

1 **Does Environmental Certification in Coffee Promote “Business As Usual”? A**
2 **Case Study from the Western Ghats, India**

3 **Arshiya Bose¹, Bhaskar Vira² and Claude Garcia³**

4
5 **Does Environmental Certification in Coffee Promote “Business As Usual”? A**
6 **Case Study from the Western Ghats, India**

7 **Abstract**

8 Conservation initiatives are designed to address threats to forests and biodiversity,
9 often through partnerships with natural-resource users who are incentivized to change
10 their land-use and livelihood practices in order to avoid further biodiversity loss. In
11 particular, direct incentives programmes that provide monetary benefits are
12 commended for being effective in achieving conservation across short timescales. In
13 biodiversity-rich areas outside protected areas, such as coffee agroforestry systems,
14 direct incentives such as certification schemes are used to motivate coffee producers
15 to maintain native tree species, natural vegetation, restrict wildlife hunting and
16 conserve soil and water, in addition to encouraging welfare of workers. However,
17 despite these claims, there is a lack of strong evidence of the on-ground impact of
18 such schemes. To assess the conservation importance of certification, we describe a
19 case study in the Western Ghats biodiversity hotspot of India, in which coffee growers
20 are provided price incentives to adopt Rainforest Alliance certification standards. We
21 analyze the conservation and social outcomes of this programme by studying peoples’

¹ Department of Geography, University Of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge CB2 3EN, United Kingdom and arshiyabose@gmail.com

² Department of Geography, University Of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge CB2 3EN, United Kingdom and bv101@cam.ac.uk.

³ Forest Management and Development (ForDev), CHN F 75.2, Universitaetstraase 168092 Zurich, Switzerland and claudio.garcia@usys.ethz.ch

22 experiences of participating in certification. Despite high compliance and effective
23 implementation, we find a strong case for the endorsement of ‘business as usual’ with
24 no changes in farm management as a result of certification. We find that such
25 ‘business as usual’ participation in certification creates grounds for diminishing
26 credibility and local support for conservation efforts. Working towards locally
27 relevant conservation interventions, rather than implementing global blueprints, may
28 lead to more meaningful biodiversity conservation and increased community support
29 for conservation initiatives in coffee landscapes.

30 **1. Introduction**

31 In the recent past, normative frameworks for social justice, environmental issues and
32 business ethics were vocalised by governments, labour unions and even religious
33 institutions. However, in the current scenario of globalising economies, ideas and
34 cultures in which social and environmental issues are transnational rather than
35 national, regulation of these norms are increasingly provided by a new set of actors,
36 such as NGOs, businesses and public-private partnerships (Giovannucci and Ponte
37 2005, Raynolds et al. 2007). In this ‘regulatory wake’ (Raynolds et al. 2007:147),
38 national and transnational actors promote new governance mechanisms or voluntary
39 regulatory systems such as certification, eco-labelling and production standards.
40 These voluntary systems act as market-based incentives, which identify and reward
41 commodities that are produced under acceptable social and environmental conditions
42 (Muradian and Pelupessy 2005). As conscientious consumers embrace certification
43 labels as guarantees of ethical and sustainable practices, certification schemes have
44 expanded across the globe and most notably in Europe and North America (Linton
45 2005, Giovannucci et al. 2008). This is particularly valid for global agrifood systems,
46 wherein governments were historically responsible for monitoring food safety and

47 quality standards and providing an assurance to the public about the conditions of
48 production. However, with a globalisation of the agrifood industry and the rise in
49 private retailers setting their own standards, there has been a shift in governance from
50 public to private actors, and indeed third-party certifiers (Hatanaka et al. 2005).

51 The coffee industry has been one of the most active spaces for voluntary regulatory
52 standards through certification oriented towards traceability, environmental
53 sustainability, fair treatment of workers, quality and price security (Marie-Vivien et
54 al. 2014). Most of these regulatory regimes are third-party certifications, with
55 potential to transform governance of global coffee chains (Muradian and Pelupessy
56 2005). A glance at a supermarket shelf reveals a diversity of packages branded with
57 imagery of resplendent tropical birds, shade trees, faces of farmers and geographic
58 origins. A closer look reveals stamps of certification labels; Fair Trade, Organic, Bird-
59 Friendly, Starbuck's C.A.F.E. Practices, UTZ-Certified and Rainforest Alliance
60 (Bacon 2010, Jha et al. 2011). This paper focuses on Rainforest Alliance (RA)
61 certification, one of the most widespread environmental certifications in the coffee
62 industry with 5.4% of the world's coffee as RA certified (3.7% of RA's certified
63 coffee comes from India) (SAN 2015).

64 The research framework for this study emerged from academic and policy discourses
65 on market-based incentives or direct payments for conserving biodiversity. Given this
66 starting point, our hypothesis was that RA certification was designed specifically to
67 achieve environmental change. The Alliance's stated mission is to "conserve
68 biodiversity and ensure sustainable livelihoods by transforming land-use practices,
69 business practices and consumer behaviour" (RA 2016). RA states, "We believe that
70 the best way to keep forests standing is by ensuring that it is profitable for businesses

71 and communities to do so. [...]. Once businesses meet certain environmental and
72 social standards, we link them up to the global marketplace where demand for
73 sustainable goods and services is on the rise” (RA 2016). Our assumption therefore,
74 was that RA certification had been a key driver of land-use and farming practices
75 amongst coffee growers who participated in RA certification. We also hypothesized
76 that coffee growers face significant economic costs associated with the actions needed
77 to meet certification standards, making certification price premiums a significant
78 driver of participation and influencer of farming and land-use practices in the region.
79 In 2010, Blackman and Rivera published an important study on the evidence base for
80 social and environmental impacts of sustainable certifications. They concluded that a
81 lack of empirical evidence and adequate counterfactuals made it difficult to draw any
82 conclusions about whether certifications had long-lasting impacts. In this study we
83 draw from their conclusions and identify further empirical gaps, such as a critical lack
84 of information on the perceptions of participating landowners (in this case coffee
85 growers) towards certification schemes (Siedenburg et al. 2012). We aim to better
86 understand the implications of sustainable coffee certifications by delving into the
87 lived experiences of producers. This study asks two questions: (a) how do coffee
88 growers experience changes associated with RA certification; (b) what are the impacts
89 of peoples’ experiences on their views and overall willingness to participate in
90 conservation projects?

91 We explore these questions by carrying out detailed case study research of Rainforest
92 Alliance certification in Kodagu District, India.

93 **2. Study Site and Methods**

94 This study was carried out over a period of fifteen months from 2011 to 2014 in

95 Kodagu district in the state of Karnataka. The district falls within the Western Ghats,
96 one of 34 global ‘biodiversity hotspots’ (Mittermeier et al. 1998, Myers et al. 2000).

97 Coffee is one of the key drivers of the regional economy and the cultural identity of
98 Kodagu (Sathish et al. 2006, Ghazoul et al. 2009). Kodagu is the largest coffee
99 producing districts in India, producing about 37% of the total volume of green coffee
100 in India (CBI 2016). As of today, coffee plantations in the district cover a total of
101 104,000 ha (75,500 ha of Robusta [*Coffea canephora*] and 28,500 ha of Arabica
102 [*Coffea Arabica*]), with a production of 120,916 metric tonnes (CBI 2016). Coffee
103 production provides direct employment for about 500,000 people in India and
104 250,000 in Kodagu alone (Lee and Lee 2010). In fact, India is a comparatively lesser-
105 known but fairly significant producer, ranking 6th in the world for green coffee
106 production (ICO 2016).

107 The landscape of Kodagu is a complex mosaic of multiple elements, many of which
108 are tree based. Trees, in one form or the other, cover over 78% of the district. Outside
109 of protected areas, the district harbors about a thousand sacred groves under more or
110 less formal community management. Private owners control shaded-coffee
111 plantations and a few scattered remnants of private forest or cardamom plantations not
112 yet converted into coffee. Shade-grown coffee plantations comprise 33% of the tree
113 cover of the district (Bhagwat et al. 2008). Unlike other coffee production areas in the
114 world, farmers maintain multi-storied coffee agroforestry system for a variety of
115 reasons, including but not restricted to tenure rights, timber and pepper production,
116 and the protection of the coffee flower buds during the dry season (Garcia et al.
117 2010). As many of these trees are the remnants from the former forest covering the
118 district, shaded coffee plantations in Kodagu have a very high biodiversity, and are

119 shown to play a role in conservation outside protected areas (Depommier 2003,
120 Bhagwat et al. 2005, Garcia et al. 2009, Ghazoul et al. 2009). Tree densities on an
121 estate range from 285 to 1471 trees per hectare, a figure that is comparable to that of
122 surrounding forests (Desjeux 1999).

123 However, this landscape is undergoing transformations linked to the intensification of
124 coffee production, many of these leading to a biodiversity loss. Garcia et al. (2009)
125 suggest that 30% of forest cover was lost between 1977 and 1997 while the area under
126 coffee doubled, particularly between 1982 and 1986. The environmental impact of
127 intensification of coffee cultivation in Kodagu is well documented. Research projects
128 have studied the impact of intensification on tree biodiversity, bird and insect
129 diversity and pollination services (Muschler 2001, Vaast et al. 2006, Rao 2011, Garcia
130 et al. 2010, Bal et al. 2011). Therefore the three major drivers of this change are (a)
131 the loss of forest cover and expansion of commercial croplands; (b) the reduction of
132 shade canopy on coffee plantations; and (c) the increase of the proportion of exotic
133 tree species in the canopy.

134 Semi-structured and open-ended interviews constitute the main research method for
135 this study. Interviews were conducted through clustered sampling based on groups of
136 certified and non-certified farmers. A total of 222 coffee growers were covered,
137 including 142 certified and 80 non-certified producers. The average size of
138 landholding was 5.32 hectares (n=222). Each farmer incurred mean production costs
139 of USD\$ 1180.4 per hectare (n=222) and yielded an average output crop of 2968.75
140 kilograms of coffee cherry per acre or approximately 1,662 kgs of green coffee per
141 hectare (n=222). (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics about coffee producers
142 interviewed in this study).

143 Narratives of change were the primary qualitative method used to explore the
144 perception of shade-grown certification by coffee growers. This was adapted from the
145 ‘Most Significant Change’ (MSC) technique that was developed for use by
146 international development organisations to monitor the impact of their projects
147 (Davies and Dart 2005). In developing these narratives of change coffee growers were
148 asked to reflect on the most significant changes they had experienced as a result of
149 participating in RA certification. Data from open-ended interviews was recoded to
150 glean key elements of the interviewee’s response to questions on changes experienced
151 as a result of RA certification. This process yielded three narratives on peoples’
152 experiences for participating in RA certification. Additionally, semi-structured
153 questionnaires were used to collect data on farmers’ perceptions of changes in yield
154 and production costs and contribution of price premiums to annual. In addition, direct
155 evidence was collected on the average density of shade trees per acre, including exotic
156 silver oak to draw comparisons between certified and non-certified farms.

157 **3. Results**

158 In order to qualify for certification, producers have to ensure that their management
159 practices comply with RA’s standards. Farms are verified by an external auditing
160 agency recruited directly by RA. In this case, IMO-Control (IMO) based in
161 Bangalore, India carries out annual audits to evaluate compliance with certification
162 standards. Once a farm is audited, its coffee is labeled as RA-certified and sold to
163 buyers of certified coffee. These certified buyers, mostly exporters purchase certified
164 coffee at a premium of between USD\$1 for unwashed Robusta and Arabica and
165 USD\$2 for washed Robusta and Arabica. Interviews with the audit agency and review
166 of official documents showed that coffee plantations in Kodagu demonstrated a high

167 degree of compliance with certification standards. It was difficult to directly verify
168 this given the sensitivity associated with carrying out random inspections of farms and
169 the confidentiality of evaluation reports. Auditors were also reluctant to share actual
170 statistics on percentage of farms that qualify or disqualify annually. However, an
171 auditor commented saying, “I have done dozens of audits and not had to disqualify
172 any farm. Everyone is compliant”. All certified producers also attested to being
173 audited before being awarded RA certification status. Given challenges of direct
174 evidence collection and the focus of our study on peoples’ lived experiences, the core
175 research approach was to create ‘Narratives of Change’.

176 **3.1 Narratives of Change**

177 RA certified coffee growers were requested to reflect on the certification process.
178 Interviewees were asked to create narratives on change that reflected their lived
179 experience of certification. For example, (a) have you modified farm management or
180 any practices in order to qualify for RA certification? ;(b) what (if any) have been
181 these modifications as a result of RA certification?; and (c) what are (if any) the
182 challenges associated with qualifying for certification? This generated three key
183 stories of change as described by certified coffee farmers, presented below:

184 **3.1(a) Business as usual scenario (69.01%):**

185 Most coffee growers in Kodagu experience RA certification as ‘business as usual’.
186 Farmers describe certification as a case where (a) almost negligible modifications are
187 required to farm management in order to qualify for RA certification or (b) in cases
188 where farm management modifications were required these were minor and easy to
189 follow.

190 For example, 69.01% (n=142) of certified producers claimed that negligible
191 modifications were required to farm management practice in order to qualify for RA
192 certification. Farmers said “Certification was a business as usual scenario” (Certified
193 Farmer (CF)-44), such that:

194 “It is very simple to follow certification rules. I did not need to make any big
195 changes to my estate’s management” (CF-23).

196 “My estate has always been eco-friendly. I didn’t have to do anything new to
197 get it certified” (CF)-10).

198 Farmers did not modify existing farming practices nor implement any additional
199 social or environmental standards in order to meet RA’s criterion. This view was
200 consistent across the range of RA standards concerning ecosystem conservation,
201 protection of water sources, wildlife conservation, occupational health and safety for
202 workers, community relations and integrated crop and waste management. For
203 example, an important critical criterion in RA standards prohibits the use of
204 agrochemicals mentioned in the List of Banned and Severely Restricted Pesticides in
205 the US by its Environmental Protection Agency or pesticides banned or severely
206 restricted in the European Union. In response to adequately meeting this criterion, a
207 certified grower commented, “I stopped using prohibited chemicals like Endosulfan
208 over 5 years ago. I did not alter what chemicals or pesticides I was using or not using
209 because of RA certification” (CF-130). While we did not directly test soil and water
210 composition to verify claims made by farmers, we are able to compare these
211 responses with those of non-certified growers. 135 of 142 certified coffee growers
212 claimed they were not using prohibited chemicals even before they joined RA
213 certification. In comparison 76 of 80 non-certified producers interviewed claimed

214 they did not use these chemicals. Seven certified coffee producers and four non-
215 certified producers asserted that many legally permitted chemicals are prohibited
216 chemicals sold under different manufacturing brands and therefore refused to answer
217 the question.

218 Concerning RA's critical criterion on wildlife protection, many certified and non-
219 certified growers claimed that traditional hunting was somewhat common despite it
220 being deemed illegal under the Wildlife Protection Act of India (1972) (WLPA).
221 However, all 142 of interviewed certified growers asserted that RA certification had
222 not added any additional wildlife protection measures to strengthen the
223 implementation of the WLPA or monitor wildlife present on coffee farms. RA
224 standards require farms to maintain a farm diary and record wildlife sightings. While
225 42.25% (60 of n=142) of certified growers had a folder for wildlife records as part of
226 the overall Farm Diary for RA, very few producers actually recorded sightings (7
227 individuals, 4.92%, n=142). These 7 growers also demonstrated that they had been
228 recording bird and wildlife sightings in journals even before they had decided to
229 participate in RA certification. For example, a farmer said, "I keep a field diary where
230 I record uncommon birds and wildlife. I enjoy watching wildlife. I was doing this
231 from many years before I joined RA certification" (CF-120). In fact, 8.75% or 7 of 80
232 non-certified growers also maintained similar wildlife journals.

233 When certified growers were asked whether they had found it challenging to meet
234 RA's standards, 84.50% (n=142) claimed that they had found qualifying easy and
235 straightforward. Describing the RA audit and qualification process, a producer stated
236 the following:

237 “I was first asked to join certification by Ecom⁴. One of their staff came to my farm
238 and explained RA certification. They said that I would not need to do much but I
239 could get a premium for my coffee. They would cover any certification fee so I agreed
240 just to see what it was all about. After some weeks someone from Ecom came back
241 and did a pre-audit. He told me I needed to put up signboards showing my coffee
242 storage godown and room where I keep any chemicals and fertilisers. A few months
243 later the auditors did a surprise inspection. Someone from Ecom called me the
244 evening before and said that he would bring the auditors the next morning. The
245 auditors came and spent about 2 hours on my farm. They walked around and
246 inspected my storage areas to see what types of chemicals were being used. They also
247 spoke to my workers in my absence and asked them about wages, health benefits and
248 whether they had to spray Endosulfan. They also asked me about a soil and water test
249 but I had already done these through the Coffee Board Research Station. I showed this
250 report to them which was a basic report telling me the pH and Nitrogen, Phosphorous
251 and Potassium composition of my soil. Then they looked at my wages diary and asked
252 me if I was employing children. I served them some of our farm’s coffee and a few
253 months later Ecom called me and said my farm had been RA certified. I have been
254 certified for three years and the audit is always the same” (CF-54).

255 Data from surveys shows that in 61.26% of audits (n=142), soil and water samples
256 were not directly tested and the qualification instead relied on most recent analysis
257 often conducted by the Coffee Board of India at the request of the producer.

258 When producers were asked to reflect on whether it was ‘difficult’ to qualify for
259 certification, 84.50% (n=142) said it was easy to qualify for certification, such as:

⁴ Ecom Trading Pvt. Ltd. is a buyer and exporter of coffee, including RA and UTZ-Certified coffees from India.

260 “Certification is no big deal to qualify for” (CF-23). In addition, 125 of 142 farmers
261 (88.02%) interviewed explained that they had experienced marginal or no increase in
262 production costs as a result of investments required by certification. The 17 farmers
263 who had experienced increased investments attributed it to the purchase of protective
264 gear for their workforce, which is required under the Occupation Health & Safety
265 standards of certification. The average production costs were USD\$434 for certified
266 Robusta farms and USD\$396.61 for non-certified Robusta farms. For Arabica,
267 production costs were USD\$504.76 per acre for certified farmers and USD\$ 644.37
268 per acre for non-certified farms.

269 Majority of certified producers, (98.59%, n=142) growers also stated they had
270 experienced no changes to coffee yields after certification. The average yield was
271 3162.5 kilograms of unwashed coffee cherry per hectare (or approximately 1771 kg of
272 green coffee) for certified growers (n=142) and 2913.5 kilograms per hectare
273 (1631.56 kgs of green coffee) for non-certified growers (n=80).

274 With regards to ecosystem management and RA’s standards on shade cover on coffee
275 farms, we found that both certified and non-certified farms had comparable density of
276 shade trees, including exotic silver oak (*Grevillea robusta*). For example, direct
277 evidence revealed that certified farms had on average 170.07 native tree species
278 (locally referred to as junglewood) per hectare while non-certified farms had 273.5
279 native trees per hectare (p=0.0424, Mann-Whitney Test). 29.39% of total shade trees
280 on certified farms (SD±57.2, mean=51.95%) were silver oak. This figure was 22.85%
281 (SD±51.3, mean=71.48%) for non-certified farms (p=0.0995, Mann-Whitney Test).
282 Furthermore, 94.36% (n=142) of certified growers said that neither certified buyers
283 nor auditors had actively encouraged shade-grown coffee during initial and follow up

284 meetings or inspections. Producers were told that RA is an environmental certification
285 but no further details on the different RA principles were shared.

286 When certified growers were asked to reflect on RA standards and shade cover, one
287 grower commented as follows:

288 “Planters are removing shade trees and planting exotics like silver oak but RA
289 certification is not preventing this because shade cover is an optional criterion and not
290 mandatory. When the auditors came I had to specially request them to mark that I was
291 following RA’s standards on shade cover (i.e. maintaining 40% shade and 12 tree
292 species per hectare) but the auditor did not know how to measure shade cover or
293 identify tree species to verify that it was indeed at least 12 species. I am a nature lover
294 but what about the hundreds of farmers who are deforesting?” (CF-79).

295 A representative from Ecom, a key buyer of RA certified coffee is quoted as: “Right
296 now maintaining 40% shade cover and 12 species per hectare is not a big issue. If RA
297 guidelines required farmers to maintain 60% or plant more junglewood species then it
298 would definitely impact our certification. If that is the case nobody will come and
299 join. Openly speaking planters are joining because not much is needed” (Ecom-2).

300 Furthermore, only four of 142 growers (2.81%) claimed that certification had
301 impacted their attitude towards conservation. These growers are quoted saying,

302 “I was always aware about the environment but you could say I am more
303 aware now. Only my attitude has changed. My practice is same as before”
304 (CF-26).

305 However, majority of respondents (97.18%, n=142) stated that certification had not
306 resulted in any changes in their attitudes towards ecologically acceptable farming

307 practices. Many of these growers also admitted that following certification had made
308 them “disappointed with certification” (CF-13), as demonstrated by the following
309 comment: “We always maintained this standard of production. It is not because of
310 certification that I am farming this way and even if we didn’t maintain these
311 standards, I don’t think we could have changed our practice so rapidly just for
312 certification” (CF-16).

313 Overall, the lived experience of RA certification is described by most participating
314 coffee growers as a ‘business as usual’ scenario.

315 **3.1(b) Bookkeeping as biggest change (17.60%):**

316 While the majority of certified farmers claimed that certification had resulted in no
317 significant changes in farming practices, a few farmers had experienced modifications
318 to the way they manage their plantations. These experiences of change, although
319 minor in the number of respondents who ascribed to the narratives, are nevertheless
320 relevant to gain a holistic understanding of how certification is perceived by coffee
321 farmers on the ground.

322 The majority of coffee growers who experienced changes to their estate as a result of
323 undertaking RA certification did so in the area of document management (17.60%,
324 n=142). Coffee farmers talked about increased ‘bookkeeping’ to refer to the additional
325 time and manpower invested in documentation required in certification. A significant
326 portion of increased documentation concerned financial management and account-
327 keeping concerning expenditures, which many growers claimed not to maintain in as
328 much detail prior to certification. In addition to maintaining accounts, certified
329 farmers are also required to maintain ‘Farm Diaries’. These diaries require farmers to
330 maintain records of the type, quantity and frequency of fertilisers and pesticides used.

331 The Farm Diary also consists of a record of meetings organised with plantation
332 workforce concerning occupation health and safety and training workshops on waste
333 management. The experience of “extra paperwork” (CF-1) has led to the perception
334 that the most critical change generated through RA certification has been increased
335 bookkeeping, as is verified by this statement by a certified farmer,

336 “Bookkeeping is more disciplined after certification. This is the biggest
337 change” (CF-17).

338 **3.1(c) Modifications in Occupational Health & Safety (13.38%):**

339 Of a total of 142 certified growers, 13.38% perceived certification standards as having
340 resulted in modifications in Occupational Health & Safety of farm workers. These
341 producers explain that the health and safety criterion requirements were experienced
342 as the most significant change resulting from certification, such as:

343 “The social obligations have become little more after certification.
344 Environmental conditions are not at all an issue” (CF-27).

345 In Kodagu, complying with RA’s certification standards on Occupational Health &
346 Safety has centred on the following activities: (a) providing plantation work force
347 with protective gear, e.g. rubber gloves, masks and coats to be used during application
348 of chemical sprays; (b) construction of shower facilities for workers; (c) construction
349 of additional toilets for workers; (d) construction of additional waste disposal units on
350 farm and (e) designating and clearly sign boarding storage areas for coffee and
351 chemical inputs. Farms who had to invest to purchase protective equipment directly as
352 a result of RA, spent USD\$192.30 as a one-time cost.

353 “Biggest change was to provide workers with protective equipment. I used to

354 give gloves from before but after certification I had to give masks and coat
355 also” (CF-35).

356 Finally, over 95.77% (n=142) of certified coffee growers interviewed said they were
357 ambivalent about continuing their participation in certification. In fact 61.97% (n=142)
358 of these certified growers claimed they were considering opting out of certification
359 within the next year. They cited their mistrust of certification as being the primary
360 rationale.

361 **4. Discussion**

362 This study explores the change experienced by coffee producers as a result of their
363 joining and qualifying for RA certification. We demonstrate through a ‘narratives of
364 change’ approach, corroborated with direct evidence concerning production costs,
365 coffee yields and presence of shade trees, that the majority of producers who
366 participate in RA certification experience it as maintaining ‘business as usual’. Those
367 coffee producers who claim to have changed their farm management practices
368 describe these changes in the area of increased book-keeping and documentation and
369 modifications in occupational health and safety. While certified producers would
370 describe book-keeping and occupational health and safety measures as minor
371 modifications, it could be argued that in fact RA’s most important impact has been to
372 ensure the safety of workers through the requirement of use of protective equipment.
373 Although occupational health and safety may not reflect in RA’s mission statement
374 and the number of producers who claim they have had to modify farm management in
375 this area, even 19 cases of increased safety for plantation workers should not be easily
376 discounted.

377 However, the ‘business as usual’ scenario raises concerns and questions about the

378 design and implementation of RA certification. Evidence from this study suggests that
379 the implementation and audits in particular, can be tightened such that the full
380 potential of existing RA standards is achieved. For example, if soil and water samples
381 from all certified farms is not directly tested by the auditors then the credibility
382 regarding the use of prohibited chemicals is difficult to verify. Furthermore there are
383 no clear stipulations on what methodology or lab tests would suffice and how recently
384 these tests need to have been conducted. Similarly, if auditors were unable to measure
385 shade canopy then it would be reasonable to assume that they would not actively
386 encourage the 40% shade and 12 species per hectare requirements.

387 **4.1. Hidden impacts of certification:**

388 At the outset, while RA certification may not be achieving significant environmental
389 outcomes, the business as usual scenario does not appear to be disruptive. Coffee
390 growers are certainly receiving price premiums for being RA certified, their farm
391 management and documentation systems are more streamlined and the occupational
392 health and safety of a few farms has been improved all as a result of participating in
393 certification. However a closer look at peoples' perceptions towards certification
394 revealed a growing disenchantment with such schemes that ultimately impacted
395 perceptions towards many other conservation projects in the region. The failure to
396 alter status quo has left imprints on farmers' perceptions about which activities and
397 ideologies constitute a conservation project. For example, reflecting on the experience
398 of participating in RA certification, certified coffee growers said the following:

399 “After doing certification, I don't understand what it means to grow
400 sustainable coffee” (CF-20).

401 “We have not done anything. I think certification is not at all concerned with

402 shade trees or environment” (CF-13).

403 “Why are you so interested to discuss conservation? They (referring to RA)
404 itself are not interested” (CF-28).

405 These comments indicate confusion, disillusionment with certification that seems to
406 stem from this experience of business as usual. Farmers have been recruited, audited,
407 approved and rewarded for maintaining status quo on their farm. Producers are
408 recruited, pre-audited, audited and awarded a certificate for few modifications,
409 especially concerning environmental impacts of their farming and land-use practices.
410 This experience has even caused suspicion regarding RA’s motives and this is evident
411 in the following comments:

412 “It is important to know what the goal of this project is. There is distrust in the
413 village because of lack of knowledge. More trust would make it a partnership.
414 Right now it is one-way traffic” (CF-18).

415 “Certification is started so traders can get more benefit than us. They get more
416 business and profit. Certification has nothing to do with farmers or
417 environment” (CF-7).

418 “Is it because RA wants my coffee? Are they keen about certification only to
419 get high quality coffee from India? We do not know what their terms are or
420 their main motive to go in for certification” (CF-30).

421 The lack of communication between RA, auditors, Ecom or other buyers of certified
422 coffee and coffee producers has played a significant role in allowing speculation and
423 mistrust of RA’s motives and the purpose of certification. None of the 142 certified
424 growers or 80 non-certified growers had ever interacted with an RA official. Their

425 first impression of RA certification is through communication with certified buyers
426 and auditors, neither of who appear to actively communicate the conservation motives
427 of RA standards. Producers are told RA is an environmental certification and a
428 signboard with RA's logo (a tree frog) is put up. However, we argue that a lack of
429 communication between RA representatives and producers is not the sole cause of this
430 growing discontent. Producers' disillusionment is further strengthened when they are
431 awarded a certificate without modifying many farm management practices, evident in
432 the following comment:

433 "I was Rainforest Alliance certified for 4 years but I did not have to do a single thing.
434 I do not think I am very eco-friendly but still I am given a certificate and premium.
435 Certifiers try to pull wool over my eyes but I know that certification is not for real
436 conservation" (CF-35).

437 RA certification is perceived as a market tool intended to serve the business interests
438 of coffee traders and exporters worldwide. The majority view is that the lack of
439 tangible changes to farm management is indicative of an underlying vested interest
440 that has not been openly communicated to farmers.

441 In some cases, we found that peoples' perceptions towards certification impacted their
442 perceptions towards conservation projects in general, even leading to an outright
443 rejection of conservation ideals. For example, a farmer is quoted as saying:

444 "If all environment projects are like certification, I am not interested in
445 keeping my shade trees" (CF-57).

446 Subsequent conservation projects have been received with scepticism on account of
447 peoples' participation in RA certification. For example, a local NGO attempting an

448 awareness campaign on the ecological importance of native shade trees was met with
449 considerable apprehension. An employee from this organisation said, “Planters tell me
450 that they already participated in a conservation scheme but it did not achieve
451 anything. They keep asking me if I, like RA have some ulterior motive and they are
452 reluctant to participate”.

453 In fact many certified growers repeatedly make reference to an underlying agenda or
454 vested interest in RA certification. For example, certified growers commented, “I am
455 RA certified and I did not have to stop or start doing anything differently. I know that
456 RA is certification is about biodiversity conservation because I see the frog label but
457 how is it that I can remove my shade trees and still be certified? There must be some
458 business agenda to certification that is not clear” (CF-31).

459

460 In this paper we argue that the growing discontent and perception of a hidden, vested
461 interest in RA certification stems from the experience of business as usual. These
462 perceptions of RA certification subsequently influence peoples’ perceptions towards
463 conservation projects and campaigns in general even if these are not associated with
464 RA.

465 **4.2 Limited impacts of RA certification**

466 The core focus of this paper is on producers’ perceptions of RA certification.
467 Empirical evidence presented in this paper cannot fully analyse why RA certification
468 standards present a business as usual scenario in Kodagu. However, empirical
469 evidence presented in this paper raises two important questions: (a) Are RA standards
470 themselves too low of a bar that allows nearly any coffee grower into the certification

471 programmes?; and (b) Is anyone allowed into certification regardless of whether they
472 meet the full criteria at the outset?

473 Based on the narratives of change and experiences of certified coffee producers,
474 primarily the business as usual scenario, evidence suggests that reality is a
475 combination of both these questions. It could be argued that RA environmental and
476 social standards are too low to drive significant modifications especially with respect
477 to specific conservation outcomes such as maintaining native shade tree species or
478 monitoring biodiversity. This study shows that the density of native shade trees and
479 exotic tree species was not statistically significant between RA certified and non-
480 certified farms. This finding is corroborated by existing ecological research in the
481 landscape that shows that the coffee agroforestry system in Kodagu is already fairly
482 biodiverse with tree densities comparable to natural forests (350 trees per hectare) and
483 species diversity (280 species have been documented across coffee farms with an
484 average of 55 species per hectare) (Garcia et al. 2010, Marie-Vivien et al. 2014, Rani
485 et al. 2011).

486 With regards to whether all producers qualify for certification at the outset, the data is
487 more ambiguous given that audit reports are not shared and auditors claim that all
488 farms qualify. However, this study also reveals that with respect to some criteria, most
489 notably the standards on chemical use, external evaluations are used to verify the use
490 of prohibited chemicals rather than direct verification. Such external evaluations raise
491 some questions about the chain of custody and auditing process.

492 Overall it could be argued that if RA's environmental standards were more specific
493 and stringent, the business as usual scenario would play out quite differently. Only
494 farms that met the criteria in their entirety would qualify for certification. Other farms

495 would have to make tangible modifications to farm management in order to be
496 certified. A set of standards that resulted in tangible steps towards the improvement of
497 ecosystem management could also address peoples' scepticism and mistrust of
498 certification, at least from the point of view of RA's environmental objective. In its
499 current avatar, RA certification is increasingly counterproductive and undermining
500 local support for conservation projects as whole.

501 An interesting analytical comparison is scholarship on peoples' perceptions towards
502 conservation projects (often in and around PAs) that restrict peoples' access and use.
503 In such cases, negative perceptions stems from the strict restrictions on livelihood and
504 land-use practices or in other words, imposing too much (Wells and McShane 2004).
505 In the case of RA certification in Kodagu, peoples' lack of support for conservation
506 efforts is rooted in mistrust emerging from a lack of visible restrictions on their
507 farming practices.

508 **5. Conclusion**

509 Sustainability certifications have expanded across the globe and now cover a wide
510 range of commodities, production systems and environmental and social concerns.
511 Despite their proliferation, evidence on their impacts is limited (Blackman and Rivera
512 2010) and recent scholarship has focussed on the technicalities of how to measure
513 impact and evaluate effectiveness. Tschardt et al. (2015) advocate numerous
514 recommendations to generate a more robust evidence base for impacts of certification,
515 such as credible counterfactuals and the use of standardised indicators of
516 sustainability. However, attention must also be directed towards fundamental
517 assumptions about the willingness and perceptions of landowners to participate in
518 such schemes. In this paper we highlight the perceptions of coffee growers

519 participating in RA certification and argue that the overall experience has been one of
 520 business as usual thereby leading to a growing discontent with conservation measures.
 521 We argue for a refined subset of standards that consider environmental threats and
 522 social concerns that are important at the landscape level but may be overlooked by the
 523 overall global certification. A global certification implemented in conjunction with a
 524 local conservation project or measures might be better suited to address both
 525 environmental outcomes as well as more adapted to alleviate peoples' mistrust
 526 towards such initiatives. One way to address this could be Landscape Labelling, as
 527 conceptualised by Ghazoul et. al (2009) and advocated more recently by Tscharnke
 528 et al. (2015) might offer a strategy that combines global certifications with locally
 529 meaningful PES schemes.

530 Finally this study also highlights the importance of implementing certification
 531 measures that are ultimately farmer-friendly and flexible in their implementation in
 532 design. In order for certification measures to attract and sustain large numbers of
 533 producers, its implementation has to consider local effects and then quickly modify its
 534 design so as to resolve any emerging issues. A credible way of achieving both
 535 flexibility and higher outcomes would be to develop country or region specific RA
 536 standards where coffee growers meet RA's global baselines standards but also receive
 537 additional price premiums or in-kind benefits (e.g. agronomic or quality enhancement
 538 support) for following these country-specific standards.

539 **Tables & Figures**

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Certified and Non-Certified Producers		
Characteristic	RA Certified Producer	Non-Certified Producer
Farm Size (ha)	4.68	5.92
Green Coffee Yield (kg/ha)	1771	1631.56
Production costs (USD\$/ha)	434	396.61
Native trees per hectare	170.07	273.5

Percentage of Silver Oak to total number of trees per hectare	29.39%	22.85%
---	--------	--------

540

Table 2	Ten Principles that Govern Rainforest Alliance's Sustainable Agriculture Certification
1.	Establishing and maintaining a social and environmental farm management system
2.	Ecosystem conservation through protection of waterways and wetlands
3.	Wildlife protection through monitoring presence
4.	Water conservation through monitoring of usage and non-contamination
5.	Fair treatment and good working conditions through prohibition of child labour and adherence of norms proposed by international bodies such as the United Nations and International Labour Organisation
6.	Occupational health and safety to reduce the risk of accidents
7.	Building community relations through consultation with surrounding farms about certification processes
8.	Integrated crop management through restriction of chemicals that pose danger to people and the environment.
9.	Soil management and conservation through prevention of erosion and reduction of chemicals use, wherever possible
10.	Integrated waste management through recycling, reducing consumption and safe disposal
Source:	(SAN 2010)

541

542 **Literature cited**

543 Bacon, C. M. (2010) "Who decides what is fair in fair trade? The agri-environmental
544 governance of standards, access, and price." The Journal of Peasant Studies, 37(1):
545 111-147.

546
547 Bal, P., C. D. Nath, K. M. Nanaya, C. G. Kushalappa and C. Garcia (2011).
548 "Elephants Also Like Coffee: Trends and Drivers of Human–Elephant Conflicts in
549 Coffee Agroforestry Landscapes of Kodagu, Western Ghats, India." Environmental
550 Management 47(5): 789.

551 Bhagwat, S., C. G. Kushalappa, P. H. Williams and N. Brown (2005) "The role of
552 informal protected areas in maintaining biodiversity in the Western Ghats of India."
553 Conservation Biology, 19: 1853-1862.

554 Bhagwat, S., K. J. Willis, J. B. Birks and R. J. Whitaker (2008) "Agroforestry: a
555 refuge for tropical biodiversity." Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 23(5): 261-267.

556 Blackman, A. and M. Naranjo (2010) "Does ecocertification have environmental
557 benefits: organic coffee in Costa Rica." Resources for the Future Discussion Paper:
558 10-25.

559 Blackman, A. and J. Rivera (2010) "The evidence base for environmental and

560 socioeconomic impacts of 'sustainable' certification." Discussion Paper, Resources for
561 the Future, RFF DP 10-17(March 2010).

562 Büscher, B. and W. Dressler (2007) "Linking neoprotectionism and environmental
563 governance: On the rapidly increasing tensions between actors in the environment-
564 development nexus." Conservation and Society, 5(4): 586.

565 CBI (2016) "Data Trends on Coffee Production in India." Coffee Board of India,
566 URL: <http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/about>, [Last accessed 12 April 2016].

567 Dart, J. and R. Davies (2003) "A dialogical, story-based evaluation tool: The most
568 significant change technique." American Journal of Evaluation, 24(2): 137-155.

569 Davies, R. and J. Dart (2005) The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique, *A*
570 *Guide to its Use*. URL: <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf> [Last accessed
571 12 April 2016].

572 Depommier, D. (2003) "The tree behind the forest: ecological and economic
573 importance of traditional agroforestry systems and multiple uses of trees in India."
574 International Society for Tropical Ecology, 44(1): 63-71.

575 Desjeux, Y. (1999) "Contribution des arbres d'ombrages des caféiers à
576 l'approvisionnement en bois de feu des petits planteurs du Coorg,(Karnataka, Inde du
577 Sud)." Mémoire de fin d'études, ENITA.

578 Garcia, C., D. Marie-Vivien, C. Kushalappa, P. G. Chengappa and K. M. Nanaya
579 (2007). "Geographical Indications and Biodiversity in the Western Ghats, India. Can
580 labeling benefit producers and the environment in a mountain agroforestry
581 landscape?" Mountain Research and Development 27(3): 206-210.
582

583 Garcia, C., S. Bhagwat, J. Ghazoul, C. D. Nath, K. M. Nanaya, C. G. Kushalappa, Y.
584 Raghuramulu, R. Nasi and P. Vaast (2009) "Biodiversity conservation in agricultural
585 landscapes: challenges and opportunities of coffee agroforests in the Western Ghats,
586 India." Conservation Biology, 24(2): 479-488.
587

588 Garcia, C. A., S. A. Bhagwat, J. Ghazoul, C. D. Nath, M. N. Konerira, K. G.
589 Cheppudira, Y. Raghuramulu, R. Nasi and P. Vaast (2010). "Biodiversity
590 conservation in agricultural landscapes: challenges and opportunities of coffee
591 agroforests in the Western Ghats, India." Conservation Biology 24(2): 479-488.
592

593 Garnett, S. T., J. Sayer and J. Du Toit (2007). "Improving the effectiveness of
594 interventions to balance conservation and development: a conceptual framework."
595 Ecology and Society 12(1): 2.
596

597 Ghazoul, J., C. Garcia and C. G. Kushalappa (2009). "Landscape labelling: A concept
598 for next-generation payment for ecosystem service schemes." Forest Ecology and
599 Management 258(9): 1889-1895.
600

601 Giovannucci, D., A. Byers and L. Pascal (2008) "Adding Value: Certified Coffee
602 Trade in North America." Munich Personal RePEc Archive, MPRA Paper No. 17174.
603

604 Grandia, L. (2007) "Between bolivar and bureaucracy: the Mesoamerican biological
605 corridor." Conservation and Society, 5(4): 478.
606

607 Hatanaka, M., C. Bain and L. Busch (2005) "Third-party certification in the global
608 agrifood system." Food Policy, 30(3): 354-369.
609

610 ICO (2016) Total Production by Exporting Countries, International Coffee
611 Organisation, URL: <http://www.ico.org/prices/po-production.pdf> [Last accessed 12
612 April 2016].
613

614 Jha, S., C. M. Bacon, S. M. Philpott, R. A. Rice, V. E. Mendez and P. Lederach
615 (2011) "A review of ecosystem services, farmer livelihoods, and value chains in shade
616 coffee agroecosystems", in (Eds.) Integrating Agriculture, Conservation and
617 Ecotourism: Examples from the Field. Springer: 141-208.
618

619 Lee, H. L., & Lee, C. Y. (Eds.). (2007). *Building supply chain excellence in emerging*
620 *economies* (Vol. 98). Springer Science & Business Media.
621

622 Linton, A. (2005) "Partnering for sustainability: business-NGO alliances in the coffee
623 industry." *Development in Practice*, 15(3-4): 600-614.
624

625 Marie-Vivien, D., C. A. Garcia, C. G. Kushalappa and P. Vaast (2014). "Trademarks,
626 Geographical Indications and Environmental Labelling to Promote Biodiversity: The
627 Case of Agroforestry Coffee in India." Development Policy Review 32(4): 379-398.
628

629 Mittermeier, R. A., N. Myers, J. B. Thomsen, G. A. Da Fonseca and S. Olivieri
630 (1998) "Biodiversity hotspots and major tropical wilderness areas: approaches to
631 setting conservation priorities." Conservation Biology, 12(3): 516-520.
632

633 Muschler, R. G. (2001) "Shade improves coffee quality in a sub-optimal coffee-zone
634 of Costa Rica." Agroforestry Systems, 85: 131-139.
635

636 Myers, N., R. A. Mittermeier, C. G. Mittermeier, G. A. Da Fonseca and J. Kent
637 (2000) "Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities." Nature, 403(6772): 853-
638 858.
639

640 RA (2016) "Rainforest Alliance: Our Mission", URL: [http://www.rainforest-](http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/about)
641 [alliance.org/about](http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/about) [Last accessed 12 April 2016].
642

643 Rani, P., Sathish, B., Mohana, G.S., Chittiappa, S. and C.G. Kushalappa (2011).
644 "Field Gude - Trees of Coffee Agroforestry Systems in Kodagu." CAFNET Project,
645 Forestry College, Ponnampet.
646

647 Rao, V. (2011) Impact of Grevillea robusta Composition on Bird Diversity in Coffee
648 Plantations in Cauavery Watershed Area of Coorg District, French Institute of
649 Pondicherry, Pondicherry.
650

651 SAN (2010). Sustainable Agriculture Standard. San Jose, Costa Rica, Sustainable
652 Agriculture Network.
653

654 SAN (2015). SAN/Rainforest Alliance Impacts Report: Evaluating the Effects of the
655 SAN/Rainforest Alliance Certification Systems of Farms, People and the
656 Environment. URL: http://www.san.ag/biblioteca/docs/SAN_RA_Impacts_Report.pdf
657 [Last accessed 12 April 2016].
658

659 Sathish, B., C. Kushalappa and S. Wall (2006) "An insight into the socio-economic
660 view of coffee based agroforestry systems of Kodagu: a small scale forestry Small-
661 scale forestry and rural development: the intersection of ecosystems, economics and
662 society." Proceedings of IUFRO 3.08 Conference, hosted by Galway-Mayo Institute
663 of Technology, Galway, Ireland, 18-23 June 2006., National Council for Forest
664 Research and Development (COFORD).
665

666 Siedenburg, J., A. Martin and S. McGuire (2012) "The power of "farmer friendly"
667 financial incentives to deliver climate smart agriculture: a critical data gap." Journal
668 of Integrative Environmental Sciences, 9(4): 201-217.
669

670 Tschardtke, T., Milder, J.C., Schroth, G., Clough, Y., DeClerck, F., Waldron, A.,
671 Rice, R., Ghazoul, J. (2015) Conserving Biodiversity Through Certification of
672 Tropical Agroforestry Crops at Local and Landscape Scales, Conservation Letters,
673 8(1), 14-23.
674

675 Vaast, P., R. Van Kanten, P. Siles, B. Dzib, N. Franck and J. M. Harmand (2006)
676 "Shade: a key factor for coffee sustainability and quality." Association for Science
677 and Information on Coffee: 887-896.
678

679 Wells, M. P. and T. O. McShane (2004). "Integrating protected area management with
680 local needs and aspirations." AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment **33**(8):
681 513-519.
682
683