LETTER • OPEN ACCESS

Drainage density and land cover interact to affect fire occurrence in Indonesian peatlands

To cite this article: R Salmayenti et al 2025 Environ. Res. Lett. 20 054036

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- Identification of dominant flood descriptors and their interaction with watershed morphology in central and southern peninsular regions of India Javesh Parmar and Subhankar Karmakar
- Sustainable freight transport: unpacking the influence of freight structure on carbon emission intensity based on empirical findings from chinese panel data Feng Xue, Lin Zhou, Linhong Wu et al.
- <u>Evaluating GEDI for quantifying forest</u> structure across a gradient of degradation in Amazonian rainforests Emily L Doyle, Hugh A Graham, Chris A Boulton et al.



247th ECS Meeting

Montréal, Canada May 18-22, 2025 Palais des Congrès de Montréal

> Register to save \$\$ before May 17

Unite with the ECS Community

UNITED

This content was downloaded from IP address 81.102.248.232 on 08/05/2025 at 16:07

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LETTERS

LETTER

OPEN ACCESS

CrossMark

RECEIVED 3 October 2024

REVISED

14 March 2025

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION 31 March 2025

PUBLISHED 15 April 2025

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence.

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.



Drainage density and land cover interact to affect fire occurrence in Indonesian peatlands

R Salmayenti^{1,3,*}, A J Baird², J Holden² and D V Spracklen¹

¹ School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

² School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

³ Department of Geophysics and Meteorology, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia

Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: eersal@leeds.ac.uk

Keywords: drainage, canal, peat fire, climate variability Supplementary material for this article is available online

Abstract

Fire occurrence in tropical peatlands is closely related to both land cover (LC) type and proximity to drainage (canal) networks. However, little is known about the extent to which LC and drainage density interact to alter fire occurrence. Here, we assess the relationship between these variables in the peatlands of Sumatra and Kalimantan, Indonesia, spanning a five-year period of inter-annual climatic variability. Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite imagery was used to map active fire hotspots. Drained peatlands experienced up to 13 times greater annual mean hotspot density (number of fire hotspots per km^2) when compared to peatlands without canals. The greatest difference in fire hotspot density between drained and undrained peatlands occurred in forested peatlands (by a factor of 2.6–13.3), followed by shrublands (1.1–7.6), crop lands (1.4–5.0) and plantations (1.2-2.6), where largest differences were found in El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) neutral years. We found a curvilinear relationship between hotspot density and canal density, with the relationship depending on LC and ENSO status. At low to moderate drainage density, hotspot density increased with drainage density in all LC types in 2013–2017. Heavily drained plantations experienced a lower hotspot density than moderately drained plantations possibly due to factors such as management practices or impacts of previous fire history. The relationship with drainage density was strongest in 2013, an ENSO-neutral year, and weakest in the strong El Niño of 2015. Our findings support the critical need for fire management in drained tropical peat areas. Peat fire management planning and peatland restoration should be tailored to the differing responses of fire to climate variability, drainage density and LC types.

1. Introduction

Peatlands cover around 4.04–4.23 M km² (Xu *et al* 2018, Melton *et al* 2022). Peat constitutes a major component of the terrestrial carbon (C) pool, storing more than 600 Gt C (Yu *et al* 2010), exceeding the 383–466 Gt C stored in vegetation (Watson *et al* 2000, Pan *et al* 2011). Tropical peatlands store 152–350 Gt C (Gumbricht *et al* 2017, Ribeiro *et al* 2021). However, ecosystem disturbances can shift peatlands from a carbon sink to a source (Hirano *et al* 2012, Turetsky *et al* 2015, Page and Baird 2016, Ribeiro *et al* 2021).

Burning of above-ground vegetation, and of the peat, leads to release of carbon to the atmosphere. Peat fires result in global annual emissions of 244–1459 Mt CO₂eq, with the highest contributions from tropical regions, especially Equatorial Asia with intensively burned peatlands (Prosperi *et al* 2020). Most peatland fires in this region occur in Indonesia, which contains 14.9 M ha of peatland (Ritung *et al* 2011). Peatland fire in Indonesia resulted in annual emissions of 12.5–822.7 Mt CO₂eq during 2000–2019 (MoEF 2021). The severe El Niño in 1997 resulted in extensive fires that released 2970–9423 Mt CO₂eq

from peat and vegetation (Page *et al* 2002), which is higher than the global annual average of carbon emissions from biomass burning (Prosperi *et al* 2020). Apart from decreasing C stocks, peat fires lead to a range of undesirable outcomes, from forest loss (Hoscilo *et al* 2011, Adrianto *et al* 2019) to economic costs (Kiely *et al* 2021). Peat fires also expose millions of people to dangerous levels of air pollution, leading to health problems and death (Kiely *et al* 2022).

Peatlands are generally combustible in dry conditions (Hayasaka 2023), and human actions, as well as extreme climatic events, may increase the frequency and intensity of fire (Sloan *et al* 2017). Fire occurrence in Indonesian peatlands is associated with the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Murdiyarso and Adiningsih 2007). The largest burn area occurs during the dry years following El Niño events, and the lowest burn area is found during La Niña years (MoEF 2022). Furthermore, projected drier conditions under future climate change (Li *et al* 2007, BMKG 2022) may escalate fire risk.

Previous studies have analysed the interactions between land cover (LC) change and peat fire at small scale (Miettinen et al 2017, Adrianto et al 2019, Vetrita and Cochrane 2019, Trancoso et al 2022). Forested peatlands in Sumatra and Kalimantan declined in area by more than half between 1990 and 2015 (The World Bank & BPS 2019), resulting in Indonesian peatlands becoming more vulnerable to fire. Peatland conversion is commonly accompanied by drainage infrastructure which has been extensively constructed across Indonesian peatlands (Dadap et al 2021) and which has impacts on carbon emissions (Hirano et al 2012). Water tables deepen in response to drainage (Basuki et al 2021, Hooijer et al 2012, Evans et al 2019, Deshmukh et al 2021), resulting in drier peatland that is more prone to fire (Tsuji et al 2021, Taufik et al 2022). Fire frequency, burn depth and burnt area are greater closer to canals than further away (Konecny et al 2016, Prayoto et al 2017, Glukhova and Sirin 2018). Rainfall and proximity to canals were key factors influencing peat fires in a 44 000 ha area in Central Kalimantan studied by Medrilzam et al (2017). Furthermore, Taufik et al (2019) suggested that drained areas experienced fire earlier in the dry season when compared to pristine peatlands.

The scale of drainage infrastructure varies depending on human activities. Each type of crop requires a specific range of water-table level, which may also vary depending on growing stage, for optimal production. For example, sago can grow in peatlands with shallow water tables (<50 cm below ground level), while oil palm requires deeper water tables (>50 cm below ground level) (Melling *et al* 2005, Matysek *et al* 2018) and needs a dense drainage network. This has resulted in a complex and varied drainage system across a range of LCs. However, it

remains unknown how fire occurrence varies with drainage density at a large scale under varied conditions including LC types and climate variability. Further assessment that integrates these variables is urgently required to improve understanding of how management changes have modified fire occurrence. This assessment is critical to informing peatland and fire management policy and practice as peatland conversion is still occurring, even while some restoration work has been conducted. In this study we provide that assessment by examining the role of drainage and LC across Sumatra and Kalimantan under a range of climate conditions characterised by ENSO.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study area

We assess relationships between drainage, landcover and fires across the peatlands of the Indonesian regions of Sumatra and Kalimantan which represent 78% of the Indonesian peatland area (Ritung *et al* 2011). Peatland extents were based on the peat map produced by the Indonesian Centre for Agricultural Land Resources Research and Development, Ministry of Agriculture (Ritung *et al* 2011), accessible via the global PeatMap by Xu *et al* (2018) at https://archive. researchdata.leeds.ac.uk/251/ (accessed in July 2023).

2.2. Datasets

The fires were represented by the active fire (hotspot) products of the Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite, from the Fire Information for Resource Management System (FIRMS), NASA. This product has a spatial resolution of 375 m with temporal coverage starting from January 2012. Daily hotspot data were collected from https://firms.modaps. eosdis.nasa.gov/download/ (accessed in July 2023). We also analysed other fire variables, including fire radiative power (FRP) from the same product and burnt area from MODIS (NASA) at https:// search.earthdata.nasa.gov/search?q=C2565786756-

LPCLOUD (accessed in February 2023) (Giglio et al 2021). For climate variables, we focused on the oceanatmosphere phenomena affecting weather conditions in Indonesia, ENSO and the IOD (Indian Ocean Dipole). The Oceanic Niño Index (ONI) and the Dipole Mode Index (DMI) are the indicators used to identify ENSO and IOD conditions based on sea surface temperature (SST) in the Pacific and the Indian Oceans. ONI is a threemonth average anomaly of the extended reconstructed SST version 5 in the Niño-3.4 region (5° N-5° S,120°-170° W). These data were obtained from National Centre for Environmental Prediction (NCEP), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), available at https://origin. cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/analysis_monitoring/ ensostuff/ONI_v5.php (accessed in July 2023). DMI represents an anomalous SST gradient between the western equatorial Indian Ocean (50°–70° E and 10° S–10° N) and the south–eastern equatorial Indian Ocean (90°–110° E and 10° S–0° N). This index is produced by NOAA and was obtained from https://psl.noaa.gov/gcos_wgsp/Timeseries/DMI/ (accessed in July 2023). We converted DMI and hotspots into three-month average values to assess the seasonal patterns (dry and wet season) in Indonesia. Based on an 11 year period (2012–2022), we analysed the temporal and spatial distribution of hotspots and the correlation between hotspot density and ONI and DMI.

The drainage map was taken from Dadap *et al* (2021) at https://purl.stanford.edu/yj761xk5815 (accessed in July 2023) and contains the canal network in 2017 for the studied areas. This product maps canals that have a width greater than 5 m and includes primary and secondary canals. Data on canal width are not available. Tertiary canals (ditches) are not covered by this map; however, the map is the best up-to date option that is publicly accessible.

The LC was identified according to a time series layer of LC maps produced by the European Space Agency (ESA) climate change initiative (CCI) (Defourny et al 2017, ESA 2017) and a plantation map from Transparent World (2014). The layer was obtained at https://earthobs3.arcgis.com/arcgis/ rest/services/ESA_CCI_Land_Cover_Time_Series/ ImageServer (accessed in September 2023) and from https://data.globalforestwatch.org/datasets/ gfw::tree-plantations/explore (accessed in September 2023). LC maps provide 22 LC categories with varied tree cover types, and the plantation map gives more detailed information on perennial crop types. The map consists of single and mixed perennial crops including oil palm, Hevea, acacia, fruits like coconut, areca, coffee, clearing/young plantation, and others.

Based on LC classes, the Indonesian peatlands across both islands consisted of 41% forest, 46% agricultural lands (plantations and other crops), 13% other vegetation, and less than 0.3% settlements and water bodies. About 75% of the agricultural lands are perennial plantations, dominated by large industrial plantations (65%). Medium and small plantations contribute 8% and 12% respectively, and the rest (15%) are clearings/very young plantations. The large industrial plantations are dominated by monocultures of oil palm and Acacia. Medium and small plantations are dominated by mixed plantation including oil palm, Hevea, fruits (coconut palm, Areca) and monoculture plantations of coconut palm and Hevea

2.3. Impacts of drainage on fire

We analysed the effect of drainage on fire hotspots in Indonesian peatlands during a five-year period, 2013– 2017. This period was selected to represent the typical variability of climate conditions in Indonesia affected by ENSO and IOD, involving an ENSO-neutral year (2013), dry years (an ENSO neutral-to-weak El Niño with negative IOD in 2014, and a strong El Niño with positive IOD in 2015), and wet years (La Niña and negative IOD in 2016–2017). We did not include the years after 2017 because the commencement of long-term national peatland restoration practice may have modified the drainage condition in places. We used ArcGIS Pro 3.1.4 for data analysis.

Grid cells with a resolution of 1 km for peat extent in the studied areas were produced and used as reference cells from which fire density values were calculated. We selected all cells that contain some peatland. Annual hotspot density was calculated as the sum of hotspots in each grid cell. An individual hotspot was assigned to a grid cell where the central coordinates of the hotspot fell within the border of the cell. Canal density was calculated as the total length of canal present in each cell.

Individual cells were assigned to four main LC categories modified from LC and plantation maps, 'forests' (the undisturbed/less disturbed ecosystem); two groups of agricultural land ('plantations' and 'other crops'), representing managed lands of a disturbed peat ecosystem; and 'other vegetation' (assumed to be unmanaged lands of a disturbed peat ecosystem). LC type is defined by the majority (>50%) of LC within each cell, and heterogeneous cells or those with no dominant LC (3% of total cells), are excluded from analysis. All cells overlapping with the plantation map were assigned as plantations. Other LC types were classified based on the ESA LC map. Assigned cells for tree cover were grouped into forests. Assigned cells for crops but not overlapping with the plantation map were grouped as other crops (assumed to be seasonal crops). The rest of the cells overlapping with shrub, herbaceous, grassland and mixed vegetated cells with tree cover or agricultural lands less than 50%, were grouped into other vegetation. We excluded cells from our analysis that were not assigned to the above four classes, such as urban areas and water bodies. LC change is often associated with drainage construction as well as fire which is used to clear vegetation (Adrianto et al 2019). To exclude these effects we only selected areas where LC remained the same throughout the study period (2013-2017), which accounts for 10.7 M ha (94% of Indonesian peatlands in Sumatra and Kalimantan). Data on drainage extent is only available for 2017 and we assume a constant drainage network during the study period.

We overlaid the grid cells containing hotspot and canal density information with the LC map. The individual cells were grouped based on canal density value, ranked from low to high, into bins containing 500 data points for every LC class. The mean values of the groups were used for further analysis. We applied data grouping to help capture the overall interaction between canals and hotspot density because the hotspot density data are skewed, with 80%-99% of grid cells having zero annual hotspots. We used Analysis of Variance to determine whether there were significant differences in hotspot density between undrained and drained peatlands, and also across different types of LC. We then plotted the distribution of the canal density and annual average hotspot density at a national level. The same analysis was also applied at a provincial level to examine regional variability. We selected two provinces where most peatlands are located and which also represent different seasonal patterns and peat conditions: Riau province with more drained peatlands, and Central Kalimantan province where undrained peatlands dominate. We used multiple regression to examine the effect of canal density, LC and ENSO on hotspot density. We identified LC and ENSO status using dummy variables (with Forest and the ENSOneutral year as the default). There are three models we applied with hotspot density as a dependent variable. The independent variable of the first model was ENSO status. The second model used ENSO status and LC type. Lastly we applied ENSO status, LC type and canal density with a quadratic function to fit the apparent curvilinear relationship we found graphically between hotspot density and canal density.

3. Results

3.1. Ecosystem conditions of Indonesian peatlands During 2013–2017, fire hotspots occurred in 38% of the study area (figure 1(b)). Over half (53%) of areas with hotspots were agricultural lands, with a dominance of plantations (table S1). There were 632012 hotspots recorded in the study area (2013-2017) with a large inter-annual variation. An ENSO-neutral year (2013) experienced 91 075 hotspots, which increased to 209 560 in 2014 (weak El Niño), and to 309 514 in 2015 (prolonged drought due to strong El Niño combined with a positive IOD). The number of hotspots was lower in 2016 and 2017 when La Niña occurred, with 16 440 and 5423 hotspots respectively. Based on Pearson's correlation, the number of dry season (July to November in 2012-2022) hotspots in Indonesian peatlands is greatly affected by ONI (r = 0.87) and moderately influenced by DMI (r = 0.52).

As shown in figure 1(c), 76% of peatlands in Sumatra had canals compared to 42% in Kalimantan. Most drained peatlands (91%) had a canal density below 3.3 km km⁻² and 55% of drained peatland had a canal density below 1.6 km km⁻². The distribution of canal densities varied in each LC (figures 1(a) and (d)). Most forested peatlands (79%) had no canals. Meanwhile, more that 92% of plantations were drained with a canal density up to 10.6 km km⁻². Other crops and other vegetation were drained in 72% and 64% of the area and canal density ranged up to 8.2 km $\rm km^{-2}$ in both LCs.

3.2. The implications of climate, drainage, and LC on peat fire

Peatlands with canals had a greater hotspot density than undrained peatlands (p < 0.001), with the largest difference in the ENSO-neutral year. In this year, median hotspot density in undrained peatlands was 0.08 km⁻² but was approximately 13 times greater in drained peatlands at 1.06 km^{-2} (figure 2). During the weak El Niño, median hotspot density was 0.35 km⁻² in undrained peatlands but 6.3 times higher (2.20 km^{-2}) in drained peatlands. The drought continued to the next year with a stronger El Niño, leading to drained peatlands having the highest hotspot densities with a median of 2.34 km^{-2} , about two times higher than for undrained peatlands (1.13 km⁻²). Hotspot density in undrained peatlands in 2015 was similar to hotspot density in drained peatlands during the ENSO-neutral year in 2013. The number of hotspots was much smaller during La Niña, when median hotspot density in undrained peatlands was 0.03 $\rm km^{-2} and$ 0.15 $\rm km^{-2}$ in drained peatlands in 2016. Despite the impact of La Niña and a negative IOD, drained peatlands still had almost double the hotspot density compared to undrained peatlands during the ENSOneutral year. Hotspots further decreased in 2017 as La Niña continued, with a median density of 0.01 km^{-2} and 0.05 km⁻² in undrained and drained peatlands, respectively.

There are differences in hotspot density at regional (province) level linked to differences in climate (figure S1). Riau has a large area of drained peatlands (76% drained) and had an average hotspot density in 2013 of 1.5 km^{-2} , seven times higher than in Central Kalimantan (33% drained) with 0.21 km⁻². In 2014, hotspot density in Riau and Central Kalimantan increased to 2.1 km⁻² and 1.2 km⁻² respectively. In 2015, hotspot density in Riau dropped to 0.5 km⁻² whereas it increased to 3.1 km⁻² in Central Kalimantan.

Hotspot density is also shaped by the type of LC. Overall, forested peatlands had the lowest mean hotspot density with 0.34 km⁻² compared to other LCs during the period of study (p < 0.001) (table 1). In the ENSO-neutral year, the mean hotspot density in Forests was only 0.04 km⁻², while plantations, other vegetation and other crops had 5.6, 8.6 and 10 times that hotspot density respectively. The relative differences in hotspot density were lower in subsequent years when El Niño and La Niña occurred. We also compared the hotspot density between undrained and drained peatlands for each LC (table 1). We found denser hotspots in drained peatlands when compared to undrained peatlands for all categories of LC.



Figure 1. Peatland extent and condition in Sumatra and Kalimantan: (a) land cover map of peatland within the study area; (b) hotspot density in a five-year period (2013–2017); (c) drainage density in study area; (d) area of land cover categories classified by drainage density; bins are equidistant with labels rounded to the nearest tenth of a km km⁻².



Figure 2. Annual hotspot density (km^{-2}) in undrained and drained Indonesian peatland (Sumatra and Kalimantan) during 2013–2017. The box shows the quartiles of the data distributed from lower (bottom edge) to upper (top edge) with the horizontal line splitting the box as the median and the x sign as the mean; the vertical line shows the range of data from lower (Q1–1.5 * IQR) to upper values (Q3 + 1.5 * IQR); the points show outliers).

In plantations, hotspot density also varies with type of plantations (table S4). Recently cleared lands and oil palm plantation experienced higher hotspot density (2.5 km⁻² and 1 km⁻² respectively) than other plantation (timber, fruit, and others) in 2013.

ENSO events in 2014 and 2015 increased the hotspot density in almost all of the plantation area, with the largest increases in timber plantation (345% and 865%) and the lowest in oil palm plantation (62% and 26%). On the other hand, hotspot density in cleared

Table 1. Mean hotspot density based on land cover types in Indonesian peatlands. U is undrained peatland with no canal, and D isdrained peatland (canal density >0 km km⁻²).

Land cover type	Mean hotspot density (km^{-2})											
	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		All years	
	U	D	U	D	U	D	U	D	U	D	U	D
Forest	0.04	0.51	0.23	1.47	0.75	1.93	0.02	0.11	0.01	0.06	0.21	0.82
Plantation	0.32	0.81	0.67	1.67	1.05	1.71	0.04	0.10	0.02	0.02	0.42	0.87
Other crops	0.37	1.66	1.44	3.52	3.19	4.48	0.15	0.34	0.02	0.07	1.03	2.05
Other vegetation	0.26	1.71	1.13	3.59	3.43	3.67	0.11	0.31	0.02	0.18	0.99	1.89



lands increased by 82% in 2014 but then decreased by 42% in 2015, unlike other plantations.

There was a curvilinear relationship for data from 2013-2017 between hotspot density and canal density, with a peak in hotspot density at a canal density of around $1-3 \text{ km km}^{-2}$ (figure 3), with the peak varying between LC types and ENSO status. Peatlands with a very dense drainage network, mostly in plantations, had a gradual decrease of hotspot density as drainage density became very high. In 2013, canal densities strongly influenced the density of hotspots with r values of 0.97, 0.96, 0.94, and 0.67 in Forests, other vegetation, other crops and plantations respectively. The increase in hotspot density with drainage density varied strongly with LC, with the lowest hotspot density in Forests and highest in other crops and other vegetation. However, the El Niño events in the proceeding years weakened the impact of drainage density on hotspots, especially in 2015 as hotspots spread to undrained areas. The r values decreased to 0.75, 0.43, 0.57, and 0.58 in forests, other vegetation, other crops and plantations respectively.

The regression analysis showed that climate condition associated with ENSO partly explained the hotspot density with $r^2 = 0.40$ (table S2). Adding LC as a categorical variable in a multiple regression increased r^2 to 0.59, while multiple regression combining the information on climate condition, LC classification and drainage density, resulted in $r^2 = 0.67$ (figure S2). All predictors significantly influenced hotspot density (p < 0.001), except for Plantation (p = 0.25) (table S3). Multicollinearity tests between the variables (climate, LC and drainage) showed the variance inflation factor and tolerance are lower than 5 and higher than 0.1–0.2, respectively, for all variables (table S3).

We also compared hotspots with other fire indicators, including FRP and burnt area. Hotspot density is strongly correlated with FRP (r = 0.95) and burnt area (r = 0.87). However, increased fire occurrence does not necessarily lead to a larger burnt area, especially in the strong El Niño in 2015 (figure S3). Both FRP and burnt area had a strong positive relationship with drainage density in 2013 (figure S3). The influence of drainage density weakened in the years following El Niño.

4. Discussion and conclusion

Our study shows the influence of drainage density on the occurrence of fire hotspots, while highlighting its interaction with LC and climate variability. These findings expand the scope of existing research on how drainage infrastructure exacerbates fire risks in peatlands with different behaviour under varying environmental conditions. The dry period following the positive anomaly of SST in the Pacific causes increases in Indonesian peatland fire activity (Murdiyarso and Adiningsih 2007). Spatially, fire occurrence in each LC type behaves differently in response to drainage and ENSO status. Higher hotspot densities are found in areas associated with human activities (deforested and drained). We found a positive relationship between canal and hotspot density up to moderate drainage density, as found in 91% of the study area in 2013. This relationship weakened especially during the strong El Niño in 2015, when drought extended to wider areas from the canals (Lu et al 2021).

For areas of high canal density which are dominated by plantations, hotspot density tended to decline as canal density increased. This may seem counterintuitive as heavily-drained peatlands are associated with deeper water tables (Hirano et al 2015), and a higher combustion risk (Hayasaka et al 2016, Khakim et al 2022). However, the pattern may be related to several factors that need to be investigated further. First, both land management and land ownership could be important. In our study area, the large industrial plantations had the highest canal density with a mean of 2.8 km km⁻², compared to 1.8 km km⁻² and 1.4 km km⁻² for medium and small plantations. The large, industrial-scale perennial plantations may have more income and resources (BPS 2022) for pro-active fire management. Additionally, there are several regulations related to fire preventive policy, such as a zero-burning policy and the Regulation (PP) No.71/2014, to maintain land use permits. Most of Plantation in the studied area (63%) is oil palm plantation. According to Prayoto et al (2017), registered large-scale oil palm companies tend to follow a zero-burning policy compared with unregistered companies. Also, the recently-cleared plantations show a decrease in hotspot density in 2015, which may indicate the contribution of land management (Sloan et al 2022). We observed different behaviour in the different plantation types. Our results show that timber plantation, which make up 25% of plantations and have a lower mean canal density than oil palm plantation, experienced an increase in hotspot density of more than 8-fold between 2013 and 2015, because these areas are more prone to the effect of ENSO (Stolle and Lambin 2003). Another point to consider is the high density of canals may limit the spread of fire, especially smoldering fire, to spread, through acting as fire breaks. According to Cattau et al (2016), most fires ignited in oil palm plantations stayed in their boundary, while fires started in degraded areas tend to escape. Lastly, peat loss has potentially occurred in densely drained peatlands due to oxidation and repeat burning (Page and Hooijer 2016), especially in plantations with shallow peat layers as suggested in the Regulation (PP) No.71/2014. Peatlands used for plantations experience intense subsidence (Hooijer et al 2012, Nagano et al 2013, Evans et al 2019, Deshmukh et al 2021). Also, according to Konecny et al (2016), the consumption of peat fuel decreases with each successive fire event. This means that densely drained peatlands may become less prone to fire since the peat has already burned in previous fire events or decomposed and has been lost to the atmosphere, and the peat surface may move closer to the water table. Our study focuses on the impacts of LC, but fire during LC changes or land clearing (Saharjo and Munoz 2005, Adrianto et al 2019, Trancoso et al 2022) was not included. Overall, our analysis does not suggest that additional drainage reduces fire risk, rather that active management is likely much more intense in heavily drained plantations, but this may vary with management practice.

For peatlands outside of the plantations LC, the positive relationship between drainage density and hotspot density appears stronger especially in 2013-2014, with the slope of the relationship varying by LC. Forests experience the fewest fire hotspots. These areas tend to have a shallower water table (Deshmukh et al 2021), which may reduce peat fire susceptibility (Taufik et al 2020). Forest canopy and understorey affect the near-surface microclimate, leading to higher fine fuel moisture content and fewer days when fuels are predicted to be available for burning (Pickering et al 2021). Other crops and other vegetation had the greatest hotspot density, and these LCs are where Cattau et al (2016) previously found that 52% of fire ignition occurred for Central Kalimantan. The area covered by other crops tends to be managed for seasonal crops by smallholders who have less capability (BPS 2022) to control fire compared to managers of sites in the plantations category. About 71% of Indonesian farmers operate at small-scale (owning crop land less than 2 ha) with the lowest income in the agricultural sector (BPS 2022). Furthermore, for many smallholders, fire is one of the tools commonly used in agricultural activities: for land preparation and biomass clearing after harvesting (Medrilzam et al 2017, Winarno et al 2020, Merten et al 2021). As seasonal crops have a short growing period of 2-6 months (BRG & BPPLHK 2019), there may be more frequent agricultural activities involving fire. In these landscapes a combination of interventions with communities may be needed to reduce fire (Carmenta et al 2021). Other vegetation had a high hotspot density, slightly lower than other crops. These areas have less

canopy cover, in the form of shrubs, grassland and mixed vegetation, and include abandoned agricultural lands (Medrilzam *et al* 2017) with limited perceived economic value. Reforestation and improvement of the hydrological condition (rewetting) of such areas may reduce fire risk (Murdiyarso *et al* 2021).

There are important differences in hotspot density at the regional level linked to ENSO (figure S1). In 2015, hotspot density in Riau dropped whereas it increased in Central Kalimantan, as the impact of El Niño on drought is more pronounced in Central Kalimantan compared to Riau (Fanin and Van Der Werf (2017). About half of plantations are located in Riau; this may explain the lower increase in hotspot density in Plantation between 2014 and 2015 when compared to other LCs (table 1).

Our study provides valuable insights into how fire density varies with density of drainage across LC and climate state in Indonesian peatlands. Deforested and drained peatlands are at a high risk of fire especially during ENSO-neutral to strong El Niño events. Hotspot density increases with canal density, with a strong correlation in 2013. El Niño events diminish the impact of canal density, especially during the prolonged drought in the strong El Nino of 2015, when relationships show moderate correlation outside Forests. Our results support the strategy of peat protection in Indonesia, including suspending further peat forest conversion, continuing reforestation of deforested peatlands, rewetting drained peatlands (BRGM 2021), as well as increasing peat fire management and local awareness. There are a number of areas that need further research. The findings of this study are limited to the primary and secondary canal network due to data availability. Excluding tertiary canals will underestimate drainage density. Future research using finer resolution drainage data could be useful. Hotspot data only indicate surface fire occurrences but not fire severity or whether fire burns into the peat. Future work is also needed to assess the effects of peatland restoration activities (Budiningsih et al 2024) including on reducing fire events and associated impacts.

Data availability statement

All datasets used in this paper are publicly available, licensed under CC BY 4.0, CC BY 3.0 and ESA CCI. PeatMap and drainage network map are from Xu *et al* (2018) (https://archive.researchdata. leeds.ac.uk/251/) and Dadap *et al* (2021) (https:// purl.stanford.edu/yj761xk5815). Daily hotspots were from FIRMS NASA (https://firms.modaps.eosdis. nasa.gov/download/). Land cover and plantation maps were from ESA (www.arcgis.com/home/item. html?id=1453082255024699af55c960bc3dc1fe) and Transparent World (https://data.globalforestwatch. org/datasets/gfw::tree-plantations/explore). All data that support the findings of this study are included within the article (and any supplementary files).

Acknowledgment

Resti Salmayenti is supported by BPI scholarship from PPAPT (Centre for Higher Education Funding and Assessment), Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology, the Republic of Indonesia, and LPDP (Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education), Ministry of Finance of Republic of Indonesia [ID No. 202205080279 and Grant Nos. 2946/BPPT/BPI.LG/IV/2024]. We are grateful to institutions and researchers (ESA CCI Land Cover project, Transparent World, FIRMS NASA, Xu *et al* (2018) and Dadap *et al* (2021), whose source data are used in this study.

ORCID iDs

R Salmayenti © https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8123-8181

J Holden © https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1108-4831 D V Spracklen © https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7551-4597

References

- Adrianto H A, Spracklen D V, Arnold S R, Sitanggang I S and Syaufina L 2019 Forest and land fires are mainly associated with deforestation in Riau Province, Indonesia *Remote Sens.* 12 3
- Basuki I, Kauffman J B, Peterson J T, Anshari G Z and Murdiyarso D 2021 Land cover and land use change decreases net ecosystem production in tropical peatlands of West Kalimantan, Indonesia *Forests* **12** 1587
- BMKG 2022 Proyeksi Perubahan Iklim (available at: www.bmkg. go.id/iklim/?p=proyeksi-perubahan-iklim)
- BPS 2022 Indikator Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Dan Karakteristik Utama Sektor Pertanian 2021 (Hasil Survei Pertanian Terintegrasi) (Statistics Indonesia (BPS))
- BRG & BPPLHK 2019 Final report of research on agrosilvofishery-based paludiculture (wana-mina-tani) to support peat restoration in the Sumatra region (BRG & BPPLHK)
- BRGM 2021 Laporan Kinerja 2021 Badan Restorasi Gambut Dan Mangrove (BRGM Badan Restorasi Gambut dan Mangrove)
- Budiningsih K, Putera P B, Nurlia A, Ulya N A, Nurfatriani F, Salminah M, Yuniati D and Widarti A 2024 Peatland restoration research: a global overview with insights from Indonesia J. Ecol. Environ. 48 263–76
- Carmenta R, Zabala A, Trihadmojo B, Gaveau D, Salim M A and Phelps J 2021 Evaluating bundles of interventions to prevent peat-fires in Indonesia *Glob. Environ. Change* **67** 102154
- Cattau M E, Harrison M E, Shinyo I, Tungau S, Uriarte M and DeFries R 2016 Sources of anthropogenic fire ignitions on the peat-swamp landscape in Kalimantan, Indonesia *Glob. Environ. Change* **39** 205–19
- Dadap N C, Hoyt A M, Cobb A R, Oner D, Kozinski M, Fua P V, Rao K, Harvey C F and Konings A G 2021 Drainage canals in Southeast Asian peatlands increase carbon emissions *AGU Adv.* **2** e2020AV000321
- Defourny P, Lamarche C, Bontemps S, De Maet T, Van Bogaert E, Moreau I, Brockmann C, Boettcher M, Kirches G and Wevers J 2017 Land cover climate change initiative-product

user guide v2. Issue 2.0 ESA-UCLouvain-Geomatics, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, Technical Report

- Deshmukh C S, Julius D, Desai A R, Asyhari A, Page S E, Nardi N, Susanto A P, Nurholis N, Hendrizal M and Kurnianto S 2021 Conservation slows down emission increase from a tropical peatland in Indonesia Nat. Geosci. 14 484–90
- ESA 2017 Land Cover CCI Product User Guide Version 2 Technical Report (available at: maps.elie.ucl.ac.be/CCI/viewer/ download/ESACCI-LC-Ph2-PUGv2_2.0.pdf)
- Evans C D, Williamson J M, Kacaribu F, Irawan D, Suardiwerianto Y, Hidayat M F, Laurén A and Page S E 2019 Rates and spatial variability of peat subsidence in Acacia plantation and forest landscapes in Sumatra, Indonesia *Geoderma* 338 410–21
- Fanin T and Van Der Werf G R 2017 Precipitation–fire linkages in Indonesia (1997–2015) *Biogeosciences* 14 3995–4008
- Giglio L, Justice C, Boschetti L and Roy D 2021 MODIS/terra+ aqua burned area monthly L3 global 500m SIN grid V061 NASA EOSDIS (Land Processes DAAC) (https://doi.org/ 10.5067/MODIS/MCD64A1.061)
- Glukhova T V and Sirin A A 2018 Losses of soil carbon upon a fire on a drained forested raised bog *Soil Sci.* **51** 542–9

Gumbricht T, Roman-Cuesta R M, Verchot L, Herold M, Wittmann F, Householder E, Herold N and Murdiyarso D 2017 An expert system model for mapping tropical wetlands and peatlands reveals South America as the largest contributor *Glob. Change Biol.* 23 3581–99

- Hayasaka H 2023 Peatland fire weather conditions in Sumatra, Indonesia *Climate* 11 92
- Hayasaka H, Takahashi H, Limin S H, Yulianti N and Usup A 2016 Peat fire occurrence *Tropical Peatland Ecosystems* (Springer) pp 377–95
- Hein L, Spadaro J V, Ostro B, Hammer M, Sumarga E, Salmayenti R, Boer R, Tata H, Atmoko D and Castañeda J-P 2022 The health impacts of Indonesian peatland fires *Environ. Health* 21 1–16
- Hirano T, Kusin K, Limin S and Osaki M 2015 Evapotranspiration of tropical peat swamp forests *Glob. Change Biol.* 21 1914–27
- Hirano T, Segah H, Kusin K, Limin S, Takahashi H and Osaki M 2012 Effects of disturbances on the carbon balance of tropical peat swamp forests *Glob. Change Biol.* 18 3410–22
- Hooijer A, Page S, Jauhiainen J, Lee W, Lu X, Idris A and Anshari G 2012 Subsidence and carbon loss in drained tropical peatlands *Biogeosciences* **9** 1053–71
- Hoscilo A, Page S E, Tansey K J and Rieley J O 2011 Effect of repeated fires on land-cover change on peatland in southern Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, from 1973 to 2005 Int. J. Wildland Fire 20 578–88
- Khakim M Y, Bama A A and Tsuji T 2022 Spatiotemporal variations of soil moisture and groundwater level in a south Sumatra peatland, Indonesia during 2015–2018 *Geogr. Environ. Sustain.* **15** 58–70
- Kiely L, Spracklen D V, Wiedinmyer C, Conibear L, Reddington C L, Arnold S R, Knote C, Khan M F, Latif M T and Syaufina L 2020 Air quality and health impacts of vegetation and peat fires in Equatorial Asia during 2004–2015 Environ. Res. Lett. 15 094054
- Kiely L, Spracklen D, Arnold S, Papargyropoulou E, Conibear L, Wiedinmyer C, Knote C and Adrianto H 2021 Assessing costs of Indonesian fires and the benefits of restoring peatland *Nat. Commun.* **12** 7044
- Konecny K, Ballhorn U, Navratil P, Jubanski J, Page S E, Tansey K and Siegert F 2016 Variable carbon losses from recurrent fires in drained tropical peatlands *Glob. Change Biol.* 22 1469–80
- Li W, Dickinson R E, Fu R, Niu G Y, Yang Z L and Canadell J G 2007 Future precipitation changes and their implications for tropical peatlands *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **34** L01403
- Lu X, Zhang X, Li F, Gao L, Graham L, Vetrita Y, Saharjo B H and Cochrane M A 2021 Drainage canal impacts on smoke

aerosol emissions for Indonesian peatland and non-peatland fires *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16** 095008

- Matysek M, Evers S, Samuel M K and Sjogersten S 2018 High heterotrophic CO₂ emissions from a Malaysian oil palm plantations during dry-season *Wetl. Ecol. Manage.* **26** 415–24
- Medrilzam M, Smith C, Aziz A A, Herbohn J and Dargusch P 2017 Smallholder farmers and the dynamics of degradation of peatland ecosystems in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia *Ecol. Econ.* **136** 101–13
- Melling L, Hatano R and Goh K J 2005 Soil CO₂ flux from three ecosystems in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia *Tellus B: Chem. Phys. Meteorol.* **57** 1–11
- Melton J R, Chan E, Millard K, Fortier M, Winton R S, Martín-López J M, Cadillo-Quiroz H, Kidd D and Verchot L V 2022 A map of global peatland extent created using machine learning (Peat-ML) *Geosci. Model. Dev.* 15 4709–38
- Merten J, Nielsen J Ø, Rosyani and Faust H 2021 Climate change mitigation on tropical peatlands: a triple burden for smallholder farmers in Indonesia *Glob. Environ. Change* 71 102388
- Miettinen J, Shi C and Liew S C 2017 Fire distribution in Peninsular Malaysia, Sumatra and Borneo in 2015 with special emphasis on peatland fires *Environ. Manage.* **60** 747–57
- MoEF 2021 Laporan Inventarisasi Gas Rumah Kaca (GRK) dan Monitoring, Pelaporan, Verifikasi (MPV) 2021 (Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia)
- MoEF 2022 National Forest Reference Level for Deforestation, Forest Degradation, and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stock: In the Context of Decision 12/CP.17 Para 12 UNFCCC (The Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia)
- Murdiyarso D and Adiningsih E S 2007 Climate anomalies, Indonesian vegetation fires and terrestrial carbon emissions *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* **12** 101–12
- Murdiyarso D, Lestari I, Hanggara B B, Saragi-Sasmito M, Basuki I and Taufik M 2021 Managing water regimes: controlling greenhouse gas emissions and fires in Indonesian tropical peat swamp forests *Wetland Carbon and Environmental Management* (American Geophysical Union) pp 355–69
- Nagano T, Osawa K, Ishida T, Sakai K, Vijarnsorn P, Jongskul A, Phetsuk S, Waijaroen S, Yamanoshita T and Norisada M 2013 Subsidence and soil CO₂ efflux in tropical peatland in southern Thailand under various water table and management conditions *Mires and Peat* **11** 1–20
- Page S E and Baird A 2016 Peatlands and global change: response and resilience *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **41** 35–57
- Page S E and Hooijer A 2016 In the line of fire: the peatlands of Southeast Asia *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.* B **371** 20150176
- Page S E, Siegert F, Rieley J O, Boehm H-D V, Jaya A and Limin S 2002 The amount of carbon released from peat and forest fires in Indonesia during 1997 Nature 420 61–65
- Pan Y, Birdsey R A, Fang J, Houghton R, Kauppi P E, Kurz W A, Phillips O L, Shvidenko A, Lewis S L and Canadell J G 2011 A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests *Science* 333 988–93
- Pickering B J, Duff T J, Baillie C and Cawson J G 2021 Darker, cooler, wetter: forest understories influence surface fuel moisture *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **300** 108311
- Prayoto P, Ishihara M I, Firdaus R and Nakagoshi N 2017 Peatland fires in Riau, Indonesia, in relation to land cover type, land management, landholder, and spatial management *J. Environ. Prot.* **08** 1312–32
- Prosperi P, Bloise M, Tubiello F N, Conchedda G, Rossi S, Boschetti L, Salvatore M and Bernoux M 2020 New estimates of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning and peat fires using MODIS Collection 6 burned areas *Clim. Change* **161** 415–32
- Ribeiro K, Pacheco F S, Ferreira J W, de Sousa-neto E R, Hastie A, Krieger Filho G C, Alvalá P C, Forti M C and Ometto J P

2021 Tropical peatlands and their contribution to the global carbon cycle and climate change *Glob. Change Biol.* **27** 489–505

- Ritung S, Wahyunto N K, Sukarman H and Suparto T C 2011 Peta Lahan Gambut Indonesia Skala 1:250.000 (Balai Besar Litbang Sumberdaya Lahan Pertanian, Ministry of Agriculture, Republic of Indonesia)
- Saharjo B H and Munoz C P 2005 Controlled burning in peat lands owned by small farmers: a case study in land preparation *Wetl. Ecol. Manage.* **13** 105–10
- Sloan S, Locatelli B, Andela N, Cattau M E, Gaveau D and Tacconi L 2022 Declining severe fire activity on managed lands in Equatorial Asia *Commun. Earth Environ.* 3 207
- Sloan S, Locatelli B, Wooster M J and Gaveau D L 2017 Fire activity in Borneo driven by industrial land conversion and drought during El Niño periods, 1982–2010 Glob. Environ. Change 47 95–109
- Stolle F and Lambin E F 2003 Interprovincial and interannual differences in the causes of land-use fires in Sumatra, Indonesia *Environ. Conserv.* **30** 375–87
- Taufik M, Minasny B, McBratney A, Van Dam J, Jones P and Van Lanen H 2020 Human-induced changes in Indonesian peatlands increase drought severity *Environ. Res. Lett.* 15 084013
- Taufik M, Setiawan B I and Van Lanen H A 2019 Increased fire hazard in human-modified wetlands in Southeast Asia Ambio 48 363–73
- Taufik M, Widyastuti M T, Sulaiman A, Murdiyarso D, Santikayasa I P and Minasny B 2022 An improved drought-fire assessment for managing fire risks in tropical peatlands Agric. For. Meteorol. 312 108738

- The World Bank & BPS 2019 Pilot ecosystem account for Indonesian peatlands: Sumatra and Kalimantan islands (The World Bank)
- Trancoso R, Syktus J, Salazar A, Thatcher M, Toombs N, Wong K K-H, Meijaard E, Sheil D and McAlpine C A 2022 Converting tropical forests to agriculture increases fire risk by fourfold *Environ. Res. Lett.* **17** 104019
- Tsuji N, Kato T, Osaki M, Sulaiman A, Ajie G S, Kimura K, Hamada Y, Shigenaga Y, Hirose K and Silsigia S 2021 Evaluation of eco-management of tropical peatlands *Tropical Peatland Eco-management* (Springer) pp 163–96
- Turetsky M R, Benscoter B, Page S, Rein G, Van Der Werf G R and Watts A 2015 Global vulnerability of peatlands to fire and carbon loss *Nat. Geosci.* **8** 11–14
- Vetrita Y and Cochrane M A 2019 Fire frequency and related land-use and land-cover changes in Indonesia's peatlands *Remote Sens.* **12** 5
- Watson R T, Noble I R, Bolin B, Ravindranath N, Verardo D J and Dokken D J 2000 Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry: A Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Cambridge University Press)
- Winarno B, Rohadi D, Herawati T, Rahmat M and Suwarno E 2020 Out of fire disaster: dynamics of livelihood strategies of rural community on peatland use and management *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **474** 072047
- Xu J, Morris P J, Liu J and Holden J 2018 PEATMAP: refining estimates of global peatland distribution based on a meta-analysis *Catena* **160** 134–40
- Yu Z, Loisel J, Brosseau D P, Beilman D W and Hunt S J 2010 Global peatland dynamics since the Last Glacial Maximum *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **37** L13402