PART II

Major Farming Systems: Investment Options and Innovations
This edition of the sourcebook includes the three major rainfed systems out of the eight system types identified by Dixon and Gulliver with Gibbon (2001) for development of detailed investment notes:

1. Rainfed farming systems in humid and subhumid areas are covered in chapter 3.
2. Rainfed farming systems in highlands and sloping areas are covered in chapter 4.
3. Rainfed farming systems in dry and cold (semiarid and arid) areas are covered in chapter 5.

The decision to start with three rainfed systems was based on the level of available resources (funds and time) and also on the fact that these rainfed systems occupy more than 540 million hectares of cultivated land globally and involve approximately 1.4 billion people, who, in turn, practice about 40 different land management and cropping arrangements. Selected readings and Web links are provided for readers who seek more in-depth information and examples of practical experience. Future editions will systematically cover the remaining farming systems.

For each farming system type, good practice examples are identified and summarized as follows:

- **Investment Notes** summarize good practice and lessons learned in specific investment areas. They provide a brief, but technically sound, overview for the nonspecialist. For each Investment Note, the investments have been evaluated in different settings for effectiveness and sustainability, and they can be broadly endorsed by the community of practitioners from within and outside the World Bank.

- **Innovative Activity Profiles** highlight the design of successful or innovative investments. These profiles provide a short description of an activity in the World Bank’s portfolio or that of a partner agency, focusing on potential effectiveness in poverty reduction, empowerment, or sustainability. Activities profiled have often not been sufficiently tested and evaluated in a range of settings to be considered “good practice,” but they should be closely monitored for potential scaling up.

**REFERENCE**

OVERVIEW

The 11 systems covered in this chapter are found in the humid and subhumid zones of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. They support an agricultural population of approximately 400 million on about 160 million hectares of cultivated land, of which only 11 percent is irrigated. Pressure on land is typically moderate—only 2.5 persons per cultivated hectare on average—although some areas of intense pressure exist.

These systems depend on slash-and-burn agriculture, where forest is cleared to cultivate root crops, cereals, and groundnuts, among other crops. The number of cattle and small ruminants is low. Cash income is based on forest products and wild game rather than on cash crops. Rainfed farming and land management systems in humid areas are characterized by their physical isolation; a lack of roads and markets hinders their economic development. Deforestation and consequent loss of biodiversity is a serious issue that affects the local to global levels. Because of locally increasing population pressure, fallow periods are shortened, resulting in soil fertility loss and yield decline, which can drive further deforestation. The agricultural growth potential is moderate. Despite the existence of large uncultivated areas and high rainfall, only modest yield increases are expected in the near future. The fragility of the soils and the call for rainforest protection, with its associated biodiversity and multiple environmental services, represent strong arguments against further extension of the agricultural system.

Eight of the 11 systems presented here can be characterized as mixed farming systems. Cereals, root crops, and tree crops are cultivated for food and cash. They use little irrigation. These systems often have an important livestock component. The degree of market development is moderate but varying and has substantial opportunities for further development. Because of their diversity, these systems differ considerably in constraints and potentials. Where population densities are low, the systems have significant potential for agricultural growth and poverty reduction. For instance, the cereal and root crop farming systems could become a breadbasket of Africa and an important source of export earnings. The mixed-maize system in eastern and southern Africa also has good potential, but it is currently in crisis because shortages of seed, fertilizer, and agrochemicals and the high prices of fertilizer relative to the maize prices have sharply curtailed agricultural investment. As a result, yields have fallen and soil fertility is declining, while smallholders are reverting to extensive production practices. In these systems, the main sources of vulnerability are market volatility, lack of improved and appropriate farming technologies, lack of off-farm opportunities, and drought (in the drier areas). The prevalence of poverty is limited to moderate, although it can be extensive in the forest-based farming systems.

POTENTIALS FOR POVERTY REDUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL GROWTH

In broad terms, there are five main farm household strategies to improve livelihoods (Dixon and others 2001):
1. Intensification of existing production patterns
2. Diversification of production and processing
3. Expanded farm or herd size
4. Increased off-farm income, both agricultural and non-agricultural
5. Complete exit from the agricultural sector within a particular farming system.

Rainfed farming systems in humid areas depend on all of these five household strategies for the halving of poverty. Among these strategies, diversification is the most significant. Livestock plays a major role in diversification. Opportunities for system development lie in improved crop-livestock integration, integrated pest management, and improved land management techniques, such as conservation farming. Sustainable land management and soil nutrient capitalization depend on secure and equitable access to resources, especially for land and water. The development of small-scale and farmer-managed irrigation will contribute to both intensification and diversification.

**REFERENCE**

Science and Local Innovation Make Livestock
More Profitable and Friendlier to the Environment
in Central America

Forage production and conservation are promising measures to alleviate livestock pressures on the environment. Improved forages can be economically profitable and a good option for improving the livelihoods of livestock producers. They also generate social gains because the adoption of new technologies that are based on improved forages generates more rural employment and increases the availability of staple foods. In a dual-purpose system, employment can be increased from one and one-half to four times. However, because few producers have the cash flow necessary to finance the required investments, farmers need to improve their farms gradually, as funds are available. Fast, large-scale adoption needs to be coordinated with financial organizations.

A potential danger exists that farmers may wish to cut more trees to expand pastures for more cattle and profits. Changing old traditions about livestock is not easy. For generations, livestock have made money for their owners, who often have little more than a pasture. Can earnings be increased and sustained? Livestock can cause environmental damage (Steinfield and others 2006). Cattle, horses, and donkeys graze not only farm pastures but also, in many cases, the larger landscape. What are the environmental consequences? This Investment Note explains how the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, or CIAT) and its partners combine science and local knowledge to profitably feed animals while benefiting the environment.

Many parts of the tropics have high annual rainfall, but no rain falls for four to seven months of the year. The landscape turns brown. During those months, livestock overgraze pastures as scarce water causes a severe shortage of livestock feed on the farm. Farmers in many areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America confront these water and feed challenges (figure 3.1). This note focuses on Central America.

Damage becomes widespread. Many farmers let their livestock free to feed in the landscape. Because most grasses are already dry, the leaves of bushes and young trees are soon gone. These pressures reduce plant health and vitality. Over the years, many plants die, especially the types animals prefer.

As plants disappear, soils become exposed. Annual rains return, washing away soils and further weakening the livestock landscape. With less vegetation comes a reduced ability to absorb water. The landscape is drier for more months of the year. When the rains stop, the water springs stop as well. Unless checked, this trend continues until eroded soils and weeds dominate the landscape.

KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

This note was prepared by M. Peters and D. White, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Cali, Colombia, and F. Holmman, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical and the International Livestock Research Institute, Cali, Colombia.
Damage also occurs to other ecologies downstream. Water flows change. The currents become more dramatic, matching the rains. When the rains stop, the flows trickle. When the rains pour, the flows can overwhelm. Many people, especially in Central America, remember the pain of Hurricane Mitch in 1999.

About 45 percent of agricultural land in South America is degraded. According to the Global Assessment of Human-Induced Soil Degradation (GLASOD) database, degradation affects even larger areas (74 percent) in Central America.1 Many inhabitants do not even notice land degradation: the story is so old that it is already part of their lives and livelihoods.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

Despite the potential economic gain (and environmental pain), relatively few farmers see the benefit of investing in forage production for their animals. Those who invest are often pleasantly surprised at the results. They tell their friends. The money is good and worth looking into, as an investor would say.

For decades, CIAT scientists have developed high-yield grasses and legumes that have high nutritional quality and can withstand major climatic and agronomic stresses. By linking science with local perspectives, CIAT is able to apply its extensive germplasm collection of more than 23,000 tropical forage varieties—the largest collection in the world.

With its partners, CIAT advances environmentally friendly and profitable livestock production practices. This process has four components: (a) matching forage germplasm to specific environmental conditions, (b) diagnosing farm and market contexts, (c) fostering innovation and learning processes, and (d) sharing knowledge and scaling out activities, including South-South interactions.

**Matching**

CIAT and its partners have developed the ability to identify grasses and legumes that thrive in specific ecologic niches. The Selection of Forages for the Tropics (SoFT) knowledge management tool enables not only scientists but also local extensionists and development practitioners to identify likely matches (Cook and others 2005). SoFT is a forage selection tool that includes fact sheets, adaptation maps, and reference lists; it is available to all on the World Wide Web.

The more sophisticated spatial analysis tool, Crop Niche Selection for Tropical Agriculture (CaNaSTA), helps identify suitable forages according to ecological niches, using measures of temperature, rain total, and rainfall seasonal pattern (O’Brien and others 2005). The tool also takes into account
both expert knowledge and local knowledge. To improve the accuracy of forage and environment prediction, development workers and extensionists enter their local information on soils. Precise information on soils is not widely available, particularly in the heterogeneous environments where many smallholders live. Experts can update the model and enhance its prediction accuracy. Inputs of their knowledge improve the adaptation information of specific forage varieties.

**Diagnosis**

Ecological criteria are not sufficient to ensure that nutritive forages grow on farms and appear on the landscape. Smallholder farmers want to invest in livelihood activities that show good, rapid results. Especially during establishment, forages require scarce farmer resources, such as labor and money. Less wealthy farmers, who are most affected by degradation, want even better payoffs. To better understand farm contexts, CIAT scientists and partners talk with farmers. Those interviews and subsequent analysis generate additional insights toward identifying a prioritized set of grasses and legumes that farmers would likely prefer (Holmann 1999; Holmann and others 2004). From there, farmers continue the selection process on their farms.

Farmers use a range of criteria to evaluate forages and feed before using them. Table 3.1 summarizes the performance of forage species according to (a) forage and feed characteristics (such as digestibility and energy content), (b) forage management and production requirements (such as soil type), and (c) postharvest considerations (such as processing).

**Fostering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Forage Use and Production Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postharvest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachiaria spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigna unguiculata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucuna pruriens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lablab purpureus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cratyli argentea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrosema brasilianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canavalia brasiliensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ elaboration.

Note: Light-gray shading = superior or preferable; medium-gray shading = medium, acceptable, or required; dark-gray shading = inferior or undesirable; uppercase letter = primary use or product; lowercase letter = secondary use or product; +/– = high amino acid quality/deficiencies in amino acids; ? = unknown; n.a. = not applicable.

a. Requires humidity.
Researchers are often surprised how farmers change and adapt recommended technologies and practices. For example, CIAT and its partners introduced Cratylia to farmers in Colombia for use as a dry season feed source to be managed as a cut-and-carry system. Farmers, however, developed several alternatives that reduced labor costs, which included direct grazing of Cratylia and Brachiaria mixtures and different cut-and-carry systems. In addition, farmers reduced establishment costs by intercropping maize, tomatoes, and cucumbers with Cratylia. Most surprising to researchers was the use of Cratylia during the wet season, when pastures were waterlogged and difficult to graze.

These farmer innovations generated new research topics, such as the response of Cratylia to grazing and trampling, and other suitable forage intercrop combinations. In Central America, the approach of co-researching with farmers has proved effective in technology adoption (White, Labarta, and Legúia 2005). Initial effects of collaborative research can be considered slow, but participation rapidly grows and endures with the proof of concept.

Forage processing also produces benefits to farmers. Hay and silage production enables farmers to feed their animals during the dry season. Despite significant investments in research on silage and hay production, small-scale farmer adoption of “traditional” (first generation) forage conservation methods has been low because of high investment costs, labor requirements, and limited access to technical knowledge (‘t Mannetje 2000). To be attractive to smallholders, investments must be low cost, be low risk, and increase profits.

An alternative for ensiling forages is use of plastic bags, named little bag silage (LBS) by Lane (2000). LBS conserves small quantities of fodder with reduced risk of fermentation. High-quality legume hay can also be packed and sold in plastic bags. Other technologies include storage in earth silos or larger plastic bags.

Sharing and Scaling

Effective expansion of research results to smallholder farmers requires information exchange and ample seed. Numerous methods enhance dialogue between farmers, including farmer field days, exchange visits, and knowledge sharing between countries. For example, Nicaraguan molds that ease the bag-filling process are now adapted and used by farmers in Colombia and Honduras. Both the private seed sector (for example, the Mexican seed enterprise Papalotla) and small-scale enterprises produce seed for widespread distribution (Chirwa and others 2007).

**MANAGEMENT: PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

Many forages grow well in areas that are prone to drought and have low soil fertility. Leguminous forages are of particular interest because they fix nitrogen, thereby contributing to system sustainability (Schultz-Kraft and Peters 1997; Shelton, Franzel, and Peters 2005). Improved pasture and forage management enables farmers to change their land uses, thereby generating positive environmental benefits.

System intensification with improved forages and soil conservation technologies increases productivity per animal (box 3.1). Intensification, from the sustainable land management (SLM) perspective, increases the productivity or carrying capacity of land. Other environmental benefits of improved forages include higher organic matter of soils, higher manure quality, and increased agricultural productivity (Giller 2001; Schultz-Kraft and Peters 1997). An emphasis is placed on highly productive and drought-tolerant materials to achieve permanent vegetation cover,

---

**Box 3.1 Example of Pasture Rehabilitation and Intensification from Honduras**

The Nuñezes are smallholder farmers in Yorito, Honduras. For years, they obtained only 35 liters of milk per day from their 12 cows, which fed on low-quality grasses. Pastures included a deforested area in the upper portion of their farm. With help from CIAT and national technicians, the Nuñezes planted Brachiaria brizantha Toledo, the hybrid Brachiaria Mulato, and the legume shrub Cratylia argentea. Management innovations included cut-and-carry forages, pasture rotations, and silage production systems that were appropriate to their smallholder farming system. The changes ensured an ample supply of high-quality fodder during the dry season. The new feeding approach generated both private financial and public environmental benefits. Milk production increased to 75 liters per day on less pasture, animals gained significant weight, and reproductive rates improved. Because their herd increased to 25 head, the Nuñezes planted more forage materials and constructed a 64-cubic-meter brick silo. Increased income from the additional milk has already paid for most of the new investments and will enable the Nuñezes to diversify into new activities. Meanwhile, the more intensive production system let the family allow steeply sloped pastures to revert to forest and thereby protect an important local water source.

---

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND**

---
thus reducing erosion risks. Cut-and-carry systems can decrease pressure on areas unsuitable for grazing, such as steep slopes and forests (Cruz and others 2003; Schmidt and Peters 2003). Landscape benefits of forages include both improved quantity and improved quality of water resources. Moreover, intensification through increased productivity can reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and pasture degradation (Steinfeld and others 2006).

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT**

Forage production and conservation are promising measures to alleviate livestock pressures on the environment (Peters and others 2001). Especially in Central America, system intensification through improved forages is attractive to farmers. Improved forages are economically profitable and represent a good option for improving the livelihoods of livestock producers (Holmann and Rivas 2005). Adopting *Brachiaria* for direct grazing during the rainy season with the shrub legume *Cratylia argentea* for feeding during the dry season can significantly improve milk and beef productivity. The number of cows can be increased between 2.1 and 3.5 times in the dual-purpose system and between 2.6 and 6.0 times in the specialized beef system. Milk production can increase from 2.3 to 3.5 times in the dual-purpose system. The investments in improved forages bring not only economic benefits for producers but also social gains, because the adoption of new technologies based on improved forages generates more rural employment and increases the availability of staple foods. In the dual-purpose system, it is possible to increase employment from 1.5 to 4.0 times. Investments are economically profitable and represent a good option for improving the livelihoods of livestock producers (Holmann and Rivas 2005).

Nevertheless, investments require ample funds or a line of credit over several years (that is, two to seven years, depending on the production system and macroeconomic conditions). Because few producers have the cash flow necessary to finance the required investments, farmers need to improve their farms gradually, as funds are available. Fast, large-scale adoption needs to be coordinated with financial organizations.

When something works, why not do more? Making livestock production more profitable creates that potential danger. Farmers may wish to cut more trees to expand pastures for more cattle and profits. The SLM challenges continue. Nevertheless, not all farmers do so. CIAT researchers have learned about the positive and negative effects of improved forages.

The environmental effects of improving forage production are mixed but largely predictable (White and others 2001). If land is expensive, intensifying production is cheaper than extending pastures into forest and other areas. Farmers tend to improve their pastures’ forages. Problems arise when land is inexpensive. In such areas, land can cost less than a bag of fertilizer. Then, the farmer finds expanding pastures into the forest more logical than improving production of existing pastures. Land becomes expensive when it is scarce, productive, or both. To make land scarce, governments need to put in place policies that restrict access. Policies to protect forests can achieve that aim, again with mixed results (Angelsen and Kaimowitz 2001). Local institutions can be fostered to encourage SLM.

The potential of improved forages to mitigate effects of expanding livestock production and to improve agroecosystem health has not yet been fully explored. Thus, further research should focus on the role of forages in matching economic and environmental sustainability through intensification and linking smallholders to markets.

Although the contributions of forages soil resources are many (such as improving nitrogen fixation, building up soil organic matter, enhancing soil biological activity and belowground biodiversity, improving manure quality, and increasing productivity of subsequent crops), the exact quantification and assessment of economic effects require further research. Other challenges include smallholder cut-and-carry systems with very limited external inputs. System nutrient balances are second-generation problems that need to be addressed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS**

Livestock have been and will continue to be part of the landscape in Central America. Matching forage germplasm with farmer preferences requires coordination among research, development, and policy. Effective efforts contain four components:

1. Targeting according to biophysical conditions
2. Diagnosing farm and market contexts
3. Fostering innovation and learning processes
4. Sharing knowledge and scaling out, including South-South interactions.

Research and development efforts need to proactively find ways to improve the feasibility of adopting forage technologies. Future research should provide alternatives so that land degradation is no longer the most attractive land-use.
option. To speed adoption processes, collaborative technical research with farmers that improves productivity and prevents degradation must go hand in hand with policies (for example, policies such as taxes, payments for carbon, market development, and media campaigns). Such linked efforts can generate incentives to change traditions and improve land management practices.

NOTE

1. The GLASOD project was funded by the United Nations Environment Programme from 1987 to 1990. The GLASOD project produced a world map of human-induced soil degradation. Data were compiled in cooperation with a large number of soil scientists throughout the world, using uniform guidelines. The status of soil degradation was mapped within loosely defined physiographic units (polygons), on the basis of expert judgment. The type, extent, degree, rate, and main causes of degradation have been printed on a global map, at a scale of 1:10 million and have been documented in a downloadable database at http://www.isric.org/UK/About+ISRIC/Projects/Track+Record/GLASOD.htm
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Agricultural Research and Extension Network. The Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN) connects policy makers, practitioners, and researchers in the agriculture sector of developing countries. The network is linked to the broader research of the Rural Policy and Environment Group of the Overseas Development Institute. The program generates research-based policy advice on ways of increasing the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of rural resource management and agricultural service delivery. The AgREN Web site contains publications, membership information, research updates, and a link to Overseas Development Institute home page. [http://www.odi.org.uk/agren/publist.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/agren/publist.html).

International Center for Tropical Agriculture. The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) is a non-profit organization that conducts socially and environmentally progressive research targeting the reduction of hunger and poverty and the preservation of natural resources in developing countries. CIAT is one of the 15 centers that make up the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. The CIAT Web site has information on its products, regions, research, and services: [http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/](http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/).

LEAD Virtual Centre. Livestock, Environment And Development (LEAD) is a multi-institutional initiative of FAO formed to promote ecologically sustainable livestock production systems. It focuses on protecting the natural resources that are affected by livestock production and processing and on poverty reduction and public health enhancement through appropriate forms of livestock development. The LEAD web site offers resources through their LEAD Virtual Centre, LEAD language platforms, Decision Support Tools, and Research & Development Projects: [http://www.virtualcentre.org/](http://www.virtualcentre.org/).

Tropical Forages: An Interactive Selection Tool. Tropical Forages: An Interactive Selection Tool is a collaborative effort between CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems, Department of Primary Industries & Fisheries (Qld), Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). A project description can be found in the Overview section and more information about the collaborators and donors can be found in the Acknowledgements section: [http://www.tropicalforages.info/](http://www.tropicalforages.info/).

University of Tropical Agriculture Foundation. The University of Tropical Agriculture Foundation (UTA) was established in 1996 in Vietnam, at the University of Agriculture and Forestry (now the Nong Lam University), Ho Chi Minh city. The mission of UTA is to educate people on managing natural resources in a way that will sustain the food and energy needs of present and future generations in tropical regions. The UTA website provides UTA news, publications, studies, resources, and services: [http://www.utafoundation.org](http://www.utafoundation.org).
Soybeans can improve soil fertility, but few African farmers plant them. Crops grown after soybeans can produce larger harvests for household consumption or market sale because of the soybeans’ nitrogen-fixing capacity (but note the caveat regarding the important differences between conventional soya, which leaves little for the following crop and sends most of the nitrogen to the grain, and promiscuous soya, which leaves much more nitrogen in the soil). The use of soybeans within an agricultural system also enables farmers to diversify production, thereby spreading their exposure to risk across different crops. Because on-farm investments are minimal, resource-poor farmers can begin production easily. The crop is attractive to women—both as a crop for sale and for home consumption. The Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute (TSBF) of the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, or CIAT) has developed a soybean promotion initiative based on strategic alliances to support market development and provide information about using soybeans. The approach recognizes that successful diversification requires cooperation among farmers and between farmers and service providers to build a viable market chain. Dialogue between the market-chain participants and service providers helps generate better understanding of each other’s needs and challenges.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Soil nutrient losses in Sub-Saharan Africa are an environmental, social, and political time bomb. Unless these disastrous trends are soon reversed, the future viability of African food systems will be imperiled (Borlaug 2003). Soil degradation is one of the major constraints in achieving food security in developing countries, particularly in Africa.

Degradation may pay in the short term, but not in the long term. Unfortunately, much of Africa is experiencing the long-term effects of degradation (Anderson 2003). Abundant yields do not continue without adequate investments in soil fertility. Many farmers are caught in a poverty trap (Barrett and others 2004), where harvests are insufficient to meet urgent household food needs—let alone generate enough income to invest in fertilizers. Moreover, chemical fertilizers are too expensive (Camara and Heinemann 2006). Organic resources sufficient to replenish nutrient losses through cropping are difficult to produce (African Fertilizer Summit Secretariat 2006). The effects of land degradation are felt beyond the farm. As productivity declines, families often expand production into new areas.

Soybeans can improve soil fertility. In Africa, however, few farmers plant them. Coordinated research and promotion activities are needed to enable soybeans to become a valuable crop within smallholder agricultural systems. This Investment Note shares the experience of TSBF and its partners in advancing soybean use in Kenya. Only by adequately addressing aspects of production, processing, and consumption can soybeans help improve both household earnings and land productivity.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

Soybeans can add nitrogen to soils (although the conventional varieties channel most nitrogen to the grain and leave little to be returned to the soil). An important development has been the breeding of promiscuous soybeans. Promiscuous varieties nodulate with the natural soil bacteria rather than with the highly variety-specific bacteria that typically have to be pro-
vided when planting conventional soya. Promiscuous varieties are typically slightly lower in yield but return a significantly higher amount of nitrogen to the soil. For smallholders, where nitrogen is a scarce and expensive input, promiscuous soya are easier to grow and add greater fertility to the overall production system. By cultivating soya beans, farmers can harvest valuable grains while improving the productive capacity of their farms. Such a positive outcome, however, is not always achieved. Only some efforts to promote soya beans have been successful. Perhaps for this reason, soya beans remain a minor crop in African farming systems.

In Nigeria, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) and Canada’s International Development Research Center implemented a comprehensive and successful soya bean project between 1987 and 1999. During that time, soya bean production increased from about 150,000 to 405,000 metric tons, an increase of 166 percent (FAO 2001). Average yields more than doubled from about 340 to 740 kilograms per hectare. Village surveys confirmed dramatic soybean production increases in Benue state. The annual production of 70 soybean farmers (a random sample) was less than 5 metric tons between 1982 and 1984, but it increased to 30 tons by 1989 (Sanginga and others 1999). At present, Nigeria produces about 850,000 metric tons of soybeans annually (figure 3.2).

Increasing demand for soya beans encouraged production and was crucial to project success. An urban market survey in Ibadan (one of Nigeria’s largest cities) revealed that whereas only two markets sold soybeans in 1987, there were more than 100 by 2000 (see figure 3.2). Soybean retailers in these markets expanded from 4 to more than 1,500 between 1987 and 1999. A similar success occurred in Zimbabwe following a project intervention led by the University of Zimbabwe (Blackie 2006).

In stark contrast, soybean promotion in Kenya generated few positive results. Despite the contribution of many national and international organizations, soybean production and consumption have not achieved widespread effects. The main reasons for the failure were (a) a lack of awareness about soybean processing and use, (b) low yields, and (c) few markets.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Because soybean cultivation can fix as much as 100 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare (Sanginga and others 2003) (but note the caveat regarding the important differences between conventional soya, which leaves little for the following crop and sends most of the nitrogen to the grain, and promiscuous soya, which leaves much more nitrogen in the soil), crops grown after soybeans produce larger harvests for household consumption or market sale. Use of soybeans within an agricultural system also enables farmers to diversify production, thereby spreading their exposure to risk across different crops. Such a farm management strategy minimizes the possibility of catastrophic harvest losses at the farm household and landscape levels.

In western Kenya, maize is usually intercropped with common beans. The major cash crops in the area are sugarcane, tobacco, and cotton. Soybeans fit into the maize-base cropping system and are currently either intercropped with maize or rotated with maize. Kenyan scientists have developed the Mbili intercropping system, which greatly increases the efficiency and productivity of maize intercropping. By skillfully altering the spacing both between and within rows of tall-growing maize while maintaining overall plant population, the lower-growing extra intercrop gains additional light and thus provides better yields without compromising the yield of the major food crop—maize. Farmers also intercrop soybeans with sugarcane. In addition, soybeans enable resource-poor farmers to take advantage of the nitrogen-fixing attributes of the promiscuous soybean varieties for their subsequent maize. The effect has been dramatic, especially if two seasons of soybeans are followed by one season of maize.

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT**

Good food, nice profit, and better soil fertility are key motivators for cultivating soybeans. Improved and sustainable
Land management comes as a welcome bonus. With positive incentives, such as households liking the taste of soybeans and a market paying attractive prices, the secondary benefits of soil fertility can easily tag along.

Soybeans are also an important cash crop with many uses. Since the 1960s, the plant has been the dominant oilseed (Smith and Huys 1987). It is a human food, is used as livestock feed, and has numerous industrial purposes (Myaka, Kirenga, and Malema 2005). The 40 percent protein content of soybeans is approximately twice that of other legumes (Greenberg and Hartung 1998). Despite these apparent uses and benefits, soybean production in Africa remains low. In 2000, Sub-Saharan Africa cultivated only 1 percent of the world’s soybean crop.

Soybean cultivation enhances social benefits and gender equity. Because on-farm investments are minimal, resource-poor farmers can begin production easily. Besides preparing meals with soybeans, many women get involved in soybean production (Sanginga and others 1999).

A recent initiative fostered by TSBF aims to broaden the exposure of rural households to soybeans in Kenya. The new initiative aims (a) to capture and hold the interest of farmers in soybeans through an information campaign (to dispel unfounded myths and emphasize benefits) and (b) to create a desire among farmers to process and consume soybeans in different forms through training in processing.

Project partners include the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, Kenyatta University, the Lake Basin Development Authority, the Kenya Forestry Research Institute, the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, and the IITA. Strategic alliances of important stakeholders in the soybean production-to-consumption chain are central to the project. TSBF has developed a three-tier approach for sustainable soybean promotion for Kenya, described as follows:

- **Tier 1—household level.** The approach begins with the creation of widespread awareness on the various benefits of soybean production, consumption, and marketing as well as with practical training. From the beginning, the project confronts unfounded common household myths and stereotypes about soybeans—mistaken information that can undermine an initiative if not adequately addressed with compelling evidence and practical demonstrations. Participatory development of soybean products emphasizes the ease of use within popular local dishes.

- **Tier 2—community level.** Surpluses of soybean production at the household level are absorbed at the community level and processed into soymilk, yogurt, soy bread, cakes, biscuits, and so on. Processing can absorb household-level production surpluses that could otherwise become a disincentive to further cultivation. Tier 2 action also creates new consumer preferences and potential demand by introducing new products, such as soymilk, soy yogurt, and meat substitutes.

- **Tier 3—industry level.** This tier continues the formalization of the soybean producer in the market. The main emphasis is to link soybean producers with input suppliers (that is, suppliers of seed, fertilizer, value-added knowledge, information, transport, and the like) and output purchasers (especially the industrial market). The project interacts with numerous actors of the supply chain, including (a) industry, to find out what products it wants; (b) farmers, to evaluate their ability to deliver products that meet industrial specifications; and (c) other stakeholders, to determine how they can contribute to the market development process.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS**

Strategic alliances support the three-tier market development for soybeans. Project partners enable smallholder farmers to benefit from soybean production by providing diverse types of necessary and complementary support. The approach recognizes that successful diversification requires cooperation among farmers and between farmers and service providers to build a viable market chain. Dialogue among the market-chain participants and service providers helps generate better understanding of one another’s needs and challenges. Different types of knowledge are shared: research, technology, production, equipment, transport, and support services (CIAT 2005). The strategic alliance has seven types of actors, whose participation is crucial for successful soybean promotion:

1. **Soybean farmers and farmer associations.** Farmer representatives are responsible for interacting with other farmers to articulate their views during the alliance meetings. By consolidating relationships with buyers and opening communication channels with all market-chain participants, farmers gain valuable experience and confidence, which in turn enhances their negotiating power.

2. **Input suppliers.** A common feature of the soybean farmers is lack of capital and inputs such as appropriate germplasm. Input service providers include agricultural input and seed suppliers and microcredit agencies.

3. **Nongovernmental organizations.** These organizations provide assistance on postproduction value-added activities: sorting, bulking, grading, packaging, transporta-
tion, haulage, and storage. Such activities enable farmers to increase their prices.

4. **Food processors.** Large-scale industries currently import soybeans. Provided that farmers produce the grains of the quality desired, these industries reafirm their commitment to purchase grain produced at agreed-on prices.

5. **Communication and information agencies.** Because of the critical role of information, a grassroots information and communication agency, AfriAfya, is in the alliance to backstop extension and to strengthen the provision of information and communication services and soybean technologies. AfriAfya is responsible for creating local content that responds to the needs of rural people.

6. **Government institutions.** The key government institutions represented in the alliance may include the ministries of agriculture, trade and industry, and finance. These institutions assist with both implementing and formulating enabling policies in support of soybeans.

7. **Donor organizations.** Organizations such as the Rockefeller Foundation provide funds for organizing and implementing the alliance.

The alliance (a) creates an opportunity for integrated resource mobilization, (b) involves each stakeholder within a larger problem-solving framework, (c) provides assistance in analyzing distinct perceptions of different actors, (d) strengthens capacity of business services, (e) effectively brokers and addresses industry needs, and (f) develops enduring public-private partnerships for long-term success.
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*Africa Fertilizer Summit.* The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) called for an Africa Fertilizer Summit from June 9–13, 2006 in Abuja, Nigeria, to be implemented by the International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC). The Summit’s objective was to increase the awareness of the role that fertilizer can play in stimulating sustainable pro-poor productivity growth in African agri-
culture and to discuss approaches for rapidly increasing efficient fertilizer use by African smallholder farmers. For more information on the summit, access the Africa Fertilizer Summit Web site: http://www.africafertilizersummit.org/FAQ.html.

*Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute.* The Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute (TSBF) of CIAT develops and disseminates strategic principles, concepts, methods, and management options for protecting and improving the health and fertility of soils by manipulating biological processes and efficiently using soil, water, and nutrient resources in tropical agroecosystems. The TSBF of the CIAT Web site has information on its products, networks, research focus, and other information and services: http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/tsbf_institute/index.htm.
The Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn (ASB) Programme is a global alliance of more than 80 local, national, and international partners dedicated to action-oriented integrated natural resources management (INRM) research in the tropical forest margins.

ASB research in Cameroon and Indonesia has revealed the feasibility of a middle path of development involving smallholder agroforests and community forest management for timber and other products. The Brazilian Amazon, in contrast, presents much starker trade-offs between global environmental benefits and the returns to smallholders’ labor. Here, the most commonly practiced pasture-livestock system, which occupies the vast majority of converted forestland, is profitable for smallholders (at least in the short term) but entails huge carbon emissions and biodiversity loss. The land-use alternatives that are attractive privately are at odds with global environmental interests.

Results from ASB research at all the benchmark sites show that attempting to conserve forests in developing countries is futile without addressing the needs of poor local people. The issues are well illustrated by a study of options facing settlers in Brazil’s Acre state. Using a specially developed bioeconomic model, ASB researchers showed that only in the unlikely event that prices quadrupled over their current level might the rate of deforestation slow. Even in that case, the braking effect is slight, and the modest saving in forestland would probably be short-lived.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Occasionally, tropical forests can be conserved while poverty is being reduced, but more often these two objectives conflict. Without action to resolve this conflict, tropical forests will continue to disappear. Striking an equitable balance between the legitimate interests of development and the equally legitimate global concerns about the environmental consequences of tropical deforestation is one of the greatest challenges of today’s generation.

Everyone in the world wants something from tropical forests. Forest dwellers wish to continue their traditional way of life based on hunting and gathering. They are losing their land to migrant smallholders, who clear small amounts of forest to earn a living by raising crops and livestock. Both groups tend to lose out to larger, more powerful interests—ranchers, plantation owners, large-scale farmers, or logging concerns—whose aim is to convert large areas of forest into big money. Outside the forests is the international community, which wishes to see forests preserved for the carbon they store—that carbon would otherwise contribute to global warming—and for the wealth of biological diversity they harbor.

Deforestation continues because converting forests to other uses is almost always profitable for the individual. However, society as a whole bears the costs of lost biodiversity, global warming, smoke pollution, and degradation of water resources.

Every year the world loses about 10 million hectares of tropical forest—an area more than three times the size of Belgium. None of the land-use systems that replace this natural forest can match it in terms of biodiversity richness and carbon storage. However, these systems do vary greatly in the degree to which they combine at least some environmental benefits with their contributions to economic growth and poor peoples’ livelihoods. What will replace forest (and for how long) is, therefore, always...
worth asking, both under the current mix of policies, institutions, and technologies and compared with possible alternatives. In other words, what can be done to secure the best balance among the conflicting interests of different groups?

INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The ASB Programme is a well-established global alliance of more than 80 local, national, and international partners dedicated to action-oriented integrated natural resources management research in the tropical forest margins. It is the only global partnership devoted entirely to research on the tropical forest margins. The goal of the ASB Programme is to raise productivity and income of rural households in the humid tropics without increasing deforestation or undermining essential environmental services. The program applies an INRM approach to analysis and action through long-term engagement with local communities and policy makers at various levels.

KEY DRIVERS FOR DEGRADATION DYNAMICS: THE ASB MATRIX—LINING UP THE FACTS

Faced with the diverging goals of conserving forests and addressing the needs of local inhabitants, policy makers need accurate, objective information on which to base their inevitably controversial decisions. To help them weigh up the difficult choices they must make, ASB researchers have developed a new tool known as the ASB matrix (table 3.2).

In the ASB matrix, natural forest and the land-use systems that replace it are scored against various criteria reflecting the objectives of different interest groups. So that results can be compared across locations, systems specific to each are grouped according to broad categories, ranging from agroforests to grasslands and pastures.

The criteria may be fine-tuned for specific locations, but the matrix always includes indicators for the following:

- Two major global environmental concerns: carbon storage and biodiversity
- Agronomic sustainability, assessed according to a range of soil characteristics, including trends in nutrients and organic matter over time
- Policy objectives: economic growth and employment opportunities
- Smallholders’ concerns: their workload, returns to their labor, food security for their family, and start-up costs of new systems or techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use to labor</th>
<th>Carbon sequestration (metric tons per hectare)</th>
<th>Biodiversity aboveground, plant species</th>
<th>Overall rating</th>
<th>Potential profitability (at social prices)</th>
<th>Employment average per hectare per year</th>
<th>Production incentives (at private prices)</th>
<th>Adoptability by smallholders</th>
<th>Returns to labor input (US$ per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural forest</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based forest management</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial logging</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber agroforest</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil palm monoculture</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland ricebush fallow rotation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous cassava degrading to imperata</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tomich and others 1998.

Note: Natural forest and the land-use systems that replace it are scored against criteria (global environmental benefits, agronomic sustainability, profitability, labor, and incentives) that are important for the diverse range of stakeholders in the landscape.
Policy and institutional barriers to adoption by smallholders, including the availability of credit, markets, and improved technology.

Between 1995 and 2005, ASB researchers have filled in this matrix for representative benchmark sites dotted across the humid tropics. Political and economic factors at work at these sites vary greatly, as does their current resource endowment: from the densely populated lowlands of the Indonesian island of Sumatra, through a region of varying population density and access to markets south of Yaoundé in Cameroon, to the remote forests of Acre state in the far west of the Brazilian Amazon, where settlement by small-scale farmers is relatively recent and forest is still plentiful.

At each site, ASB researchers have evaluated land-use systems both as they are currently practiced and in the alternative forms that could be possible through policy, institutional, and technological innovations. A key question addressed was whether the intensification of land use through technological innovation could reduce both poverty and deforestation.

LESSONS LEARNED

The matrix allows researchers, policy makers, environmentalists, and others to identify and discuss trade-offs among the various objectives of different interest groups.

The studies in Cameroon and Indonesia have revealed the feasibility of a middle path of development involving smallholder agroforests and community forest management for timber and other products. Such a path could deliver an attractive balance between environmental benefits and equitable economic growth. Whether this balance is struck in practice, however, will depend on the ability of these countries to deliver the necessary policy and institutional innovations.

Take the examples of Sumatran rubber agroforests and their cocoa and fruit counterparts in Cameroon. These systems offer levels of biodiversity that, although not as high as those found in natural forest, are nevertheless far higher than those in single-species tree plantations or annual cropping systems. Like any tree-based system, they also offer substantial levels of carbon storage. Crucially, technological innovations have the potential to increase the yields of the key commodities in these systems—thereby raising farmers’ incomes substantially—to levels that either outperform or at least compete well with virtually all other systems. However, to realize this potential, policy makers, researchers, and others must find ways of delivering improved planting material—the key input needed.

The Brazilian Amazon, in contrast, presents much starker trade-offs between global environmental benefits and the returns to smallholders’ labor. Here, the most commonly practiced pasture-livestock system, which occupies the vast majority of converted forestland, is profitable for smallholders but entails huge carbon emissions and biodiversity loss. Systems that are preferable from an environmental point of view, such as coffee combined with banjarr (a fast-growing timber tree), can pay better but have prohibitively high start-up costs and labor requirements and are riskier for farmers. An alternative pasture-livestock system, in which farmers are expressing interest, offers even higher returns to land and labor but only slightly improves biodiversity and carbon storage. In other words, the land-use alternatives that are attractive privately are at odds with global environmental interests. Only a radical overhaul of the incentives available to land users, including smallholders, could change things.

Just how radical would the overhaul have to be? Very radical—even for a small effect—according to ASB research. Consider the gathering of wild Brazil nuts, one of the most environmentally benign uses of the Amazon’s forests. At current prices offered to smallholders, Brazil nut harvesting pays well below the going rate for wage labor. To persuade smallholders merely to slow the pace of deforestation, the price of nuts would have to rise more than fourfold.

Research by ASB scientists of the Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária on the pasture-livestock system in the western Amazon of Brazil shows that, with a combination of legumes to enrich pastures and solar-powered electric fences to control the pattern of grazing by their cattle, smallholders could double milk production per cow and triple the carrying capacity of their land, bringing a marked increase in profitability. In addition, because this pasture system is sustainable without annual burning to control weeds, seasonal smoke pollution would be reduced (see ASB Programme 2002).

So why have these practices not been adopted widely already? First, the vast majority of smallholders cannot get access to the necessary credit, seeds, or hired labor and are too far from markets to be able to sell the increased milk supplies. Second, aiming for these higher profits entails increased risk, in part because of the higher initial investment costs. But even if these barriers were eliminated, widespread adoption of such improvements would likely increase—not decrease—the pressure on neighboring forests. The reason is that the greater profitability of the
improved system would make the agricultural frontier more attractive to new settlers. Thus, under the present mix of policies and institutions, plus the incentives they create, the forests in Brazil’s western Amazon will continue to fall whether the smallholder succeeds or fails.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT: PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

Given these results, what can be done to balance the objectives of forest conservation and poverty reduction in these tricky settings? Some assert that the best opportunities for meeting both objectives lie in the harvest of various products from community-managed forests. In practice, such extensive systems require low population densities plus effective mechanisms for keeping other groups out if they are to prove sustainable.

Where forests are converted, agroforests often represent the next best option for conserving biodiversity and storing carbon, while also providing attractive livelihood opportunities for smallholders. For both economic and ecological reasons, however, no single land-use system should predominate at the expense of all others. Mixes of land uses increase biodiversity at a landscape level, if not within individual systems, and also can enhance economic and ecological resilience. A mixed landscape mosaic represents an especially attractive option in cases such as Brazil, where no single system offers a reasonable compromise between different objectives.

Where productivity of the natural resource base has already sunk to very low levels, concentrating development efforts on the simultaneous environmental and economic restoration of degraded landscapes is an option that is well worth exploring.

The precise mix of interventions needed—hence the benefits and costs of restoration—varies from place to place. In Cameroon, improved cocoa and fruit tree systems could be a win-win proposition in place of unsustainably short fallow rotations. In Indonesia, millions of hectares of Imperata grasslands are the obvious starting point.

The direction of change in land-use systems determines the environmental consequences. For example, if farmers replace unsustainable cassava production with an improved rubber agroforest, they help restore habitats and carbon stocks. But if such a system replaces natural forest, the environment loses. Intensification of land use through technological change is a two-edged sword. It has great potential to increase the productivity and sustainability of existing forest-derived systems, thereby raising incomes. By the same token, however, these higher incomes attract more landless people to the agricultural frontier in search of a better living. Therefore, technological innovation to intensify land use will not be enough to stop deforestation. Indeed, it often will accelerate deforestation. If both objectives are to be met, policy measures intended to encourage intensification will need to be accompanied by measures to protect those forest areas that harbor globally significant biodiversity.

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT**

The main point for policy makers is that without tangible incentives linked to the supply of global environmental benefits, people will continue to cut down tropical rainforests. Results from ASB research at all the benchmark sites show that attempting to conserve forests in developing countries is futile without addressing the needs of poor local people. But how can the necessary incentives to conserve be put in place? Only a limited number of policy instruments have so far been tried, and there is still much to learn about what does and does not work. Part of the answer lies in the developing countries themselves, where such measures as securing land tenure and use rights can be taken. But should these countries have to shoulder the entire financial burden of forest conservation when all face urgent development imperatives, such as educating and vaccinating rural children?

The bottom line is that if the international community wants the global benefits of rainforest preservation, it is going to have to pay for some of the costs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS**

The issues are well illustrated by a study of options facing settlers in Brazil’s Acre state. (Faminow, Oliveira, and Sá 1997). These farmers clear forest gradually over the years, with pasture for cattle becoming the dominant land use. In addition, about 50 percent of farm families harvest nuts from the part of their farms that remains forested.

Using a specially developed bioeconomic model, ASB researchers explored how labor, capital, and land would be allocated to different on-farm activities over a 25-year period under different price and market scenarios. When they applied the model to Brazil nuts, the researchers found that doubling the farm-gate price of nuts would not decrease and might even increase the rate of deforestation. The reason is that farmers probably would reinvest the extra cash they earned in clearing forest faster. From the farmers’ perspective, even at the higher price, cattle production remains by far the more profitable
activity. Only in the unlikely event that nut prices quadrupled over their current level might the rate of deforestation slow. Even then, the braking effect would be slight and the modest saving in forest would probably be short-lived.

The researchers concluded that subsidizing the price of Brazil nuts would not by itself be an effective policy measure for conserving forests.
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ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins. ASB is a global partnership of research institutes, non-governmental organizations, universities, community organizations, farmers’ groups, and other local, national, and international organizations. ASB is the only global partnership that is entirely devoted to researching the tropical forest margins. Since 1994, it has operated as a system-wide program of the Consultative Group for International Research in Agriculture (CGIAR). The ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins Web site contains information on its impact, regions, themes, publications, and other resources: http://www.asb.cgiar.org/.

ASB Policybriefs series. ASB’s Policybriefs series takes the lessons learned from experiences at the local or national levels and distills them for a broader, international audience. ASB aims to deliver relevant, concise reading to key people whose decisions will make a difference to poverty reduction and environmental protection in the humid tropics: http://www.asb.cgiar.org/publications/policybriefs.

ASB reports. ASB has summary reports on Brazil, Cameroon, and Indonesia, as well as working group reports on climate change, biodiversity, and socioeconomic indicators. http://www.asb.cgiar.org/publications/countryreports/.

ASB Voices series. The ASB Voices series aims to provide insights and perspectives from people’s real-life experiences and challenges in the humid tropics for a broad audience. The series is able to highlight the implications

Rewarding Upland Poor for Environmental Services. The Rewarding Upland Poor for Environmental Services (RUPES) program aims to enhance the livelihoods and reduce poverty of the upland poor while supporting environmental conservation on biodiversity protection, watershed management, carbon sequestration and landscape beauty at local and global levels. Through partnership with its major donor, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) has taken on the role of coordinating a consortium of partners interested in contributing and being a part of RUPES. The RUPES website offers information on RUPES sites, partnerships, and activities: http://www.worldagroforestry.org/sea/Networks/RUPES/index.asp.

World Agroforestry Centre. Using science, the World Agroforestry Centre generates knowledge on the complex role of trees in livelihoods and the environment, and fosters use of this knowledge to improve decisions and practices to impact the poor. The World Agroforestry Centre Website provides information on their news and events, recent publications, agroforestry information and other information resources: http://www.worldagroforestry.org/es/default.asp.
Countries are increasingly relying on finite groundwater reserves (built up over centuries) for household, agricultural, and industrial needs. Although addressing water shortages in the short term, groundwater exploitation brings its own host of problems. Solving these problems means conducting holistic studies of hydrologic systems to find appropriate solutions that will result in real water savings.

The North China Plain is China's most important agricultural center, producing more than half the country’s wheat and a third of its maize. The deficit between rainfall and crop requirements has been met by irrigation from aquifers underlying the plain. Pumping water from the aquifers has led to the continued decline of groundwater levels despite improved irrigation efficiency and reduced pumping.

An International Water Management Institute (IWMI) study (Kendy and others 2003) used a water-balance approach—a simple accounting method to quantify hydrologic changes. The model shows clearly that simply changing the amount of water applied for irrigation will not affect the rate of groundwater depletion, which leaves only two other variables: rainfall and evapotranspiration. With rainfall beyond management control, the only way to reduce groundwater depletion and to achieve real water savings is to address evapotranspiration. The water-balance approach allowed IWMI to formulate successful water-saving choices. The sets of options comprise a combination of changing cropping patterns, leaving certain areas of land to lie fallow, and changing land use to urban uses. Each set of options is a different combination of land uses that will deplete no more than 460 millimeters per year—brining rainfall and evapotranspiration into equilibrium.

KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

With growing populations, changing weather patterns, and increasing pollution of bodies of surface water, countries around the world are relying more and more on finite groundwater reserves built up over centuries for household, agricultural, and industrial needs. Although addressing water shortages in the short term, groundwater exploitation brings its own problems. It can cause surface water depletion, saltwater intrusion into freshwater aquifers, and subsidence of the land surface (box 3.2). Governments are quick to turn to improving water efficiency as the best solution to the problem but are too often disappointed. Research increasingly shows that in devising water management strategies to conserve water and halt the decline of groundwater levels, policy makers must conduct holistic studies of hydrologic systems to find appropriate solutions that will result in real water savings. What is needed is not a simple one-size-fits-all policy or solution but varying management approaches to suit specific situations. The concept of hydroeconomic zones, which categorizes a hydrologic system into different zones—each having its own best set of water-saving measures—could be a useful tool in this exercise.

The paradox of increasing irrigation efficiency and reduced pumping yet declining groundwater levels (see box 3.2) has puzzled water policy experts and resource managers. It provided the impetus for an IWMI study (Kendy and others 2003) in Luancheng county, located in the Hai River basin, one of the three rivers draining the North China Plain. The study examined the nexus between agricultural policies in the area, water management approaches, and actual water use in an effort to explain the steady decline in groundwater levels and to find appropriate solutions to halt this decline.

TRENDS IN RESOURCE USE

This note was prepared by E. Kendy, The Nature Conservancy, Washington, DC.
As agricultural policies and water management strategies evolved over the years, water-use trends changed accordingly. With increased winter wheat cropping and a shift from cotton to more irrigation-intensive maize, an increase in groundwater use that would mirror the cropping patterns could be expected. However, the reality is quite different. Contrary to expectations, groundwater pumping did not grow with the increase and change in cropping. Even more surprisingly, pumping rates actually decreased during the late 1970s and early 1980s before finally stabilizing in the 1980s (figure 3.3). Nevertheless, groundwater levels have declined steadily throughout the period under study. This seeming contradiction has puzzled water policy experts and resource managers and provided the impetus for IWMI’s study (Kendy and others 2003).

**KEY DRIVERS FOR DEGRADATION DYNAMICS: THE POLICY–WATER USE NEXUS**

IWMI’s study used a water-balance approach to try to find the answer. It is a simple accounting method used to quantify hydrologic changes. The soil/water balance and the groundwater balance in Luancheng county were both studied. The study concluded that the continued decline in groundwater levels is caused by the long-standing agricultural policy of achieving food self-sufficiency by continually increasing the irrigated area, coupled with the use of irrigation water from the aquifers underlying the plain. Pumping water from the aquifers has led to the continued decline of groundwater levels despite improved irrigation efficiency and reduced pumping.
groundwater to supplement precipitation. Even more interesting is what the study reveals about the connection between increasing irrigation efficiency and groundwater levels. In Luancheng county, irrigation efficiency has increased, causing more than a 50 percent decrease in groundwater pumping since the 1970s (figure 3.4). However, groundwater levels continue to drop steadily. Because excess irrigation water seeps through the soil back to the aquifer underlying irrigated areas and replenishes the water supply, the only significant inflows and outflows to the system are through precipitation and crop evapotranspiration. As long as those two factors remain constant, increased irrigation efficiency will save no water. Instead, other options, such as reducing the length of the growing season and reducing the extent of irrigated land, need to be considered to halt the decline of groundwater levels.

The model clearly shows that simply changing the amount of water applied for irrigation will not affect the rate of groundwater depletion, which leaves only two other variables: rainfall and evapotranspiration. With rainfall beyond management control, the only way to reduce groundwater depletion and to achieve real water savings is to address evapotranspiration. This conclusion is further borne out by the relationship among rainfall, evapotranspiration, and resulting depletion in groundwater over the study period (figure 3.4).

In the early years before irrigation development, precipitation exceeded evapotranspiration and the excess water recharged the aquifer, sometimes causing it to overflow. As irrigated areas grew and the number of crops harvested each year rose, evapotranspiration increased until it exceeded rainfall (see figure 3.4). At that point, groundwater mining began, and since that time, the amount of groundwater mined has been the difference between rainfall and evapotranspiration, regardless of the amounts pumped out of the aquifer. As long as this difference remains virtually constant, the rate of groundwater depletion, too, will remain constant.

Taking into consideration the entire hydrologic system, including the soil profile and the underlying aquifer, water policy experts and resource managers have overlooked a simple but nevertheless vital factor over the years: as long as crop evapotranspiration remains constant or increases, no reduction in the rate of groundwater depletion can occur. The answer lies in methods that will either maintain or reduce the rate of evapotranspiration. The holistic study of

Figure 3.4  General Relationships between Precipitation and Evapotranspiration for Cropland in Luancheng County, 1947–2000
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Source: Author’s elaboration.
the hydrologic system points in the right direction in the search for these solutions.

A concept that is useful in studying hydrologic systems is that of hydronomic zoning. A hydrologic system such as a river basin is divided into hydronomic (\textit{hydro} [water] + \textit{nomus} [management]) zones, which are defined primarily according to the destination of the drainage outflow from water uses. Thus, there are zones where water can be reused and where it cannot, because of location and quality. Moreover, each hydrological system can be classified into all or some of the following zones: water source, natural recapture, regulated recapture, stagnation, environmentally sensitive, and final-use zones (figure 3.5).

The classification of the system into the different hydronomic zones (Molden, Sakthivadivel, and Keller 2001) helps identify the best methods of saving water because each zone has its own best set of water-saving measures. In identifying these sets of measures, researchers must account for the extent to which the system has excess water available for depletion, the level of groundwater dependence, and the extent of pollution and salinity loading.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR BOTH WATER AND LAND MANAGEMENT: A SELECTION OF**

**POSSIBLE ANSWERS**

The most popular and the most politically acceptable way of attempting to save water is to increase irrigation efficiency. However, IWMI’s study has clearly shown that this method will not always be effective. Examining a hydrological system as a system of hydronomic zones has shown that efficiency technologies will not be effective in natural and regulated recapture zones with groundwater storage and low salt buildup. If significant salt buildup or pollution occurs in a regulated recapture zone, efficiency technologies will be useful in controlling pollution. These methods will also be useful where no significant recharge of the aquifer occurs or where the recharge is heavily polluted. Such technologies will also decrease energy use. In a natural recapture zone such as Luancheng county, irrigation efficiency will not be effective in stemming groundwater decline. Thus, a variety of other options has been suggested and considered.

Water price increases to increase irrigation efficiency are often suggested as a water conservation measure. In the case of Luancheng county, this measure might not be appropriate because reducing pumping but irrigating the same area will not stop groundwater decline. Rather, what is required is a change in land use; whether this result will ensue from higher prices is debatable.

Figure 3.5  Hydronomic Zones in a River Basin

Source: Author’s elaboration.
Aside from irrigation efficiency, a variety of water-saving technologies are put forward as possible solutions. Some of the technologies may exacerbate the problem if used inappropriately. For example, although sprinkler irrigation will save energy and allow for more precise application of water and fertilizers, leading to higher yields, it will not always be effective in reducing groundwater decline. In some situations, it might even aggravate the problem if farmers decide to irrigate more crops with the water they save. Technologies that reduce evaporation, such as the use of mulching and the establishment of greenhouses, would be ideal for Luancheng county.

Changing the cropping pattern is one possibility that needs to be carefully looked at. Adopting less water-intensive cropping patterns than the currently predominant winter wheat and summer maize combination is one suggestion. The amount of water saved will depend on the length of the growing season, the crop’s root depth, and its leaf area. Studies have shown, however, that any cropping routine that includes a winter wheat cycle will not show any significant reduction in groundwater depletion. Thus, introducing a winter fallow season appears to be the only way of seeing any significant water savings through crop changes. This option, unfortunately, is not likely to be socially and economically palatable.

Another option is the transformation of land use from rural to urban. Although specific data are not available for Luancheng county, urban land use is commonly accepted as depleting much less water than crop evapotranspiration. An urban setting would call for a different range of water conservation measures. In the city of Shijiazhuang, overpumping of groundwater has resulted in the deformation of the water table into a funnel shape, which has affected elevations of water levels at different points and has caused directional changes to the natural flow of groundwater. Thus, water that would naturally have flowed to the aquifers of Luancheng county is flowing instead to the aquifers of Shijiazhuang city. Reducing the net amount of water pumped for the city is imperative if this unsustainable situation is to be reversed.

In an urban setting, precipitation tends to leave the system as runoff, rather than recharging the underlying aquifer, because many of the land surfaces are impermeable. Here, unlike in the study area, efficiency technologies would have a significant effect. A more expensive option is to treat wastewater and then use it to recharge the aquifer. Studies in California have shown that both measures, although they are expensive, show better results in terms of water yield-to-cost ratios than agricultural water conservation, land falling, and surface storage construction.

With respect to improving water-use efficiency in urban areas, industrial facilities provide greater potential savings than do households. Water use per industrial product in China is 3 to 10 times greater than in other industrial countries. Discouraging water-intensive industries is a measure that has been adopted in some Chinese cities. Likewise, many different measures can be considered singly or together in the urban context to provide optimal water-use efficiency.

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT**

None of the measures described earlier will be sufficient on its own to solve the problem of groundwater depletion. Thus, an appropriate mix of measures must be identified to achieve optimal water savings and reduced levels of groundwater depletion. Using the kind of thinking underlying the concept of hydronomic zoning, together with a water-balance approach, the study in Luancheng county set out to identify the right mixture of solutions. It formulated water-saving choices that could be adopted. The sets of options are made up of a combination of changing cropping patterns that leave certain areas of land to lie fallow and changing land use to urban uses. Each set of options is a different combination of land uses that will deplete no more than 460 millimeters per year—bringing rainfall and evapotranspiration into equilibrium.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- One must not automatically assume that improving irrigation efficiency will save water. First, consider the fate of excess irrigation water and whether it replenishes the hydrologic system. If excess irrigation water replenishes the hydrologic system, then improved irrigation efficiency will not save water and may, in fact, consume more water by increasing crop production.
- Land and water must be managed in conjunction to achieve sustainable water use. A water-balance approach should be used to associate each land use with its associated net water depletion and to create a sustainable mosaic of land uses.
- For landscape-scale land-use planning, hydronomic zoning should be used to identify areas where improved irrigation efficiency would actually improve water management.
In places where improved irrigation efficiency does not save water, the only way to reduce the rate of hydrologic depletion (such as water-table declines) is to reduce evapotranspiration. Evapotranspiration reduction can be accomplished by reducing the area devoted to cropland (replacing it with less water-consumptive land use) and by reducing the growing season on cropland. Reducing the evaporation component of evapotranspiration, for example, by mulching with plastic, can save a smaller amount of water. In the North China Plain, however, the amount of water that could potentially be saved by reducing evaporation is not enough to stabilize declining water tables.

One should not blindly invest in improvements to irrigation efficiency. They are expensive and often are ineffective in saving water at the basin scale. Moreover, downstream water uses and valuable aquatic ecosystems often rely on the “excess” irrigation water that would be “saved.”

INVESTMENT NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

- Establish comprehensive worldwide databases of water use, consumption, and availability by basin.
- Research to understand water consumption (depletion) rates for different land uses—especially urban areas—to facilitate combined land- and water-use planning.
- Design and implement urban wastewater treatment to convert final use of hydronomic zones (contaminated by polluted wastewater) into water-reuse zones.
- Improve urban water-use efficiency and stormwater recharge.
- Locate cities upstream from irrigated agricultural areas, which can reuse treated urban wastewater. (The converse—locating irrigation upstream from cities—is less efficient because crops consume most of the water that they use, whereas cities consume only a small fraction of the water they use.)
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The concept of payment for environmental services (PES) arises from the recognition that those who protect resources require compensation for the services they provide to the wider community. One of the most important prerequisites for a functioning PES scheme is an appropriate regulatory framework that establishes property rights and obligations for land use through which environmental services may be negotiated.

A number of PES schemes and pilot programs have been initiated in recent years, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean. However, experience is inadequate for a thorough comparison of the relative effectiveness of different approaches—and for their replication elsewhere. Transaction costs and the need for government intervention in critical resource areas may prove more expensive than the potential benefits. With skillful analysis of experience, however, PES schemes may be able to overcome some of the limitations of regulatory instruments associated with the creation of incentives for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. At the same time, these schemes may stimulate the formation of social capital in the regions where they are established.

PES schemes implemented to date have not been beneficial to the poor: they attract as service providers those who hold titles, own larger areas, and obtain incomes from sources outside the production unit (thus making land retirement from production represent little in terms of opportunity cost to the landowner). To improve equity requires that schemes restrict or differentiate payments to low-income households. PES schemes involving market creation should be linked to a regulatory system that establishes specific limitations on productive activities and that creates the need for those who possess environmental liabilities to negotiate trades with those who exceed the stipulated norms. Without this regulatory framework, there is little hope of creating markets for environmental services.

KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

New opportunities for adding value to sustainable rural land resources management are being created in many parts of the world under the rubric of payments for environmental services. Such opportunities arise from the growing perception that ensuring nature’s services in the long run requires not only that they should be valued by society, but also that these values inspire compensation to those who protect resources.

As described in box 3.3, natural resources protection and good land-use practices generate a gamut of services of both economic and cultural importance, besides ensuring continuation of functions essential to support and maintain living organisms, including humans.

LESSONS LEARNED

Experience in a number of countries to date, particularly in the Americas, suggests that creation of environmental services markets and payment schemes is viable and offers opportunities for equitable and efficient provision of public goods. Environmental services markets function best when they meet the following conditions:

- They provide measurable benefit to the environment from adopting best practices.

This note was prepared by P. H. May, Department of Agriculture, Development and Society, Federal Rural University, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
The sources of services are identifiable (for example, improved agricultural practice, new protected areas).

A regulatory framework establishes limits within which negotiations can occur.

Services provided are contingent on payment (that is, one should not have to pay for what one would probably receive anyway).

Beneficiaries and providers agree on compensation amounts and terms.

Scientific research can help identify the origin of services provided and monitor the provision of downstream benefits, relating the latter to the quality of resources protection at the source. However, science has few good tools to arrive at appropriate and equitable values for PES. These values must be negotiated between “buyers” and “sellers.” Economic analysis of the willingness of beneficiaries to pay for these services can provide a useful benchmark. In most instances where payment schemes have begun, the opportunity cost of income forgone from alternative land uses has served as a yardstick for the maximum that should be paid to a property owner to retire land from nonconserving uses. Although this measure is a good indicator of cost to the provider, it may fail to take into account future opportunities for productive land use and need to be adjusted over time.

One of the most important prerequisites for a functioning PES scheme is an appropriate regulatory framework that establishes property rights and obligations for land use and sets conditions within which environmental services may be negotiated. For example, in some countries, such as Brazil, land-use codes establish a minimum share of private land that must remain under native vegetation in each biome. Many landowners have not complied with this rule, finding occupation of all or a good part of their properties more lucrative. Others have retained more forest cover than required by law. When the government began to enforce this legislation more rigorously, trading was permitted between deficit and surplus forestland owners. This trade became the germ of a PES scheme that is now being tested in various parts of Brazil. In the same vein, carbon trading could not take place if quantitative limits were not placed on greenhouse gas emissions.

A number of PES schemes and pilot programs have been initiated in recent years, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean. Descriptions of these experiences are summarized in table 3.3.

The first and largest PES scheme to be implemented was Costa Rica’s program for environmental service payments. Created at a national scale in 1997, the program by 2005 had

---

**Box 3.3 Types of Environmental Services Generated by Good Land-Use Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water and Soil-Related Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values (recreation, worship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of erosion and sedimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced salinity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microclimate regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced emissions from burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon sequestration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of terrestrial carbon stocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity Conservation Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity and scale for wildlife conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values (recreation, worship, existence value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3.3 Incidence of Costs and Benefits for Environmental Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Opportunity costs</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Payment mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon sequestration</td>
<td>Local farmers and landowners (avoiding deforestation)</td>
<td>Global society</td>
<td>Clean development mechanism, biocarbon fund, and non-Kyoto funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed protection</td>
<td>Farmers in upper watersheds and catchment areas (forgoing production on fragile lands)</td>
<td>Local downstream communities and enterprises</td>
<td>Water-use charges, taxation of water-using enterprises, royalties for electricity generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>Local ranchers and farmers and wood-producing enterprises (protecting ecosystems)</td>
<td>Global society and traditional peoples</td>
<td>Compensation funds and benefit sharing for traditional knowledge and germplasm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s elaboration.
been applied to 500,000 hectares of privately owned forests. The program is administered through the National Forestry Financing Fund (Fondo Nacional de Financiamiento Forestal, or FONAFIFO) financed from a combination of sources, including a 3.5 percent gasoline levy, electrical utility payments for hydroelectric catchment protection, and grant funds for an ecomarkets project from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) that began in 2001. In Costa Rica, there is now broad public recognition that intact forests and their environmental services have value. GEF support has ensured greater attention to biodiversity conservation and to a more equitable distribution of payments; recipients include women and indigenous communities whose activities promote environmental services (Hartshorn, Ferraro, and Spergel 2005).

More recently, in 2003, the Mexican government created a national program of payments for water services provided by private forest landowners who agree to protect existing forests and to restore forest cover on degraded lands. In its first year alone, the program reached more than 128,000 hectares in rural communities and ejidos (collective properties) in 15 states. In contrast to the program in Costa Rica, the Mexican program is financed from general government revenues rather than from earmarked sources associated with specific environmental service beneficiaries. A GEF-financed project to extend the program and its global benefits, as well as to test market-based mechanisms, is in initial stages of implementation (Guillén 2004).

The GEF has also cofinanced two programs involving research and PES trials in agricultural and forest management systems. The programs primarily focus on Central America. The first is under way in Belize, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua, under the auspices of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor and the Program for Sustainable Hillside Agriculture in Central America. Its objectives are to enable these countries to better adapt to climatic events and water scarcity in prolonged dry seasons and to ensure clean, sufficient, and regular water supplies to communities within this isthmus of globally important biodiversity. PES pilot schemes were initiated in 2002 in six microwatersheds in which municipal governments established funds to finance conservation treatments and modest payments to farmers for improvement in water supplies. The payment scheme led farmers to adopt soil and water conservation technologies that include ceased burning, and use of green manures, terracing, and hedgerows. As a result, water sources are showing signs of recovery. Implementing local pilot actions is perceived to be an effective instrument for developing sound policies at a national level. In Belize and El Salvador, the pilots are intended to provide the basis for structuring national PES programs.

A second pilot program, the Integrated Silvopastoral Approaches to Ecosystem Management, involves pilot valuation studies and PES payment trials with livestock producers in three sites in Colombia, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua. In these locales, land users agreed under contract to receive annual payments averaging US$500 per hectare up to a maximum of US$4,500 per property over four years based on incremental provision of biodiversity-related services in their production systems. The payments were to reach a total of 35,000 hectares over the project’s cycle. Payments are defined on the basis of a point system ascribing weights to different land-use attributes insofar as they contribute to biodiversity conservation. As the project evolves, each landowner has the opportunity to increase his or her payment through implementation of agreed practices (Pagiola and others 2004).

Finally, in Brazil, government agencies, small farmers’ organizations, and nongovernmental organizations have joined forces to create a program for sustainable development of rural family production in the Amazon (ProAmbiente). The program began in 2004 in 11 pilot areas in the nine Amazon states. In each state, 500 rural households—primarily land reform beneficiaries—were selected to participate in the scheme. Operationally, ProAmbiente combines conventional credit operations with regular monthly payments for farmers, equivalent to up to 40 percent of the credit. These payments are contingent on compliance with land-use criteria based on certified environmental services. Such services include avoiding deforestation, allowing carbon sequestration, reestablishing hydrologic functions, conserving biodiversity, protecting the soil, and reducing risk of fire. The scheme is operating on a pilot basis using general government revenues and seeking funds from international donors and carbon traders for the environmental services payments.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Devising a workable PES scheme also requires looking at the incidence of costs and benefits. If changes in land use are proposed as a means of benefiting the global environment through climate change mitigation or biodiversity conservation, the costs should be borne by global society and not by farmers in developing nations. If the majority of benefits are received locally, however, such as through clean and reliable water supply, local water users should share the costs. In
most cases, however, cross-benefits occur: in integrated watershed management, biodiversity may be protected and water supplies ensured simultaneously. This dual benefit provides opportunities for environmental services to be financed jointly by different beneficiaries through the same resource-protective activities in a geographic area. This facet makes it logical to create an environmental services fund to receive and disburse contributions from different beneficiaries to finance installation and maintenance of a bundle of land-use practices in a given locale. The differential incidence of environmental service benefits and payment mechanisms is described in table 3.3.

Despite the promise of PES, a number of perils and pitfalls can unnecessarily encumber those who seek to set up PES schemes and those who might benefit from them, particularly the rural poor. These difficulties may be summed up in the concept of transaction costs. The contract negotiations, time, and money involved may actually exceed the net benefits of setting up such a scheme, thereby making adoption of land-use codes or other regulations seem easier or more cost-effective than relying on the magic of the marketplace.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS**

Experience with the establishment of PES schemes, even in Latin America where they have a longer history, is as yet quite new. Therefore, it is not possible to thoroughly compare the relative effectiveness of different approaches for replication elsewhere. Expectations for PES schemes generally soar but in all likelihood greatly exceed their probable potential to reduce transaction costs and the need for government intervention in critical resource areas. Nevertheless, PES schemes may be able to overcome some of the limitations of regulatory instruments associated with the creation of incentives for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. At the same time, they may stimulate the formation of social capital in the regions where they are established. The following principal lessons have been learned from PES experiences to date, focused primarily on watershed services:

- Calculating the value of benefits arising from specific land-use practices is a gray area subject to great uncertainties. PES schemes will be more effective, for example, if they are directed at water quality than at water supply associated with enhancement of forest cover, because conventional wisdom and scientific proof diverge a number of ways regarding the water-flow regulation functions of forests.

- At the outset of program design, it is best to begin with services for which a clear established demand exists (for example, improvement in water quality associated with discharge of animal residues) and for which a relationship between the change in practices and the condition of ambient water quality supplied is relatively easy to prove.

- The best “bang for the buck” is obtained by promoting practices that offer multiple benefits, such as restoration of streambank vegetation, which can simultaneously reduce sedimentation of water courses, sequester carbon, and reestablish biological connectivity between forest fragments.

- Rather than invest in complicated procedures to calculate environmental benefits, PES should be estimated initially on the basis of opportunity costs associated with adoption in comparison with a baseline scenario (for example, the net income forgone from land retired from production to permit regeneration). It is not always necessary to cover the full opportunity costs of such practices to attract an adequate number of service providers.

In general, PES schemes implemented to date have not been beneficial to the poor. They attract service providers who hold titles, own larger areas, and obtain incomes from sources outside the production unit (thus making land retirement from production represent little in terms of opportunity cost to the landowner). To improve equity requires that schemes restrict or differentiate payments to low-income households.

PES schemes involving market creation should be linked to a regulatory system that establishes specific limitations on productive activities and that creates the need for those who possess environmental liabilities to negotiate trades with those who exceed the stipulated norms. Without this regulatory framework, there is little hope of creating markets for environmental services.
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Flows. The FLOWS bulletin provides a review of selected topics pertaining to the assessment of the effectiveness of payment arrangements for watershed services and lessons being learned. Each issue provides a space for reader commentary and responses to previous issues, and announcements of pertinent new reports and papers, and upcoming events: http://www.flowsonline.net/.
Humid tropical forests provide a range of products and services. Fallow cycles are considered the most common source of deforestation in southern Cameroon and are attributed to smallholder agriculture. As fallow periods become shorter, fallow composition changes, ultimately endangering the succession process of the natural forest.

Lands that have been fallow fewer than 10 years form an important component of the agricultural landscape in the humid forest zone of southern Cameroon. These fallow types of land have been shown to be an essential part of local livelihoods. They are used not only for cropping but also as key reserves of nontimber forest products. There are good reasons to focus on the development of sustainable fallow shifting cultivation systems, which may be more environmentally acceptable than permanent farming systems in terms of deforestation, soil erosion, and carbon storage.

INTRODUCTION

Two major environmental concerns face policy makers and stakeholders regarding the humid forests of Cameroon: deforestation and forest degradation. Humid tropical forests provide a range of products and services that include timber and nontimber forest products, forest biomass used as a fertility input (when converted to ash through slash-and-burn techniques), conservation of important biodiversity, protection of soil resources and watersheds, prevention of desertification, and regulation of local and global climatic patterns through carbon sequestration. Fallow cycles are considered the most common source of deforestation in southern Cameroon and are attributed to smallholder agriculture (Gockowski and Essama-Nssah 2000). As population pressures increase and fallow periods become shorter, fallow composition changes, ultimately endangering the succession process of the natural forest.

Most studies on shifting cultivation have assumed that species diversity declines when the length of fallow periods is reduced. A wide range of authors have adopted this theoretical presentation of the essence of ecological dynamics in shifting cultivation (for example, Ruthenberg 1980; Sanchez 1976). This theory has helped fuel the condemnation of following by many governments because it clearly shows that when fallow periods are shortened because of land scarcity and population pressure or other factors, this farming system will in all cases create a downward spiral of low species diversity and declining yield in the subsequent cropping seasons.

Fallow lands fewer than 10 years old form an important component of the agricultural landscape in the humid forest zone of southern Cameroon. These fallow types of land have been shown to be an essential part of local livelihoods. They are used not only for cropping but also as key reserves of nontimber forest products. However, a consequence of increasing resource-use pressure and subsequent shortening of fallow duration is the invasion of these land-use systems by the Asteraceous species *Chromolaena odorata* (L.) (Ngobo, McDonald, and Weise 2004; Weise 1995; Weise and Tchamou 1999).

*Chromolaena* is widely regarded as a serious threat to agriculture in West Africa and is rapidly spreading throughout Southeast Asia into the South Pacific and into central and eastern Africa from the infestations in western Africa and South Africa. Moreover, shorter fallow periods are believed to cause environmental damage in the form of soil mining and accelerated erosion. In combination with national interests in protecting forest resources for other...
purposes, this result has, in many cases, led to an official antipathy toward fallowing practices, making development of sustainable fallow shifting cultivation—which may be more environmentally acceptable than permanent farming systems in terms of deforestation, soil erosion, and carbon storage—more difficult to focus on.

The reported resource-use intensification in the study area and the increasingly acknowledged need for more productive and environmentally friendly agricultural systems for local resource-poor farmers have stimulated renewed interest in the mechanisms by which, among other functions, fallow systems restore ecosystem fertility and biodiversity. Concern for more profitable and ecologically sustainable fallow systems provided impetus for initial research, particularly given the reported increasing abundance of falls of shortened duration in the humid forest zone of Cameroon. A lack of reliable information regarding the characteristics of these land-use systems in the humid forest zone of southern Cameroon has hindered resource managers’ attempts to develop adapted strategies.

**DESCRIPTION OF FOREST FALLOW MANAGEMENT INNOVATION**

The activity reported here underlines the need to distinguish forest falls dominated by *Chromolaena* from fallow types that have recently been a forest when designing strategies and policies for sustainable management of short falls in the humid forest zone of southern Cameroon. The low frequency of forest species recorded in frequently cropped falls emphasizes the urgent need to develop vegetation management strategies that aim at accelerating plant succession during the fallow phase. The information and knowledge presented are specific to the Mengomo, located in the southern part of the humid forest zone of Cameroon, but they are relevant for similar humid forest sites in Africa.

The major site where the information for this note was derived is situated at 2°20′N and 11°03′E. Mengomo is a small locality (598 inhabitants and 83 households) that lies 52 kilometers south of the city of Ebolowa. It is characterized by a hot and moist equatorial climate, with a minimum mean annual temperature of about 20°C and a maximum of 29°C. (National Meteorological Station of Yaoundé, mean of 11 years: 1983–94, as cited in Santoir and Bopda 1995). The mean annual rainfall is about 1,800 millimeters, falling in a bimodal pattern, which determines two rainy seasons (March to July and August to November) and two drier seasons (July to August and November to March) of unequal duration. The main natural vegetation is a mosaic of semi-deciduous tropical forest, fallow fields of various length, and vegetation (Letouzey 1968). The farming system is one of the least intensified among villages of the area, and production is highly oriented toward subsistence. The site is characterized by yellow ferralitic and highly desaturated soils that fall into the Food and Agriculture Organization class of orthic ferrasols (Koutika, Kameni, and Weise 2000).

**EFFECTS ON VEGETATION COMMUNITY AND BIODIVERSITY**

Both species and functional diversity were significantly associated with vegetation structure and plant community composition in falls of five to seven years under different land-use intensity regimes. Recently forested fallow types displayed the highest values of stand structural parameters, except for the site disturbance index. There was no significant effect of fallow type on the mean basal area or crown cover.

Approximately 225 species of vascular plants were recorded in the study sites, belonging to 72 to 74 families. The most richly represented families were, Euphorbiaceae, Fabaceae (or Papilionaceae), and Sterculiaceae, respectively; with 23, 21, and 12 genera. Although up to 85 plant species were common to all fallow types, about 67 plants were exclusive to stands that had been forests before the previous cropping cycle (table 3.4). Among the species most frequently found in all study sites were *Chromolaena*, *Haumania danckelmaniana* Milne-Redh., *Milletia* spp., *Dioscorea* spp., *Cissus* spp., *Cnestis ferruginea* DC, and *Nephrolepis biserrata* (Sw.) Schott, which were present in more than 70 percent of the sites.

Frequently cropped falls were characterized by the abundance of *Chromolaena*, *Albizia zygia* Macbride, and *Dioscorea* spp, with the understory characterized by a few Poaceae and some Cyperaceae. The vegetation in moderately cropped falls was consistently least diverse (58 to 132 species). Although *Chromolaena* was still abundant, this fallow type was characterized by the importance of Combretaceae and Marantaceae species, represented by different species of *Palisota* and *Megaphrynum*. There was more understory than in the previous fallow type, and it comprised some forest herbaceous species like *Aframomum* spp., *Harungana madagascariensis*, and *Haumania danckelmaniana*. A high number of species (150 to 171) was recorded in recently forested falls. The vegetation in fallow sites of this type was clearly stratified in three distinguishable layers: (a) an upper story dominated by pioneer semiwoody species (of up 8 meters height), (b) an intermediate stratum that
comprised small individuals of mostly secondary or primary forest species, and (c) a lower story dominated by secondary forest herbaceous species. Characteristic species of the mature secondary forest were consistently present in this fallow type.

**PATTERNS OF VARIATION IN SPECIES COMPOSITION AMONG FALLOW TYPES**

Ordination analyses showed a clear pattern of distribution of species along a gradient of resource-use intensity. Except for mean litter depth, a significant positive correlation was found between plant biodiversity (as indicated by the number of species and other diversity indices) and fallow structural features. Conversely, there was a negative significant correlation between plant species diversity and crown cover of woody plants as well as site disturbance index. The influence of vegetation composition and vegetation structure on species assemblages reported in this study, which was highly correlated with litter depth and basal area, suggests that there is a gradient of soil organic matter content and soil moisture from less intensively farmed to more intensively farmed fallow types.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

The results of this study suggest that increasing land-use intensity (reflected here by increasing the number of fallow cultivation cycles) will initially have little effect on the species diversity of the shortened fallow plant community. However, as the link to the forest is reduced, altering the site vegetation’s structural characteristics and decreasing shade (leading to a more homogeneous microclimate), an adverse effect will occur, and the species richness will decline. Nevertheless, other studies have shown that increasing land-use intensity results in the loss of some uncommon useful species of shortened fallow systems, such as *Megaphrynium* spp. and *Sarcophrynium* spp. (Aweto 2001; van Dijk 1999). As in this study, lack of replacement with uncommon weed species may occur because they are being exposed to competition from ubiquitous species through habitat disturbance.

In Cameroon, smallholder agriculture is held to be the major source of deforestation. Therefore, any proposed multi-sectoral approach for addressing deforestation must start with agriculture. A summary of the lessons and challenges while designing sustainable vegetation management strategies for the humid forest area of southern Cameroon follows:

- **Sustainable pathways for rural development in the humid forest zones** can minimize the damage and, in some cases, even improve the environmental services of the cultivation-forest mosaic ecosystem. The productivity of fallow lands needs to be assessed to evaluate their sustainability and economic viability for local resource-poor farmers.
- **Measures to achieve these goals** are (a) to focus on the collection and dissemination of relevant and reliable information, (b) to work with a larger set of stakeholders, and (c) to use Cameroonien expertise to gain local perspective and build capacity.
- **Given the global importance of fallows of 5 to 10 years in the humid forest zone of southern Cameroon**, as well as the considerable variation in published estimates of plant species diversity and change, development of a reliable and indisputable monitoring mechanism is imperative. The rapid evolution in remote-sensing technologies offers the best potential for quantifying patterns of change. Reliable and replicable estimates from such techniques would be of great use to policy makers and other stakeholders.
- **It is, therefore, necessary to develop improved systematic data gathering** to update understanding of the contribu-

---

**Table 3.4 Total Number of Plant Species Recorded in Three Fallow Types in the Humid Forest Zone of Southern Cameroon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant community composition</th>
<th>Frequently cropped</th>
<th>Moderately cropped</th>
<th>Recently forested lands</th>
<th>Total fallows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total species</td>
<td>111–165</td>
<td>58–132</td>
<td>150–171</td>
<td>224–225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species with frequency of presence greater than or equal to 70 percent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species with frequency of presence greater than or equal to 50 percent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total families</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72–74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with 1 species</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species exclusive to fallow type</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author’s elaboration.*
tions of fallows (and shortened fallows, in particular) to household, community, and national livelihood strategies. Such data will be of great use to policy makers and development organizations in developing improved and sustainable fallow systems that may benefit both small-scale farmers and the environment.
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The harvesting of indigenous fruit trees (IFTs) represents an important food supplement and cash income for rural people in many tropical countries. Most of the fruits from IFTs are still being harvested from the wild, and traditional crops and fruits play a valuable role in supporting household food security. However, this role could be significantly enhanced if improved varieties and production, harvesting, and storage techniques could be made available to the rural poor. Thus a pro-poor strategy involves moving away from depending only on wild harvesting.

Participatory domestication is defined as genetic improvement that includes farmer-researcher collaboration and is farmer led and market driven. It was devised to overcome the shortcomings of earlier top-down approaches of conventional breeding and forestry. It leads to consideration of the wider context in which it is possible to identify which traditional crops and fruits are becoming marginalized; how much diversity occurs within them; and what their productive and genetic potentials, postharvest requirements, and processing and marketing potentials are. These efforts involve plant taxonomists, ethnobotanists, crop breeders, crop scientists, food scientists, agricultural engineers, human nutritionists, and economists and are conducted in conjunction with farmer associations and commercial establishments.

**INTRODUCTION**

The harvesting of indigenous fruit trees from the wild predates settled agriculture and represents an important food supplement and cash income for rural people in many tropical countries. Evidence is accumulating that IFTs can contribute significantly to household income in every region in the tropics (Akinnifesi and others 2007; Leakey and others 2005) and is a major opportunity for asset building for smallholder farmers. For example, in southern and eastern Africa, most of the food crops grown by small-scale farmers did not originate from Africa. Maize, beans, groundnuts, sweet potatoes, and cassava are all exotics from tropical America and have largely displaced the sorghum, millet, cowpeas, and yams produced by yesterday’s traditional farmers. Marginalizing African crops has resulted in collapsed traditional seed systems, reduced farm biodiversity, poorer diets, decreased food security, and declining cultural tradition. Ironically, today the demand for traditional foods by urban consumers is increasing because indigenous small grains, pulses, fruits, and leafy green vegetables are both tasty and nutritious. However, often these foods are not readily available. In addition, in times of food scarcity, these traditional crops and fruits play a valuable role in supporting household food security. This role could be significantly enhanced if improved varieties and production, harvesting, and storage techniques could be made available to the rural poor.

A large amount of knowledge on the opportunities, challenges, knowledge gaps, and constraints of IFTs has been gathered in recent years. Continued enthusiasm exists among researchers and development practitioners (especially in the past two decades) to explore the opportunities to meet the food needs of humanity through IFTs. As a result, increasing emphasis is placed on tree domestication strategies (promoting IFTs with economic potential as new cash crops), product development, and commercialization and marketing of agroforestry tree products. This profile highlights the opportunities, achievements, and challenges of IFT domestication, use, and marketing in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

This profile was prepared by F. K. Akinnifesi, O. C. Ajayi, and G. Sileshi, World Agroforestry Centre, Makoka, Malawi.
TREE DOMESTICATION INNOVATION

Participatory domestication is defined as genetic improvement that includes farmer-researcher collaboration. It is farmer led and market driven. It was devised to overcome the shortcomings of earlier top-down approaches of conventional breeding and forestry. Participatory domestication approaches have been applied by the World Agroforestry Centre for U. kirkiana, Sclerocarya birrea, and S. cocculoides in southern Africa (Akinnifesi and others 2006) and for Dacryodes edulis and Irvingia gabonensis in West Africa (Tchoundjeu and others 2006). In Latin America, Bactris gasipaes Kunth and cupuáçu (Theobroma grandiflora) have been subjected to domestication, especially in Brazil and Peru (Clement and others 2008). The objectives of the domestication projects led by the World Agroforestry Centre are (a) to identify technically, economically, and socially viable investment opportunities for indigenous fruit domestication in the context of sustainable land management and (b) to establish pilot projects that meet preestablished investment criteria.

The domestication research started by identifying species preference depending on the extent they are able to meet the subsistence and cash-income needs of the producers and market participants. Franzel, Jaenicke, and Janssen (1996) described the seven principles and application of priority setting that were tested in various regions. Results of the priority setting across regions are presented in table 3.5.

Akinnifesi and others (2007) described detailed principles and strategies for participatory domestication based on clonal selection and vegetative propagation. These strategies have had significant benefits—for example, the long juvenile phase (period before first fruiting) has been reduced from 10–15 years to 3–4 years for D. edulis in western Africa, for U. kirkiana in southern Africa, and for cupuáçu (Theobroma grandiflora) in Latin America.

BENEFITS OF ACTIVITY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

The IFT species previously mentioned are important in many ecosystems, and farmers make efforts to conserve and cultivate them on farmlands. Five factors are important in cultivation and sustainable management of IFTs: site requirements, genetic variability and improvement potential, propagation methods, nutritional properties, and commercial potential (Jama and others 2007). Knowledge is important for tree management and sustained land management. Akinnifesi and others (2007) provide insights into the potential of integrating IFT cultivation into smallholder production in ways that contribute to livelihoods, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land productivity.

Trees can contribute to improved organic matter accumulation, erosion control, and nutrient recycling from deeper soil layers. In a farming system that includes income from tree crops, the farmer can use some of the returns from fruits to invest in fertilizers, seeds, and other inputs in other parts of the system.

LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR SCALING UP TREE DOMESTICATION

### Table 3.5  List of the Four Most Preferred Priority Indigenous Fruit Tree Species in Selected Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, and Uganda)</td>
<td>Adansonia digitata (baobab)</td>
<td>Tamarindus indica (tamarind)</td>
<td>Ziziphus mauritiana (ber)</td>
<td>Sclerocarya birrea (marula)</td>
<td>Field surveys (n = 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa (Malawi, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe)</td>
<td>Uapaca kirkiana (wild loquat)</td>
<td>Strychnos cocculoides (wild orange)</td>
<td>Parinari curatellifolia (maula)</td>
<td>Ziziphus mauritiana (ber)</td>
<td>Field surveys (n = 451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa (Cameroon, Ghana, and Nigeria)</td>
<td>Irvingia gabonensis (wild mango)</td>
<td>Dacryodes edulis (African plum)</td>
<td>Chrysophyllum albidum (star apple)</td>
<td>Garcinia cola (bitter cola)</td>
<td>Workshops + field surveys (n = 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahelian zone (Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, and Senegal)</td>
<td>Adansonia digitata (baobab)</td>
<td>Tamarindus indica (tamarind)</td>
<td>Vitellaria paradoxa (shea)</td>
<td>Ziziphus mauritiana (ber)</td>
<td>Field surveys (n = 470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and R.B. de Venezuela)</td>
<td>Euterpe oleracea (açai)</td>
<td>Bactris gasipaes (pupunha)</td>
<td>Theobroma grandiflora (cupuáçu)</td>
<td>Myrciaria dubia (camu-camu)</td>
<td>Workshop (Roraima, Brazil, October 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the fruits from IFTs are still being harvested from the wild, and traditional crops and fruits play a valuable role in supporting household food security. However, this role could be significantly enhanced if improved varieties and production, harvesting, and storage techniques could be made available to the rural poor. Thus, a pro-poor strategy involves moving away from depending only on wild harvesting. Domestication research and development for IFTs have progressed significantly, especially in Africa and Latin America; efforts to prioritize, select, and cultivate superior cultivars of IFTs using participatory approaches are noted across the regions. Such strategies generally involved the following:

- Application of farmer-centered, market-led approaches involving careful participatory selection of the right species and elite cultivars to be promoted; development of low-cost simple propagation techniques; and establishment and management practice in cooperation with farmers
- Postharvest handling, product development, and prospecting of IFT products
- Market research, enterprise development, and commercialization.

The overall objective is to identify, conserve, improve, and promote traditional crops and fruits as a means of improving their seed systems and markets, thereby making the crops more attractive to small-scale farmers. Specific aims are

- To better understand which traditional foods are becoming marginalized and explore avenues for their revitalization
- To explore opportunities for processing traditional foods in ways that make them more attractive and easily prepared by urban consumers, thereby strengthening their demand and markets.

In the wider context, it is possible to identify which traditional crops and fruits are becoming marginalized; how much diversity occurs within them; and what their productive and genetic potentials, postharvest requirements, and processing and marketing potentials are. These efforts involve plant taxonomists, ethnobotanists, crop breeders, crop scientists, food scientists, agricultural engineers, human nutritionists, and economists and are conducted in conjunction with farmer associations and commercial establishments.

Following is a summary of the lessons learned and challenges encountered:

- The investment needs for wider cultivation and scaling up of tree domestication of IFTs include (a) quality planting material in sufficient quantity, (b) adequate skills and resources for village-level nurseries in decentralized systems, and (c) facilities for micropropagation and tissue culture centers for rapid multiplication of specialized propagules (Akinwunm and others 2006).
- Measures to speed up the multiplication of improved planting materials are necessary. They include the application of biotechnology and tissue culture techniques in germplasm multiplication. Delivery deserves greater attention.
- Research and development on the domestication of IFTs has advanced in only a few species, such as Uapaca kirkiana, Sclerocarya birrea, Parinari curatellifolia in southern Africa; Dacyodes edule and Irvingia gabonensis in western Africa; and Theobroma grandiflora and peach palm (Bactris gasipaes) in Latin America. There is a need to expand the range of IFTs currently being researched in different regions of the tropics.
- Droughts and climate affect fruiting potentials, cycles, and seasonal variability and cause major reduction in fruit production and quality. It is important to investigate how tree planting affects climate change, on one hand, and how trees are or can be affected by climate change, on the other. This information will ensure that sufficient resilience is built into tree domestication efforts.
- Farmers and researchers have complementary knowledge and knowledge deficiencies, so integrating both parties' knowledge through participatory processes has been shown to speed up technology adoption and performance.
- Comparatively few studies provide conclusive evidence regarding the profitability and payback periods of IFT cultivation or wild collection. Smallholder farmers may need initial incentives or credit lines for tree establishment, management, and value addition.
- Tree-based practices such as IFTs are more complex than conventional crop practices because of the multiyear cycles required for testing, modification, and eventual adoption by farmers. The key factors that drive adoption of improved IFTs and their effects at multiple scales (that is, household and landscape levels) need to be studied. These studies will provide insights into the level of technology change that would stimulate adoption and effects of IFTs. Such studies are important to guide investment, adoption, and policy decisions regarding IFTs.
- As the technology development processes become com-
plex, the uptake of the technologies by farmers will remain low. The development and dissemination of IFT systems must continue to emphasize practices that require little capital and simple methods of scaling up improved processes and techniques to wider communities. Such low-cost techniques include small-scale nursery operations, vegetative propagation, use of organic manures, and tree management.

- For market-led IFT initiatives, the market attribute of IFT products must be unique or substantial enough and should be comparable or superior to conventional product sources to make a dent in the market. For instance, camu-camu (Myrciaria dubia) is being promoted in Latin America for the extremely high vitamin C content in its pulp (2.8 to 6.0 grams of ascorbic acid per 100 grams), which is 30 times as high as the equivalent weight of orange.

- Second-generation issues, such as the potential occurrence of new pests following the introduction of new trees, must be carefully investigated as IFTs are domesticated and improved germplasm is selected.

- Improved systematic data gathering is needed to update global knowledge on the contributions of IFTs to household, community, and national income and livelihood strategies. This information will enhance the potential opportunities for policy makers and development organizations to use IFTs as an intervention strategy for reducing poverty.

- Innovative research and development efforts on IFTs are needed to help bring about improvements in cultivation, scaling up, markets, and small-scale enterprises in the tropics. The improved performance of the market for agroforestry tree products would stimulate growth in the rural economy.

- Adoption of agroforestry is not a simple direct relationship of only technological characteristics; it is a matrix of several groups of factors that include household- and community-level factors, institutions, and the socioeconomic constraints and incentives that farmers face. As a result, rather than technology change alone, the development of IFTs should place a balanced emphasis on the economics, the people, and the institutional and policy context under which farmers operate.

**INVESTMENT NEEDS, PRIORITIES, AND SCALING UP**

One of the most effective ways to scale up IFT cultivation is to involve farmers in the entire process of participatory selection, propagation, nursery and tree establishment, and management of superior planting materials. Their involvement will dramatically shorten the time required to produce and disseminate planting materials from centralized nurseries to farmers. It is important to provide farmers with high-quality germplasm and to make it available in a timely manner. Farmers can be organized to produce high-quality seed, seedlings, and vegetative propagule, as evidenced in small-scale nursery enterprises managed by farmer groups, for example, in western and southern Africa and in Peru.

Valuing the contribution of IFTs to the national economy is long overdue, and investment resources should be devoted to their development. Very few cases of active promotion of IFTs have been documented in the tropics. Cross-collaboration and knowledge exchange need to be fostered among regions where species are cultivated, used, or traded; indicators and tools for assessing effects should be developed; and investments in priority IFTs should be increased.

**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The following key policy priorities emerge from the general literature on the relationship and development of IFTs:

- One way IFTs could be scaled up and mainstreamed into government thinking is to proactively create awareness and raise the profile of the contributions of IFTs during policy debates and in development intervention programs. Such activities will require a long-term investment and an appraisal of policies governing land and tree tenure in many countries in the tropics so that institutional constraints to tree planting can be reduced and policies can be enacted that facilitate cross-border trades and harmonization of exploitation, transportation, and germplasm exchange.

- Regulations must be formulated that will ensure that IFT exploitation, processing, commercialization, and on-farm cultivation does not pose a threat to their conservation. IFTs should be treated as cultivated crops instead of intangible forest products from the wild.

- Policies must be enacted to ensure that intellectual property rights of farmers—such as farmer breeders and community custodians—are well protected. Such policies will ensure that benefits from IFT domestication are not exploited by large-scale commercial growers. Adoption of the International Union for the Protection of New Plant Varieties by governments in the tropics is suggested.
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World Agroforestry Centre. Using science, the World Agroforestry Centre generates knowledge on the complex role of trees in livelihoods and the environment, and fosters use of this knowledge to improve decisions and practices to impact the poor. The World Agroforestry Centre Web site provides information on their news and events, recent publications, agroforestry information and other information resources: http://www.worldagroforestry.org/es/default.asp.
Although the clean development mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol makes some allowance for afforestation and reforestation, it has so far excluded “avoided deforestation”—for good reasons. However, the global climate change community increasingly recognizes that it must address the challenge of reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD). Besides the obvious magnitude of the potential for REDD to reduce climate change, the current situation is creating perverse incentives and disincentives affecting other dimensions of climate change mitigation. The current Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) good practice guidelines for national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories provide a coherent framework for dealing with aboveground as well as belowground carbon effects of agriculture, forestry, and other land use (AFOLU).

According to expert opinion in the IPCC community that is responsible for the guidelines, however, the net emission estimates from changes in land use and land cover may carry an unacceptably high uncertainty margin (as much as 60 percent). Data and methods available in national and international research networks can be analyzed to improve the accuracy of estimates, derive better estimates of the uncertainty, and identify ways of reducing it. An effective mechanism for reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation would have related but separate mechanisms at the international and national levels. Between countries, political negotiations should be convened to establish commitments to baseline and target emission levels. Countries that attain superior performance in avoided carbon emissions should be eligible for carbon offset payments or credits through multilateral or bilateral arrangements.

The current debate over avoided deforestation offers a chance to correct some of the major inconsistencies in the current system of carbon trading. Some key constraints that need to be overcome relate to scale, scope, political commitment, technical procedures, and data quality. Best practice is emerging on the types of national and local mechanisms that countries can apply with much lower transaction costs than current CDM projects. Avoided deforestation with sustainable benefits can generate both local and global benefits. Research by the Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn (ASB) Programme and others shows that intermediate land uses can store significant quantities of carbon, maintain flows of ecosystem services, generate good economic returns, and reduce pressure on remaining forests.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND DESCRIPTION

Climate change and its global effects can no longer be ignored. Although cutting emissions from fossil fuel consumption obviously deserves continued attention by all levels of global society, the approximately 20 percent of emissions that are caused by loss of forests and peatlands cannot remain outside the purview of climate change mechanisms. Recognizing this, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change invited a discussion “on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries, focusing on relevant scientific, technical, and methodological issues, and the exchange of relevant information and experiences, including policy approaches and positive incentives” in its 11th session on agenda item 6 (statement FCCC/CP/2005/L.2).

The World Agroforestry Centre (also known as the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry, or ICRAF) prepared a submission for consideration in the discussion. The submission is based on extensive research across the humid tropics by a consortium of international and national research centers involving countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.
national organizations operating within the ASB Programme,1 with key research results generated by Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia, Peru, the Philippines, and Thailand. This profile summarizes the case for avoided deforestation with sustainable benefits as a simple way to reduce carbon emissions from deforestation and degradation.

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION: THE ASB OPTION

Several years ago, the international science community established that land-use change and the conversion and degradation of forests generate about 20 percent of global carbon dioxide emissions. Although the CDM of the Kyoto Protocol makes some allowance for afforestation and reforestation, it has so far excluded avoided deforestation. Good reasons exist for this omission:

- The definition of what is and is not a forest is ambiguous.
- The CDM has taken a project approach. Reforestation deals with enhancing tree cover on degraded lands, where monitoring carbon stocks and attributing changes to project activities are easier.
- The CDM pays great attention to leakage (making sure that gains in one place do not cause losses in another place) and additionality (ensuring that carbon gained or conserved, relative to baselines, would not have occurred without the project). Those issues cannot be reasonably addressed in avoided deforestation projects with limited geographic scope.
- The complexity of rules for applying the CDM to afforestation and reforestation has meant that many of the potential benefits have been offset by the costs of consultants, research organizations, and government agencies. Little carbon value has reached local beneficiaries. In the more difficult case of avoided deforestation, the benefits are even more uncertain.
- The national guidelines for GHG inventories (IPCC 2006) indicate that net emission estimates from changes in land use and land cover may carry an uncertainty margin of as much as 60 percent. This margin makes reaching a valid estimate of the contribution of land-use changes to global carbon dioxide difficult and is the largest uncertainty in quantification of GHG inventories. Much deforestation is actually planned by land managers for higher economic returns. Completely avoiding deforestation would require offset payments that are not feasible under present circumstances. Negotiating interme-

diate targets for partial deforestation of a particular landscape would be very complex.

Despite the difficulties, however, the global climate change community increasingly recognizes that it must address the challenge of reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation. Besides the obvious magnitude of the potential for REDD to reduce climate change, the current situation is creating perverse incentives and disincentives affecting other dimensions of climate change mitigation. For example, an annex I country that imports biofuels from non–annex I countries to meet its Kyoto targets is not accountable for forest conversion that biofuel production might cause. Furthermore, public and political willingness to contribute to the control of GHGs through relatively small reductions elsewhere will erode if large and avoidable emissions are not scrutinized. Nonparticipation by Australia and the United States creates similar problems for the Kyoto Protocol.

The current IPCC good practice guidelines for national GHG inventories provide a coherent framework for dealing with aboveground as well as belowground carbon effects of AFOLU. The IPCC framework could become the primary framework for reporting and accountability in non–annex I countries, aligned with the rules that currently apply to annex I countries.

As mentioned previously, expert opinion in the IPCC community that is responsible for the guidelines holds that the net emission estimates from changes in land use and land cover may carry an uncertainty margin of as much as 60 percent. In time, the use of the IPCC guidelines over multiple measurement periods will reduce this margin as annual updates provide better information on which to base future estimates, but the current uncertainty margin is clearly unacceptably high. The opportunity to participate in a market for reduced AFOLU carbon emissions would generate clear incentives to improve the accuracy of the accounts.

Data and methods available in national and international research networks can be analyzed to improve the accuracy of estimates, derive better estimates of the uncertainty, and identify ways to reduce it. The two components of uncertainty are interlinked: the classification of land cover and land-cover change is unsatisfactory, and there is too much uncertainty regarding the mean carbon stocks per unit area in each land-cover class. Clearly, the binary classification (for example, with just “forest” and “nonforest” as classes) is insufficient. Analysis so far suggests that a classification that results in 5 to 10 land-cover classes may lead to the lowest overall uncertainty. Further data compilation and analysis
are needed. This work has already started. The IPCC support office is providing support to full-system carbon accounting.

An effective mechanism for reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation would have related but separate mechanisms at the international and national levels. Between countries, political negotiations should be convened to establish commitments to baseline and target emission levels. Countries that attain superior performance in avoided carbon emissions should be eligible for carbon offset payments or credits through multilateral or bilateral arrangements.

Each non–annex I country that voluntarily participates in the new REDD rules should have scope for flexible rules to create positive incentives for rural and forest-dependent people to benefit from more sustainable and clean development pathways. Such incentives would ensure the sustainability of the carbon stocks and reserve more of the country’s natural capital for the future. A number of countries have gained experience with such mechanisms already, and pilots exist elsewhere. Individual countries involved in the international mechanism should have the flexibility to meet avoided carbon emission targets through national mechanisms appropriate to their own conditions, following principles already established among annex I countries.

**BENEFITS AND EFFECT OF ACTIVITY**

The current debate over avoided deforestation offers a chance to correct some of the major inconsistencies in the current system of carbon trading. Some key constraints that need to be overcome relate to scale, scope, political commitment, technical procedures, and data quality. Best practice is emerging on the types of national and local mechanisms that countries can apply with much lower transaction costs than current CDM projects. Avoided deforestation with sustainable benefits can generate both local and global benefits. Research by the ASB Programme and others shows that intermediate land uses can store significant quantities of carbon, maintain flows of ecosystem services, generate good economic returns, and reduce pressure on remaining forests.

**LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICATION**

Lessons can be learned from the rules of the Kyoto Protocol that already apply between annex I countries, where all land-use and land-cover changes are accounted for, without restriction to any specific concept of forest and without loss of national sovereignty over mechanisms. That accounting framework includes all changes in carbon stock, including peatlands, trees outside forests, agroforestry lands, and flows of other GHGs.

A simple solution to the issue of avoided deforestation at the international level would be to allow developing countries to be voluntarily listed in a new annex X. These countries would follow current rules for emissions related to land use and land cover that exist between annex I countries, while leaving the energy-related emissions for future consideration. The CDM would still apply in the energy sector, but the issuance of carbon credits and associated markets would follow established procedures for annex I countries. No new procedures would be needed, and transaction costs could be much reduced.

Once the playing field is selected and the rules are set (for example, AFOLU accounting at the national level), the real game can begin: determining the baseline of expected emissions that will be used for deciding what will constitute reduction. In some ways, this process is akin to a market where national self-interests need to balance across a range of current issues, including world trade in agricultural and forest-derived commodities.

National and subnational governments would need to know how much avoided emissions they could provide and at what cost. Summary data of this type would require appraisal of scenarios for integrating economic development and land-cover change. Currently, such estimates are not available, although some promising advances have been made in the countries of Meso-America.

In an earlier phase of the discussions on CDMs, an inventory was made of abatement costs, largely in the energy sector. These results indicated that a fraction of hot-air emissions existed that could be avoided at negative total economic costs because they generate net economic costs at the societal level. A range of emissions is also associated with moderate economic gain that could be offset at feasible levels of financial transfer. A range of emissions associated with substantial economic gains that could not be offset under current carbon prices is also likely to exist. Figure 3.6 presents a schematic view of these different types of avoided emissions, plotted in terms of economic benefits from carbon emission against the value of carbon. In addition, displayed across the top of figure 3.6 are some of the policy options that countries might promote to achieve different levels and types of emissions.

For the avoided deforestation debate in tropical countries, to our knowledge no estimates are available for the
cumulative abatement costs (see figure 3.6). As an extension of the ideas presented in this profile, the ASB consortium for Indonesia is currently undertaking such an analysis for representative areas of Indonesia for the period since 1990.

Best practice is emerging on the types of national and local mechanisms that countries can apply to reduce carbon emissions from avoided deforestation, potentially with much lower transaction costs than current CDM projects. Incentive and rights-based mechanisms can be put in place to reduce carbon emissions from avoided deforestation while sustaining the asset base, rights, and well-being of people dependent on those resources. Countries such as Costa Rica and Mexico already have substantial experience in implementing such mechanisms at the national and sub-national scale. Large-scale afforestation programs, such as those currently implemented in China, India, and Indonesia, could be revised to better address avoided carbon emissions. Forest, landscape, and watershed management projects can be revised to provide greater incentives to avoid carbon emissions through avoided deforestation. Case study evidence from across Asia and a pan-tropical synthesis show that realism, conditionality, voluntarism, and pro-poor are important criteria for evaluating the performance of incentive and rights-based mechanisms.

NOTE
1. The ASB Programme comprises a well-established global alliance of more than 80 local, national, and international partners dedicated to action-oriented integrated natural resource management (INRM) research in the tropical forest margins. It is the only global partnership devoted entirely to research on the tropical forest margins. ASB’s goal is to raise the productivity and income of rural households in the humid tropics without increasing deforestation or undermining essential environmental services. The program applies an INRM approach to analysis and action through long-term engagement with local communities and policy makers at various levels.
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ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins. ASB is the only global partnership devoted entirely to research on the tropical forest margins. It is a global partnership of research institutes, non-governmental organizations, universities, community organizations, farmers’ groups, and other local, national, and international organizations. Since 1994, ASB has operated as a system-wide program of the Consultative Group for International Research in Agriculture (CGIAR). The ASB Program Web site contains information on its impact, regions, themes, publications, and other resources: http://www.asb.cgiar.org/

CarboFor. The CarboFor website is developed under the main webpage of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) to serve the communities working on land-use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) activities and the associated climate change. The website features Projects carried out by CIFOR and its partners; publications of carbon and climate change-related issues around the LULUCF sector; research activities directed for forest management purpose, as well as highlights of current issues, detailed Events and Links to useful sites: http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/carbofor.

CPWF. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) is an international, multi-institutional research initiative with a strong emphasis on north-south and south-south partnerships. It aims to increase the productivity of water used for agriculture, leaving more water for other users and the environment. The CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food features Announcements, Capacity Building Activities, Research, and Publications: http://www.waterandfood.org/.

Food and Agriculture Organization. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations serves as a neutral forum where all nations meet as equals to negotiate agreements and debate policy on efforts to defeat hunger. The FAO webpage on the Quesungual agroforestry farming system describes the Lempira Sur project, where farmers learn new cultivation methods to prevent soil erosion: http://www.fao.org/FOCUS/E/honduras/aguaro-e.htm.

IPCC-NGGIP Technical Support Unit. The Technical Support Unit for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change–National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme (IPCC-NGGIP) is based at the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies in Japan and is funded by the government of Japan. The IPCC-NGGIP Technical Support Unit’s Web site includes information on its internship program, a list of staff members, contact information, and a link to the IPCC home page: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/tsu/tsustaff.htm.

Rewarding Upland Poor for Environmental Services. Rewarding Upland Poor for Environmental Services (RUPES) is a program that aims to enhance the livelihoods and reduce poverty of the upland poor while supporting environmental conservation on biodiversity protection, watershed management, carbon sequestration, and land-
scape beauty at local and global levels. With the International Fund for Agricultural Development as a major donor, the World Agroforestry Centre has taken on the role of coordinating a consortium of partners interested in contributing and being a part of RUPES. The RUPES Web site offers information on RUPES sites, partnerships, and activities, [http://www.worldagroforestry.org/sea/Networks/RUPES/](http://www.worldagroforestry.org/sea/Networks/RUPES/).

**World Agroforestry Centre.** Using science, the World Agroforestry Centre generates knowledge on the complex role of trees in livelihoods and the environment, and fosters use of this knowledge to improve decisions and practices to impact the poor. The World Agroforestry Centre Web site provides information on their news and events, recent publications, agroforestry information and other information resources: [http://www.worldagroforestry.org/es/default.asp](http://www.worldagroforestry.org/es/default.asp).
On-Farm Integration of Freshwater Agriculture and Aquaculture in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam: The Role of the Pond and Its Effect on Livelihoods of Resource-Poor Farmers

In areas with abundant freshwater resources, numerous options exist to integrate terrestrial and aquatic crops. Agricultural restructuring and diversification have been considered important for rural economic development and poverty reduction. Before 1999, high-yielding rice culture was the first priority for food security and export. Thus, a vast area of rice fields and fruit orchard ponds remained underused from an aquaculture point of view. In 1999, the Vietnamese government launched the Sustainable Aquaculture for Poverty Alleviation strategy and implementation program as part of a wider poverty-reduction program (Luu 2002). The goal was to culture fish, prawn, or shrimp together with land-based crops and livestock on the same farm, a technique referred to as integrated agriculture-aquaculture systems (Nhan and others 2007).

From 1999 to 2005, the freshwater aquaculture farming area increased steadily—on average 12 percent annually. Aquaculture production grew even faster, by 42 percent per year, especially between 2002 and 2005 (figure 3.7). This expansion was in part the result of the development of intensive Pangasius culture, characterized by the use of manufactured feeds, by high investments, and by economic risks, making it the domain of rich farmers (Hao 2006; Nhan and others 2007). IAA farming, in contrast, enhances or facilitates on-farm nutrient recycling and increases the total farm output, for rich and poor farmers (Edwards 1998; Prein 2002).

This profile was prepared by D. K. Nhan, D. N. Thanh, and Le T. Duong, Mekong Delta Development Research Institute, Can Tho University, Can Tho Vietnam, and M. J. C. Verdegem and R. H. Bosma, Aquaculture and Fisheries Group, Department of Animal Sciences, Wageningen University, Wageningen, Netherlands.
Two projects, intended to stimulate the development of sustainable agriculture and to improve small-scale farmers’ livelihoods in the Mekong Delta, were carried out between 2002 and 2006:

1. Improved resource-use efficiency in Asian integrated pond-dike systems (Pond-Live), funded by the European Commission.
2. Impact assessment of policy reforms to agricultural development funded by the Vietnamese Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Using experience from these two projects, this profile explores the major factors influencing the adoption of various types of aquaculture, describes the resource flows, and reviews roles of ponds in farming systems in the Mekong Delta. Then, it assesses implications for sustainable land management, describes lessons learned for practical application, and makes policy recommendations.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Pond-Live project was implemented at three different sites in the Mekong Delta, with the goal of improving resource-use efficiency of freshwater IAA systems (Nhan and others 2007). A participatory learning-in-action approach was applied, passing through six phases (Little, Verdegem, and Bosma 2007):

1. Expert consultation and literature reviews
2. Formulation of problems and identification of key research and development issues
3. Analysis of interactions among household’s conditions and IAA farming performance
4. On-farm monitoring of pond nutrient flows
5. On-farm technology interventions
6. Evaluation, sharing, and dissemination of research results and proposal of further improvements.

Phases 1, 2, and 3 were carried out in the first year of the project. From the second year onward, phases 4, 5, and 6 were implemented, and the process was repeated to create a cycle of continuous development of adaptive technologies of higher productivity and better nutrient use.

A companion study was carried out at eight different sites and was aimed to identify effects of policy reforms on changes in agricultural production and household’s livelihoods. The study sites were located in four districts: Cao Lanh and Lai Vung, in Dong Thap province, and Chau Thanh and Cho Gao, in Tien Giang province.

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION: ADOPTION OF AQUACULTURE PRACTICES

In the Mekong Delta, very few poor farmers adopt aquaculture. Results from the Pond-Live project showed that only 6 percent of poor farmers practiced aquaculture compared with 42 percent and 60 percent for intermediate and rich farmers, respectively (Nhan and others 2007). Richer farmers tended to intensify the fish production, stocking high-value species such as catfish (Pangasianodon hypophthalmus) or climbing perch (Anabas testudineus) and using commercial feed. Between 2000 and 2004, the percentage of poor households practicing aquaculture increased only 2 percent,
while 12 percent and 15 percent more households of intermediate and rich farmers, respectively, took up aquaculture (table 3.6).

The contribution of farming activities to household income was lower for the poor than for the intermediate and the rich. Off-farming or nonfarming jobs are relatively more important for poor people, who generally considered crop production as their most important economic activity and aquaculture as least important. From 2000 to 2004, the contribution of aquaculture to household income increased, but this effect only occurred among the intermediate and the rich groups.

In the Mekong Delta, the adoption of IAA farming was influenced by a combination of biophysical, socioeconomic, and technological settings at community, household, and farm levels. First, at community level, agro-ecology and market accessibility are major driving factors. In rice-dominated areas, more farmers practiced IAA farming than in fruit-dominated areas. Rich farmers with good market accessibility tended to practice commercially oriented aquaculture systems relying heavily on external inputs. Second, the household’s wealth status and resource base determine whether the pond culture is adopted or rejected. Nhan and others (2007) identified the major reasons farmers adopt aquaculture: (a) increased use of on-farm resources, given positive contributions of government advocacy, suitability of soil and water, recycling of nutrients, pest control in rice fields, and creation of jobs for family members; (b) income generation through aquaculture; (c) environmental improvements; and (d) improved nutrition of household.

Major factors why farmers did not take up pond farming included (a) insufficient capital to introduce technologies; (b) insufficient landholding; (c) difficult farm management (for example, family labor, distance between homestead and farmland, and poor access to extension service); (d) pesticide use for crop production conflicting with aquaculture activities; and (e) poor soil and water quality.

Finally, factors at community and household levels, pond physical properties (such as pond width and depth), and the availability of nutrient sources (on farm or off farm) as pond inputs, together determine to a large extent the type of farming systems adopted. Three major types of IAA systems could be distinguished: (a) low-input fish farming, (b) medium-input fish farming, and (c) high-input fish farming (Nhan and others 2006, 2007). The low-input farming system is commonly practiced in fruit-dominated areas, the medium-input system in rice-dominated areas, and the high-input system in rice-dominated areas with good market accessibility.

### Table 3.6 Percentage of Farm Households Practicing Freshwater Aquaculture in 2000 and 2004 by Wealth Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth groups</th>
<th>Number of households 2000 (%)</th>
<th>2004 (%)</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPAD project (unpublished data).
Note: Percentages are always given as a fraction of the number of households.

**ON-FARM RESOURCE FLOWS AND THE ROLE OF THE POND**

In the Mekong Delta rural areas, most of households have a pond near the homestead. In the past, the main purpose of digging ponds was to raise the level of low-lying grounds for house construction or for orchards. Fish farming was not considered a high priority because wild fish were abundant in rice fields, floodplains, canals, and rivers. Currently, farm households not practicing IAA farming do not stock hatchery juveniles in their pond, which is used for wild fish capture instead.

The pond within IAA systems plays multiple roles, which differ from one system to another. Currently, the main use of the pond is to recycle on-farm nutrients while growing fish for home consumption or income generation (Nhan and others 2007). In low- and medium-input fish-farming systems, on-farm nutrients are the main input source of the pond (figure 3.8). Livestock and rice-field components that receive nutrients or energy mostly from off-farm sources provide important amounts of nutrient-rich wastes and byproducts (Nhan and others 2006). Byproducts collected from rice fields include not only rice residues but also crabs and golden snails. About 11 percent of the nitrogen in these wastes or byproducts is thrown into ponds and harvested as fish, while 67 percent accumulates in the sediments and 22 percent is lost through water exchange. Annually, farmers typically extract water from the pond to irrigate fruit crops cultivated on dikes during the dry season and remove pond sediments to fill up orchard dikes adjacent to the pond. In this way, the nutrient-rich mud and water can be considered fertilizers for terrestrial crops within the system. Integrating aquaculture into existing land-based farming systems yields various benefits to farmers: (a) higher fish production, (b) low external nutrient inputs, (c) treatment of wastes and byproducts from terrestrial crops, and (d) storage of nutrients in pond sedi-
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ments for later use as fertilizer. In contrast to intensive fish farming, these benefits are within reach of poor farmers.

BENEFITS OF IAA AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

IAA farming can positively affect sustainable land management. These effects include the following:

- Integrating aquaculture into existing land-based farming systems enhances the use of farm resources by creating new nutrient cycles between farming components and by improving overall food productivity and farming profitability.

- A diversified IAA farming system with more synergisms between farm components means a more economically stable farming system. For example, recently in the Mekong Delta, livestock production has not been stable because of disease outbreaks and fluctuations of input and output market prices. Thus, fish produced within an IAA system can compensate for possible losses of livestock production.

- IAA farming rehabilitates farm soil. Intensive fruit and rice production depends highly on heavy use of inorganic fertilizers. Introducing fish into orchard ponds or rice fields enhances farm organic matter recycling and maintains the high fertility of orchard dikes and rice-field soil.

- Improved nutrient recycling between farming components in IAA systems results in a higher fraction of nutrient inputs ending up in farming products while smaller amounts of nutrients accumulate within the system or flow into the environment.

- IAA farming systems produce low-cost fish not only for the IAA household but also for poor consumers. In the Mekong Delta, fish contribute about 76 percent of the average supply of animal protein (Haylor and Halwart 2001; van Anrooy 2003), but wild fish resources have declined because of rice intensification and overfishing.

LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICABILITY

The following lessons were learned from applying a participatory learning-in-action approach to develop IAA farming:

- IAA systems are diverse. Identification of biophysical, socioeconomic, and technical factors interacting at different levels (for example, community, household, and pond; phases 1 to 3) is of great importance for finding meaningful interventions at site or household levels.

- A farm bioresource flow diagram is an important tool. At phases 2 and 3, farmers usually have a wide range of options, paying much attention to a particular component rather than the whole system. The diagram helps farmers fully identify their resources and recognize various options to improve their farming system.

- A key factor to success of the participatory learning-in-action approach is the participation of all stakeholders, particularly local farmers and extension workers. Nevertheless, the stakeholders need to understand the whole process of a project, as well as goals and outcomes of each phase within the process. During field visits, researchers and extension workers need to help cooperating farmers gradually upgrade their capacity in technology development by implementing phenomenon observation and explanation, collecting simple data, explaining on-farm trial results, identifying problems, and suggesting possible solutions.

- Improved technologies are context specific. Field visits and discussions among cooperating farmer, local farmers, extension workers, and researchers are necessary so that improved technologies in one place can be taken up adaptively in another.

- Unlike on-station experiments, on-farm trials lack real replications, and data variations between farms are large. Reducing the number of parameters sampled and increasing the number of farms would be advisable. Multivariate data analysis is an important tool in analyzing data and interpreting results (Nhan and others 2006).
INVESTMENT NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

The government advocated developing IAA farming as a way of reducing poverty. Unfortunately, most poor farmers could not respond. The government and extension agencies need to define and implement appropriate solutions. Some of these may include the following:

- The conventional, linear approach that focuses mainly on technology transfer needs to be replaced by the participatory learning-in-action approach, giving attention to integrated resources management rather than a single component.
- A package of immediate and long-term support actions with different choices of appropriate technologies should be provided to pull poor farmers into IAA farming. Time must be taken to categorize local biophysical and socioeconomic contexts to provide tailor-made support actions. Farmers often take up new or improved technologies when they constitute slight improvements to traditional farming practices. After a small improvement has been proven, others will follow more easily.
- Because of the complexity of integrated farming, farm management skills need to be improved.

Extension of IAA farming in the Mekong Delta originally focused on on-farm integration only. Such an approach will hardly produce optimal fish yield considering the large variation in the types, quantity, and quality of on-farm wastes or by-products available. A one-solution-fits-all approach is not feasible.

Integration requires that external contexts be considered. Therefore, propagation of IAA farming should take into account integration with external inputs and diversification toward more commercially valuable crops. Such an approach would create new off-farm jobs and raise the demand for expert advice. The latter concurs with the creation of new jobs directly and will in the long run benefit more poor households than immediate or well-off households (Edwards 1998; Little and others 2007).
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OVERVIEW

Farming systems in highlands and sloping areas are estimated to provide for an agricultural population of 520 million people, who cultivate 150 million hectares of land, of which 20 percent is irrigated. There is intense population pressure on the resource base, which averages 3.5 people per cultivated hectare.

In most cases, the farms are diversified mixed crop-livestock systems, producing food crops (such as cassava, sweet potatoes, beans, and cereals) and perennial crops (such as bananas, coffee, and fruit trees). Crop productivity is reduced through the high altitudes, lower temperatures, and shorter cropping seasons compared with the lowlands. Steep slopes and thin soil horizons that are prone to erosion characterize these systems. Livestock can be an important system component that depends on the extensive upland grazing areas. Sales of cattle or small ruminants are often the main source of cash income. Many highland areas are home to the last remaining primary forests. Extensive forested areas are sometimes used for grazing and constitute agricultural land reserves that can be put into production through slash-and-burn techniques. In the Andes, Southeast Asia, and South Asia, uplands are home to large groups of indigenous people. Poverty is usually high.

With intense population pressure on the resource base, farm sizes are usually small. Declining soil fertility is a big problem because of erosion, biomass shortage, and shortage of inputs. Given the lack of road access and other infrastructure, the level of integration with the market is often low. Few off-farm opportunities can be found in the highlands, and seasonal migration is often necessary to find additional income.

POTENTIALS FOR POVERTY REDUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL GROWTH

The driving forces for poverty reduction are emigration (exit from agriculture) and increases in off-farm income. Diversification, especially to high-value products with relatively low transport and marketing costs, can also contribute significantly to poverty reduction. Such products can include crops such as fruit trees, coffee, and tea or, in more temperate areas, olives and grapes, among others. Livestock production also has a potential for further development.
Hillsides are an important agro-ecosystem in the tropics and subtropics. Traditional slash-and-burn practices, widely used in the hillside areas of Central America, have been a driving force in agricultural expansion and landscape degradation. Farmers in a village called Quesungual, Honduras, developed a slash-and-mulch system and eliminated the burning. This was the origin of the Quesungual Slash-and-Mulch Agroforestry System (QSMAS). With support from the Honduran government and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, a process to validate the system that involved the active participation of farmers was initiated. Farmers practicing QSMAS can produce sufficient maize and beans to meet their household needs and sell the excess in local markets. In addition, innovative farmers are intensifying and diversifying this system by using vegetables and market-oriented cash crops, as well as raising livestock. QSMAS demonstrated a high degree of resilience to extreme weather events, such as the El Niño drought of 1997 and Hurricane Mitch in 1998. Permanent cover protects the soil from raindrop impact and crust formation, while minimizing surface evaporation. In addition, surface residues favor nutrient recycling, improve soil fertility, and could result in higher carbon storage in soils.

The success of QSMAS is a reflection of a community-based learning process in which local people and extension service providers share ideas and learn together. At the landscape level, QSMAS has contributed to the conservation of more than 40 native species of trees and shrubs. Newer QSMAS farms (two to five years old) serve as sinks for methane with low emission levels of nitrous oxide. These results help mitigate climate change.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Hillsides are an important agro-ecosystem in the tropics and subtropics. More than 11 percent of the agricultural lands in these areas are classified as hillsides (4.1 million square kilometers). Tropical hillsides in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are home to about 500 million people, 40 percent of whom live below the poverty line.

In southwest Honduras, most farms are small (80 percent are fewer than 5 hectares) and are located on steep hillsides (a 5 to 50 percent slope). QSMAS is an indigenous land management practice based on planting annual crops with naturally regenerated trees and shrubs. QSMAS enables farmers to achieve food security by simultaneously improving harvests and soil fertility. This Investment Note explains how the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, or CIAT) and its partners combine scientific and local knowledge to further improve the land management practice and foster its use.

Stagnated agricultural productivity coupled with rapid population growth causes uncontrolled expansion of agriculture and ranching into hillside forests. The resulting environmental damage includes not only the loss of trees but also water and soil losses from runoff and erosion. Reversing land degradation while increasing food production is an essential strategy to improve both rural liveli-

---

This note was prepared by L. A. Welchez, Consortium for Integrated Soil Management, Tegucigalpa, Honduras; M. Ayarza, Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute of Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Tegucigalpa, Honduras; E. Amezquita, E. Barrious, M. Rondon, A. Castro, M. Rivera, and I. Rao, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Cali, Colombia; J. Pavon, Instituto Nacional de Tecnologia Agropecuaria, Managua, Nicaragua; and O. Ferreira, D. Valladares, and N. Sanchez, Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Forestales, Siguatepeque, Honduras.
hoods and natural resource management in hillside regions (Ayarza and Welchez 2004).

Traditional slash-and-burn practices have been a driving force in agricultural expansion and landscape degradation. Such systems are widely used in the hillside areas of Central America. A number of factors have led to this form of land use:

- Lack of opportunities for off-farm employment
- Scarce resources to invest in intensifying production
- The quick economic benefits to farmers from the slash-and-burn system
- A scarcity of technical assistance and little adaptation of appropriate technologies that promote soil cover and eliminate the need for burning
- Increased urbanization (rural areas are rarely a priority for central governments)
- Few national or local policies to encourage the use of environmentally friendly production practices.

BUILDING ON LESSONS LEARNED

Although small farmers practice slash and burn extensively, a small group of farmers in a Honduran village called Que-sungual came up with an important change: they planted crops under a slash-and-mulch system and eliminated the burning. This was the origin of QSMAS. In the early 1990s, a development project of the Honduran government with the support of FAO noted this anomaly and concentrated efforts to improve and generalize this practice in the region. The project initiated a process of validation with the active participation of farmers. Local organizations, farmer communities, and small enterprises grew along with the process of supporting the adoption of improved QSMAS practices. Widespread adoption of QSMAS was supported by a local government ban on burning. Before long, several villages of the region had almost completely forgone the use of fire.

Farmers practicing QSMAS could soon produce sufficient maize and beans to meet their household needs and sell the excess in local markets. In addition, innovative farmers are intensifying and diversifying the system by using vegetables and market-oriented cash crops, as well as raising livestock. QSMAS demonstrated a high degree of resilience to extreme weather events, such as the El Niño drought of 1997 and Hurricane Mitch in 1998. Permanent cover protects the soil from raindrop impact and crust formation, while minimizing surface evaporation. In addition, surface residues favor nutrient recycling, improve soil fertility, and could result in higher carbon storage in soils.

QSMAS plots have three layers of vegetation: mulch, crops, and dispersed shrubs and trees. The system starts with the selection of a well-developed fallow (with numerous and diverse trees and shrubs). Farmers selectively slash and prune the fallows, remove firewood and trunks, and uniformly distribute the biomass (leaves and fine shoots) as mulch. Then, pioneer crops such as sorghum (Sorghum vulgare) or common beans (Phaseolus vulgaris), whose seedlings are capable of emerging through the mulch, are sown by broadcast. Maize (Zea mays) is not sown as a pioneer crop because (a) the abundant mulch restricts the emergence of seedlings and (b) late-season planting (August) does not provide adequate soil moisture for grain filling.

For about 10 years after the pioneer crop, the system maintains agricultural production because of the regrowth potential of trees in the system. QSMAS annually produces maize intercropped with beans or sorghum. Management is zero tillage, with continuous slashing and pruning of trees and shrubs for firewood to avoid excessive shading of the crops. Continuous mulching from leaf litter, slashing of trees, and applying crop residues are supplemented with spot fertilization technologies and occasional use of pre-emergence herbicides.

The small farmer was not a major obstacle to larger-scale implementation of QSMAS. Extensionists and their organizations often maintained a monocrop production bias and opposed the comprehensive approach of QSMAS. A lack of training in demand-driven participatory extension dominated rural development projects, which focused efforts on physical, supply-driven indicators. Although much was said about collaboration between local and professional knowledge systems, the approach was rarely implemented (Welchez and Cherrett 2002).

The success of QSMAS is a reflection of a community-based learning process in which local people and extension service providers share ideas and learn together. The strategy to promote adoption and integration consists of three main components: (a) collective action, (b) technological innovations, and (c) policies and negotiations.

The project promoted collective action by strengthening the capacity of households (both men and women), local groups, educational institutions, and development organizations to organize and identify leaders and negotiate their interests with government representatives, service providers, and policy makers. Several local development organizations learned to devise action plans to improve agricultural practices using QSMAS.

Training services strengthened entrepreneurial capacity of men and women to transform and add value to agricul-
tural products and sell them in the market. Technological innovation enhanced the capacity of farmers and household heads to adapt the components of QSMAS to their production systems and to develop appropriate innovations according to their own land and labor constraints.

The bargaining capacity of local communities to negotiate incentives and regulations supporting the adoption of QSMAS was strengthened. Local government officials were informed of the negative effects of burning on crop production and water availability. They enacted laws with severe penalties for people using fire in agricultural practices. Other laws were advanced with respect to common forestlands and water reservoirs. Significant improvements in financial services and infrastructure were negotiated with the Honduran government.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Letting soils rest as fallow after a cropping cycle has been a traditional management practice throughout the tropics to restore soil fertility. In southwest Honduras, successful restoration of soil fertility after cropping for 2 to 3 years usually requires a 14- to 20-year fallow period. Use of QSMAS can produce 10 years of crops with a fallow period of 5 to 7 years. In QSMAS plots, a key factor that contributes to the restoration of soil fertility is the coexistence of deciduous trees and shrubs. They serve as sources of mulch that protect the soil, retain water, and cycle nutrients during both production and fallow periods. An improved agricultural productive capacity together with provision of several environmental services (including reduced soil losses and improved water quality) can help convince farmers to move away from the traditional slash-and-burn system and toward QSMAS.

Recent research has shown that using QSMAS generates both economic and environmental benefits, which should provide an incentive to national and local authorities to encourage QSMAS. The socioeconomic and biophysical benefits of QSMAS are many:

- **Food security.** Farmers achieve productivity increases of traditional staple crops (such as maize, beans, and sorghum) and can diversify with other food crop options. Other benefits reported by QSMAS farmers are improved incomes, less labor invested in land preparation and weed control, reduced production costs, and higher net profits.
- **Increased market involvement.** Surpluses from improved yields and crop diversification provide householders with the production capacity to link with local markets.
- **Other products.** QSMAS contributes to improved availability and quality of water, not only to local communities but also to users downstream. QSMAS farms are also good sources of firewood for domestic consumption.

QSMAS generated benefits at the farm and landscape levels:

- **Farm level.** QSMAS has proved to be productive and sustainable while providing an improved physical, chemical, and biological resilience to agricultural plots. According to farmers, the following are among the main biophysical benefits of the system: (a) reduced soil erosion, (b) improved soil water-holding capacity when rainfall is erratic (irregular or insufficient), (c) improved soil fertility from efficient recycling of nutrients through mulch, and (d) improved resilience of the system from natural disasters.
- **Landscape level.** The adoption of QSMAS by farmers has contributed to improvements in environmental quality. The widespread use of QSMAS has decreased soil losses and has reduced the sediments in watercourses. QSMAS has contributed to the conservation of more than 40 native species of trees and shrubs. Newer QSMAS farms (two to five years old) serve as sinks for methane, with low emission levels of nitrous oxide. These results help mitigate climate change.

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT**

QSMAS is a resource-efficient production system that improves livelihoods while conserving the natural resource base. There are four main reasons behind its successful adoption by farmers:

1. **Reduced soil losses from erosion.** A combined effect of permanent soil cover and presence of stones improves crop water productivity and water quality.
2. **Increased availability of soil nutrients.** Trees and organic resources maintain or even increase nitrogen and phosphorus, while enhancing soil biodiversity and biological activity.
3. **Mitigation of climate change.** The no-burn practices reduce the negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions.
4. **Enhanced biodiversity.** Conservation of trees and shrubs favors local biodiversity. Cumulative benefits of widespread QSMAS practices improve biodiversity of the landscape.

In the past decade, more than 6,000 resource-poor farmers have adopted QSMAS on 7,000 hectares in the Lempira
department, formerly the poorest region in Honduras. This response has generated a twofold increase in crop yields (for example, maize from 1,200 to 2,500 kilograms per hectare in year 1; beans from 325 to 800 kilograms per hectare in year 1) and cattle stocking rates, along with significant reductions in labor and agrochemical costs (Ayarza and Welchez 2004; Clerck and Deugd 2002). By way of nonformal diffusion processes, the system has also been accepted among farmers in northwest Nicaragua.

Scientists from the CIAT, FAO, and the Consortium for Integrated Soil Management conclude that the Quesungual system—or elements of it—could be adapted for use in hillside areas of Africa, Asia, and South America. The project supported by the Challenge Program for Water and Food expects to identify new areas that could be suitable for QSMAS and to provide the tools for adapting and promoting the entire system or its components in these areas.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS**

- **Reach consensus.** The principle of QSMAS is sustainable land management through the protection of the natural resources that are essential for agricultural productivity. The practices include (a) the use of local natural resources (that is, vegetation, soil, and microorganisms) with introduced crops; (b) field preparation without using burning or tillage; (c) the continuous slash and mulch of naturally regenerated vegetation; and (d) spot application of fertilizers and occasional herbicide use. Successful implementation requires detailed discussion with farmers on all four components.

- **Use local knowledge.** The success of QSMAS depends on local perspectives and knowledge. Close collaboration with local farmers is essential for understanding how to manage system components, particularly the native tree and shrub vegetation.

- **Use local support.** A key factor for the widespread adoption of QSMAS was a decision made in a local referendum to forbid the use of burning to prepare fields for planting. This action would have been impossible without the support of local authorities and a clear understanding by farmers of the negative effects of burning and the multiple biophysical and socioeconomic benefits from the restoration of soil organic matter.

- **Train farmers.** Although maintaining the QSMAS plots is not expensive, the initial investment, especially labor, is higher than the traditional slash-and-burn system. Extensionists need to explain the potential benefits returned from their labor and costs. QSMAS has some limitations: (a) lower rates of seed germination when the mulch layer is too thick, (b) a higher incidence of pests and diseases during the initial years because of the mulch and the increased humidity from shade, and (c) a similar or even reduced productivity during the first year (FAO 2001).

Although the potential is great for the adoption of QSMAS in other regions of the world, it is important to realize that any project supporting its validation requires substantial commitments of time and resources within the context of a long-term framework. With additional research, development investments would enable more farmers to adapt QSMAS to their local biophysical and socioeconomic conditions. Investments would also permit researchers and development practitioners to analyze the feasibility of establishing payments for environmental services from smallholder QSMAS. Fostering positive incentives for sustainable land management on and off farms could improve the productivity and resilience of tropical hillside agro-ecosystems.

**NOTE**

1. The system is being used within the upper watersheds of the Lempa River in the department of Lempira, Honduras (around 14 degrees, 4 feet, 60 inches North; 88 degrees, 34 feet, 0 inches West) at 200 to 900 meters above sea level. The region’s life zone (Holdridge) is a subhumid tropical forest with semideciduous and pine trees, and its climatic classification is tropic humid-dry (Koppen Aw) with a bimodal rainfall distribution during the year. Mean annual precipitation is about 1,400 millimeters falling mainly from early May to late October, with a distinct dry season of up to six months (November through April). During the dry season, strong winds blow from the north and the enhanced evapotranspiration rates cause severe water deficits (more than 200 millimeters) until the onset of rains. Temperature ranges between 17 and 25 degrees Celsius. Soils are classified as stony Entisols (Lithic Ustorthents) influenced by volcanic ashes associated with igneous and intrusive rocks, usually with low-labile phosphorus (that is, less than 5 mg kg⁻¹) and low soil organic matter content (2.8 to 3.9 percent) with pH values ranging from 4.1 to 6.2.
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International Center for Tropical Agriculture. The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, or CIAT) is a not-for-profit organization that conducts socially and environmentally progressive research aimed at reducing hunger and poverty and preserving natural resources in developing countries. CIAT is one of the 15 centers that make up the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. The CIAT Web site has information on its products, regions, research, and services. http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/.

Challenge Program on Water and Food. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Challenge Program on Water and Food is an international, multi-institutional research initiative with a strong emphasis on North-South and South-South partnerships. Its goal is to increase the productivity of water used for agriculture, leaving more water for other users and the environment. The Web site of the CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food features announcements, capacity building activities, research, and publications: http://www.waterandfood.org/.

FAO Web page on the Quesungual agroforestry farming system. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations leads international efforts to defeat hunger by acting as a neutral forum where all nations meet as equals to negotiate agreements and debate policy. The FAO Web page on the Quesungual agroforestry farming system describes the Lempira Sur project, where farmers learn new cultivation methods to prevent soil erosion. http://www.fao.org/FOCUS/E/honduras/agro.htm.

Module 5 of the Agriculture Investment Sourcebook. The Agriculture Investment Sourcebook discusses how to implement the rural strategy of investing to promote agricultural growth and poverty reduction by sharing information on investment options and identifying innovative approaches that will aid the design of future lending programs for agriculture. Module 5 of the Agriculture Investment Sourcebook discusses the investment in sustainable natural resource management for agriculture. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTAGISOU/Resources/Module5_Web.pdf.

World Agroforestry Centre. The World Agroforestry Centre uses science to generate knowledge on the complex role of trees in livelihoods and the environment and fosters the use of this knowledge to improve decisions and practices affecting the poor. Its Web site provides information on news and events, recent publications, agroforestry, and other resources. http://www.worldagroforestry.org/.
The common bean is a major staple food crop in Africa. PABRA (the Pan-African Bean Research Alliance) aims to enhance the food security, income, and health of resource-poor farmers in Africa through research on beans. Partners operate in different agro-ecological and socioeconomic environments through a series of collaborations with local agencies and directly with farmers in research groups.

The improved bean varieties have environmental benefits beyond the farm. For example, some require less cooking time than traditional varieties. Fuelwood consumption (as well as the time spent collecting fuel) has fallen sharply, releasing women especially for other livelihood activities. Innovative bean farmers used improved technologies from service providers (such as pest-tolerant high-yielding varieties, fertilizers, commercial pesticides, and improved cultural practices) to blend with local options (the use of wood ash, cow urine, cowshed slurry, and local plant extracts for pest control; the use of animal and green manure for improved soil fertility; and the improvement of agronomy through cultural practices, such as mixed cropping, staggered planting, and use of local crop cultivars). Although the immediate benefit was increased yields from improved bean management, the second benefit, which was broader and even more exciting, was the enhancement of farmer innovation and farmer-to-farmer communication.

PABRA researchers are striving to improve the nutritional content of beans and to improve market access. The PABRA approach also helps in the active exploration of other technologies and improved services (such as quality seeds, markets, credit, improved livestock, fertilizers, tree nurseries, irrigation facilities, and soil and water conservation methods). District authorities in Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda use the PABRA farmers groups to develop and implement community-based project proposals.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUE**

Beans are popular in Africa—and for good reason. Beans are healthful and profitable, and with good management, they contribute to farm diversification and productivity. Can more farmers benefit from cultivating these fast-growing legumes? Africans confront numerous agricultural, communication, and transportation challenges. This investment note explains how the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, or CIAT) and its partners combine their scientific, organizational, and marketing efforts to address these challenges and reach more farmers.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Natural resources are the key to rural development in Africa (Anderson 2003). Despite their importance, a majority of Africans still face both food shortages and degradation of their natural resources. Two-thirds of the population (405 million people) live on small-scale farms (Conway and Toenniessen 2003), where declines in soil fertility severely reduce harvests.

Although overexploitation of natural resources comes in many forms, the results are the same: a loss of both productive capacity and resilience. Soil degradation threatens (a) the sustainability of agricultural yields and (b) the ability of agriculture to deliver crucial services, such as water availability, biodiversity, and carbon storage.

---

This note was prepared by D. White, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical and Pan-African Bean Research Alliance.
For many generations, traditional farm practices met household food needs. Population growth and accompanying pressure on land, however, have stressed this equilibrium. Farmers typically respond by either intensifying agricultural production or expanding into marginal lands (Dixon and Gulliver with Gibbon 2001). Nevertheless, harvests from these efforts are typically low because no or few investments in soil fertility maintenance are made. Although chemical fertilizers have produced impressive yield gains in much of the world, fertilizers are rarely available or too expensive in much of Africa (Crawford and others 2003; Gregory and Bumb 2006). There are also serious misunderstandings regarding fertilizer. For example, some farmers believe that to be effective, the fertilizer actually needs to touch the seed—which in fact hinders germination and damages both the crop and the farmers’ faith in the technology. Furthermore, the advice farmers are typically given in the use of fertilizer is poor; recommendations ignore crucial differences in soil type and, as importantly, key economic factors about the prices of both inputs and outputs (Conroy and others 2006). Local ways to enhance farm productivity are needed (Giller 2001).

LESSONS LEARNED

The common bean is a major staple food crop in Africa. Farmers plant approximately 4 million hectares of beans, which represent 20 percent of the total crop area planted. In many parts of eastern, central, and southern Africa, beans are referred to as the “poor man’s meat.” Beans provide nearly 40 percent of dietary protein and are valued as one of the least expensive sources of protein. Many people eat beans twice a day. During hard times in some areas, households survive on just one meal of beans a day.

A major lesson learned is the importance of having an active regional and local institutional partnership to facilitate the dissemination and scaling up of cropping and land management innovations. PABRA’s goal is to enhance the food security, income, and health of resource-poor farmers in Africa through research on beans. PABRA works in partnership with farmers and rural communities, nongovernmental organizations, national agricultural research institutes, traders, and other private sector partners. Crucial roles and responsibilities of partners include improving bean varieties, producing and disseminating seed, sharing information, and training extensionists and researchers.

Collaborative PABRA efforts enhance farmer access to improved quality seeds that farmers prefer. This process involves the following:

- Understanding farm household needs, their taste preferences, and their sources of bean seed
- Supporting partners involved in decentralizing bean variety selection, seed production, and distribution
- Strengthening and catalyzing partnerships with strategic actors
- Facilitating access to information and preferred seed varieties by commercial seed producers
- Providing key support services: technical inputs, outreach products, and colearning
- Sharing lessons learned, including successful cases of wider effect at the local, national, and regional levels (for example, Ethiopia and southern Tanzania) that demonstrate how change processes work with PABRA partners
- Adapting lessons to new areas and crops (such as cassava and teff) with new partners.

Since the early 1980s, the bean research network has worked to improve the productivity, resilience, and acceptability of bean varieties. National agricultural research systems and extension partners released about 200 improved beans in 18 countries. Partners operate in different agroecological and socioeconomic environments. PABRA partners have overcome production problems, such as bean pests and diseases and poor soil fertility, and have made new bean varieties available to more farmers.

PABRA has fostered strategic partnerships that play complementary roles in reaching end users. By late 2006, PABRA partner organizations had trained more than 300 associations with about 15,000 farmers. Topics included variety testing, seed production, and agronomic practices. Knowledge sharing among farmers has greatly accelerated technology dissemination and adoption. National programs have been encouraged to conduct participatory varietal selection or plant breeding with farmers. Those approaches have ensured that new varieties are quickly made available to farmers before their formal release. To speed up dissemination, PABRA has supported the development of community-based seed production as an agro-enterprise strategy. Technical resource manuals in 11 local languages have been developed and supplied to farmers and extension organizations.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Beans generate environmental benefits both on and off farms. Farmers often cultivate beans in rotation or in association with other crops. This strategy diversifies farm production against risks and can enable farmers to improve soil
fertility. Bean cultivation within a farm management strategy may enhance the yields of other crops, such as maize.

Although PABRA has promoted the use of improved bean varieties that thrive in poor soils, such beans perform better when integrated with good farm management practices. PABRA researchers look for and examine a wide range of locally generated solutions for improving soil fertility, such as green manures and organic soil amendments. In many parts of Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Rwanda), bean crop residues are used as (a) a green manure to increase soil organic matter or (b) a livestock feed, with manure applied to fields. PABRA also serves as a forum for sharing management practices.

Pests and diseases can destroy harvests and cause food shortages. The early 1990s were troubling times for both bean farmers and consumers in eastern Africa. Bean root rot disease decimated harvests in intensely cultivated areas, causing severe food shortages and high prices. To help solve the problem, PABRA scientists from CIAT and the Institut des Sciences Agronomiques du Rwanda identified bush and climbing bean varieties with resistance to the disease. Partners introduced these varieties to Kenya and southwest Uganda.

Improved bean varieties are not the only way to achieve better harvests and possibly improve soil fertility. Climbing beans can generate higher yields than bush beans, enabling farmers to sustainably intensify production on tiny plots. Integrated pest and disease management (IPDM) can be effective in improving system outputs. Farmers typically combine local knowledge and researcher-generated innovations (such as timely planting, weeding, use of botanical pesticides, and sowing or use of Tephrosia to restore soil fertility while warding off pests).

Results show that such practices are effective in countering bean root rot and other diseases and pests. According to PABRA, improved practices to counter pests, diseases, and poor soils reached 400,000 farmers by 2005. Although this figure is well behind the numbers of those adopting improved varieties, it represents a very promising start.

Improved bean varieties have environmental benefits beyond the farm. Some of the improved beans require less cooking time than traditional varieties. Women report reduced fuelwood consumption of almost 50 percent. Women can also spend less time collecting firewood during the day and can dedicate that time to other livelihood activities.

**Rationale for Investment**

Beans can play a role in achieving sustainable land management in Africa. Their ability to be profitable while contributing to overall farm production and resilience makes them an attractive crop for many African farmers. Evidence suggests that bean varieties generate substantial benefits for producers, consumers, and other actors in the bean supply chain. Significant effects, however, tend to be found in areas of intense efforts to disseminate seed. As part of the revised PABRA strategy of 2003, the network aims to achieve greater use of improved bean varieties. The goal was to deliver and ensure training in improved bean technologies to 2 million households (10 million end users) in 18 countries by 2008. Expectations have already been exceeded. As a result of the strategic partnerships, about 6.5 million households (30 million end users) had been reached at the end of 2006. Critical to that success was packaging seed in small, affordable quantities. Fifty tons of seed can reach a million farmers with 50-gram seed packets. More work is required to reach the hundreds of millions in need of improved bean technologies.

According to PABRA, farmers who planted improved varieties reported increased yields, had fewer losses to pests and diseases, enhanced family nutrition and health, and realized higher incomes. In some countries, bean research and development activities have brought substantial economic returns. For example, in Tanzania the internal rate of return to research investments was estimated at 60 percent over a 20-year period (1985 to 2005). Economic benefits can be seen from the farmer’s perspective. In eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, farmers’ incomes from beans increased nearly fivefold. Higher incomes were generated not only from increased bean sales for consumption but also from the sale of seeds. In some countries, seed production and sales have become moneymaking enterprises and generated employment, often with PABRA support.

Cultivating beans appears to be a wealth-neutral agricultural activity. Farmers in several countries, particularly Rwanda, reported that poor or very poor members of the community were as likely to adopt the new varieties as better-off farmers. Many adopters are women, who have seen their incomes rise substantially. To reduce the risk of men trying to appropriate the income gains by taking over what is traditionally a women’s crop, PABRA has sought to build the capacity of women’s groups and associated service providers in starting and running agro-enterprises. Other social benefits realized by participating bean farmers include exposure to new services providers (that is, credit and input supplies) and to new information on health and nutrition.

Beans are highly vulnerable to climatic stresses, especially drought. In recent years, PABRA partners have developed
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

To reach marginalized farmers, PABRA must reinforce its efforts to disseminate seed-based and other technologies. Adoption patterns reveal three priorities: (a) disseminating technologies in areas that have been neglected or bypassed, (b) offering a greater number of varieties to allow greater resilience of production and household food security, and (c) continuing to develop and adapt knowledge-based technologies (such as IPDM) that typically lag seed technologies.

PABRA researchers are striving to improve the nutritional content of beans. As part of the HarvestPlus initiative, researchers are working to develop biofortified beans, focusing on iron and zinc in agronomically superior varieties. Efforts to enhance the contribution of beans, particularly for those affected by the continuing spread of HIV/AIDS, require coordination with organizations outside the agricultural sector. Besides developing and disseminating new varieties that are rich in minerals, PABRA must launch promotional campaigns to involve community-based health and nutrition workers.

As African farmers produce more and better beans, they will need to participate in markets. Ensuring that beans remain profitable requires investments in cost-effective processing options and efforts to open up new regional markets. If prices for beans and other cash crops can be sustained, farmers will likely be more willing to invest in their farms, especially in the fertility of their soils.

The PABRA approach reaches well beyond the innovators. Farmers in Kisii, Kenya, cited benefits from the adoption of improved bean technology: increased amounts of household food, increased household income, availability of food year-round, improvements in family health and relationships with other farmers, and increased income controlled by women. Data from Uganda show increasing involvement in local trade of beans as the farmers move beyond subsistence. Farmers have also started to actively explore other technologies. For example, farmers in northern Tanzania experimented with a locally available phosphate-based fertilizer (Minjingu Mazao) on the bean crop. But they quickly went on to test the fertilizer on other crops, such as maize and vegetables, and also modified their fertilizer use on those crops.

Encouraged by their experiences with beans, farmers started to actively seek improved services, such as quality seed, markets, credit, improved livestock, fertilizers, tree nurseries, irrigation facilities, and soil and water conservation methods (Blackie and Ward 2005). They raised these issues openly with local officials and visitors—something they lacked the confidence to do previously. Through the enhanced participation, local officials, community leaders, nongovernmental organizations, and politicians gain information for local planning. The research groups are an important and dynamic component in the local innovation system. Government ministries (agriculture, livestock, health, education, and marketing) and district authorities in Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda use the farmers groups to develop and implement community-based project proposals.
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*International Center for Tropical Agriculture*. The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) is a non-profit organization that conducts socially and environmentally progressive research targeting the reduction of hunger and poverty and the preservation of natural resources in developing countries. CIAT is one of the 15 centers that make up the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. The CIAT Web site has information on its products, regions, research, and services: http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/.
In East Africa, zero-grazing systems constitute the most common smallholder dairy system; farmers cut and carry feed to their confined dairy cows. Fodder legumes have been tested for more than 50 years as protein supplements, but with little adoption. Fodder shrubs are a low-cost, easy-to-produce protein source that could also contribute to sustainable land management (SLM). They are highly attractive to farmers because they require little or no cash. Moreover, they do not require farmers to take land out of use for food or other crops. But the technology is knowledge intensive and requires the farmer to learn new skills.

The spread of fodder shrubs has been substantial, and by 2006 (about 10 years after dissemination began in earnest), they were contributing about US$3.8 million per year to farmer incomes across East Africa. Critical to the expansion were extension approaches involving (a) dissemination facilitators (specialists who promote the use of fodder shrubs among extension providers and support them with training, information, and access to seeds); (b) farmer-to-farmer dissemination; (c) large nongovernmental organization (NGO) promoters, which facilitated seed flows (seed availability was a key constraint in many areas); and (d) civil society campaigns involving a broader set of partners than just farmers and extension providers.

**PROJECT OBJECTIVE**

Low quality and quantity of feed resources are the greatest constraint to improving the productivity of livestock in Sub-Saharan Africa (Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development 1992). Dairy production is increasing rapidly in the highlands of East Africa, which hosts roughly 3 million dairy farmers, including some 21 million in Kenya alone (SDP 2006). Milk demand is concentrated in towns and cities, and dairy production has grown rapidly around those urban areas, to take advantage of low marketing costs. But farm sizes are also generally small in such peri-urban areas, exacerbating feed constraints. Land degradation is also a pervasive problem; most of the land is sloping, and soil erosion reduces crop productivity.

Zero-grazing systems are the most common smallholder dairy system; farmers cut and carry feed to their confined dairy cows. Napier grass is the basal feed of choice, but its protein content is too low to sustain adequate milk yields. Manufactured dairy meal is available in most areas, but few small farmers use it because of its high price. Fodder legumes have been tested in East Africa for more than 50 years as protein supplements, but there are few cases of widespread adoption, especially in the smallholder sector. The objective of introducing fodder shrubs in East Africa was to provide a low-cost, easy-to-produce protein source that could also contribute to SLM.

**STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION**

The highlands of East Africa extend across central and western Kenya, westward to Uganda and Rwanda, and to the south in parts of northern Tanzania. Altitudes range from 1,000 to 2,200 meters. Rainfall occurs in two seasons, March through June and October through December, and averages 1,200 to 1,500 millimeters annually. Soils, primarily nitosols, are deep and of moderate to high fertility. Population density is high, ranging from 300 to more than 1,000 people per square kilometer. In central Kenya, which has the region’s highest population density and the most dairy cows, farm size averages 1 to 2 hectares. Most farmers have title to their land; thus, their tenure is relatively secure. The main crops are coffee, which is produced for cash, and...
maize and beans, which is produced for food. Most farmers also grow Napier grass (*Pennisetum purpureum*) to feed their dairy cows, and farmers crop their fields continuously because of the shortage of land. About 80 percent have improved dairy cows. The typical family has 1.7 cows, kept in zero- or minimum-grazing systems. Milk yields average about 8 kilograms per cow per day, and production is for both home consumption and sale. Dairy goats, which are particularly suited to poorer households, are a rapidly growing enterprise (Murithi 1998; Staal and others 2002).

The main feed source for dairy cows in Kenya is Napier grass, supplemented during the dry season with crop residues (such as maize and bean stover, as well as banana leaves and pseudostems) and indigenous fodder shrubs. Few farmers purchase commercial dairy meal (16 percent crude protein). Dairy meal use has declined in recent years because farmers feel that the price ratio of dairy meal to milk is unfavorable and because they lack cash to buy the meal. Many also suspect the nutritive value of dairy meal, in part because of scandals concerning fraudulent maize seed and agrochemicals sold to farmers (Franzel, Wambugu, and Tuwei 2003; Murithi 1998; Staal and others 2002).

Smallholder dairy systems in Rwanda, northern Tanzania, and Uganda are similar to those in Kenya, but the density of dairy farmers and cows is generally lower, as is government extension support and private sector marketing infrastructure.

**PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION**

Fodder shrubs are highly attractive to farmers because they require little or no cash. Moreover, they do not require farmers to take land out of use for food or other crops. The only inputs required are the initial seed and minimal amounts of labor, which farmers are usually willing to provide. But like many agroforestry and natural resource management practices, fodder shrubs are knowledge intensive and require considerable skills that most farmers lack. These skills include raising seedlings in a nursery, pruning trees, and knowing the best ways to feed the fodder to livestock. Such skills are difficult to acquire as is, at times, the necessary seed. Thus, the technology does not spread easily.

Farmers prefer planting fodder shrubs in the following locations and arrangements:

- In hedges around the farm compound
- In hedges along contour bunds and terrace edges on sloping land. The shrubs thus help conserve soil and, when kept well pruned, have little effect on adjacent crops
- In lines with Napier grass. Results from intercropping experiments show that introducing the leguminous shrub *Calliandra calothyrsus* into Napier grass does not depress the grass yields (Nyaata, O’Neill, and Roothaert 1998)
- In lines between upper-story trees. Many farmers plant *Grevillea robusta*, a tree useful for timber and firewood, along their boundaries. Fodder shrubs may be planted between the trees in the same line (NARP 1993).

Seeds are planted in nurseries and then transplanted on the farm at the onset of the rains, after about three months in the nursery. Experiments on seedling production have confirmed that the seedlings may be grown “bare root”; that is, they may be raised in seedbeds rather than by the more expensive, laborious method of raising them in polythene pots (NARP 1993).

The shrubs are first pruned for fodder 9 to 12 months after transplant, and pruning is carried out four or five times a year (Roothaert and others 1998). Leafy biomass yields per year rise if the shrubs are pruned less frequently and allowed to grow taller, but as this happens, competition from the shrubs means that adjacent crop yields are negatively affected (Franzel and Wambugu 2007). The most productive compromise is probably in the range of four to six pruneings annually at 0.6- to 1-meter cutting height. This approach yields, under farmers’ conditions, roughly 1.5 kilograms of dry matter (4.5 kilograms of fresh biomass) per tree per year planted at a spacing of two to three trees per meter in hedges. Thus, a farmer needs about 500 shrubs to feed a cow throughout the year at a rate of 2 kilograms of dry (6 kilograms of fresh) matter per day, providing about 0.6 kilogram of crude protein. This amount provides an effective protein supplement to the basal feed of Napier grass and crop residues for increased milk production. A typical farm of 1.5 hectares could easily accommodate 500 shrubs without replacing any existing crops (Paterson and others 1998).¹

On-farm feeding trials have confirmed the effectiveness of *C. calothyrsus* as a supplement to the basal diet. Two kilograms of dry *C. calothyrsus* (24 percent crude protein and digestibility of 60 percent when fed fresh) have about the same amount of digestible protein as 2 kilograms of dairy meal (16 percent crude protein and 80 percent digestibility); each increases milk production by about 1.5 kilograms under farm conditions. But the response varies, depending on such factors as the health of the cow and the quantity and quality of the basal feed (Paterson and others 1998).

Since *C. calothyrsus* was introduced in the mid-1990s, several other shrub species have also been tested and dis-
seminated (Wambugu and others 2006). In Kenya, *Leucaena triandra* (an exotic species), *Morus alba* (mulberry, a naturalized species), and *Sesbania sesban* (an indigenous species) are grown widely but not as commonly as *C. calothyrsus*. In Rwanda, *C. calothyrsus* and *Leucaena diversifolia*, also an exotic, are the most common fodder shrubs. In Uganda, these same two shrubs, along with *Sesbania*, are widely grown. In northern Tanzania, *C. calothyrsus* and *Leucaena leucocephala* are the most widely used species.

**BENEFITS AND EFFECT OF THE ACTIVITY**

The main benefit to using fodder shrubs is increased milk production. In an economic analysis from Kenya in 2006, the authors compared the value of increased milk production with the costs of establishing a nursery, raising 500 *C. calothyrsus* seedlings, transplanting them on the farm, and harvesting them for feed (Hess and others 2006). In the first year, the farmer spends about US$13 establishing the nursery, raising the seedlings, and transplanting them. About US$1.70 of this amount is for seed and the rest is spent on labor. Beginning in the second year, when the farmer starts harvesting the shrubs, the 500 *C. calothyrsus* shrubs increase net household income by about US$95 to US$122 a year, depending on the location. The main causes of variation in income increases across location were differences in milk prices. The analysis does not take into account several other benefits of fodder shrubs. First, they increase the butterfat content of milk (in the farmers’ terms, its “creaminess” and “thickness”). Second, the extra nutrients that the shrubs provide may improve the cow’s health and shorten the calving interval. Finally, farmers can also benefit from harvesting and selling seeds.

Fodder shrubs also make important contributions to SLM, which are not taken into account in the previous analysis:

- **Nitrogen fixation.** Five of the six species fix nitrogen from the atmosphere and thus contribute to improving soil fertility. As long as these species are grown in hedges that are 1 meter high, they do not compete with crops grown next to them.
- **Increased quantity and quality of manure.** Most fodder species are high in tannins, which bind protein and increase the levels of nitrogen in manure. The increase in quantity and quality of manure helps improve soil fertility.
- **Soil erosion control.** Fodder shrubs are planted along the contour, thereby reducing soil erosion. The shrubs are particularly effective when combined with grasses.
- **Substitutes for products obtained from forests.** Most of the shrub species provide firewood, fencing, and stakes, thus reducing the need to source them off the farm and deplete woodlands.

In the Kabale area of western Uganda, more than 70 percent of farmers mentioned fencing, firewood, soil fertility improvement, and stakes as important benefits of fodder shrubs (Mawanda 2004). In central Kenya, more than 30 percent mentioned firewood, soil fertility improvement, and improvement in animal health (Koech 2005).

The spread of fodder shrubs has been substantial. By 2006, about 10 years after dissemination began in earnest, 224 organizations across Kenya, Rwanda, northern Tanzania, and Uganda were promoting fodder shrubs, and more than 200,000 farmers had planted them (table 4.1). The number of shrubs averages 71 to 236 per farmer, depending on the country. Note, however, that this number is still well below the 500 shrubs needed to feed a single dairy cow. The explanation is that many farmers adopt incrementally (they plant some shrubs to see how they perform before adding more), and others partially adopt (they apply several different strategies for providing protein supplements—herbaceous legumes, dairy meal, and so forth—to better manage the risks of relying on a single strategy). The number of shrubs per farmer is higher in countries such as Uganda, where NGOs promote fodder shrubs; it is lower in countries such as Kenya, where farmer-to-farmer dissemination is the main cause of the spread.

Fodder shrubs currently contribute about US$3.8 million annually to farmer incomes across East Africa. If all farmers were to adopt them, the potential is more than US$200 million per year.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

Representatives of 70 organizations promoting fodder shrubs were interviewed and asked to name the most important factor explaining their achievements in disseminating fodder shrubs. With a mean score of 4.1 on a scale of 0 to 5.0, the most important factor was that fodder shrubs met the needs of farmers (Franzel and Wambugu 2007). Other key factors were that the fodder shrubs were profitable, that effective extension approaches were used, and that partnerships with other organizations facilitated success. Less important factors included long-term commitment by key players, farmers’ commercial orientation, farmers’ skill levels, availability of training materials, and backstopping from research. Many of the reasons for the
spread are related to the technology itself, its attractiveness to farmers, and the socioeconomic environment (in particular, the rapid growth of the smallholder dairy industry in the region). Franzel and Wambugu (2007) found that five extension approaches were critical for the spread of the practice:

1. **Dissemination facilitators.** Dissemination facilitators are extension specialists who promote the use of fodder shrubs among extension providers and support them by providing training, information, and access to seed. Dissemination facilitators were employed by international organizations such as the World Agroforestry Centre or national agricultural research institutes such as the National Agricultural Research Organization of Uganda. The dissemination facilitators proved to be highly effective. In central Kenya, for example, over a two-year period, a dissemination facilitator assisted 22 organizations and 150 farmer groups comprising 2,600 farmers to establish 250 nurseries and plant more than 1 million fodder shrubs (Wambugu and others 2001).

2. **Farmer-to-farmer dissemination.** Survey results showed that farmers played a critical role in disseminating seeds and information to other farmers. A survey of 94 farmers in central Kenya, randomly selected from farmers who had planted fodder shrubs three years before, revealed that 57 percent had distributed planting material (seeds or seedlings) and information to other farmers. On average, those providing planting material gave to 6.3 other farmers. But most astounding was that 5 percent of the farmers accounted for 66 percent of all dissemination. These master disseminators differed from other farmers in no appreciable way—they included both men and women and had different ages, levels of education, and other characteristics.

### Table 4.1 Farmers Planting Fodder Shrubs in Kenya, Northern Tanzania, Rwanda, and Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of organizations</th>
<th>Number of farmers</th>
<th>Rough estimate</th>
<th>Number of trees per farmer</th>
<th>Notes and sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promoting fodder shrubs</td>
<td>planting</td>
<td>according to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data in “records” column are from 4 random sample surveys and reports from 23 organizations, mostly from 2004 to 2005. Data in “rough estimates” column include numbers in areas with fodder shrubs for which there are no data (for example, Coast, Kisii, and Machakos) and increases in central and eastern provinces since 2003 surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>according to</td>
<td>records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>farmers planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51,645</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>81,645</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17,519</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>27,519</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data in “records” column are from 14 organizations in Arusha and Kilimanjaro and estimates of numbers of collectors, planters, processors, and users in Tanga. Data in “rough estimates” column are for farmers in Mwanza, Lushoto, and other parts of northern Tanzania where fodder shrubs are promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9,590</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77,369</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>82,369</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>156,123</td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>205,523</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education, and farm sizes. Farmers receiving planting material from other farmers had high rates of success in planting; about 75 percent had received fodder shrubs.

3. Large NGO promoters. In Rwanda and Uganda, a few large, international NGOs facilitated the dissemination of fodder shrubs to thousands of farmers, accounting for over half the farmers planting in the two countries. Large NGOs were also important in facilitating the spread of the practice in Kenya and Tanzania. Some of the NGOs employed hundreds of extension staff members and thus had significant reach. Many promoted dairy production and wanted to ensure that farmers had sufficient feed for their cows. Others promoted SLM and helped farmers plant shrubs for a range of purposes: soil erosion control, firewood, and fodder.

4. Facilitation of seed flows. Seed availability was a key constraint in many areas. *Calliandra calothyrsus*, the main species used, produces relatively little seed, and farmers need to be trained to collect, maintain, and treat it before planting. An assessment of the seed market chain found that private seed vendors in western Kenya were effective in providing seed to big institutional suppliers, such as NGOs, but were ineffective in reaching farmers, particularly in central Kenya where the greatest number of potential adopters were. Following the study, the World Agroforestry Centre and its partners assisted seed vendors in central Kenya in forming an association that forged links with seed providers in western Kenya and in packaging seeds in small packets for sale to farmers in central Kenya (Franzel and Wambugu 2007). Over an eight-month period in 2006, 43 seed vendors sold more than 2.3 tons of seed, sufficient for more than 40,000 farmers. A thriving private seed market is a key to sustainable growth in the adoption of fodder shrubs.

5. Civil society campaigns. A much broader set of partners than just farmers and extension providers can add significant value in promoting a new technology such as fodder shrubs. The SCALE (Systemwide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and the Environment) methodology brings civil society stakeholders together to plan and implement campaigns to promote new practices (AED 2006). By engaging a wide range of stakeholders who represent all aspects of a given system (in this case, dairy production), the SCALE method generates change across many levels and sectors of society, using a combination of different social change methodologies, including advocacy, mass communication, and social mobilization. Experience with the SCALE approach in central Kenya highlights the effectiveness of civil society campaigns as complements to more conventional extension programs. Religious leaders; media (radio, television, and the press); private input suppliers; local government administrators; and dairy companies each have a critical role to play in sensitizing and training farmers about new practices such as fodder shrubs.

### ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICATION

This paper documents the substantial progress that has been made in promoting fodder shrubs in East Africa. But the 200,000 farmers planting them represent less than 10 percent of dairy farmers in the region. Because of the knowledge-intensive nature of the technology, it will not spread easily on its own and thus requires outside facilitation. Considerable investments are still required to reach the other dairy farmers and to sustain the uptake process. With formal extension systems in decline throughout Africa, more efforts are needed to develop other approaches for spreading the use of fodder shrubs. This profile documents four dissemination approaches that are particularly effective and that indicate where greater investment in research and development is needed:

- Dissemination facilitators to support organizations promoting fodder shrubs offer a high return on investment. These facilitators do not train farmers; rather, they train trainers and therefore have a high multiplicative effect in promoting new practices.
- Mechanisms are needed to promote farmer-to-farmer dissemination and, in particular, master disseminators, who spread new practices in their communities. Research is needed to determine how best to select master disseminators and how to support them. Is it worthwhile to assist them with transportation (such as bicycles) or train them in the use of fodder shrub technologies or extension methods? Can they be assisted by offering cash for providing extension services, either in exchange for the information they provide or through selling inputs, such as fodder shrub seeds and seedlings?
- Seed vendors face an array of constraints: NGOs giving out free seed and undercutting their business, government seed centers selling seed to institutional buyers at subsidized prices, and government services demanding licensing fees. Efforts in Kenya have been successful in helping seed vendors organize and increase their sales and reach. More efforts are needed to support them, by linking them with institutional buyers and lobbying governments for policy reforms to provide them with a level...
playing field. Efforts are also needed to help seed vendors in other countries emerge and organize themselves.

- Civil society campaigns offer great promise for both sensitizing communities about new practices and training farmers in their use. Key questions that research could address concern the scope of the campaign (for example, fodder shrubs, enriched feeds, or dairy production); the balance between sensitization and training; and the relative importance and effectiveness of involving different types of stakeholders, such as media, religious leaders, and dairy companies.

Finally, investments are needed in two other key areas to sustain progress in fodder shrub adoption and outcomes, especially with regard to SLM:

- **Improved species diversification.** The range of species currently available to farmers should be expanded to include more indigenous shrubs. A broader range will reduce the risk of pests and diseases and promote local biodiversity. The most widely planted shrub, *C. calothyrsus*, has numerous qualities that make it attractive: it is easily propagated, it grows fast and withstands frequent pruning, and it competes little with adjacent crops. But it is not among the most nutritious of feeds (Hess and others 2006); greater efforts are needed to find shrubs that have *C. calothyrsus*’s favorable features and are higher in nutritive quality. Moreover, improved species are needed for marginal environments. Fodder shrub species are currently available for the highlands (1,200 to 2,000 meters), but few are available for higher altitudes or for semiarid areas.

- **Soil erosion prevention.** More research is needed on the role that fodder shrubs can play in curbing soil erosion. In Rwanda, fodder shrub hedges are used for making progressive terraces, which form because soil builds up behind a hedge that stops soil from moving down the hillside. Fodder shrubs are also used to stabilize existing terraces. Policy makers want to know the costs and benefits of using biological means to prevent soil erosion, such as fodder shrubs, as compared with radical terracing, in which manual labor is used to build terraces.

**NOTE**

1. For example, such a farm would typically have available about 500 meters of perimeter and several hundred meters in each of three other niches: along terrace edges or bunds, along internal field and homestead boundaries, and in Napier grass plots. With the recommended spacing, the needed 500 trees would occupy only 250 meters of this available space.
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SUGGESTED READING

OVERVIEW

Rainfed dry or cold farming systems cover about 3.5 billion hectares, but they support a relatively modest agricultural population of 500 million. Approximately 231 million hectares of land are cultivated, of which 18 percent is irrigated. Population density is low, with 2.1 people per hectare of cultivated land.

These lower-potential systems are generally based on mixed crop-livestock or pastoral activities, merging eventually into sparse and often dispersed systems with very low productivity or potential because of environmental constraints on production. In Africa, the main crops are millet and sorghum. In the Middle East and North Africa, the system is based on wheat, barley, and a wide variety of pulses and oil crops, among others. Crop-livestock integration is important, especially when cattle are fertilizing fields while browsing on cereal straw after the harvest. In some of the systems, small-scale irrigation opportunities exist, allowing pastoralists to supplement their livelihoods in diet and income. New irrigated areas are developed in the Middle East and North Africa through new drilling and pumping technologies. Market development is limited.

The main source of vulnerability is great climatic variability and drought, leading to crop failure, weak animals, and the distress sale of assets. Population density is modest; however, pressure on the limited amount of cultivated land is very high. Overgrazing is common, resulting in low livestock productivity, environmental damage, and desertification. Poverty is extensive, often severe, and accentuated by drought.

POTENTIALS FOR POVERTY REDUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL GROWTH

The potentials for poverty reduction and for agricultural growth are modest. Rainfed dry or cold farming systems have some characteristics similar to highland rainfed systems because of the low agricultural potential and the poor marketing infrastructure. Exit from agriculture has been judged to be the most important strategy for poverty reduction, followed by increase in off-farm income and diversification.

Diversification is based on livestock, on irrigation where possible, and on improved land management that allows better resistance to climate variability. Animal productivity can be improved by better using crop residues and byproducts, by promoting locally adapted breeds, by controlling epizootic diseases, and by improving village poultry production. Support to small-scale private livestock trading has some potential. Hides and skins, for instance, are often undervalued products. There is limited potential for agricultural development, except where irrigation can be developed and where water resources are not overexploited. The development of higher-value crops, such as fruits and vegetables, is restrained because of rainfall uncertainties and relatively poor market links. Thus, a key priority is reducing the likelihood of crop failure in drought years through improved land and water management and multiplication of palatable, drought-resistant, and early-maturing crop varieties. The regeneration of forests and natural vegetation is necessary for sustainable fuelwood supply and for soil fertility management.
Livestock perform many functions in the global economy and at the household level, such as providing food, improving economic security, enhancing crop production, generating cash income, and producing value-added goods that can have multiplier effects and create a need for services. With increasing population pressure, farmers and governments are striving to produce more food using the existing land-based resources. The result is a reduction in the land available for pasture and restrictions on the movement of animals for grazing. Increases in livestock production and productivity can be coupled with environmental sustainability if timely interventions are adopted. Without a clear strategy for the closer integration of crops and livestock, the outcome is inevitably widespread environmental degradation.

The International Institute for Land Reclamation and Improvement (ILRI) has identified resource management policy research as a key strategy. Such research includes establishing trends on how current livestock management affects resource use and conservation in the future and on how changes in government policies affecting the institutions that deal with risk, credit, commodity pricing, and macroeconomic policies influence resource use and the environment.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Livestock perform many functions in the global economy and at the household level, such as providing food, improving economic security, enhancing crop production, generating cash income, and producing value-added goods that can have multiplier effects and create a need for services (Sere and Steinfeld 1996).

With increasing population pressure, farmers and governments are striving to produce more food using existing land-based resources. In some regions, such as Africa and Latin America, increased food production is being achieved by expanding croplands into more marginal areas. In South and Southeast Asia, the trend is for rapid expansion of urban areas into former agricultural lands. In both cases, however, the net result is a reduction in the land available for pasture and grazing, thereby restricting the movement of animals. There are two major ways of increasing livestock productivity in the various production systems, either through intensification of systems using high-input production and management principles, including improved breeds, improved animal health, and cut-and-carry industrial systems, or through more intensively managed ranching systems. Increased livestock production and productivity could be coupled with environmental sustainability if timely interventions are adopted.

Land management invariably implies nutrient, water, and vegetation management, and sustainable land management (SLM) demands integrated technological, policy, and institutional interventions. Increases in crop yield or pasture through improved agronomic practices (for example, optimum nutrient inputs) could enhance water-use efficiency while the nutrient outflow through harvested products (for example, livestock feeding on residues) could be high.

This note does not review the available literature on livestock-environment issues but rather uses selected case studies involving livestock-water and livestock-land interactions in Sub-Saharan Africa. These cases are used to indicate potential
interventions that could help reduce the degradation of land and water resources in smallholder livestock systems.

Globally, livestock systems cover about 3.4 billion hectares of grazing land (Sere and Steinfeld 1996) and use feed from about 25 percent of the cropland. In 1996, about 442,884,000 metric tons of dry matter (DM) was consumed to provide the meat and milk demanded by world markets (de Haan, Steinfeld, and Blackburn 1997). In the future, even more dry matter will be needed as the demand for meat and milk increases with growing urbanization, human population growth, and increased incomes. For example, in Africa, from 2000 to 2020, ruminant populations are predicted to increase from 279 million to 409 million tropical livestock units (TLUs). About half of the rangelands and a third of the mixed rainfed production systems are in Sub-Saharan Africa (Peden, Tadesse, and Misra 2007).

Livestock production systems vary greatly around the world, as do their management and the relative importance of livestock products and services. Accordingly, various combinations of production systems have evolved in different parts of the world as the result of spatial and temporal diversity in climate, population density, economic opportunities, and cultural practices (Stangel 1993). The typical sequence, however, is that as populations rise, cropping activities expand, fallow periods formerly used to restore soil fertility are no longer possible, and concurrently, cropping takes over marginal or fallow lands previously used for livestock grazing. Without a clear strategy for the closer integration of crops and livestock, the outcome is inevitably widespread environmental degradation (Tarawali and others 2001).

Although they are not entirely distinct from each other, four stages of livestock intensification processes have been observed (Ehui and others 2003; McIntire, Bourzat, and Pingali 1992). These stages dictate the positive or negative relationships between livestock- and land-based resources.

In the first stage, at low population density and abundance of land, crop and livestock activities are extensive and specialized. Limited interaction occurs between crop-livestock producers and pastoralists. In this case, the environmental effect of livestock on land management could be positive, even in areas where the resource base is marginal. Well-managed livestock will do better than crops in these marginal areas.

In the second stage, agriculture intensifies because of population growth and changes in market structures. This stage is typical in mixed-crop livestock systems of Sub-Saharan Africa, where the two components are complementary (in some cases, however, competition for land-based resources between livestock and crop enterprises can be found). This type of intense integrated crop-livestock interactions occurs in systems like the dry savanna of West Africa (Tarawali and others 2001).

In the third stage, both agriculture production and livestock production intensify. Livestock producers use more crops to produce meat and milk; crop farmers need draft power and manure to maintain their intensified cropping systems. Unless market conditions attract external inputs to restore resource balances and minimize depletion of land-based resources by farmers and livestock producers, the long-term consequence is nutrient mining and degradation of water resources.

In the fourth stage, where markets and improved technologies accompany population growth and increased labor prices, the system increasingly depends on external inputs, thereby developing more profitable specialized livestock enterprises. Where markets are weak (as in much of Sub-Saharan Africa), with increasing population pressure and declining farm size, however, even the traditional grazing areas—including steep slopes and communal lands—become converted to crop fields (although the return for investment is relatively low), thereby forcing livestock systems to use even more marginal areas. In contrast, in areas where market access for livestock products is appealing, farmers integrate multipurpose forages with both feed and soil fertility restoration value.

In general, the different livestock production systems developed in various parts of Sub-Saharan Africa are greatly influenced by the way livestock interacts with water and nutrient resources. Attempts to sustain the land resource base also vary greatly across regions, production systems, and economic incentives.

**LIVESTOCK WATER AND NUTRIENT INTERACTIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Livestock transform poor-quality, bulky vegetation into high-value products of economic importance and nutritional use (Delgado and others 1999). They enhance system productivity by recycling nutrients and providing manure, by supplying draft power for the crop enterprises, and by providing livelihood options. Draft animals provide about 80 percent of the power used for farming in developing countries. The byproduct of crop production (crop residue) is a principal input for livestock production, and the byproduct of livestock (manure and draft power) is a key input for the crop sector. In addition to recycling nutrients, livestock redistribute nutrients between cropland and pastureland or...
within the cropland between different plots (feeding live-
stock on agricultural residues). The complementarities
between the livestock and crop subcomponents could be
much higher than the potential competition between them,
particularly when well-managed livestock can contribute
positively to sustainable vegetation cover, improved land
management, and biodiversity. Moreover, use of livestock
may offset the need for petroleum for mechanized agri-
culture. Although a huge potential exists for a more balanced
view of livestock, livelihoods, and environment, the potential
role of improved livestock management in promoting SLM
is neglected in the scientific and development arena.

In contrast, livestock are most frequently cited as one of the
major drivers of changing land use and soil degradation
(Steinfeld and others 2006), although that may not always
be true in well-managed mixed crop-livestock systems of
Sub-Saharan Africa. Livestock could be one of the factors
contributing to off-site problems of sedimentation, carbon
emissions and climate change, reduced ecosystem function,
and changes in natural habitats that ultimately lead to loss
of genetic stock and biodiversity, particularly in regions
where the livestock density is high, the carrying capacity is
low, and the livelihood options are limited.

Although erosion from croplands is commonly consid-
ered the major cause of land degradation in the African
highlands, Dunstan, Matlon, and Löffler (2004) indicated
that overgrazing is one of the primary causes of land degra-
dation (49 percent) in the developing world, followed by
agricultural activities (24 percent), deforestation (14 per-
cent), and overexploitation of vegetative cover (13 percent).
Land fragmentation and limited farm size also contribute to
inappropriate livestock management, resulting in land
degradation. High livestock density may lead to trampling,
depletion and pollution of water, emission of greenhouse
gases, and loss of plant and animal genetic resources (de
Haan, Steinfeld, and Blackburn 1997). Livestock production
also will have an off-site effect, such as the expansion and
intensification of cropland to satisfy the increasing demand
for feed, which in turn may lead to erosion and pollution. In
crop-livestock systems, where crop production is favored in
resource allocation over livestock, arable lands and fertile
corners are commonly allocated for production of food
grains while less fertile farm corners, hillsides, and degraded
outfields are allocated for grazing and pasture. In these sys-
tems, livestock can cause huge pressure on the land by greatly
reducing chances for rotation and vegetative recovery.

In response to these environmental concerns, various
initiatives are being developed or proposed to adopt holistic
approaches. However, the effects of livestock on dryland sys-
tems are sometimes overstated because changes in range-
land vegetation are often more affected by rainfall, soil type,
and topography than by grazing (Tarawali and others 2001).
Similarly, grazing could have a positive effect on soil poros-
ity and infiltration rates in the presence of good vegetative
cover, whereas the effect could be negative in overgrazed
areas (Tarawali and others 2001).

Livestock provide nutrients to global agriculture equiva-
ient to US$800 million per year (Jansen and de Wit 1996). Like
that of water, nutrient flow between different ecosystem
components is highly affected by the livestock produc-
tion system. In the Sahel, Fernandez-Rivera and others
(1995) indicated that if all animals in the sorghum-millet
production systems were used for producing manure,
manure input would range from 300 to 1,600 kilograms per
hectare. The potential of manure to contribute to sustain-
able farming in these systems could be influenced by live-
stock population, spatial location of animals at manuring
time, manure excretion per animal, efficiency of manure
collection, and availability of feed and land resources
(Tarawali and others 2001). In contrast, in semiurban small-
scale livestock systems of Sub-Saharan Africa, where land is
intensively cultivated and animals are stall fed, manure must
be handled, stored, transported, and spread on fields. Most
nutrients excreted as urine from stall-fed animals may be
lost, through either volatilization or leaching. Thus, a move
to more stall-feeding of animals could greatly reduce the
amount of nutrients recycled to the rural agricultural sys-
tems. In extensive land-use systems, animals graze to satisfy
feed requirements and are herded close to watering points.
In these situations, animal manure and urine is highest in
nonproductive areas, such as near watering holes, in resting
areas, and along paths of animal movement. This situation
results in high accumulation of nutrients in these areas and
increases the risk not only of nutrient losses but also of con-
tamination of water resources.

Global livestock population requires considerable
amounts of water; however, the estimation of these require-
ments is crude (Peden, Tadesse, and Misra 2007). Water
constitutes about 60 to 70 percent of animal liveweight.
Livestock maintain this level by drinking, consuming
moisture-laden feed, and capturing metabolic water (from
intercellular respiration). The major nutrients required for
metabolic function of livestock come from feed, voluntary
water intake, and the atmosphere (for example, oxygen).
Livestock lose water and nutrients to the subsystem in the
form of evaporation, urine, feces, lactation, and respiration.
Depending on the scale, these losses could be inputs for
other nonlivestock system components as organic fertilizers.
When thinking about livestock and water, most people visualize the direct consumption of drinking water. Evidence suggests that voluntary water intake ranges between 25 and 50 liters per TLU per day (Peden, Tadesse, and Misra 2007). This volume varies greatly by species and breed, ambient temperature, water quality, level and water content of feed, and animal activity. In terms of volume, the most important interaction of water and livestock is through evapotranspiration processes in producing animal feed. In the tropics, animals usually consume (in kilograms of DM per day) between 1.5 and 3.5 percent of their body weight, depending on the quality of the diet, feed availability, environmental conditions, and other factors. If one assumes about 0.5 kilogram cubic meters of rangeland water productivity, water required to produce maintenance feed for one TLU is 100 times more than the water required for drinking. Less than half of the plant material is eaten by animals and about half of what is eaten is returned to the soil as manure (if the animals are in pastureland). Thus, only about 25 percent of pasture could go to animals, and the rest could support ecosystem services.

In general, the farming sector is under huge pressure to produce more crop and animal products per units of water and nutrient investment. Livestock subsystems, which strongly interact with crop and other system components across fields, farms, and landscapes, should be efficient users of resources if the food demand by the growing population is to be satisfied and the environmental services are to be sustained. Therefore, an integrated systems approach that minimizes competition for land-based resources between different system subcomponents needs to be adopted, and interventions must be introduced that would create win-win situations for enhancing livestock water and nutrient productivity at various scales.

LESSONS LEARNED

Water productivity describes the production of more economic agricultural products per unit of water, expressed in terms of product per units of evapotranspiration (Rockström, Barron, and Fox 2003). Peden, Tadesse, and Misra (2007) suggested the following four major strategies to enhance livestock-water productivity:

1. Improving feed strategies by promoting nongrain feed sources with high water productivity, using crop residues and byproducts as feed, and adopting practices that encourage more uniform grazing
2. Conserving water by managing animals in a way that reduces land and water degradation (such as overgrazing, erosion, and nutrient depletion), including adopting nutrient recycling principles
3. Enhancing animal productivity through better livestock health, nutrition, and animal husbandry practices
4. Providing adequate quality of drinking water synchronized with available feed.

Additional interventions that would enhance livestock-water productivity include increasing the availability of mineral blocks in pastures and water, improving the digestibility of low-quality crop residue, and mixing livestock feed strategically.

Furthermore, livestock interventions to reverse degraded lands in small-scale livestock systems include the following:

- Gaining the confidence of community experimenters
- Minimizing soil erosion of grazing and pasturelands through physical and biological measures
- Increasing soil organic matter through improved forages, improved management of pasturelands, and improved manure and crop residues
- Improving the water budget of the system through water conservation measures
- Increasing the nutrient status of the soil through improved nutrient recycling and application of key nutrients
- Adopting integrated approaches enhancing the productivity of the crop-livestock systems, particularly through improved livestock management.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCALING UP LIVESTOCK SYSTEMS USING INTEGRATED LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCE APPROACHES

The following interventions, which emerged from the research work of national, regional, and international research institutions in East Africa, could address the growing concerns of livestock-environment interaction at farm and higher scales and are envisaged from the perspective of harmonizing livestock to the existing crop-livestock systems of Sub-Saharan Africa. Feed and fodder requirements for livestock present the crucial interface at which positive and negative of effects of livestock are decided. Feed and fodder obviously drive livestock productivity, and they are commonly the major input factor deciding the economic return from animal husbandry. Ingested feed and fodder carbon and nitrogen inefficiently converted into meat and milk...
contribute substantially to greenhouse gases (Blümmel, Krishna, and Ørskov 2001).

The following approaches to promoting efficient feeding strategies have shown promise for scaling up:

- **Legume forage banks.** From the early 1980s, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture and the International Livestock Research Centre for Africa (the current ILRI) promoted alley cropping and forage banks—with multipurpose legume shrubs as key strategies—to boost livestock production and improve soil fertility through nitrogen fixation and addition of nutrients supplied as green manures or mulch.

- **Integrating food-feed crops.** Generally, where land and water are allocated and used exclusively for fodder production, the efficiency of conversion of natural resources into livestock product might be high. A range of management options exist for increasing biomass production in mixed crop-livestock systems. They include intercropping, thinning out of densely planted crops, and of course, fertilizer application (Blümmel, Krishna, and Ørskov 2001). For instance, in the dry savanna of West Africa, Tarawali and others (2001) reported that 1 hectare of improved cowpeas could benefit a farmer by an extra 50 kilograms of meat per year from better-nourished animals and also produce an additional 300 kilograms of cereal grains as a result of improved soil fertility.

- **Increasing livestock feed by growing crop mixtures.** Crop mixtures reduce risk in drought-prone areas (such as much of Sub-Saharan Africa). For example, where forage legumes are relay cropped with another crop, the legumes may still yield a useful harvest after the drought-affected crop or the early-maturing component is harvested. Preliminary empirical findings show that the relay-cropped forage can produce up to 4 metric tons of DM per hectare of high-quality fodder using the residual moisture and nutrients, without competing with the main food or cash crop and thus not interfering with the production objectives of farmers. This finding suggests increased water productivity at farm and higher scales.

- **Forage legumes in degraded farms and systems (decision guides).** Producers using crop-livestock systems need reliable and accurate information on where to grow forages, on the costs and benefits (both long- and short-term) of introducing forage legumes into their systems, and on how to identify the spatial and temporal niches for integration of forages with win-win benefits of soil fertility restoration, erosion control, increased vegetative cover, and minimized land degradation. Decision guides that could help farmers and development actors to target legume interventions have been tested across communities and systems and are currently available.

- **Soil and water conservation as niches for integration of forages.** Protecting upper watersheds is important not only for preserving sustainable flow of water to downstream users but also for minimizing land degradation and erosion of soils and biodiversity. Besides minimizing erosion and runoff, these interventions became important niches for integration of livestock feed in various systems. The multiple use of forages as biological stabilizers and sources of high-quality feed, particularly for calves and milking cows during the dry season, is a very important incentive for integration and promotion of forages.

- **Zai systems as forage niches.** Livestock water and nutrient productivity could be enhanced through adoption of water- and nutrient-saving technologies, particularly in degraded farms and landscape niches. Zai is a water and nutrient harvesting intervention that was developed by farmers in Burkina Faso in response to the recurrent drought of the 1970s and 1980s. When farmers planted forages (for example, vetch, Napier grass) treated by zai pits, forage yield was increased as much as 10-fold. Tuber yields of potatoes increased about fivefold compared to untreated plots. The benefits were highest in degraded farms and systems.

- **Increasing livestock feed through spot application of fertilizers.** In the dryland, mixed crop-livestock systems of Sub-Saharan Africa, crop and livestock productivity is constrained not only by shortage of water but also by nutrient deficiency. At Sadore, Niger, where the annual average rainfall is 560 millimeters, not using fertilizers resulted in a harvest of 1.24 kilograms of pearl millet grain per millimeter of water, whereas using fertilizers resulted in the harvest of 4.14 kilograms of millet grain per millimeter of water (ICRISAT 1985).

- **Improved manure management.** Manure is a key resource for reversing land degradation and improving soil water-holding capacity, thereby enhancing water productivity. Producers can adopt several practical interventions to improve the quality of the manure generated by livestock. Runoff can be prevented from passing across the feedlot surface by installing up-gradient ditches to reduce significantly the volume of wastewater; storage lagoons and holding ponds can be used to contain excess wastewater; manure can be stockpiled at a safe distance away from any water supply; and grass filter strips, filter fencing, or straw bales can filter solids and nutrients in
runoff. Composting manure will help reduce volume and enhance the value and acceptance of manure as a source of plant nutrients. The efficiency of manure is also improved when manure use is combined with water conservation technologies, such as zai pits.  

- **Outfield grazing management on water and nutrient resources.** Free grazing systems, which are common in pastoral and mixed crop-livestock systems of Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, are considered a major cause of land degradation and depletion of water resources. Experience of the African highlands initiative indicates that the following approaches can significantly improve sustainability of outfield grazing: (a) introducing fast-growing forages as forage banks, particularly in homestead areas, improving crop residue management, and introducing rotational pasture management; (b) assisting communities in identifying spatial and temporal niches for forages and in accessing technologies to increase feed production and livestock productivity; and (c) assisting communities in developing local rules and bylaws to guide the management of free grazing.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS AND POLICY MAKERS

In general, policy makers have not considered the effect of livestock on land productivity as a policy objective in itself but merely as an input for achieving other policy objectives. Land degradation is not seen as posing a serious policy concern unless it threatens livelihood and immediate regional and national objectives (Scherr 1999). The ongoing challenge is therefore to identify policies, institutions, and technologies that will enhance the positive and mitigate the negative effects of livestock on the environment. ILRI has identified resource management policy research as a key strategy (Ehui and others 2003). This strategy includes establishing trends on how current livestock management affects resource use and conservation in the future and on how changes in government policies affect those institutions in terms of risk sharing, credit, commodity pricing, and selected macroeconomic policies on resource use and the environment. The most relevant policy area related to SLM is the policy framework. It should promote the mitigation of negative effects of livestock production on environmental health, including the following:

- Integrate livestock in designing irrigation and other water-related development projects. The current policy of Sub-Saharan African countries is biased toward crop production, but livestock drinking and feeding are not part of the design of irrigation projects. Integrating livestock in the wider water development agenda will boost livestock-water productivity and promote SLM.

- Promote integrated crop-livestock systems, whereby crop and livestock enterprises are complementary, resource recycling is practiced, water depletion and nutrient mining are minimized, and key critical external inputs are introduced.

- Encourage participatory policy formulation to regulate stocking rates in pastoral systems, and allocate land to groups that will enhance resource-use efficiency.

- Promote well-managed coralling, based on keeping livestock on selected areas over a given time period to provide fertilizer for crops while reducing nutrient losses from manures through volatilization and runoff.

- Employ full cost recovery for developing water points and animal health services to encourage livestock keepers to adjust stocking rates to the carrying capacity of the system.

- Promote access to water points and feed resources across scales, particularly for the poor, as an incentive to promote gender equity and improve land and water management practices. Poor farmers may be willing to invest labor and other resources to guarantee the sustainable productivity of their limited number of livestock.

### INVESTMENT NEEDS

- Promoting small-scale irrigation through diversions, water harvesting, and groundwater use, with due consideration to environmental consequences and upstream-downstream relationships, could be an important policy strategy to improve livestock-environment interaction. Increased access to irrigation will increase feed availability from crop fields, forages, grasslands, and other niches that will reduce the grazing pressure on marginal lands.

- Incentives for strategically located markets and value-added processing to facilitate livestock sales and thus match livestock resource (that is, feed and water) demands pressure on carrying capacity of the natural resources base.

### NOTE

1. A TLU is equivalent to 250 kilograms liveweight.

### REFERENCES
Increasing needs of food, feed, and fiber for the ever-increasing population in the semiarid tropical regions of the developing world are putting pressure on the rainfed areas to make a greater contribution from the vast area under dryland agriculture. The smallholder farmers rely on dryland subsistence productivity for their livelihood, but the productivity of dryland systems remains low because of low and erratic distribution of rainfall coupled with low to negligible inputs of nutrients. Moreover, maintenance of soil organic matter is a challenge because of competing uses for organic and crop residues. Organic matter is not just the source of nutrients; it is essential for preserving the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of the soil so that the soil can perform productivity and environment-related functions on a continuing basis. With little investment in the management of soils, large areas under dryland agriculture are in various stages of physical, chemical, and biological degradation. Strategies that can achieve sustainable improvement in dryland productivity by facilitating an integrated land and water management and conservation approach are highlighted, along with a special focus on integrated nutrient management (INM) of soil.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Farm holdings in the subarid tropics not only are distinct in terms of size, shape, and location on a toposequence but also vary widely in the cropping patterns and the quality and quantity of nutrients used for crop production. A major constraint is the timely availability of knowledge and the right information about soil health for the farmers (Singh and others 2004). Farmers do not know what is ailing their farm in general. Establishing high-quality soil analytical laboratories in each district of a state is of utmost importance so that timely and correct information can be provided to the farmers relating to the diagnosis of soil fertility constraints (Wani and others 2003, 2005).

Apart from water shortage, the productivity in rainfed systems is constrained by low soil fertility. The soils in the subarid tropical regions generally have low organic matter and nutrient reserves. Soil erosion removes the top soil layer, which results not only in loss of soil but also in loss of organic matter and plant nutrients, which largely are stored in the top soil layer (Wani and others 2003). Among the major nutrients, nitrogen is universally deficient; phosphorus deficiency ranks second only to nitrogen in most subarid tropical soils. The work of the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) has shown that potassium reserves in subarid tropical soils are generally adequate (Rego and others 2007). Most subarid tropical soils have low to moderate phosphorus sorption capacity, and most of the rainfed systems require low to moderate rates of phosphorus applications to meet their phosphorus requirements when residual benefits are also considered (Sahrawat 1999, 2000; Sahrawat and others 1995). Many farmers’ fields in the subarid tropical regions of India are deficient in secondary nutrients and micronutrients. ICRISAT’s extensive survey of farmers’ fields in the subarid tropical regions of India revealed that deficiencies of sulfur, boron, and zinc are very widespread, and in most cases 80 to 100 percent of farmers’ fields were critically deficient in these nutrients (table 5.1) (Rego and others 2007).

**LESSONS LEARNED**

Several microorganisms in the soil decompose plant and animal residues, and several groups of microorganisms are
involved in important biological processes. Microorganisms regulate nutrient flow in the soil by assimilating nutrients and producing soil biomass (immobilization) and by converting carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, and sulfur to mineral forms (mineralization). Among the important findings were the following:

- **Symbiotic nitrogen fixers.** A symbiotic partnership between bacteria (*Rhizobium* and *Bradyrhizobium*) and legumes contributes substantially (up to 450 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year) to total biological nitrogen fixation (BNF).
- **Nonsymbiotic and associative nitrogen fixers.** Inoculation with bacteria (*Aztobacter* and *Azospirillum*) reduces the nitrogen requirement of cereals or nonlegume crops up to 20 kilograms per hectare.
- **Plant growth–promoting rhizobacteria.** These bacteria improve plant growth through hormonal effects and reduce disease severity.
- **Phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms.** These bacteria and fungi solubilize inorganic phosphates and make them available to plants in usable form.
- **Vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae.** These fungi help increase uptake of nutrients such as phosphorus, sulfur, and copper and improve plant growth.

### BIOLOGICAL NITROGEN FIXATION

BNF is an economically attractive and ecologically sound process and is an integral part of nitrogen cycling in nature. *Rhizobium* inoculation is practiced to ensure adequate nodulation and BNF. Efficient strains of *Rhizobium* and *Bradyrhizobium* supplied as inoculants are used as biofertilizers by seed or soil inoculation.

Recent results from a long-term study conducted under rainfed conditions on a vertisol for 12 years demonstrated that the inclusion of grain legumes such as pigeonpeas and chickpeas in the production systems not only provided extra income but also increased the productivity of succeeding or intercropped cereal such as sorghum and maize. Such systems also maintained the soil nitrogen status (Rego and Nagewara 2000). Nitrogen mineralization potential of soil under legume-based systems was twofold higher than under a cereal-cereal system (Wani and others 1995). Another long-term study showed that in cropping systems involving legumes, land and water management factors, such as the broad-bed and furrow landform and use of inorganic fertilizers, increased the organic matter, increased available nitrogen and phosphorus status of soils, and improved soil physical and biological properties (table 5.2). Results also showed that in the improved system higher carbon was sequestered and the biological properties of the soil were improved, which led to higher productivity of systems and higher carrying capacity of land (both of people and of animals). The application of phosphorus to the improved system increased the amount of carbon sequestered by 7.4 tons of carbon per hectare in 24 years (Wani and others 2003).

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT: PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Enhancing and sustaining agricultural productivity and food security in the subarid tropics requires adopting INM...
strategy. INM strategy includes maintenance or adjustment of soil fertility and plant nutrient supply to sustain the desired level of crop productivity, using all available sources of nutrients (for example, soil organic matter, soil reserves, BNF, organic manures, mineral fertilizers, and nutrients) supplied through precipitation and irrigation water. INM is a holistic approach focusing on the cropping system rather than on individual crops. INM focuses on the farming system rather than on individual fields. It does not preclude the use of renewable nutrient sources such as BNF and organic manures and minimal use of mineral fertilizers.
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Table 5.2: Biological and Chemical Properties of Semiarid Tropical Vertisols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Soil depth (cm) 0–60</th>
<th>60–120</th>
<th>SE±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil respiration (kg C/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbial biomass carbon (kg C/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic carbon (tons C/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral nitrogen (kg N/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net nitrogen mineralization (kg N/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>–3.3</td>
<td>–6.3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbial biomass nitrogen (kg N/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmicrobial organic nitrogen (kg N/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>156.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nitrogen (kg N/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>156.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen P test (kg P/hectare)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICRISAT.

Note: SE = standard error of mean; C = carbon; N = nitrogen; P = phosphorus; kg = kilogram. The data are for 1998, after 24 years of cropping under improved and traditional systems in catchments at the ICRISAT Center in Patancheru, India.

---

Vermicompost can be prepared from all types of organic residues, such as agricultural residues, sericultural residues, animal manures, dairy and poultry wastes, food industry wastes, municipal solid wastes, biogas sludge, and bagasse from sugarcane factories. Vermicompost can be prepared by...
different methods in shaded areas, such as (a) on the floor in a heap, (b) in pits up to 1 meter deep, (c) in an enclosure with a wall 1 meter high constructed with soil and rocks or brick material or cement, and (d) in cement rings. The procedure for preparation of vermicompost is similar for all methods.

Vermicompost can be used on agricultural, horticultural, ornamental, and vegetable crops at any stage of the crop. Vermicompost is a rich source of major and micro plant nutrients (see table 5.3) and can be applied in varying doses in the field.

### RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT

On-farm studies made on smallholder farms for three seasons in the subarid tropical region of Zimbabwe showed that applications of fertilizer nitrogen (8.5 kilograms nitrogen per hectare) in combination with manure application at 3 or 6 tons per hectare have the potential to improve the livelihoods of farmers. The maize yields of the crop were dramatically increased by the applications of manure and nitrogen in small doses (Ncube and others 2007).

ICRISAT’s recent on-farm research in the subarid tropical regions of India showed that balanced nutrition of rainfed crops is crucial for sustainable increase in productivity and maintenance of fertility. For example, in the subarid tropical regions of India where most farmers’ fields were found deficient not only in nitrogen and phosphorus but also in sulfur, boron, and zinc, the application of sulfur, boron, and zinc with nitrogen and phosphorus significantly increased the yield (by 30 to 120 percent) of field crops, including sorghum, maize, castor, sunflower, and groundnut (Rego and others 2007).

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

Rainfed production systems have two major constraints: water shortages and general low soil fertility. To make these systems sustainable at reasonable productivity levels, farmers need to integrate soil and water-conserving practices with balanced nutrition of crops by adopting INM. The knowledge available about different sources of nutrients, such as BNF, organic manures, and mineral fertilizers, can be used to develop a suitable strategy for INM to sustain crop productivity. INM strategy is realistic, attractive, and friendly to the environment. INM will enhance the efficiency of biological, organic, and mineral inputs for sustaining productivity of subarid tropical soils. Judicious and balanced use of nutrients from biological sources, mineral fertilizers, and organic matter is a prerequisite for making rainfed agriculture efficient through increased efficiency of rainfall use. Specific recommendations include the following:

- Recognize that different crops require different rhizobia.
- Select the right type of biofertilizer (inoculant).
- Use fresh inoculant that is within the limit of its expiration date.
- Use well-tested inoculants produced by reputable manufacturers.
- In India, insist on high-quality inoculants with the Indian Standards Institution (ISI) mark.
- Prepare inoculum slurry by using a sticking agent such as jaggery, rice porridge, or gum arabic.
- Mix seeds with inoculum slurry by hand.
- Dry seeds on a plastic sheet kept under a shade.
- Sow seeds within 48 hours after inoculation.
- Use high nitrogen-fixing crops or varieties.
- Practice mixed and intercropping agriculture (that is, row and strip) with legumes.
- Use appropriate tillage practices, landform treatments, and nutrient amendments.
- Use appropriate mineral fertilizers in amounts to meet the nutrients requirements.
- Ensure that efficiency of applied fertilizers is optimized through adoption of suitable practices:
  - Form or type—as recommended for the crop
  - Method—furrow placement and covering with soil instead of broadcasting
  - Time—splitting of nitrogen doses instead using one application
  - Quantity—just sufficient to meet plant demand without adversely affecting BNF
- Undertake detailed soil analysis to identify soil fertility constraints limiting crop production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient composition</th>
<th>Vermicompost (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic carbon</td>
<td>9.8–13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.51–1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.19–1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>0.15–0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>1.18–7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>0.093–0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>0.058–0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>0.0042–0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0.0026–0.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.2050–1.3313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>0.0105–0.2038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICRISAT.
■ Develop suitable nutrient management recommendations from soil analysis results and share that knowledge with the farmers, stressing the need for adoption of INM to maintain fertility and productivity.
■ Optimize and harness full potential of available biological and organic sources and use chemical fertilizers to supplement the gap in the nutrient requirements of the production system.
■ Adopt an integrated strategy rather than a piecemeal approach for sustainable development (for example, for most land management issues, addressing water management, fertility management, pest management, and improved cultivars is also necessary because all these components are synergistically interlinked with sustainable land management).

INVESTMENT NEEDS BY LOCAL AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS OR OTHER DONORS
■ Investments are urgently needed to help establish high-quality, reliable, and functional soil-plant analytical laboratories in developing countries. The cost to provide analytical support for analysis of soil and plant samples could range from US$20,000 to US$100,000, depending on the extent of automation and the number of samples to be analyzed in a year.
■ Enhancing awareness among the farmers, development agents, and policy makers to discuss soil quality and to adopt sustainable INM practices is necessary. If land degradation is to be minimized, continued investments in capacity building and training of personnel involved are needed.
■ Investments to enhance the use of biological and organic resources through incentives for increased adoption are needed for sustainable land management.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
■ Enable policies and incentive mechanisms for greater adoption of INM practices.
■ Establish appropriate institutions that can ensure timely availability to farmers of high-quality products and knowledge about those products and sustainable INM practices.
■ Enable policies and mechanisms to produce, distribute, and use various sources of different plant nutrients.
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The community watershed model has become popular because it brings together, as a package for rural development, the best expertise available locally and from all the consortium partners. The model uses the microwatershed as a geographic unit for soil and water conservation and management, and the effect is strengthened with improved agronomical practices and diversified income-generating activities. Water management is used as an entry point for enhancing agricultural productivity and rural incomes. The consortium’s approach aims to showcase increased incomes for villagers. When the villagers are convinced that the innovations improve their livelihood security, they become ambassadors of the cause, convincing neighboring villages to practice community watershed development technologies.

The success of the Kothapally example has led to the acceptance of the watershed approach in large areas of India, as well as in China, Thailand, and Vietnam. Countries and agencies in Sub-Saharan Africa are also becoming involved.

The data show that with the community watershed approach, productivity and incomes can be doubled through collective action and knowledge-based management of natural resources. Water management is just an entry point and not an end in itself. Community watershed development needs to go further and adopt the livelihood approach with technical backstopping from multidisciplinary teams from different institutions working together in a consortium to harness the benefits of a holistic integrated genetic and natural resource management (IGNRM) approach through empowerment of stakeholders.

INTRODUCTION

In rainfed tropical areas of Asia and Africa, natural resources are severely degraded because of soil erosion, nutrient mining, depleted groundwater levels, waterlogging, and removal of vegetative cover. Although drylands have sustained large populations, many dryland areas are increasingly showing up as hotspots of poverty and malnutrition. In addition, many such areas are predicted to face more frequent and severe droughts because of increasing climate variability and eventual change (Wani and others 2002). Monsoon rains are erratic, and a few torrential downpours cause severe runoff, which removes nutrient- and carbon-rich topsoil, thereby contributing to land degradation (table 5.4).

The community watershed approach is being used to overcome the livelihood constraints posed by natural resource degradation by way of the IGNRM approach. In this approach, research and development activities are implemented at landscape scales with benchmark sites representing the different semiarid tropical agro-ecoregions. The entire process revolves around the principles of empowerment, equity, efficiency, and environment, which are addressed by adopting specific strategies prescribed by consortium institutions from the scientific, nongovernment, government, and farmer groups. This approach
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addressed the issues of participation, equity, sustainability, and technical support, which were found to be important constraints for enhancing the effect of watershed programs in India in a meta-analysis of 311 case studies (Joshi and others 2005).

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION

The community watershed model has become popular because it brings together as a package for rural development the best expertise available locally and from all the consortium partners. Although the model uses the microwatershed as a geographic unit for soil and water conservation and management, its effect is strengthened with improved agronomical practices and diversified income-generating activities. Water management is used as an entry point for enhancing agricultural productivity and rural incomes. The knowledge-based entry point to build rapport with the community in place of a money- and capital-based entry point enhanced community participation by providing tangible economic benefits to individuals through enhanced productivity. Farmers’ participatory research and development approach is fully operationalized, and no free inputs are provided to farmers. The consortium’s approach aims to showcase increased incomes for villagers. After they are convinced that the innovations improve their livelihood security, they become ambassadors for the cause, convincing neighboring villages to practice community watershed development technologies (Wani and others 2006).

Although the activities initiated by the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and its partners started with soil and water conservation, the watersheds became the site for implementing IGNRM. In Adarsha watershed, Kothapally, in Andhra Pradesh, India, the package of interventions included introducing broad-bed and furrow cultivation, planting *Gliricidia* on the bunds (an embankment used especially in India to control the flow of water) for green manure, introducing new crops, using high-yielding and stress-tolerant improved cultivars and cropping systems, innovating with pest management techniques, and developing microenterprises for additional income generation along with low-cost rainwater harvesting and groundwater recharging structures throughout the toposquence.

Choosing an appropriate cropping sequence and matching crop rotation with the soil profile and changing rainfall patterns helped minimize the effect of drought in Kothapally. A combination of maize-pigeonpea and maize followed by chickpea proved to be most beneficial because these crops could use the soil moisture more efficiently, thus encouraging farmers to shift from a cotton-based system. Moreover, studies showed that soils in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and Rajasthan were not only thirsty but hungry too, and they suffered from critical deficiency of micronutrients such as zinc, boron, and sulfur along with nitrogen and phosphorus. Adding those micronutrients to the soil resulted in a 28 to 70 percent increase in the yields of crops, and a balanced fertilizer application with nitrogen and phosphorus along with micronutrients increased yields up to 120 percent (Rego and others 2007).

In Tad Fa and Wang Chai watersheds in Thailand and in Thanh Ha and Huong Dao watersheds in Vietnam, the package of practices included introducing improved crop varieties; constructing and rehabilitating farm ponds; introducing legumes to the cropping systems; using vegetative contour bounds, using staggered trenches, and planting *Gliricidia sepium* trees and vetiver grass on bunds; growing fruit trees on steep slopes; using contour cultivation on mild slopes; introducing innovative integrated pest management (IPM) techniques, such as using molasses to trap moths; and diversifying cultivation with horticultural crops.

In China, farmers from Lucheba and Xiaoaxincum watersheds have harvested rainwater in underground cisterns and surface tanks; diversified the systems by growing high-value vegetables and fruits; introduced innovative IPM options, such as use of light traps and tobacco waste; and earned additional income from allied activities, such as rearing of pigs and rabbits as well as biogas production. Leujigh village in Lucheba watershed has become a model biogas village for the country. The village uses plant and animal wastes (pig manure) for biogas production, thereby allowing sanitation and energy self-sufficiency.

BENEFITS AND RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY

Many innovations are being implemented with success in watersheds. In Thailand, an innovative IPM technique of mixing molasses with water and storing it in open bottles to trap adult moths before they lay their eggs has practically eliminated the use of chemical pesticides in vegetable crops.

The innovations also provide income-generating activities to women’s self-help groups (SHGs) and landless farmers. In Kothapally and hundreds of watersheds in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan, the members of the SHGs feed parthenium weed to earthworms, generate valuable vermicompost, and earn about Rs 500 per person per month from its sale. The SHGs also
produce and sell biopesticide made from neem and *Gliricidia* plant leaves using earthworms. Catering to the needs of generating biodiesel plantations, the SHG members started a nursery to raise seedlings of *Jatropha* and *Pongamia*.

Likewise, the women’s SHG in Goverdhanpura in Bundi district of Rajasthan has started manufacturing washing powder as an income-generating activity. The small profit helps run the SHG and provides additional income to women members.

**Increasing Crop Productivity**

Increasing crop productivity is common in all the watersheds and is evident soon after the inception of watershed interventions. For example, in benchmark watersheds of Andhra Pradesh, improved crop management technologies increased maize yield by two and one-half times and sorghum by three times. Overall, in 65 community watersheds (each measuring approximately 500 hectares), implementing best practices resulted in significant yield advantages in sorghum (35 to 270 percent), maize (30 to 174 percent), pearl millet (72 to 242 percent), groundnuts (28 to 179 percent), and pigeonpeas as a sole crop (97 to 204 percent) and as an intercrop (40 to 110 percent). In Thanh Ha watershed of Vietnam, yields of soybeans, groundnuts, and mung beans increased by three- to fourfold (2.8 to 3.5 tons per hectare) as compared with baseline yields (0.5 to 1.0 tons per hectare), thereby reducing the yield gaps between potential and farmers’ yields. A reduction in nitrogen fertilizer (90 to 120 kilograms of urea per hectare) by 38 percent increased maize yield by 18 percent. In Tad Fa watershed of northeastern Thailand, maize yield increased by 27 to 34 percent with improved crop management.

**Improving Water Availability**

Improved water availability in the watersheds was attributed to efficient management of rainwater and in situ conservation. Establishing low-cost water-harvesting structures (WHSs) throughout the toposequence improved groundwater levels, benefiting many small farmers. Even after the rainy season, the water level in wells nearer to WHSs sustained good groundwater yield. In the various watersheds of India, such as Lalatora in Madhya Pradesh, the treated area registered a groundwater level rise of 7.3 meters. At Bundi, Rajasthan, the average rise was 5.7 meters, and the irrigated area increased from 207 hectares to 343 hectares (figure 5.1). In Kothapally watershed, the groundwater level rise was 4.2 meters in open wells. The various WHSs resulted in an additional groundwater recharge per year of approximately 428,000 cubic meters on average. This improvement in groundwater availability guaranteed the supply of clean drinking water. In Lucheba watershed in southern China, a drinking-water project, comprising a water storage tank and pipelines to farm households, was a joint effort of the community and the watershed project. It solved the drinking-water problem for 62 households and more than 300 head of livestock and provided major impetus for the excellent farmer participation in the project. Similarly, in Thanh Ha watershed in Vietnam, collective pumping of well water and establishment of efficient water distribution systems enabled the farmers’ group to earn more income by growing watermelon, which provided maximum income for households.

Through improved yields and income-generating opportunities, the families in the watershed projects have more money in their hands. For instance, in Kothapally, the average income (including livestock and nonfarming sources) was Rs 42,500 (US$1,036.60) in 2001. In comparison, the average income in the neighboring villages without watershed management approaches was Rs 27,600 (US$673.10). Even in the drought year of 2002, Kothapally farmers earned more from crop cultivation than farmers in the neighboring villages, resulting in reduced migration from Kothapally. In the Tad Fa and Wang Chai watersheds in Thailand, farm income increased 45 percent. On the whole, the farmers

| Table 5.4  Seasonal Rainfall, Runoff, and Soil Loss from Different Benchmark Watersheds in India and Thailand |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Watershed                                      | Seasonal | Runoff (mm) | Soil loss |           |           |           |
|                  | rainfall (mm) | Treated     | Untreated | Treated   | Untreated | Treated   | Untreated |
| Kothapally, Andhra Pradesh, India               | 743      | 44         | 67        | 0.82      | 1.90      |           |           |
| Lalatora, Madhya Pradesh, India                 | 1,046    | 70         | 273       | 0.63      | 3.2       |           |           |
| Ringnodia, Madhya Pradesh, India                | 764      | 21         | 66        | 0.75      | 2.2       |           |           |
| Tad Fa, Khon Kaen, northeast Thailand           | 1,284    | 169        | 364       | 4.21      | 31.2      |           |           |

*Source: Authors’ elaboration.*
earned an average net income of B 45,530 (US$1,230) per cropping season (Shiferaw and Rao 2006).

Improved land and water management practices along with integrated nutrient management—consisting of applications of inorganic fertilizers and organic amendments such as crop residues, vermicompost, farm manures, and *Gliricidia* loppings, as well as crop diversification with legumes—not only enhanced productivity but also improved soil quality. Increased carbon sequestration of 7.4 tons per hectare in 24 years was observed with improved management options in a long-term watershed experiment at ICRISAT. Normalized difference vegetation index estimation from satellite images showed that within four years, vegetation cover increased by 35 percent in Kothapally. The IGNRM options in the watersheds reduced loss of nitrate-nitrogen in runoff water (8 kilograms compared with 14 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare). Introduction of IPM in cotton and pigeonpeas substantially reduced the number of chemical insecticidal sprays during the season, and reduced use of pesticides resulted in less pollution of water bodies with harmful chemicals.

**Conserving Biodiversity**

Conservation of biodiversity in the watersheds was engendered through participatory natural resource management (NRM). The index of surface percentage of crops, crop agrobiodiversity factor (CAF), and surface variability of main crops changed as a result of integrated watershed management interventions. Pronounced agrobiodiversity effects were observed in Kothapally watershed, where farmers now grow 22 crops in a season with a remarkable shift in cropping pattern from cotton (200 hectares in 1998 to 100 hectares in 2002) to a maize-pigeonpea intercrop system (40 hectares to 180 hectares), thereby changing the CAF from 0.41 in 1998 to 0.73 in 2002. In Thanh Ha, Vietnam, the CAF changed from 0.25 in 1998 to 0.60 in 2002 with the introduction of legumes. Similarly, rehabilitation of the common property resource land in Bundi watershed through the collective action of the community ensured the availability of fodder for all the households and income of US$1,670 per year for the SHG through sale of grass to the surrounding villages. Aboveground diversity of plants (54 plant species belonging to 35 families) as well as belowground diversity of microorganisms (21 bacterial isolates, 31 fungal species, and 1.6 times higher biomass carbon) were evident in rehabilitated common property when compared with the degraded common property (9 plant species, 18 bacterial isolates, and 20 fungal isolates, of which 75 percent belonged to *Aspergillus* genus) (Wani and others 2005).

**Promoting Natural Resource Management at the Landscape Level**

Data obtained by using new science tools, such as remote sensing, promote a comprehensive understanding of the effects of the changes (that is, vegetation cover on degraded lands) in the watersheds. This knowledge, in turn, has provided the indicators to assess agricultural productivity. Promoting NRM at the landscape level by using tools that provide the needed database is anticipated to have better effect because of the possible integration of all the factors (natural resources with the ancillary information).

Although some interventions took place at plot to farm levels, the effects of NRM—such as sustainability of production, improved soil and water quality, and other environment resources—have been looked at from a landscape perspective. Equal attention was focused on both on-site and off-site effects. The effect of water conservation at the upper ridge on downstream communities was also consid-
ered. This effect accounts for some successes in addressing concerns about equity issues, such as benefits for the poorest people—like the landless, who were previously unable to take advantage of improved soil and water conditions in activities implemented only at field scales. Clearly, off-site effects of watershed management—upstream-downstream equity—need to be strengthened for enhanced outcomes.

Enhancing Partnerships and Institutional Innovations

Enhancing partnerships and institutional innovations through the consortium approach was the major impetus for harnessing the watershed’s potential to reduce household poverty. The underlying element of the consortium approach adapted in ICRISAT-led watersheds is engaging a range of actors with the locales as the primary implementing unit. Joint efforts of ICRISAT and key partners—the national agricultural research systems (NARSs), nongovernmental organizations, government organizations, agricultural universities, and other private interest groups—with farm households as the key decision makers effectively addressed complex issues. SHGs, such as village seed banks, were established to provide timely and high-quality seeds. These SHGs also created the venue for receiving technical support and building the capacity of members, such as women, in managing conservation and livelihood development activities. Incorporating a knowledge-based entry point in the approach led to the facilitation of rapport and at the same time enabled the community to make rational decisions for its development. As demonstrated by ICRISAT, the strongest merit of the consortium approach is in capacity building, where farm households are not the sole beneficiaries, but researchers, development agents, and students of various disciplines are also trained, and policy makers from the NARSs are sensitized on the entire gamut of watershed activities. Private-public partnership has provided the means for increased investments not only for enhancing productivity but also for building institutions as engines for people-led NRM.

Lessons Learned and Scaling Up

The success of the Kothapally example led to the acceptance of the watershed approach by the government of Andhra Pradesh for scaling up in 150 watersheds through the Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project, which is supported by the U.K. Department for International Development. Observing this success, the government of Karnataka has also adopted productivity enhancement initiatives in pilot watershed sites and scaled out through the World Bank–funded Sujala Watershed Project. With financial support from the Sir Dorabji Tata Trust, the ICRISAT-led consortium of partners has implemented watershed projects in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan in India. Watershed projects are also being implemented in Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu in partnership with the Confederation of Indian Industry and the Coca-Cola Foundation. With funding from the Asian Development Bank, ICRISAT’s model of watershed development was implemented in selected villages in China, India, Thailand, and Vietnam.

The outcomes of the ICRISAT’s watershed research and development activities are also being used for South-South cooperation among countries in Asia and Africa. Considering the usual long time lag between NRM research and subsequent results, ICRISAT and the Soil and Water Research Management Network are focusing on adapting existing knowledge for local conditions rather than on initiating new research. For example, following visits to India by African officials, the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa and the Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR) entered into a memorandum of understanding to facilitate long-term collaboration. The government of Rwanda, through its agricultural research institute, is working with ICAR to implement pilot sites for the adaptation and demonstration of Indian experiences in integrated management of watersheds.

Recommendations for Practitioners

- Manage natural resources on a smaller catchment scale (500 to 3,000 hectares) by adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach.
- Adopt a holistic community watershed approach using water management as an entry point for improving livelihoods.
- Remember that soil and water conservation measures are just the beginning for watershed development and not an end, as generally adopted.
- Recognize that knowledge-based entry-point activity promotes better community participation than subsidy-based entry-point activity.
- Adopt productivity enhancement and income-generating activities to ensure tangible economic benefits to individuals for increased collective action in the watersheds.

Investment Needs
Soil and water conservation measures address long-term sustainability issues, and benefits are both on site and off site. This approach calls for investments by governments, development donors, and others.

Depending on topography, socioeconomic parameters, and infrastructure availability, development costs would vary between US$500 and US$1,500 per hectare.

**POLICY AND FINANCIAL INCENTIVES**

- Community watershed projects’ success depends on participation and collective action by the members. Policies enabling collective action for management of natural resources are needed.
- More investment in upland and upstream areas is needed to minimize land degradation and to address equity and gender parity issues.
- The artificial divide between rainfed and irrigated agriculture needs to be discarded. Work needs to be in a continuum, from rainfed to supplemental to fully irrigated systems, if investments are to improve livelihoods.
- Financial incentives for poor upstream people who provide environmental services to downstream people need to be provided to encourage them to be better managers of natural resources.

**NOTE**

1. For example, Adarsha Watershed, Kothapally, in Andhra Pradesh, India, received 345 millimeters of rainfall in 24 hours on August 24, 2000. This downpour constituted about 40 percent of mean annual rainfall.
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Pastoral systems in arid and semiarid regions of Sub-Saharan Africa are well suited to cope effectively—and in an environmentally sustainable manner—with the prevailing harsh and erratic ecological conditions of those regions. The ability of pastoralists to move their herds over large distances and to take refuge in more favorable sites during droughts was critical to their livestock and livelihoods. Moreover, by maintaining the supply of animal food products during regional droughts, they also mitigated the impact of simultaneous crop failures on food security in adjacent, more humid areas. Today, however, unfortunately, mobility of pastoralists is increasingly being constrained, which is causing the effectiveness of the pastoral system to deteriorate fast. Furthermore, development policies have undermined the basic foundations of pastoralism.

For many years, the multiple values and needs of traditional mobile pastoralism have been neglected or misunderstood. Only from the mid-1970s have field studies on pastoral systems emerged to help explain seasonal livestock movements, herd-sex structures and productivity, rangeland ecology, and the multiple functions of pastoralism. The advantages of opportune and flexible use of natural resources, rather than control of stocking rates, have only recently been accepted as the recommended scientific basis of livestock development.

Mobile pastoralism can be an efficient and sustainable system. Improving natural rangelands in arid and semiarid regions would also improve the world’s carbon storage capacity, biodiversity, and water quality. Arid and semiarid lands represent about two-thirds of Africa’s total land area of nearly 30 million square kilometers and host about 189 million people. Enhancing the condition and availability of natural rangelands and water resources for pastoral production would simultaneously improve wild food availability, provide critical micronutrients, and diversify regional rural economies. Moreover, increasing the area and condition of rangelands adjacent to cropping areas would favor the sustainability and productivity of the cropping systems through (a) reduced soil erosion resulting from the increased water retention capacity of the rangelands and (b) increased availability of animal manure per cropping area unit. Finally, mixed crop-rangeland systems would reduce the impact of food-crop failure induced by drought and crop-specific pests or diseases, thus contributing to the livelihood of the 180 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa who are food insecure.

**INTRODUCTION**

Pastoral systems in arid and semiarid regions of Sub-Saharan Africa used to cope effectively and in an environmentally sustainable manner with the prevailing harsh and erratic ecological conditions of those regions. The ability to move their herds over large distances and take refuge in more favorable sites during droughts was critical to the livestock and livelihoods of pastoralists. Moreover, by maintaining the supply of animal food products during regional droughts, they mitigated the impact of simultaneous crop failures on food security in adjacent, more humid areas. Unfortunately, mobility is increasingly being constrained by various developments, and the effectiveness of the pastoral system is deteriorating fast. As a result, pastoralists are now burdening rather than supporting larger societies. This note provides the rationale for investment in the recovery of mobility of these pastoral systems.
KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Mobile pastoral systems in arid and semiarid regions make sustainable use of natural resources by tracking climatic and landscape variability (Niamir-Fuller 2000). However, land degradation will occur when livestock is forced to stay year round in restricted areas. In semiarid and adjacent subhumid regions, land degradation is clearly linked to settlement and to the combined effect of growing human populations and uncoordinated different land uses. For example, in West Africa, uncontrolled expansion of low-input cropping systems, accompanied by uncontrolled bush fires, fuelwood collection, and increasing numbers of sedentary livestock, induces severe degradation of both croplands and rangelands (Leloup 1994). Hence, the notion that overgrazing or livestock holding in general is the primary cause of desertification in Africa is no longer justified.

TRENDS OF RESOURCE USE

During the past century, frequency and distances of herd movements have declined (see, for example, Niamir-Fuller 2000), and various forms and degrees of settlement have occurred. Spontaneous settlement is usually caused by long droughts; encroachment of other land uses (Cullis and Watson 2004; Leloup 1994; Mkutu 2004); comparative lack of infrastructure and social services; disease control policies (Morton 2001); shifting of ownership (Niamir-Fuller 2000); and breakdown of customary pastoral social hierarchies, in addition to social insecurity (Morton 2001). Governments sometimes promote settlement to intensify and commercialize animal production and to facilitate social control and delivery of social and livestock specific services (Pratt, Le Gall, and de Haan 1997). Involuntary settlement of pastoralists by governments because of dam construction, famine, and civil war has also been reported (Larsen and Hassan 2003).

Since about the 1920s, vast areas of natural rangelands in arid and semiarid regions have been taken over by cropping systems, semiprivate and private livestock and game ranches, nature reserves, and infrastructure. The encroached rangelands included the better areas for grazing during the dry season, which provided easier access to water. Such areas are the key resources ensuring the overall sustainability of the pastoral system.

KEY DRIVERS

The demands of growing human populations everywhere else have been driving the increasing competitive and conflicting use of arid and semiarid regions.

For a long time, the multiple values and needs of traditional mobile pastoralism have been neglected or misunderstood. Until the 1970s, pastoralism was considered inefficient and backward, and livestock research and development focused on providing veterinary care and increasing beef productivity per animal. Only from the mid-1970s have field studies on pastoral systems emerged to help explain seasonal livestock movements, herd-sex structures and productivity, rangeland ecology, and the multiple functions of pastoralism (Blench and Marriage 1999; Breman and de Wit 1983; de Ridder and Wagenaar 1984). The advantages of opportune and flexible use of natural resources, rather than control of stocking rates, have only recently been accepted as the recommended scientific basis of livestock development (Behnke, Scoones, and Kerven 1993).

Various policies, such as the following examples, have undermined basic foundations of pastoralism:

- State boundaries were established that neglected the interests of local land-use patterns and societies.
- Pastoralists have been weakly represented at the national level. Ministries in charge of livestock generally do not address issues of accessibility of natural resources or availability of social services (that is, education, health care, and infrastructure).
- Inadequate land-use policies and legislation have neglected existing customary tenure systems and undermined relevant local authorities, in particular with regard to the use of natural rangelands (Kirk 2000).
- Unfavorable incentive policies have been practiced. Dumping of beef, in particular by the European Union, was favored by African governments. This practice reduced the income of West African pastoralists and caused them to take up arable farming. National government policies of subsidizing inputs have favored cropping systems over pastoral systems and fuel (Pratt, Le Gall, and de Haan 1997). Moreover, subsidizing livestock ranching at the expense of rangelands for pastoralists and wildlife is still ongoing (Cullis and Watson 2004).

LESSONS LEARNED

- Mobility of pastoral systems enhances ability to cope with droughts and prevents natural resources degradation.
- Rather than changing environmental conditions and the inherent malfunctioning of pastoral systems, the increas-
ing degradation and downward poverty cycle associated with these systems can be explained by misunderstanding, lack of knowledge, and neglect of the effectiveness and needs of mobile pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid areas.

- The multifunctionality of pastoral systems—such as the supply of live animals, milk, meat, manure, hides, transport, and animal traction—makes Sub-Saharan Africa’s mobile pastoralist more productive than U.S. and Australian livestock systems under similar ecological environments (Breman and de Wit 1983; de Ridder and Wagenaar 1984). Fodder supply is achieved with minimal labor and low economic cost, chance of disease transmission between animals is low, and access to various markets and social communities and gatherings is easy (Niamir-Fuller 2000).

- The ecological, social, and economic interests of mobile pastoralists have been too often overlooked.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Rather than a backward, antiquated system, mobile pastoralism can be an efficient and sustainable system. Improving natural rangelands in arid and semi-arid regions would improve the world’s carbon storage capacity, biodiversity, and water quality.

Arid and semi-arid lands represent about two-thirds of Africa’s total land area of nearly 30 million square kilometers (UNEP 2000) and host about 189 million people. The semiarid and arid areas in the Horn make up 70 percent of the total land area of this type and provide an average of 20 to 30 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), with substantial subregional trade (Little 1996). In West Africa, the pastoral sector contributes between 10 percent and 20 percent of total GDP in Mali, Mauritania, and Niger, and there is active trade between those countries. Pastoral development could, therefore, be an important force in regional development.

Support to mobile pastoralists would be of immediate benefit to the approximately 30 million pastoral peoples living in arid areas (Thornton and others 2002). These people are some of the most deprived populations in the region, and they often remain far removed geographically, linguistically, culturally, academically, and economically from those who run the country (Pratt, Le Gall, and de Haan 1997).

More than most other groups, mobile pastoralists are involved in and affected by enduring social tensions that often result from competition over natural resource uses. Such cases are of concern in national situations, such as those in Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Sudan, and Tanzania, as well as in transnational situations, such as those between Kenya and Somalia or Mauritania and Senegal (see, for example, Shazali and Ahmed 1999; van Driel 2001). Pastoral development could, therefore, prevent some of the conflict or postconflict social upheaval and deprivation.

Enhancing the condition and availability of natural rangelands and water resources for pastoral production would simultaneously improve the availability of wild foods, provide critical micronutrients, and diversify regional rural economies. Moreover, increasing the area and condition of rangelands adjacent to cropping areas would favor the sustainability and productivity of cropping systems through (a) reduced soil erosion resulting from the increased water retention capacity of the rangelands and (b) increased availability of animal manure per cropping area unit. Finally, mixed crop-rangeland systems would reduce the impact of food-crop failure induced by drought and crop-specific pests or diseases, thus contributing to the livelihood of the 180 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa who are food insecure (Ehui and others 2002).

**RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENTS**

Declining mobility is leading Sub-Saharan African pastoralists in a downward cycle of environmental degradation, poverty, and increased food-aid dependency. Standards of living are falling among the approximate 20 million mobile pastoralists in Africa, often resulting in settlement and the need to rely on alternative income sources, such as cropping and hired labor; on out-migration to urban centers; or, ultimately, food aid (Niamir-Fuller 2000). Absentee investors and owners are increasingly contracting pastoralists to herd their livestock while often putting restrictions on livestock movements to facilitate control (Fafchamps, Udry, and Czukas 1998).

Per capita ownership of livestock is declining significantly, and many pastoralist families are now below the minimum subsistence level. In addition, production per livestock unit is declining. For example, from 1975 to 1995, beef production per animal declined slightly from 135 kilogram per head to 129 kilogram per head (Ehui and others 2002). Frequent and almost permanent relief interventions in human food aid and feed supplements for livestock are the result (Morton 2001; Pratt, Le Gall, and de Haan 1997). For example, in the Horn of Africa, pastoralists usually represent the part of the national population that most depends on food aid. The insights described earlier suggest that investing in mobile pastoral development would address the following
issues of general interest to economic development of the arid and semiarid areas of Sub-Saharan Africa:

- Maintain efficient natural resource use in arid and semiarid areas.
- Support important subregional and national economies.
- Reduce poverty.
- Reduce social conflicts.
- Enhance food security.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

Broad-Based Consultations and Partnerships

Raising awareness of all policy makers on national, subregional, and regional levels is required to define the long-term vision on the role of mobile pastoral systems as a tool of sustainable natural resources management. Timing (that is, dovetailing campaigns to raise awareness with the preparation of major policy papers, such as World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and donor assistance strategies) and broad-based ownership (that is, involvement of infrastructure and social service departments) are essential because of the crosscutting nature of the issues. Adequate representation of pastoralists in defining a long-term vision and the subsequent follow-up is critical. The ALive program, with its Web site, facilitates communication among various stakeholders.

Research

Monitoring activities need to be supported to fill the gaps in knowledge on a country-by-country basis (for example, total number of pastoralists and their livestock, importance of absentee owners, benefits and costs to national economy, physical constraints to mobility, policies constraining mobility, pastoral organizations). Meanwhile, adequate indicators to monitor the situation of mobile pastoralism and its role in larger economies need to be defined; then, long-term measurement needs to be arranged. Research should also assess the lessons learned that are available in the literature regarding various attempts to improve the situation of pastoralists (for example, water-use fees, grazing fees, livestock corridors, integrated livestock-wildlife management, integrated livestock-forest management, and grazing reserves) while attempting to produce new, out-of-the-box incentives to be tested.

Incentive Policies

Public funds and mechanisms need to be used to support the viability and mobility of pastoral systems (for example, by introducing countervailing import tariffs on meats and limiting distribution of subsidized livestock feed). Providing livestock feed causes declining mobility, thereby inducing long-term dependency and abuse of systems, which often reach only the more sedentary and wealthy livestock owners (Hazell 2000). Water-use fees would improve sustainability of water infrastructure and cause better spatial distribution of livestock. Permitting livestock in nature reserves may also be a viable option to enhance mobility.

Resource Access Policies

A critical priority is the development of appropriate legislation that ensures access and user rights (not necessarily property rights) to critical grazing and water resources; limits encroachment of other uses and users (for example, cropping and ranching); integrates various natural resources uses and users; and, in some areas, reclaims some of the important lost grazing and water resources for pastoral use. Although highly sensitive, such legislation is absolutely essential for environmentally and socially sustainable development of these areas. Where increased cropping and declining stock numbers have made long migration impossible, shorter treks, with a closer integration of crops and livestock, are probably the best strategy. Community institutions can facilitate and enforce contracts between the different land uses and users.

Infrastructure

Infrastructure needs concern mostly water, networks of pathways through crop areas, markets, and mobile communication and weather forecasting equipment to manage drought. Sustainability of those investments is a major issue that needs to be addressed through clear agreements with pastoral users on cost-sharing and maintenance responsibilities.

Services

Service needs concern the technical services, such as veterinary care and livestock marketing information, and cover adapted social services, such as health care and education. Needed investments include equipment and training to replace the current static service models for human and animal health and education with mobile service models. Major strategic decisions are required in education on the curriculum (with a focus on pastoral indigenous knowledge rather than more formal teaching and language) and “training-the-trainer” programs (Kratli 2001). In health care, the major
strategic decision concerns the combination of human and animal basic health care systems, an issue that is often debated and has many synergies, but is rarely implemented.

NOTE

1. Natural rangelands and water resources contribute to many aspects of interest to economic and social development, such as biomass fuels, human and veterinary health care products, shelter materials, water transport, cultural values, and sometimes ecotourism.
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LEAD electronic conference policy papers. Livestock, Environment And Development (LEAD) is a multi-institutional initiative of FAO formed to promote ecologically sustainable livestock production systems. It focuses on protecting the natural resources that are affected by livestock production and processing and on poverty reduction and public health enhancement through appropriate forms of livestock development. LEAD hosts an electronic conference on Maintaining Mobility and Managing Drought. This e-conference discusses and reviews two policy options papers to inform policy makers and decision makers in international aid and financial institutions on the latest developments in key areas important for pro-poor livestock development, and provide them with options on how to address them: http://www.virtualcentre.org/en/ele/econf_03_alive/policy.htm.
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The International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), based in Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic, has been working with farmers in the Middle East and North Africa to develop innovative crop diversification alternatives for smallholder farmers. In marginal drylands of the Khanasser valley, the rural poor live between the traditional agricultural areas and the arid rangelands with less than 200 millimeters of yearly rainfall. Pressures on these lands are considerable, landholdings are shrinking in size, and land productivity is decreasing—with resulting increased poverty and out-migration.

In the past, promising technologies were not adopted because they were developed in isolation from the requirements of the local communities and were based on an inadequate understanding of the asset base and flows as well as local informal institutions. This study shows that sharing knowledge and increasing public awareness of land degradation facilitate closer cooperation among the stakeholders involved in sustainable land management (SLM) and result in options targeted at the various sectors of the population, each with different access to natural, physical, human, and financial capital. Although income generation is the first priority of the land users, most of the technological options also contribute to more sustainable management of the land. The lessons learned in this pilot program are applicable more widely in the Middle East and North Africa.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

In marginal drylands of the Khanasser valley, the rural poor live between the traditional agricultural areas and the arid rangelands with less than 200 millimeters of yearly rainfall. Extending more than 450 square kilometers, the valley’s main habitats are agricultural lands and rangelands that are home to 58 villages of 5 to 270 households per village and a total population of approximately 37,000. Pressures on these lands include high population growth rates, erratic rainfall patterns and droughts, soil erosion from both wind and water, declining soil fertility, saline groundwater, lack of drought-tolerant germplasm and alternative crop-livestock options, lack of credit and financial capital, lack of information about new technologies and farming practices, unclear land property rights, policy disincentives to invest in dry areas, and lack of markets and market information. As a result of high population growth rates, landholdings are shrinking in size, and land productivity is decreasing—with resulting increased poverty and out-migration.

The farming systems are dryland rainfed mixed crop-livestock and pastoral, as defined by Dixon and Gulliver with Gibbon (2001). Agriculture, based on extensive sheep rearing and cultivation of barley mainly for forage, is still the main activity; however, livelihoods depend on both on- and off-farm income. Households in the Khanasser valley can be categorized into three main groups (La Rovere and others 2006):

- Agriculturalists who grow crops, fatten lambs, and undertake wage labor (about 40 percent of the households)
- Laborers who are semilandless and rely mostly on on-farm earnings and migrations (50 percent of the households)
- Pastoralists who are extensive herders, migrating for wage labor or occasionally engaging in intensive lamb fattening (about 10 percent of the households).

This note was prepared by R. Thomas, F. Turkelboom, R. La Rovere, A. Aw-Hassan, and A. Bruggeman, International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas, Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic.
The main coping strategies of households living in these marginal areas, therefore, include diversifying livelihood strategies, intensifying agriculture, finding off-farm employment, and exiting agriculture. This grouping immediately raises questions on who to target and with what. If the goal is primarily poverty alleviation, then interventions should focus on the poorest (laborers and pastoralists). If the goal is to expand food production, then the focus should be on agriculturalists. If the goal is to protect the land, the emphasis should be on the mainly government-controlled communal rangelands and the privately owned cultivated land (land used mainly by pastoralists and agriculturalists).

The tool used to help orient the project team was a simple analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the marginal dry areas. The input to the analysis came from contributions from land users, researchers, extension agents, and decision makers. Table 5.5 summarizes the results of this exercise.

The study attempted comprehensively to address the complexity of this marginal dryland by identifying environmentally benign options that improve livelihoods, reduce poverty, and sustain the natural resource base. An interdisciplinary approach was taken to introduce new land-use options and to broaden interactions among local communities, researchers, and local and national governments by creating multistakeholder platforms (Campbell and others 2006).

**LESSONS LEARNED**

First, the study team analyzed previous experiences. In the past, promising technologies were not adopted because they were developed in isolation from the requirements of the

| Major Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats for the Khanasser Valley as an Example of Marginal Drylands |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
| Indigenous knowledge and local innovations | Cash-flow problems (resulting in lack of long-term investments) | Investments of off-farm income into productive resources | Aging and feminization of active Khanasser population |
| Strong social networks and rich local culture | Poor nutritional status of children | Better education levels and expertise | Declining social networks |
| Comparative advantage for small ruminant production | Limited experience with nontraditional farming enterprises | Increased awareness of the risks of resource degradation | Destruction of traditional “beehive houses” |
| Salt lake with rich bird biodiversity | Lack of adapted crop germplasm | Cooperatives | Increased population pressure and too small landholdings |
| Relatively unpolluted environment | Decreasing productivity | Improved market knowledge | Depletion of groundwater resources |
| Reasonable mobility and accessible markets | Degraded natural resource base (soil, groundwater, vegetation) and degrading management practices | Out-migration and off-farm opportunities | Recurrent droughts |
| Improved basic services (electricity, roads, mobile-phone network) | Land degradation masked by variations in rainfall | Sheep fattening | Further decline of soil fertility and groundwater levels |
| | Poor extension services | Potential to improve the traditional barley system | Declining groundwater quality and salinization of irrigated fields |
| | | Improved germplasm | Population by intensive sheep fattening and untreated village sewage |
| | | Diversification for cash and subsistence purposes | Degradation of the fragile Jabul salt lake ecosystem |
| | | Agrotourism, ecotourism, and cultural tourism | Unreliable export markets for sheep |
| | | Soil fertility improvement | |
| | | Rangeland rehabilitation and medicinal plants collection | |
| | | Better government services and increased attention to poverty alleviation and environmental services in marginal areas | |

*Source: Authors’ elaboration.*
local communities and were based on an inadequate understanding of the asset base and flows and of local informal institutions. Clearly, a need existed to study livelihood strategies in greater detail for better targeting of agricultural and nonagricultural interventions. Multistakeholder processes are required that bring together local populations and decision makers to develop common understandings of the different perceptions of these marginal zones and to facilitate better organizational ability of community-based groups. In addition, the time lag between the announcement of a change in restrictions to cropping on marginal lands and the implementation of the new regulations pointed to the need to improve communication between policy makers and land users.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT: PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Following this analysis, the team then developed and refined a set of options that had been researched previously in the area. After on-farm trials, the options were tried and tested jointly by researchers and interested land users who were organized into farmer interest groups on a voluntary basis. From this collaboration, the following feasible options were identified:

- Options that strengthen the traditional farming system:
  - New barley varieties selected by using a participatory breeding approach
  - Barley production with application of phosphogypsum to improve soil fertility and to increase and stabilize production in dry years
  - Dairy products from sheep for consumption or sale
  - Seed priming of barley seeds with nutrient solutions to improve crop establishment

- Diversification options:
  - Barley intercropped with Atriplex shrubs to stabilize forage production, increase biomass during dry years, and enhance protein content in sheep diets
  - Improved vetch production by selection of drought-tolerant varieties to reduce production risks
  - Improved management of rainfed cumin (a new cash crop) to stabilize and increase production and improve its marketing value
  - Olive orchards, using water harvesting and cultivating on foothill slopes, to increase production and reduce summer irrigation by groundwater

- Intensification options:
  - Improved lamb fattening by using lower-cost feeds

- Institutional options:
  - Traditional dairy institutions (Jabban) for sharing knowledge and providing informal credit
  - Village saving and credit associations (Sanadiq, established and operated by a parallel development project led by the United Nations Development Programme).

RATIONALE FOR INVESTMENT

The marginal zone of Syria represented by this case study covers about 11 percent of the country’s land area and 14 percent of the population (about 2 million people). Poverty is greatest in areas located within this zone. The fact that many men migrate to urban areas results in labor shortages and in sociocultural decline from the loss of social structure and cultural heritage. Investments are needed both to restore the social and physical infrastructures and to reverse land degradation. The latter is a slowly changing variable not perceived as urgent by local populations but is a process that threatens long-term sustainability of the region. Importantly, this approach can be applied (with local adaptations) across large areas of North Africa, Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, and Central Asia that are characterized by similar agro-ecological and socioeconomic factors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

The study showed that knowledge sharing and increased public awareness of land degradation are required to facilitate closer cooperation among the stakeholders involved in SLM. As a result of closer integration among all stakeholders, the study team developed a set of options. The options are targeted at the various sectors of the population—each with different access to natural, physical, human, and financial capital. Although the team recognizes that income generation is the first priority of the land users, most of the technological options also contribute to more sustainable management of the land. The study demonstrated to government researchers, extension agents, and land users the value of collaboration. Consequently, plans are under way to replicate the Khanasser valley example in similar areas of Syria.

For each crop enterprise, specific technological objectives have been identified along with a corresponding agro-economic approach. A summary of the objectives and the approaches taken to introduce technological interventions is shown in table 5.6.

For all these technologies and options, the study team prepared feasibility reports, including ex ante economic
analyses (La Rovere and Aw-Hassan 2005; La Rovere and others 2007). The study team took this effort further, however, with analysis based on the characteristics of the different livelihood categories and assets of the defined population groups. Thus, the options were categorized as follows:

- Profitable in the short term and requiring more awareness and information
- Profitable but requiring investment and are prone to climatic risks
- Highly profitable but needing high investments
- Profitable only in the long run and needing initial investment.

**MULTILEVEL ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK**

To help determine the main driving variables, the study used a toolbox approach that comprises diagnostic, problem-solving, and process tools (Turkelboom and others 2004). An example of a multilevel analytical framework used to identify the main constraints on the hill slopes of the valley is presented in figure 5.2. Biophysical and socio-economic factors are examined in a framework consisting of a “spatial pillar” and a “stakeholder pillar” that are linked both vertically and horizontally. The tool lists the main prioritized issues that constrain the adoption of technologies and resources and identifies potential solutions. This simple framework requires a multidisciplinary approach and helps foster greater understanding and communication among all parties.
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WEB RESOURCES

Integrated Natural Resource Management Web site. Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) is a research approach that aims at improving livelihoods, agroecosystem resilience, agricultural productivity, and environmental services. The Web site facilitates the sharing of experiences, approaches, and results among scientists working on INRM issues in the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research and partner institutions. http://www.icarda.cgiar.org/INRMsite/.
Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies in Sustainable Land Management Approaches to Combat the Impacts of Climate Change

Climate change has the potential to significantly undermine efforts in the sustainable management of agricultural land, particularly in subtropical and tropical regions. The impacts of climate change of concern to agricultural land management include amplification of drought-flood cycles, increase in wind and rain intensity, shift in the spatial and temporal distribution of rainfall, and range expansion of agricultural pests and diseases. The degree of this maladaptation to climate variability could increase over the next several decades, with climate change potentially derailing future development efforts in climate-vulnerable regions such as Africa.

Developing more coherent links between land management and institutional change could create a more conducive environment for land improvement. For example, the recent revegetation phenomenon in the Sahel is rooted both in technical support for land improvement and in legal code reforms that provided local communities with control over resource management decisions.

In Africa, with its dependence on rainfed agriculture, the combined factors of variable rainfall, high temperatures, and poor soil fertility heighten the sensitivity of smallholder producers to shocks from extreme climate events. In the near to medium term, there is reasonably good potential to enhance rainfed production sustainability through improvements in water capture and storage, combined with better soil and fertility management. Fairly modest changes have the potential to triple cereal yields in high-risk farming environments.

There are also opportunities to link greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation simultaneously with sustainable land use and adaptation to climate change. Other options include advances in probabilistic forecasting, embedding of crop models within climate models, enhanced use of remote sensing, and research into “weather within climate.” These advances, however, will need to be matched with better means for disseminating forecasts to farming communities through multiple forums, such as those where information on water, health, housing, and disaster management is shared.

INTRODUCTION

Climate change has the potential to significantly undermine efforts to sustain and manage agricultural land, particularly in subtropical and tropical regions. The impacts of climate change—including (a) amplification of drought-flood cycles, (b) increase in wind and rain intensity, (c) shift in the spatial and temporal distribution of rainfall, and (d) range expansion of agricultural pests and diseases (IPCC 2007)—are of concern to agricultural land management. The disruptive impacts of climate change on agriculture are more likely to be experienced in terms of increased seasonal and interannual climate variability and higher frequency of extreme events than as mean changes in the climate.

These effects will not be uniformly distributed, nor will they be exclusively negative. High-latitude zones that do not limit moisture are expected to experience increased productivity from warmer temperatures and longer growing seasons, assuming relatively modest temperature increases (less than 3°C). In contrast, low-latitude zones that will undergo the smallest increase in warming will likely be subjected to the greatest negative influence from climate change and variability because of the multiple pressures of land degradation, poverty, and weak institutional capacity. This combination of stress factors increases the vulnerability of smallholder producers to shocks from extreme climatic events, such as El Niño episodes, thus leading to

This note was prepared by J. Padgham, U.S. Agency for International Development.
heightened risk of a poverty trap at the local level and diminished economic growth at the national level (Brown and Lall 2006). The degree of this maladaptation to climate variability could increase over the next several decades, with climate change potentially derailing future development efforts in climate-vulnerable regions such as Africa.

Climate change has the potential to intersect with sustainable land management (SLM) efforts directly (by affecting soil function, watershed hydrology, and vegetation patterns) and indirectly (by stimulating changes in land-use practices and altering the dynamics of invasive species). This note examines critical issues related to how climate change will affect soil and water management, and it explores the potential to improve land management through efforts to mitigate agricultural GHG emissions, to use seasonal climate forecasts to support agriculture management decisions, and to adapt to climate variability and change.

**KEY SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES: SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT**

Intensification of the hydrologic cycle, in which climate change is manifested by increased frequency and intensity of flooding and drought, as well as by more extreme storms with high-intensity rainfall, could significantly affect land management. Substantial increases in future soil erosion are projected because of the important role of extreme events that contribute to total soil erosion (Nearing, Pruski, and O’Neal 2004). Agricultural soils of the tropics are particularly vulnerable to erosion from extreme events because low soil organic matter levels and weak structures reduce their resilience to erosive forces; crop productivity in these areas is quite sensitive to cumulative soil loss. Socioeconomic factors that mediate land-use practices will also influence future changes in soil erosion risk. These factors include shifts in cropping patterns and land use in response to market signals that would occur, for instance, with increased demand for biofuels and rural out-migration.

Addressing the threat of increased soil erosion posed by climate change will require better quantification of the problem, greater attention to prioritizing which production systems and regions are vulnerable, and a redoubling of soil erosion management efforts:

- **Quantification.** Future approaches to soil erosion modeling and assessment will need to better capture the role of extreme events in soil erosion (Boardman 2006). Efforts to integrate meteorological time series from global climate models into soil erosion models are beginning to address this research gap. However, the complexity of these models will likely limit their use to wealthy regions. In developing regions, two-dimensional hillslope models and geographic information systems can be used more widely to quantify erosion and develop landslide hazard maps.

- **Prioritization.** Because limited resources will be available for addressing the multitudinous impacts of climate change, identification will be necessary of priority areas where serious soil erosion is occurring that could accelerate with climate change. Boardman (2006) suggested identifying soil erosion hotspots where anthropologically induced soil erosion is high because of topography, climate, and population growth. These areas include (a) the Andes and Central American highlands; (b) the Loess Plateau and Yangtze basin in China; and (c) the countries of Ethiopia, Lesotho, and Swaziland, as well as the Sahel in Africa.

- **Management.** Widening the adoption of practices and technologies that enhance soil coverage will become increasingly critical to future agricultural land management under climate change. The broad category of conservation agriculture contains many such interventions—cover crops, agroforestry, and improved fallows to reduce the period during which soil surfaces are exposed—which, along with conservation tillage and use of green manuring, can maintain or increase soil organic matter levels and conserve soil moisture (Lal 2005; Sanchez 2000).

The resilience of conservation farming systems in the Central American highlands to El Niño drought and the catastrophic soil losses from Hurricane Mitch provides strong evidence of conservation agriculture’s soil stabilization potential. However, achieving broad-scale adoption of this set of practices is a significant challenge, given that factors such as land tenure instability, rural labor shortages, and nonfarm income sources tend to have a dissuasive influence on soil improvement measures (Knowler 2004).

Developing more coherent links between land management and institutional change could create a more conducive environment for land improvement. For example, the recent revegetation phenomenon in the Sahel is rooted both in technical support for land improvement and in legal code reforms that provided local communities with control over resource management decisions, such as in Niger, where ownership of trees was transferred from central to local control. This policy change appears to have been an...
important catalyst for investments in agroforestry and land rehabilitation. The area that has undergone revegetation is extensive, with estimates of between 2 million and 3 million hectares in Niger (U.S. Geologic Survey, unpublished data) and 0.5 million hectares in Burkina Faso (Reij, Tapan, and Belemvire 2005).

Regions that are highly dependent on climate-sensitive sectors are vulnerable to changes in water availability with climate change. Africa’s dependence on rainfed agriculture exemplifies this situation because the combined factors of variable rainfall, high temperatures, and poor soil fertility heighten the sensitivity of smallholder producers to shocks from extreme climate events. A recent assessment by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2007) estimated that between 75 million and 250 million people in Africa will experience increased water stress by the end of this century as a result of elevated surface temperatures, increased rainfall variability, and aridity. Semi-arid regions are the most vulnerable to rainfall reductions. For example, a 10 percent decrease in precipitation in regions receiving 500 millimeters per year is estimated to reduce surface drainage by 50 percent (de Wit and Stankiewicz 2006).

Long-term changes in precipitation patterns may simply reduce the total amount of land available for agriculture. In the near to medium term, however, there is reasonably good potential to sustain and enhance rainfed production through improvements in water capture and storage combined with better soil management. One of the key challenges will be to diminish the feedback between water management risk and declining soil fertility, wherein the prospect of crop failure from insufficient soil moisture hinders investments in soil fertility, which, in turn, diminishes the potential of soils to capture and retain water, thus increasing the vulnerability to drought. One way to address this issue is to focus on the manageable part of climatic variability by linking better in situ rainfall retention with incremental amounts of fertilizer to bridge ephemeral dry spells that occur during sensitive plant growth stages. Rockström (2004) reported that these types of fairly small-scale changes can double and triple cereal yields in high-risk farming environments.

LESSONS LEARNED

GHG emissions from agriculture represent a significant source of climate forcing. Globally, agriculture contributes between 70 and 90 percent of anthropogenic nitrous oxide, between 40 and 50 percent of anthropogenic methane, and 15 percent of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions (DeAngelo and others 2005). Land clearance for agriculture, nitrogenous fertilizer, flooded rice production, and livestock constitute the main sources of agricultural GHGs.

Reducing the global warming potential of agriculture provides a number of opportunities to simultaneously link GHG mitigation with SLM and adaptation to climate change. From a GHG mitigative standpoint, avoiding agriculturally based emissions of nitrous oxide and methane through enhanced factor productivity and energy efficiency is more economical than modifying land-use practices to enhance carbon sequestration in soil (Smith and others 2007). Soil carbon sequestration, as a mitigative strategy, is less robust because carbon storage in soils is impermanent (that is, lasting decades); is sensitive to management changes; and can result in elevated nitrous oxide emissions.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Specific options for linking GHG mitigation with SLM include the following:

- **Change water management practices in paddy rice production.** Significant future reductions in methane emissions from rice can be achieved through improved water management. For instance, over the past two decades, 80 percent of paddy rice production in China has shifted from continuously flooding to ephemeral drainage at midseason. This change resulted in an average 40 percent reduction in methane emissions and an overall improvement of yield because of better root growth and fewer unproductive panicles (Li and others 2006). An additional 20 to 60 percent reduction in methane production is possible without sacrificing yield through adopting shallow flooding and through slowing methane production by substituting urea for ammonium sulfate fertilizer (DeAngelo and others 2005; Li and others 2006).

- **Improve nitrogen-use efficiency.** Reductions in methane emissions from rice do not necessarily lead to an overall reduction in net GHG emissions, because shifts between anoxic and oxic soil environments accelerate nitrification and denitrification processes, resulting in greater nitrous oxide production (DeAngelo and others 2005; Li and others 2006). Leakage of nitrogen from rice and other cropping systems can be reduced by better matching fertilizer application with plant demand (for example, by applying slow-release fertilizer nitrogen, split fertilizer application, and nitrification inhibitors). Enhanced nitrogen-use efficiency can also be achieved through the
practice of site-specific nutrient management in which fertilizer nitrogen is used only for supplying that increment not provided by indigenous nutrient sources. This method can both reduce nitrous oxide emissions and improve the economics of production through enhanced factor productivity.

- Retain more biomass on agricultural lands. Carbon sequestration on agricultural lands can be enhanced through the deployment of SLM practices such as agroforestry, conservation tillage, use of rotations and cover crops, and rehabilitation of degraded lands. Increasing carbon sequestration in soils, although less effective at reducing global warming potential than avoiding emissions, is essential for bolstering the long-term sustainable management of soil and water. Other carbon sequestration practices, such as agroforestry and improved falls, also produce a number of ancillary benefits (for example, improved income, nutrition, and protection of biodiversity).

SEASONAL CLIMATE FORECASTS AND SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Agricultural productivity and economic growth strongly track seasonal and interannual rainfall variability in countries that rely heavily on rainfed agriculture (Brown and Lall 2006). This relationship has important implications for SLM in highly variable climate regimes because investments in land improvement and yield-enhancing technologies are often stymied by uncertainty and risk around the timing, distribution, and quantity of rainfall. To the extent that climate change is manifested as increasing intra- and interannual climate variability, the influence of rainfall uncertainty in dampening SLM investments could become even greater.

Advances in improving the ability to provide useful seasonal climate forecasts and in developing pathways for disseminating and applying that information will be required to address this critical information gap. Forecasts that are timely and locally relevant can aid decision making. In good rainfall years, farmers and supporting institutions can invest in greater inputs to recover from or prepare for production downturns in poor rainfall years, when risk-avoidance strategies are prudent (Hansen and others 2006). Progress in climate-based crop forecasting will depend on (a) continued advances in probabilistic forecasting and downscaling, (b) embedding of crop models within climate models, and (c) enhanced use of remote sensing and research into “weather within climate.” For seasonal climate forecasts to be effective, however, advances in forecasting skills will need to be matched with better means of disseminating forecasts to farming communities through multiple forums, such as those where information on water, health, housing, and disaster management is shared (Vogel and O’Brien 2006).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

Climate change is occurring within a background of larger global change with respect to population growth, urbanization, land and water use, and biodiversity. Thus, efforts to adapt to the impacts of climate change should do so in a manner that is consistent with these broader development issues. In this context, there are several opportunities to apply the products and services developed for SLM that will enhance adaptation to climate change in agriculture:

- Address maladaptation to current climate variability. There is significant scope for enhancing climate risk management in vulnerable regions, such as in El Niño–affected areas of southern and eastern Africa. It can be accomplished through (a) a broader use of water conservation in agriculture; (b) better understanding of and support for local coping strategies; (c) resolving production bottlenecks, such as access to seed; (d) promoting changes in policies to give local communities greater stake in resource management decisions; and (e) providing access to seasonal climate information by local decision makers.

- Invest in soil protection. Conservation agriculture practices and measures that increase soil organic matter and reduce the time that soils are bare will become more important for enhancing the resilience of soils to greater erosive forces with climate change. Stabilizing the resource base and replenishing soil fertility through low-cost and locally relevant means is an important precursor to more technologically intensive adaptation measures, such as expansion of irrigation and use of drought-tolerant varieties (Sanchez 2005). SLM has significant knowledge and operational presence in this area.

- Couple soil fertility improvements with soil water management. In smallholder production systems, farmers tend to invest in soil fertility only after other production risks, especially those associated with access to water, are lessoned. Reducing water risk is more cost-effective than attempting to address absolute water scarcity. SLM could assist in this process through several entry points, such as (a) targeting small investments in rainwater capture and storage for supplemental irrigation, (b) pro-
motivating practices that reduce runoff to bridge the gap between rains, and (c) linking fertility inputs to seasonal rainfall projections.
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Cumin is an innovative cash crop in the Middle East and North Africa. It requires relatively little land, little water, and few soil nutrients because of its low biomass. Farmers are attracted to it because of these low input requirements and its relatively short cycle of about 100 days. The International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas, based in Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic, has been working with farmers to develop innovative crop diversification alternatives for smallholder farmers. This note shows the potential for introducing a reliably profitable cash crop to a conventional monocropping system in an area of low rainfall. Cumin provides a profitable rotation crop for poor farmers reliant on barley cash crops. The requirements of the new crop were carefully investigated to ensure that it was a consistent and reliable alternative.

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION
Currently, cumin is the only rainfed cash crop available for Khanasser farmers as an alternative to barley monocropping. Preliminary results indicate that yields of barley after cumin are more sustainable than barley monocropping and that residual water is available for the following barley crop. When grown under supplemental irrigation, cumin requires less water than wheat. The inclusion of cumin contributes to diversification of the cropping system and farm income, and manual weeding and harvesting of the crop generate local employment opportunities.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND DESCRIPTION
Cumin is a cash crop with a short growing cycle and demands few moisture and nutrient inputs. Cumin is suitable for households with even small amounts of agricultural land; however, they will need to have adequate family labor.

Proper agronomic management reduces the risk for farmers. Some suggested management practices include the following:

- Planting in mid-January
- Mixing seeds and fertilizer, and planting them together (using cereal drill)
- Using a seed rate of 30 kilograms per hectare
- Fertilizing:
  - At planting, 50 kilograms per hectare of triple super phosphate and 50 kilograms per hectare of urea
  - If spring rains are adequate, 50 kilograms of ammonium nitrate (33 percent) can be top-dressed
- Weed control:
  - Hand weeding at early stages of cumin growth
  - Herbicide application of Treflan 15 days before planting and Afalon or Gesagard soon after emergence.

BENEFITS AND RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY
Cumin provides an alternative rainfed cash crop with acceptable yields ranging from 50 to 1,000 kilograms per hectare with averages around 250 kilograms per hectare. Gross income per season is about LS 28,990 per hectare (US$576 per hectare) with a net annual profit of about LS 16,245 per hectare (US$323 per hectare). Yields and profits are higher if the crop is irrigated. Only small land areas of 0.08 to 1.60 hectares are required for profitable activities; however, this figure varies with fluctuating market prices.

This profile was prepared by F. Turkelboom and R. Thomas, International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas, Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic.
LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR SCALING UP

- Inputs have a high cost.
- Good management knowledge is needed to obtain good returns and reduce risks of failure.
- Cumin planted in succession is susceptible to the buildup of cumin wilt disease (but this disease does not affect the following barley crop).
- Fluctuations in cumin prices make the profits from growing cumin uncertain, but during the period studied, prices always remained above the minimum profitability thresholds (and they have recently improved).
- Cumin prices remain competitive even in marginal areas, although they depend on international trade and need close monitoring.
- Farmers need better access to market and price information before they make planting or marketing decisions.
- Management recommendations that reduce production risks should be transferred to farmers through local extension services and farmer interest groups.

ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

For rainfed production systems, the investment cost is currently US$248 per hectare with a net return on capital of 106 percent. Net return on land is estimated at US$263 per hectare, on hired labor at 5 percent and on family labor at 17 percent. Cumin is attractive to farmers because of its low water requirements, short duration, and ability to contribute directly to household cash flow. Market price fluctuations represent a high risk.
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CHAPTER 5: RAINFED DRY AND COLD FARMING SYSTEMS
The International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), based in Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic, has been working with farmers to develop innovative crop, forage, and livestock diversification alternatives for smallholder farmers. The objectives of ICARDA’s work on forage systems are to introduce leguminous forage species (for example, vetch) to the farming systems of poor livestock farmers in rural and urban communities. This effort is intended to improve production and make use of the nitrogen-fixing ability of this legume on soils that have been depleted of nutrients and soil organic matter.

Vetch is an annual forage legume that is planted in rotation with barley in winter. It is either grazed or cut for hay-making in early spring. Vetch seed can be harvested in late spring. Similarly, vetch straw is produced in late spring and used as a protein supplement to cereal straw for sheep meat and milk production. Vetch can be grown in dry areas with annual rainfall ranging from 200 to 400 millimeters although it is riskier than the more drought-tolerant barley.

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION

Field experimentation with farmers has shown that yields of barley straw and grain increase by 25 to 40 percent when grown in rotation with vetch, as compared to continuous barley cropping. In addition, feeding vetch hay or grain as a supplement to low-quality cereal straw improves lamb growth by 20 to 30 percent. Lambs grazing on vetch in early spring gain as much as 100 to 150 grams per day.

When vetch is planted in rotation with barley, soil fertility is increased by 10 to 15 percent—mainly through increases in soil nitrogen and phosphorus. Additional income can be earned by selling vetch seed and straw. In comparisons with other tested options, the production and marketing risks of vetch are lower than those for cumin and wheat. Investment cost is US$126 per hectare with a net return on capital of 160 percent, and net return on land is US$202 per hectare.

LESSONS LEARNED

More information is required on the beneficial effects of vetch on soil fertility over the long term to increase the attractiveness of this option. Agronomic management can be improved considerably by paying more attention to seeding rates and planting methods. Farmers need access to better storage and use practices of vetch hay and would benefit from reduced costs of weeding. Vetch appears to fit well within the diversification strategies used by farmers under mixed or intensive systems.

ISSUES FOR SCALING UP: INVESTMENTS

Future research on vetch should include efforts to empower farmers to use the technology and improve the establishment and harvest of the crop. Greater support is required to establish and maintain viable forage seed systems. This effort can be accomplished by paying more attention to the creation of market opportunities for fodder and forage seed. Efforts are required to improve seed quality of high-yielding varieties and to make these varieties more readily available to farmers.

SELECTED READING

In a conventional crop-breeding program, the most promising lines are released as varieties, and their seed is produced under controlled conditions; only then do farmers decide on adoption. The process often results in many varieties being released, and only a few are adopted. The International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) based in Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic, has been working with farmers to develop innovative crop, forage, and livestock diversification alternatives for smallholder farmers.

The Decentralized-Participatory Plant Breeding (D-PPB) approach pioneered by ICARDA focuses on an alternative way of conducting plant breeding that is more efficient in bringing new varieties to farmers regardless of their farm size, location, wealth, or education. These varieties are adapted to the physical and socioeconomic environment. The component activities include (a) training of farmers, researchers, and extension personnel; (b) field trials; (c) seed production; and (d) dissemination workshops and publications.

PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION

The D-PPB process turns the delivery phase of a plant breeding program upside down. The program is based on the following concepts:

- The traditional linear sequence of scientists to extensionists to farmers is replaced by a team approach with scientists, extension personnel, and farmers participating in variety development.
- Selection is conducted in farmers’ fields using agronomic practices they decide on.
- Farmers are the key decision makers.

The general scheme starts with planning meetings where farmers assist in designing a research agenda in which they will participate. Under the D-PPB approach, the initial farmers’ adoption drives the decision of which variety to release. Hence, adoption rates are higher and risks are minimized, because farmers gain intimate knowledge of varietal performance as part of the process. The investment in seed production is nearly always paid off by farmers’ adoption.

BENEFITS AND RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY

Agriculturalists and land-poor laborers are benefiting from quicker access to improved barley varieties as a result of the D-PPB approach. Indirectly, pastoralists and their sheep herds benefit from better barley. The cyclical nature of D-PPB programs has enriched farmers’ knowledge and has improved their negotiation capability, thereby empowering farming communities. Key project benefits include the following:

- Improved varieties are released quicker, and adoption rates are higher.
- Different varieties are being selected in different areas of Syria in direct response to different ecological constraints.
- Farmers spontaneously tested new varieties as early as three years after starting the program. Thousands of hectares have been planted with two newly released varieties, and about 30 varieties are under large-scale testing.
- In advanced yield trials, several lines outyielded the local varieties; yield gains were modest in Mugherat (10 to 11 percent) and higher in Khanasser (22 to 28 percent).

Farmers in Mugherat and Khanasser selected tall varieties and varieties that grow faster in winter. The visual selection of farmers in Mugherat was more closely corre-
lated with grain yield \((r = 0.503)\) than that of farmers in Khanasser \((r = 0.059)\).

**LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICATION**

- Farmers are excellent partners: their contribution to the program increases with their understanding of the process, which becomes more and more demand driven.
- The quality of participation is unrelated to culture, religion, education, age, wealth, or gender.
- As the program develops, the breeder becomes more and more a facilitator and a provider of genetic variability.
- Participatory plant breeding increases crop biodiversity, promotes the use of land races and wild relatives, and is ideal for organic conditions.
- In the case of Syria (the only country where a detailed study was conducted), the cost-benefit ratio of participatory plant breeding is less than half \((0.38)\) that of conventional plant breeding.
- Participatory plant breeding offers the possibility of improving more than one crop within the same program (one of the first requests of farmers across many countries).
- Participatory plant breeding allows quick response to both agronomic and climatic changes.
- Participatory plant breeding is a good entry point (easy to organize) for integrated participatory research.
- Participatory plant breeding is a good training ground for future plant breeders and can be used in university curricula.

**ISSUES FOR SCALING UP: INVESTMENTS**

In several countries, the D-PPB approach generated changes in the attitude of policy makers and scientists toward the benefits of participatory research. At the same time, variety release systems are considered too rigid.

Extension services need to take on new tasks. The role of extension in the D-PPB approach is in participating with farmers and researchers, in developing technology, and in involving additional farmers in the process, rather than in transferring research results from researchers to farmers.

The difficulty of national program scientists in dealing with farmers as partners is an ongoing concern. Changes within the national agricultural research and extension systems are slow.

**SELECTED READINGS**


Changes in climate patterns, such as the ones projected by climate change scenarios for many parts of the developing world, have the potential to change current land management practices fundamentally and to alter the risk profile of agriculturally based economies. Thus, with additional increasing commercialization and expansion of agriculture and its integration into international markets and supply chains, new risk management approaches are required that are adapted to the agricultural and rural sectors in developing countries and to the pervasive risks affecting those sectors. This profile outlines the fundamental elements of a climate risk management approach for agricultural systems.

INTRODUCTION

Farming and land management activities are exposed to seasonal climate risks arising from interannual climate variability and anthropogenic perturbations of the climate system, which are likely to result in more frequent extreme weather events. A key element of agricultural and rural risk management includes the efficient use of inherently variable natural resources (for example, runoff) and measures to increase the resilience of land and crop management systems against seasonal climate threats (for example, droughts and floods). Unmitigated risks are likely to result in increased crop and yield losses and, in extreme cases, in loss of the natural resource base (for example, soil erosion).

Land management practices and agricultural expansion can alter (increase or decrease) the exposure to natural perils and the potential impacts associated with them. Extreme climatic events can result in irreversible damage to land management and farming systems and, by extension, to human livelihoods. Coping strategies of rural and agriculturally based communities in response to such events often lead to unsustainable land management practices. For instance, after cyclones destroyed vanilla plantations in Madagascar in 2004, many rural communities turned to shifting cultivation that infringes on protected areas and causes soil erosion. Thus, sustainable farming, of which risk management is an important component, is essential to sustainable land management and the preservation of the natural resource base.

Longer-term changes in climate patterns, such as the ones projected by climate change scenarios for many parts of the developing world, have the potential to change current land management practices fundamentally and to alter the risk profile of agriculturally based economies. These changes represent an additional layer of risk and uncertainty, and increasingly they need to be considered as part of a sound climate risk management framework.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND DESCRIPTION

Agricultural actors in developing countries—including commercial producers and smallholder farmers, rural communities, suppliers, traders, and planners—have long dealt with the risks in agricultural production and have adopted traditional and ad hoc means to cope with them. At the same time, with increasing commercialization and expansion of agriculture and its integration in international markets and supply chains, risk patterns and exposure can change dramatically and require risk management approaches that are adapted to the agricultural and rural sector in developing countries and to the pervasive risks affecting it.

This profile was prepared by A. Lotsch, World Bank, Agriculture and Rural Development Commodity Risk Management Group, Washington, D.C.
The Commodity Risk Management Group has worked with partners in several countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America with the objective of assisting agricultural producers and farmers, rural lending institutions, and governments in developing means to identify, quantify, and manage risks arising from both market forces (such as commodity price volatility) and climatic events (such as seasonal droughts, floods, and storms). With respect to land management systems, the overarching objectives of risk management include protection of agriculturally based livelihoods; sustainable use of natural assets (for example, soil, water, and plant genetic material); and management of undesirable outcomes from climate-related stress (for example, plant diseases).

Although markets can have a long-term effect on the development of land management systems through trade and commodity prices (thereby altering risk profiles), seasonal variations in climate—particularly extreme events—tend to have more direct effects on the natural resource base and agricultural assets. This profile focuses mostly on risks arising from seasonal weather variability and extreme events. The fundamental elements of a climate risk management approach for agricultural systems are outlined here and include several novel technologies and approaches to managing long-term and seasonal climate risks.

**PRESENTATION OF INNOVATION**

The development of risk management solutions requires a systematic and stepwise approach. The principal framework for risk assessments in the productive sector includes risk identification, risk quantification, and design of risk management instruments.

**Risk Identification**

Several perspectives may be chosen to identify risks affecting agricultural production:

- **Spatio-temporal.** Identify the regions or locations that are affected by climatic stress and the season during which such stress has the most significant impacts.
- **Supply chain.** Identify the elements in an agricultural supply chain in which value added is at risk because of variability in climate. Additional risks in a supply chain may arise directly or indirectly from weather perturbations, such as diseases and product quality, and from logistical and operational disruptions.
- **Institutional.** Identify the operations or assets of institutions that are at risk, such as the lending portfolio of a microfinance institution or the delivery of goods and services (for example, business interruption for input suppliers).

**Risk Quantification**

After risks and their systemic links have been identified, the potential losses arising from such risks need to be quantified. For quantitative risk, modeling framework risk is commonly defined as a function of (a) the climate or weather hazard, (b) the exposure of agricultural assets to natural hazards, and (c) the vulnerability of these assets to such hazards. Specifically,

- **Hazard** are described by their spatial and temporal statistical properties (for example, likelihood of cyclones of a certain strength making landfall in a particular location).
- **Exposure** describes the absolute amount of assets (for example, plantations) and economic activity that may experience harm because of the effects of natural events.
- **Vulnerability** (or sensitivity) captures the degree to which assets and productive activities are susceptible to negative impacts of natural hazards.

This breakdown of risk is important because it illustrates that risk can arise from (a) temporary or permanent changes in hazard patterns (for example, climate cycles); (b) changes in the exposure (for example, agricultural expansion and intensification); and (c) changes in the vulnerability profiles (for example, crop choices). That is, risk can be reduced most effectively by managing the exposure and reducing the vulnerability (increasing the resilience) of land management systems, whereas changing hazard patterns that are largely controlled by climatic processes is more difficult.

**Risk Management**

Last, an appropriate risk management mechanism needs to be developed to reduce (mitigate), transfer, or share the residual risk. The appropriate management solution is a function of (a) the magnitude of the risk; (b) the likelihood that a negative outcome may be realized; (c) the institutional (informal or formal) capacity to cope with the risk; and (d) the nature of the underlying hazard (for example, droughts represent a covariate risk that tends to affect large areas simultaneously and generally results in long-term and indirect losses, whereas floods tend to be more localized and cause direct damage to crops and infrastructure such as irrigation systems).
Several existing and new technologies have been used and piloted in recent years to support risk modeling and management in developing countries. These include (a) geo-information technologies, such as space- or air-borne remote sensing and cyclone and flood modeling; (b) probabilistic and quantitative risk modeling; and (c) innovative approaches to transfer (insure) risk through market-based approaches. These innovations can enhance and complement more conventional approaches to risk management in the productive sectors, such as water storage, crop diversification, or flood mitigation schemes. Some of these innovations are featured here in relation to the risk framework described:

- **Remote-sensing technologies.** Remote-sensing technologies can provide cost-effective and rapid means to collect hazard information. Satellite-based sensors provide repeated observations of atmospheric and terrestrial conditions and can cover large geographic areas with moderate resolution sensors or small areas with very high spatial resolution. Examples for applications of remote-sensing technology include (a) flood mapping and detection, (b) measurement of tropical rainfall, (c) monitoring of vegetation and crop conditions, and (d) cyclone tracking. Although remote-sensing technology provides a very powerful tool in many risk applications, a key limitation is that it is a relatively new technology that provides limited historical observations, which are critical in modeling the long-term patterns of climatic hazards. (For some sensors, reliable time series are available from the mid-1980s; however, the more advanced technologies generally provide fewer than 10 years of temporal observations.)

- **Bio-geophysical and atmospheric models.** Bio-geophysical and atmospheric models are frequently used when direct observations of hazards are not available. Careful calibration of models allows the simulation of hazard patterns over a longer time period, which is critical to quantify trends and return periods of extreme climate events, such as severe droughts or floods. Examples of state-of-the-art modeling in support of hazard analysis include (a) floodplain and inundation models using numerical water balance and drainage, (b) cyclone models that dynamically simulate the trajectories and wind speed of cyclones, and (c) regional circulation models that can be used to simulate seasonal climate patterns and provide seasonal forecasts.

- **Risk models.** Risk models combine the information about hazards in a probabilistic framework with information about the vulnerability and exposure of assets to estimate the likely damages and financial losses arising from extreme climatic events. Advances in geo-information technology, such as geographic information systems, facilitate the assimilation and analysis of hazard, vulnerability, and financial models in an integrated framework. Many of these systems have become user friendly and can be deployed on desktop computer systems to be used in an interactive and dynamic fashion by decision makers in support of risk assessment and management.

- **Innovative approaches for risk transfer.** Most developing countries lack agricultural insurance. Traditional multiperil crop insurance (MPCI) programs, which compensate farmers on the basis of yield loss measured in the field, have major drawbacks: (a) adverse selection (that is, farmers know more about their risks than the insurer, leading the low-risk farmers to opt out and leaving the insurer with only bad risks); (b) moral hazard (that is, farmers’ behaviors can influence the extent of damage that qualifies for insurance payouts); and (c) high administrative costs, especially in small farmer communities, and difficulties of objective loss adjustment. As a result, a strong movement exists to develop index-based insurance solutions, which have several advantages over MPCI. Index-based insurance products are contingent claims contracts for which payouts are determined by an objective parameter, such as rainfall, temperature, and regional yield level, that is highly correlated with farm-level yields or revenue outcomes. Farmers with index contracts receive timely payouts because the compensation is automatically triggered when the chosen index parameter reaches a prespecified level. The automatic trigger reduces administrative costs for the insurer by eliminating the need for tedious field-level damage assessment, while the objective and exogenous nature of the index prevents adverse selection and moral hazard. Index products are most suitable for covariate risks (risks affecting larger areas or groups of people simultaneously), and most index product development to date has concentrated on rainfall deficit (that is, drought), which is particularly difficult to insure by traditional methods.

**BENEFITS AND RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY**

Several benefits accrue from following a systematic approach to assessing risks in the productive sector in relation to sustainable land management and from applying the specific technologies described in this profile:
The disaggregation of risk into hazard, vulnerability, and exposure provides a clear framework under which experts from different disciplines, including climate experts and meteorologists, social scientists, engineers, and agronomists, can collaborate on risk assessments. In addition, it defines a clear functional relationship between natural hazards and negative outcomes of risk.

A clear risk management framework identifies the areas where investments would have the highest marginal effect to reduce risk. For instance, systematic risk modeling reveals how increasing exposure (for example, agricultural expansion in floodplains) contributes to the overall risk compared to the vulnerability arising from poor farming practices.

A risk management framework is scalable, and the same general framework can be used with varying geographic and sectoral detail. That is, simple risk models can be developed when data availability and quality are an issue, and more detailed and sector-specific models can easily be incorporated if appropriate data are available.

Quantifying and mapping risks has an important awareness-raising effect because risks are frequently not explicitly addressed. Risk assessments can provide a powerful tool to introduce measures to manage risks before damages and losses occur, rather than after a disaster and severe event.

Climate risk management provides a framework to promote new technology, such as better computer-based land-monitoring systems, and to build capacity for public and private sector entities, such as planning departments or the domestic insurance market.

LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICATION

Good data are the most critical inputs for any risk modeling. Unfortunately, adequate data are rarely found in most client countries, or poor data management systems prevent the data from being readily used. Despite sophisticated satellite technology and models, no substitute exists for high-quality data collection on the ground by agencies such as hydrometeorological services and statistical bureaus. In many countries, particularly in Africa, the capacity to collect data on natural hazards, including weather data, is deteriorating rapidly. Investments in hydrometeorological infrastructure and data management systems are fundamental to supporting climate risk management, which is virtually impossible without solid data and statistical capacity at all administrative levels.

National and local agencies could use readily available public data sources, such as the ones derived from satellite data, more effectively. Capacity building in technical agencies, such as agrometeorological services, has the potential to unlock the wealth of underused data sources that can generate a variety of public goods.

Simple hazard and risk assessments can be performed in most countries by compiling data from existing sources (for example, land-use inventories or climatological time series) and integrating them systematically in a common framework (through spatial-reference data layers in a geographic information system). This approach can provide a powerful starting point for engaging local agencies and stakeholders and can stimulate more focused sector- or asset-specific risk analyses.

Insurance markets in the productive sectors, in particular agriculture, are largely underdeveloped in most client countries. Index-based insurance products using quantitative risk modeling can potentially provide more adapted risk management solutions for the agricultural sector in developing countries. Deploying them effectively, however, requires capacity building in the domestic insurance sector, leveraging of local capacity to model risk, investments in sustainable data collection and management systems, and risk education and sensitization among stakeholders (such as producers, suppliers, and lending institutions in an agricultural supply chain).

INVESTMENT NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Key investments for better climate risk management include the following:

- Upgrading of hydrometeorological infrastructure, including synoptic weather stations, gauging stations for river runoff and surface water, and agrometeorological sites. This fundamental investment requires a long-term perspective, including the development of institutions and agencies that have the mandate and resources to manage such systems and create added value through dissemination of climate information.

- Capacity building at the national and below-national levels to collect, manage, disseminate, and use data for climate and disaster risk management. Such capacity building includes basic training of technical personnel, development of risk assessment protocols (before and after seasonal events), and statistical capacity building.
■ Development of multisector risk management frameworks that clearly delineate and facilitate public and private sector responsibilities in risk management, including insurance through market-based instruments and disaster response by public entities. A key element of such a framework is effective multilevel and multisector stakeholder coordination.

■ Systematic development and updating of baseline data and natural hazards and risks arising from them. This effort would include development of land management information systems, with routine inventories of the natural resource base, inventories of the key assets in the productive sectors, and updating of vulnerability profiles using some of the technologies described in this profile.

■ Improvement of rural infrastructure and capacity. Hard solutions for improving transportation, water storage facilities, information and communication infrastructure, drainage and irrigation systems are needed, as well as soft solutions for improving market development and diversification, community-driven risk management plans, or capacity extension services.
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*Dartmouth Flood Observatory Web site.* This Web site contains an active archive of large floods, from 1985 to the present. http://www.dartmouth.edu/~floods.

*International Task Force on Commodity Risk Management in Developing Countries.* Lighting Africa is a World Bank Group initiative. Its aim is to provide up to 250 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa with access to non-fossil fuel based, low cost, safe, and reliable lighting products with associated basic energy services by the year 2030. Web site: http://www.itf-commodityrisk.org.
Diagnostic surveillance approaches used in the public health sector can now be adapted and deployed to provide a reliable mechanism for evidence-based learning and the sound targeting of investments in sustainable land management (SLM) programs. Initially, a series of case definitions are developed through which the problem can be quantified. Then, sample units are screened to determine whether they meet the case criteria. This process involves conducting prevalence surveys requiring measurement of a large number of sample units. The land management surveillance approach uses a combination of cutting-edge tools, such as satellite remote sensing at multiple scales; georeferenced ground-sampling schemes based on sentinel sites; infrared spectroscopy for rapid, reliable soil and plant tissue analysis; and mixed-effects statistical models to provide population-based estimates from hierarchical data.

The approach provides a scientifically rigorous framework for evidenced-based management of land resources that is modeled on well-tested scientific approaches used in epidemiology. It provides a spatial framework for testing interventions in landscapes in a way that samples the variability in conditions, thereby increasing the ability to generalize from outcomes. The baseline that the protocol generates provides a scientifically rigorous platform for monitoring outcomes of intervention projects at a landscape level. The approach is particularly well suited to providing high-quality information at low cost in areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa, where existing data on land resources are sparse. It is being used in a United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) capacity-building project to guide strategies for land restoration in five West African dryland countries and in a World Bank Global Environment Facility (GEF) project in Kenya, led by the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, which is designed to tackle land degradation problems in the Lake Victoria basin. Soil health surveillance has been recommended as part of a strategy endorsed by the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) for saving Africa’s soils and is proposed for Sub-Saharan Africa as a component of the Global Digital Soil Map of the World project.

**INTRODUCTION**

Many of the problems associated with managing land stem from a lack of systematic and operational approaches for assessing and monitoring land degradation at different scales (village to global). As a result, there is no mechanism for sound targeting of interventions and no basis for reliable evidence-based learning from the billions of dollars that have been invested in SLM programs. Recent scientific and technical advances are enabling diagnostic surveillance approaches used in the public health sector to be deployed in SLM. Land degradation surveillance provides a spatial framework for diagnosis of land management problems, systematic targeting and testing of interventions, and assessment of outcomes.

A broad range of stakeholders, such as regional and national policy makers, donors, environmental convention secretariats, and civil society, are asking these key questions:

- What is the state of the nation’s land at a particular point in time?
- How much agricultural land in Sub-Saharan Africa is currently suffering from productivity declines and off-site impacts attributable to soil degradation?
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What caused the degradation in places where it exists, and how can further degradation be prevented?
Can land degradation be reversed, and if so, what are the costs to individuals and to society?
Are there cost-effective and socially acceptable means for treating degraded lands to increase their productivity, while avoiding harmful side effects to the environment, such as the pollution of surface waters and accelerated greenhouse gas emissions?

PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION

Surprisingly, the world does not have clear answers to these questions at present. The basic premise of this project is that a problem cannot be managed unless progress can be measured from a baseline toward a well-defined target. Thus, a land health surveillance system must accomplish the following:

- Provide high spatial resolution and practical, timely, and cost-effective information about where specific land degradation processes occur in a given region or country and how those processes are changing over time.
- Identify areas at risk of degradation and the commensurate preventive measures in a spatially explicit way.
- Provide a framework for rigorous scientific testing and implementation of locally relevant rehabilitative soil management interventions, addressing what works, what does not, where, how, and at what cost to individuals and society.
- Anticipate and respond to external requests from a wide audience (that is, farmers, conservationists, scientists, and policy makers).

PRESENTATION OF DIAGNOSTIC SURVEILLANCE AND OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Human health surveillance techniques are a normal part of public health. Health surveillance is based on case definitions that define prevalence (percentage of people affected) and incidence (new cases). This project proposes an analogous land health surveillance system that provides the scientific and factual database essential to informed decision making and appropriate policy action (Shepherd and Walsh 2007).

Soil health diagnostic surveillance aims are as follows:

- Provide diagnostic information on land degradation problems to guide resource allocation and management decisions.
- Identify cause-and-effect relationships needed for primary prevention, early detection, and rehabilitation of degraded land at different spatial scales.
- Provide a scientifically rigorous platform for testing and monitoring land management interventions.
- Provide a conceptual and logical framework for understanding coupled social-ecological systems.

A diagnostic surveillance framework (box 5.1) can provide a basis for a quantitative, evidence-based approach to land management. After a problem has been identified, a critical step is to describe a case definition through which the problem can be quantified. Problems such as disease in populations generally exist as a continuum of severity; however, for practical reasons, dichotomizing the diagnostic continuum into “cases” and “noncases” or “affected” and “nonaffected” is often helpful. The lack of rigorous stipulation of diagnostic criteria for key land degradation problems is a major impediment in formulating a sound development policy. Adequate definitions of degraded land and nondegraded land are a prerequisite to assessing the extent of land degradation.

After case definitions are stipulated, a screening test is required to measure the problem in individuals or sample units and classify them as “case” or “noncase.” The availability of rapid, reliable (that is, highly repeatable and reproducible), and cost-effective screening tests (for example, equivalent to blood tests used in medicine) is key to using the surveillance framework to conduct prevalence surveys involving measurement of a large number of sample units. In clinical medicine, large investments are made in development of screening tests, and even the case definition may be defined in relation to the screening test. For example, for some disorders, an operational case definition is used that assigns an arbitrary cut-off value of the screening test as a decision threshold for treatment.

The surveillance approach is put into effect using a combination of cutting-edge tools (figure 5.3), including satellite remote sensing at multiple scales; georeferenced ground-sampling schemes based on sentinel sites; infrared spectroscopy for rapid, reliable soil and plant tissue analysis; and mixed-effects statistical models to provide population-based estimates from hierarchical data. The methods provide accurate information on the areas where land degradation is taking place, on the different manifestations of land degradation and soil constraints, on the extent of the problems, and on the sort of intervention strategies that are required to prevent or reverse degradation. The methods have been designed to be simple and cost-effective so that
The diagnostic surveillance framework involves the following steps:

1. Identify the specific land degradation problem or groups of problems.
2. Develop a rigorous case definition of affected and nonaffected states.
3. Develop a screening test (or set of tests) so that subjects can be assigned rapidly to affected or nonaffected states. Infrared spectroscopy can play a key role as a screening tool for identification of cases.
4. Apply the screening test to subjects in randomized sampling schemes designed to provide unbiased prevalence data on the specified problem.
5. Conduct measurements. Simultaneous measurement of environmental and socioeconomic correlates permits problem risk factors to be identified. Controllable risk factors point to the main management levers for controlling the problem.
6. Confirm risk factors through follow-up surveys that measure changes in the problem over time (incidence) and assess intervention outcomes. Assessment of outcomes may lead to a new or refined problem definition.

The accompanying figure shows the relationship of these steps.

Source: International Centre for Research in Agroforestry.
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they can be implemented in isolated areas and in countries with limited resources.

At a regional or national scale, land degradation risk domains are first established using low-resolution time-series satellite information on vegetation cover. These domains are further sampled using sentinel sites, consisting of 10-by-10-kilometer blocks. Within sentinel sites, high-resolution imagery and ground sampling are used to gather data on vegetation and soil condition at randomized points. Infrared spectroscopy is used for rapid, reliable, and low-cost
soil analysis and development of soil condition indexes. Degradation indexes are related to risk factors such as vegetation type and cover and are then mapped out through calibration to the satellite imagery using statistical inference. This information is used to spatially target land management strategies for systematic testing. The sentinel sites provide not only a framework for change detection through follow-up surveys (for example, after five years) but also a spatial platform for testing recommended land management options. For example, spatially distributing tree planting trials in each sub-block ensures that species are tested over a wide range of land conditions; consequently, growth performance can be correlated with site indexes, which can be used to predict tree performance at new sites. The steps used in the framework are described in more detail in box 5.2

The land degradation surveillance framework is being used in a UNEP capacity-building project to guide strategies for land restoration in five West African dryland countries (see http://www.worldagroforestry.org/wadrylands/index.html) and in a World Bank GEF project in Kenya, led by the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, which is designed to tackle land degradation problems in the Lake Victoria basin. Soil health surveillance has been recommended as part of a NEPAD-endorsed strategy for saving Africa’s soils (Swift and Shepherd 2007) and is proposed for Sub-Saharan Africa as a component of the Global Digital Soil Map of the World project (see http://www.globalsoilmap.net/). Further information on infrared spectroscopy for sensing soil quality is available at http://www.worldagroforestrycentre.org/sensingsoil/.

**Figure 5.3  Successive Samples of Land Degradation Problem Domains at a Hierarchy of Scales Using Satellite Imagery, Ground Sampling, and Laboratory Analysis of Soils by Infrared Spectroscopy**

Source: ICRAF.

**BENEFITS AND RESULTS OF THE ACTIVITY**

The activity provides a scientifically rigorous framework for evidenced-based management of land resources, modeled on well-tested scientific approaches used in epidemiology.
The land degradation surveillance framework involves the following steps:

1. At a regional or national scale, establish land degradation risk domains using low-resolution time-series satellite information on vegetation cover in combination with long-term rainfall records. The risk domains indicate areas where land may have been degraded or recovered over the past 25 years and are used as a sampling frame for more detailed studies. Alternatively, stratification and sampling of the Landsat World Reference System grid can be used as a sampling frame. Ancillary data on population, infrastructure, climatic zones, and the like are integrated to build quantitative scenario analyses.

2. Sample contrasting areas using moderate-resolution (for example, Landsat, ASTER, SPOT) satellite imagery, which provides data on major land-cover conversions. Processing of full-coverage imagery at this scale provides data on prevalence of woody cover and bare soil areas. Variation within these areas is further sampled through sentinel sites to provide more detailed information on land condition. Sentinel sites consist of 10-by-10-kilometer blocks, which are logistically convenient for field sampling while being large enough to encompass major landscape variability.

3. For the sentinel sites, obtain high-resolution (0.6 to 2.4 meter) satellite imagery, which allows individual fields, trees, and erosion features to be observed. Within the sites, a standardized, georeferenced ground survey is used to provide direct measurement of land condition. The 10-by-10-km blocks are spatially stratified into 2.5-kilometer sub-blocks. Within each sub-block, an area of 1 square kilometer is sampled using a cluster of 10 randomized 1,000-square-meter observation plots. Direct observations are made in four 100-square-meter subplots. Socioeconomic surveys also use the cluster design (for example, sampling of households or villages nearest to cluster centroids).

4. Within plots, observe landform, topography, visible signs of soil erosion, land use, vegetation type and cover, and vegetation density and distribution, and take soil samples. Vegetation type is classified using the Food and Agriculture Organization Land Cover Classification System, supplemented with woody biomass estimates. Single-ring infiltration measurements are made on a selection of plots (three in each cluster). A field crew of four people can complete a block in about 14 to 16 field days. The number of plots can be adjusted, if desired, to meet different objectives.

5. Characterize soil samples using infrared spectroscopy. This technique is widely used in industry for rapid and routine characterization of materials and has been adapted for rapid, reliable, and low-cost soil analysis. This no-chemical method is attractive for laboratories in developing countries because it minimizes sample preparation and requires only a source of electricity. Furthermore, many agricultural inputs and products can be analyzed using the same instrument. Subsets of samples are sent to specialized laboratories for conventional soil analysis and isotope analysis. These expensive analyses, conducted on relatively few samples, are calibrated to the infrared spectral data and predicted for all samples. Also, spectral indicators of soil condition are derived that successfully screen soils into intact or degraded categories.

6. Compile standard data-entry sheets that can be enabled for Web-based data entry. The data are compiled in a central database. Individual users are provided with password access to their own data.

7. Use specialized statistical analyses for handling hierarchical data to derive population-based estimates for indicators of land condition and to analyze the effect of environmental covariates (for example, vegetation cover and soil spectral indicators) at different spatial scales. Robust statistical inference mechanisms with spatial models, pedotransfer functions, and expert systems are under development.

8. Use the georeferenced sampling scheme to allow ground observations (for example, soil condition index) to be calibrated directly to satellite imagery and to be spatially interpolated and mapped.

9. Produce electronic atlases showing areas that are already degraded, areas at risk, and intact areas, with matched recommendations on intervention strategies.

10. Propose spatially explicit land management strategies for systematic testing (for example, enrichment planting of trees to meet specific tree-density targets).

11. Through the sentinel sites, provide not only a framework for change detection through follow-up surveys (for example, after five years) but also a spatial platform for testing land management interventions. For example, spatially distributing tree planting trials in the blocks ensures that species are tested over a wide range of land conditions, so that growth performance can be related back to site indexes, which can be used to predict tree performance at new sites.

Source: International Centre for Research in Agroforestry.
Currently, no comparable system is in operation. The systematic application of the approach will provide unbiased prevalence data on land degradation problems and permit quantification of land degradation risk factors, thereby enabling preventive and rehabilitative measures for SLM to be appropriately targeted. The approach provides a spatial framework for testing interventions in landscapes in a way that samples the variability in conditions, thereby increasing the ability to generalize from outcomes. The baseline that the protocol generates provides a scientifically rigorous platform for monitoring effects of intervention projects at a landscape level. The hierarchical sampling frame and statistical methods used allow systematic aggregation of results and population-level inferences to be made about land properties at different scales. The approach is particularly well suited to providing high-quality information at low cost in areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa, where existing data on land resources are sparse.

LESSONS LEARNED AND ISSUES FOR WIDER APPLICATION

The most difficult area for adoption is the advanced data analysis techniques used. An efficient solution to this barrier could be establishment of regional analytical centers, which would provide sampling schemes (global position system points, standardized forms, and protocols), as well as remote-sensing information and processing of field data posted by field teams on the Internet. In addition, the centers would fulfill a technical and scientific capacity-building and support role.

INVESTMENT NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Widespread application of this approach principally requires investment in capacity building of national teams in the approaches and methods. Operating costs for implementing a national surveillance system in the field are modest, and existing soil or natural resource survey departments could easily take up this role. The advanced data analysis techniques used are the most difficult area for adoption. An efficient solution to this barrier could be establishment of regional analytical centers that would provide sampling schemes (global position system points, standardized forms, and protocols); remote-sensing information; and processing of field data posted by field teams on the Internet. The centers would also fulfill a technical and scientific capacity-building and support role. A government would need to take the following steps to implement a national-level surveillance program:

- Provide exposure training in the approaches and methods to a national team of scientists.
- Equip a national soil laboratory with a near-infrared spectrometer (about US$75,000), provide basic training, ensure basic facilities for soil processing and storage, and provide limited conventional soil analysis.
- Provide resources for two survey teams for about 12 months of fieldwork every five years (each team will need one surveyor and two field assistants, as well as a vehicle, a global positioning system, an auger set, and field operating funds) to establish sentinel sites (for example, 50 sites) throughout the country.
- Train a national remote-sensing and geographic information system lab in data analytical techniques with support from the regional surveillance center.
- Orient national agronomic testing and socioeconomic research programs to work through the sentinel sites.
- Establish additional sentinel sites for setting up baselines and monitoring outcomes for individual development projects aimed at land improvement.
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Global Digital Soil Map of the World. Global Digital Soil Map of the World project seeks to make a new digital soil map of the world using state-of-the-art and emerging technologies for soil mapping and predicting soil properties at fine resolution. The map will be supplemented by interpretation and functionality options that aim to assist better decision-making in various global issues, such as food production and hunger eradication, climate change, and environmental degradation: http://www.globalsoilmap.net./

West Africa Drylands Project. The West Africa Drylands project emphasizes the application of science-based tools to help accelerate learning on sustainable dryland management and increase adaptive capacity at all scales, from local communities to regional and international policy bodies. Learn more about the project on its web site: http://www.worldagroforestry.org/wadrylands/index.html.