the costs of Kökyar I could be explained either by the superior work efficiency or inferior work quality of the private sector approach.

4 The present functioning of the Kökyar Protection Forest

4.1 The leasing system

Back in 1987, when afforestation work was still in the early stages, the Forest Management Station and Water Management Station, out of the dire financial situation, came up with a leasing system that is fundamentally still in force today: plots of already

1683

planted orchards, and plots which were ready for planting were offered to private leasers (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). Leasing contracts guarantee them, for a period of about 10 to 15 years, a small section of orchard land (mostly between 0.5 and 1 ha), regular irrigation water supply and some technical advice in fruit production. On this basis, an apparently satisfactory farming income can be generated by the leasers (socio-economic household survey 2012). The leasers, in return, have to pay a substantial lease and an irrigation water fee. Additionally, they have certain duties and prohibitions. The main duty is to annually attend 7 to 50 days of compulsory labour, which is mostly maintenance work on the shelterbelt plantations and the irrigation canals. The main prohibition is not to damage the poplar plantations by cutting of trees or branches (even if they overshadow fruit trees) or by grazing. The leasers have to compensate any loss of poplar trees on their area. Some contracts further contain prohibitions to change the cultivation from fruit trees to field crops, although it is anyhow economically the most promising to cultivate fruit trees (socio-economic household survey 2012).

This system of economic incentives and regulative norms, as it is fixed in the lease contracts, guarantees the cultivation and persistence of vigorous orchards amongst undamaged poplar shelterbelts, it provides free labour for the maintenance of infrastructure and poplar shelterbelts, and it ensures an income to the lessor organisations that they can reinvest into the plantation. The project leaders soon recognised the leasing system as an instrument to successively transform Kökyar from a purely government-sponsored protection forest into a self-supporting protection forest (Aksu Prefectural Greening Committee, 2006). Consequently, they try to set the lease as high as possible, without the leasers backing out (interview 1; socio-economic household survey 2012).

Kökyar II is organised in parallel to Kökyar I.

Kökyar III also features an orchard leasing system, with the main difference being that the local government withdraws and private large-scale investors step into the role of the governmental lessor organisations: they act as main tenants who first make the

necessary infrastructure investments and then sublease their huge estates in small patches to hundreds of leasing households, compensating their initial investment costs with income from the subleases. The exact conditions under which the main tenants obtain land from the government are presently unknown, as are the conditions under which they sublease it. However, it seems that privatisation of the protection forest business has advanced the idea of converting Kökyar into a self-supporting system, as government grants have been reduced substantially ever since (Aksu Prefectural Forestry Department and Kuqa Television Station, 2006).

4.2 The perspective of Aksu citizens

The Kökyar Protection Forest is assumed to provide vital regulating ecosystem services for the nearby inhabitants of Aksu City, such as extreme temperature alleviation, wind speed reduction, air humidification, air filtration, and soil fixation (Yimit et al., 2006; Halik, 2003). Among these, wind speed reduction, air filtration and soil fixation are the most important items, since this combination of ecosystem services has the effect of dust and sand storm mitigation, the primary reason for which Kökyar Protection Forest was initiated. It is well documented that there was a notable improvement in the dust and sand storm situation of Aksu City after the establishment of Kökyar Protection Forest (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 2006; Halik, 2003; Aksu citizens interviews 2011; socio-economic household survey 2012). However, the precise contribution of Kökyar to this positive development is hard to determine, since there are more contributing factors in addition to Kökyar, such as the extension of the irrigated agricultural area around Aksu, the reduction in livestock densities in the surrounding semi-deserts, and fluctuations in precipitation patterns (interview 2; Yimit et al., 2006; Yang and Cui, 2006). The first volume of the Kökyar Annals illustrates the Kökyar effect by presenting figures for reduced wind-borne sand events between the years in three periods between 1954 and 1990 (cf. Table 4; Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996).

1685

The figures demonstrate, first of all, that the situation in Aksu City and Onsu County Town, which are directly adjacent to Kökyar Protection Forest, improved considerably over this period, whilst at the Fifth Corps of the First Agricultural Brigade, which is 60 km away from Kökyar (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996), wind-borne sand events remained frequent – thus indicating that *local* measures have caused this improvement. Furthermore, the table demonstrates that the situation at Aksu and Onsu was relatively stable between the first two periods, but suddenly grew massively better in the third period – thus indicating that a *new* measure starting from 1987 must have caused the improvement. Spatial and temporal coincidences combine to provide strong evidence for Kökyar being the main factor effecting the reduction of sand storm events.

This data set, however, does not clarify the physical properties of the alleged reduction, whereby the term “wind-borne sand events” obscures the duration of each “event” as well as the concentration of airborne particles. The second volume of the Kökyar Annals does present dust quantities by annual averaged densities of “total suspended particles” (TSP), but only for the years from 1996 till 2006, thus not allowing a comparison with the previous years (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 2006). For clarification of the exact dust and sand storm mitigation effect of Kökyar Protection Forest, more research is necessary.

Methods for the economic valuation of ecosystem services could theoretically attach annual monetary values to dust and sand storm mitigation effects. The Kökyar Annals indeed present a precise figure for the Kökyar Protection Forest, attaching a value of CNY 285 ha⁻¹ to the joint effect of airborne sand reduction and soil fixation (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; value adjusted for inflation). However, this figure is cited from a publication which is not focused on peri-urban protection forests in drylands, but rather aims at estimating an average Chinese forest value (Qi, 2007; Lang and Li, 2000). Since Kökyar Protection Forest is established precisely on the largest dust fields in the region where it has the maximal impact on a large urban population in immediate vicinity, it is expected to have a far above-average value, and the presented

1686

figure is likely to understate the true monetary value of Kökyar's regulating ecosystem services.

Because of uncertainties in respect to the physical properties as well as the monetary value of the dust and sand storm mitigation effect exerted by the Kökyar Protection Forest, this paper refrains from expressing the benefits of its regulating ecosystem services in monetary terms. Yet, the principal fact that Kökyar significantly reduces dust and sand storms appears to be beyond doubt.

4.3 The perspective of the farmers

The following description of the socio-economic situation of the Kökyar farmers is based on a household survey conducted in 2012 on the area of Kökyar I. The transferability of the survey to Kökyar II and III is uncertain. Their leasing conditions may differ, while the market and environmental conditions are very similar.

The Kökyar I leasers recruit mostly from the huge pool of Han-Chinese migrant workers who jump at the chance to get settled there with their families (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; socio-economic household survey 2012). Families mostly have 2 to 5 members and both husband and wife are involved in farm work. During harvest time they may hire additional seasonal workers, while in winter some use their spare time to make extra money on Aksu City construction sites. Their main agricultural income is generated by the cultivation of fruit trees and the resulting harvests. In addition, many leasers can create indirect incomes from their land: dead wood is used as fencing material or as fuel substituting coal; small scale horticulture and husbandry beneath the fruit trees contribute to subsistence; animal dung provides some quantities of fertilizer. However, these indirect income items, although doubtlessly contributing to the living conditions of the farmers, are presently not quantifiable and cannot be incorporated into the subsequent income calculations.

The leasing contracts usually assign areas between 0.5 and 1 ha to the households, with some outliers at 2 or 3 ha, thus fostering small-scale farming. The lease is tailored to the age of the fruit trees and expected yield, shifting between 0 and CNY 15 000 ha⁻¹.

1687

Irrigation water fees usually fall between 1125 and CNY 1275 ha⁻¹. A high share of leasers additionally have to perform compulsory labour of up to 50 man-days per year, its value being assessable by the fees they have to pay in case they are prevented. Besides the fixed costs for the lease, irrigation water and compulsory labour, the leasers need to make annual farming investments in fertilisers, pesticides, machinery, diesel, and harvest hands. While annual costs are rather steady, annual incomes vary from year to year, since the yields depend on weather conditions, pests, and natural fructification alternations (cf. Table 5). The net income shifts between CNY 55 166 ha⁻¹ in a year of good harvest (2010) and CNY 11 465 ha⁻¹ in a year of bad harvest (2011), with the long-term average being CNY 47 376 ha⁻¹.

Based on the household survey conducted in 2012, it can be estimated that the household members on average have to spend 180 man-days per leased hectare per year (socio-economic household survey 2012). Net farming incomes per working day can be calculated by dividing per-hectare net farming incomes by per-hectare work load (cf. Table 6).

While years of good harvests appear to provide satisfying incomes, years of bad harvest result in marginal incomes, with the income per man-day lying below the wage level of migrant workers and seasonal workers (socio-economic household survey 2012; interview 3). With such strong year-to-year variability, it is hard to evaluate their long-term income situation. However, from the perspective of the farmers themselves, the actual conditions seem to be promising on the long run, since during the household survey conducted in 2012 nearly all of them were optimistic for the future and declared themselves willing to sign up for the next leasing period (socio-economic household survey 2012).

4.4 The perspective of the governmental organisations

The governmental organisations running the Kökyar Protection Forest (i.e. the Water Management Station and Forest Management Station as subsidiary bodies of the

Aksu River Drainage Area Management Department and the Aksu Prefectural Forestry Department) are the organisational backbone of the system. They are responsible for tending the shelterbelts, maintaining roads and canals, operating the irrigation system, managing and enforcing the leasing system, and educating leasers in the cultivation of fruit trees. To fulfil these indispensable tasks, they are equipped with all necessary resources and staff, involving substantial costs (Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 2006; interview 1). A part of the costs can be covered by lease payments and irrigation water fees derived from the leasing households, yet from the perspective of the government budget, the system is far from economic self-sufficiency (interview 1). As it was not possible to conduct interviews with the persons responsible for the Kökyar project, no exact data on permanent government grants could be gathered. However, an interview with the former head of the Forest Management Station revealed that the Water Management Station and the Forest Management Station can only cover 30 % of their expenses with the income generated from the lease and irrigation water fees. The remaining 70 % of their budget is being covered by government grants (interview 1). Lease payments and irrigation water fees can be assessed at an amount of CNY 5.765 million (CNY 8979 ha⁻¹ lease and CNY 1324 ha⁻¹ water fees, multiplied by 560 ha extant orchard area within Kökyar I (socio-economic household survey 2012; Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996). This being their self-generated income share of 30 %, the other 70 % covered by governmental grants must amount to CNY 13.451 million, and the total budget must add up to CNY 19.215 million. Unfortunately, it is unknown how the budget is divided between the orchards and the shelterbelts.

In the very near future, the poplar shelterbelts will provide an additional income to the Water and Forest Management Station. Besides their protective value to the orchards, they also have a direct economic value in their timber, which needs to be harvested before becoming over-mature. The earliest planted poplars are already almost fit for cutting. As soon as a systematic harvest begins, an annual wood increment of 21.5 m³ ha⁻¹ at a value of CNY 8545 ha⁻¹ can be logged in the shelterbelt areas

1689

(Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996; monetary value adjusted for inflation). As investment costs for the shelterbelts are unknown, there is no way to determine the net income they provide. However, a comparison between the expected gross timber income of CNY 8545 ha⁻¹ and both the gross and net income of the orchards (CNY 78 704 ha⁻¹, CNY 47 376 ha⁻¹; see above) already shows that the shelterbelts are being by far less profitable than the orchards.

A timber income of CNY 8545 ha⁻¹ translates into an overall timber income of CNY 4 785 144 for the area of Kökyar I (CNY 8545 ha⁻¹, multiplied by 560 ha extant shelterbelts). This additional income reduces necessary annual government grants from 70 to 45 % and, in absolute numbers, from 13.451 to CNY 8.666 million (values adjusted for inflation). Although a systematic harvest has not yet begun, timber is integrated into the income calculation, since it has regular annual increments which the governmental organisations could convert into income at any time. Incomes and costs of the two Stations are summarised in Table 7.

4.5 The perspective of the local economy

The Kökyar Protection Forest originated from the idea of protecting Aksu City against dust and sand storms. Yet, the invention of the orchard leasing system between the poplar shelterbelts gradually transformed it into a prospering branch of the local economy. However, this branch is still dependent on annual government grants for the maintenance, regulation, and organisation tasks performed by the Water and Forest Management Station. This section sets out to clarify whether the government grants to Kökyar are justified solely by the protective ecosystem functions it provides, or whether it also benefits the local economy.

This question can be answered by summing up all types of costs and incomes, as they were outlined in the previous sections, and calculating the net benefit. But prior to this, the figures of the previous sections need to be transformed to fit the needs of the net benefit calculation: firstly, from the perspective of local economy it is necessary to account for the time farmers work in their orchards as an additional farming

Comparing the initial investment costs of CNY 61 245 ha⁻¹ with the overall annual net benefit of CNY 10 530 ha⁻¹ shows that net benefits at the current level would offset initial investment costs within merely 6 years. However, this is not the actual payback period, since within the first 10 to 15 years after initialisation, fruit trees had not reached full fructification, and consequently there were no or only marginal annual net benefits. The actual historic development of the net benefit has not been researched, but under the simplified assumption of a linear net benefit development from CNY 0 ha⁻¹ in the first project year to CNY 10 530 ha⁻¹ in the 25th project year, the payback period can be roughly approximated at 20 years. In the case of Kökyar II and III, the payback period can be assumed to be shorter, due to their higher orchard share.

6 Discussion and outlook

The paper describes the historic establishment and present functioning of Kökyar Protection Forest with regard to the operational processes as well as with regard to the financial conditions.

Concerning the operational processes, the paper could describe Kökyar I in satisfactory detail, due to the available systematic documentation (especially the Kökyar Annals) and additional field research (Kökyar household survey, expert interviews). Since Kökyar II is organised in the same way as Kökyar I, its operational processes are adequately covered by the description of Kökyar I. The differing operational processes of Kökyar III, however, could not be described at the same detail due to the lack of systematic documentation. Further research could clarify the functioning of the new privatised approach chosen in Kökyar III, especially in comparison to Kökyar I and II.

Concerning the description of the financial conditions, the paper could reliably determine the establishment costs of Kökyar I based on sound sources, and there is good evidence that the figure are broadly transferable to Kökyar II and III. The present financial conditions of the Kökyar Protection Forest, by contrast, have formerly not been subject to any publications, and the authors could base their calculations only on their

1693

own socio-economic household survey and additional interviews. These calculations are based on a sample size of 19 leasing households within the area of Kökyar I. A bigger sample size, also comprising leasing households of Kökyar II and III, would have made the results more reliable. Furthermore, it would have been desirable to conduct interviews with leaders of the governmental organisations of Kökyar I and II, and with large private landholders of Kökyar III. However, this appears to be hard to achieve under the present political tensions in Xinjiang and the resulting scepticism towards any type of social surveys.

For a more comprehensive understanding of the costs and benefits of the Kökyar Protection Forest, future research should be directed towards two main fields. Firstly, the exact physical properties of the regulating ecosystem services provided by the Kökyar Protection Forest still need to be determined, especially regarding the amount of dust and sand avoided in the city of Aksu. Secondly, the negative consequences of the Kökyar water consumption for downstream ecosystems need to be investigated. Principally, every drop of water diverted from Aksu River for the purpose of irrigating the Kökyar Protection Forest is detracted from its lower reaches and its main stem, the Tarim River. The resulting desiccation of downstream ecosystems and the consequent loss of downstream ecosystem services may challenge the positive image of Kökyar Protection Forest.

Appendix A: List of interviews

Interview 1

Interviewee: Ibrahim Yusup, between 1986 and 1995 head of the Kökyar Greening Project Protection Forest Management Station

Interviewers: Siegmund Missall, Abdulla Abliz, Aliya Badrulla

Place and date: Urumqi, 15 October 2012

1694

Table 7. Annual incomes and costs of the Water and Forest Management Station for Kökyar I.

Income and cost item	Adjusted for inflation [CNY million]
Gross income	
Lease income	5.024
Irrigation water income	0.740
Timber	4.785
Costs	
Total costs	19.215
Net income	
Loss, covered by regular government grants	-8.665

1703

Table 8. Annual benefits and costs of Kökyar I from the perspective of local economy.

Benefit and cost item	Adjusted for inflation [CNY million]
Gross benefits	
Fruit harvests (long-term average)	44.038
Timber	4.785
Lease income	5.024
Irrigation water income	0.741
Costs	
Lease payments	5.024
Irrigation water fees	0.741
Compulsory labour	0.601
Fertilisers	6.447
Pesticides	3.008
Machines and diesel	0.627
Harvest hands	1.939
Opportunity costs of farm work	5.198
Expenses of the governmental organisations	19.215
Net benefit	
Annual financial net benefit for the local economy	11.789

1704




Figure 1. Geographic position of Aksu City in the Tarim Basin, northwest China (adapted from Paproth and Pietsch, 2011).

1705




Figure 2. The project areas of Kökyar I, II, III, and IV (partial view; adapted from Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 2006).

1706



Figure 3. Aerial view of the northern edge of Kökyar I (adapted from Aksu Prefectural Greening Committee, 2006).

1707




Figure 4. Compulsory labour on the Kökyar fields (adapted from Kökyar Annals Compilation Committee, 1996).

1708




Figure 5. Graphic summary of the cost and benefit flow of Kökyar I (red arrows representing costs, black arrows monetary benefits).