

1

## FIAASTD Global Chapter 6

2

### Options to Enhance the Impact of AKST on Development and Sustainability Goals

3

4 *Coordinating Lead Authors:* Ameenah Gurib-Fakim (Mauritius) and Linda Smith (UK)

5 *Lead Authors:* Nazimi Acikgoz (Turkey), Patrick Avato (Germany and Italy), Deborah Bossio

6 (USA), Kristie Ebi (USA), André Gonçalves (Brazil), Jack A. Heinemann (New Zealand), Thora

7 Martina Herrmann (Germany), Jonathan Padgham (USA), Johanna Pennarz (Germany), Urs

8 Scheidegger (Switzerland), Leo Sebastian (Philippines), Miguel Taboada (Argentina), Ernesto

9 Viglizzo (Argentina)

10 *Contributing Authors:* Felix Bachmann (Switzerland), Barbara Best (USA), Jacques Brossier

11 (France), Cathy Farnworth (UK), Constance Gewa (Kenya), Edwin Gyasi (Ghana), Cesar

12 Izaurrealde (Argentina), Roger Leakey (UK), Jennifer Long (Canada), Shawn McGuire (Canada),

13 Patrick Meier (USA), Ivette Perfecto (Brazil), Christine Zundel (Brazil)

14 *Review Editors:* David Bouldin (USA) and Stella Williams (Nigeria)

15

16 **Key Messages.....4**

17 **6.1 Improving Productivity and Sustainability of Crop Systems.....7**

18 **6.1.1 Small-scale, diversified farming systems**

19 6.1.1.1 Research options for improved productivity

20 6.1.1.2 Land use options for enhancing productivity

21 **6.1.2 Achieving sustainable pest and disease management**

22 6.1.2.1 Diversification for pest resistance

23 6.1.2.2 Tools for detection, prediction, and tracking

24 **6.1.3 Plant root health**

25 6.1.3.1 Low input options

26 6.1.3.2 Research needs and options

27 **6.1.4 Value chains, market development**

28 6.1.4.1 Research and capacity development needs

29 **6.2 Improve Productivity and Sustainability of Livestock systems.....24**

30 **6.2.1 On-farm options**

31 **6.3 Breeding Options for Improved Environmental and Social Sustainability.....26**

32 **6.3.1 Crop breeding**

33 6.3.1.1 Options for conventional plant breeding

34 6.3.1.2 Optimize the pace and productivity of plant breeding

35 **6.3.2 Livestock breeding options**

36 6.3.2.1 Research needs

1	<b>6.4</b>	<b>Improve Forestry and Agroforestry Systems as</b>	
2		<b>Providers of Multifunctionality.....</b>	<b>36</b>
3	<b>6.4.1</b>	<b><i>On-farm options</i></b>	
4	6.4.1.1	Reducing land degradation through agroforestry	
5	<b>6.4.2</b>	<b><i>Market mechanisms and incentives for agroforestry</i></b>	
6	<b>6.5</b>	<b>Sustainable Management of</b>	
7		<b>Fishery and Aquaculture Systems.....</b>	<b>40</b>
8	<b>6.5.1</b>	<b><i>Governance and management options</i></b>	
9	<b>6.6</b>	<b>Improve Natural Resource Management and Habitat Preservation.....</b>	<b>44</b>
10	<b>6.6.1</b>	<b><i>The landscape management challenge</i></b>	
11	<b>6.6.2</b>	<b><i>Address poor land and soil management to deliver sustainable increases in</i></b>	
12		<b><i>productivity</i></b>	
13	6.6.2.1	Options for fertile lands	
14	6.6.2.2	Options for low fertility lands	
15	<b>6.6.3</b>	<b><i>Sustainable Use of Water Resources to meet on-farm food and fiber demands</i></b>	
16	6.6.3.1	Managing evapotranspiration	
17	6.6.3.2	Multiple use livelihoods approach	
18	6.6.3.3	Management and financing options	
19	<b>6.7</b>	<b>Using AKST to Improve Health and Nutrition.....</b>	<b>60</b>
20	<b>6.7.1</b>	<b><i>On-farm options for reducing malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies</i></b>	
21	<b>6.7.2</b>	<b><i>Research needs for reducing malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies</i></b>	
22	6.7.2.1	Reducing food contaminants	
23	<b>6.7.3</b>	<b><i>Reduce factors that facilitate the emergence and re-emergence of human and</i></b>	
24		<b><i>animal diseases</i></b>	
25	6.7.3.1	On-farm options	
26	6.7.3.2	Research needs	
27	<b>6.7.4</b>	<b><i>Tackling persistent chemicals to protect human health and the environment</i></b>	
28	6.7.4.1	On-farm options	
29	6.7.4.2	Off-farm technology	
30	<b>6.7.5</b>	<b><i>Information and knowledge systems</i></b>	
31	6.7.5.1	Traditional, local knowledge options	
32	6.7.5.2	Science and technology options	
33	6.7.5.2.1	<i>Remote sensing technology</i>	
34	6.7.5.2.2	<i>Information and communications technology (ICT)</i>	
35	6.7.5.2.3	<i>Nanotechnology</i>	
36	6.7.5.3	Participatory approaches to AKST	
37	<b>6.8</b>	<b>Adaptation to Climate Change, Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases .....</b>	<b>76</b>

- 1 **6.8.1** ***AKST knowledge and innovation***
- 2 6.8.1.1 Technological (high-input) options
- 3 6.8.1.2 On-farm (low input) options
- 4 **6.8.2** ***Sustainable use of bioenergy***
- 5 6.8.2.1 Liquid biofuels for transport
- 6 6.8.2.2 Bioenergy and rural development

1 **Key Messages**

2

3 **1. Many of the challenges facing agriculture over the next 50 years will be able to be**  
4 **resolved by smarter and more targeted application of existing AKST. But new science and**  
5 **innovation will be needed to respond to both intractable and changing challenges.** These  
6 challenges include climate change, land degradation, availability of water, energy use, changing  
7 patterns of pests and diseases as well as addressing the needs of the poor, filling the yield gap,  
8 access to AKST, pro-poor international co-operation and entrepreneurialism within the  
9 'localization' pathway.

10

11 **2. Smarter and more targeted application of existing best practice AKST will be critical to**  
12 **achieving development and sustainability goals.** It is essential to build on the competences  
13 and developments in a wide range of sectors to have the maximum impact. The greatest scope  
14 for improvements exists in small-scale diversified production systems.

15

16 **3. The challenges are complex, so AKST must be integrated with place-based and context**  
17 **relevant factors to address the multiple functions of agriculture.** A demand-led approach to  
18 AKST needs to integrate the expertise from a range of stakeholders, including farmers, to  
19 develop solutions that simultaneously increase productivity, protect natural resources including  
20 those on which agriculture is based, and minimize agriculture's negative impact on the  
21 environment. New knowledge and technology from sectors such as tourism, communication,  
22 energy, and health care, can enhance the capacity of agriculture to contribute to the development  
23 and sustainability goals. Given their diverse needs and resources, farmers will need a choice of  
24 options to respond to the challenges, and to address the increasing complexity of stresses under  
25 which they operate. There are opportunities to enhance local and indigenous self-sufficiency  
26 where communities can engage in the development and deployment of appropriate AKST.

27

28 **4. Advances in AKST, such as biotechnology, nanotechnology, remote sensing, precision**  
29 **agriculture, information communication technologies, and better understanding and use**  
30 **of agroecological processes and synergies have the potential to transform our**  
31 **approaches in addressing development and sustainability goals, but will need to be**  
32 **inclusive of a wide variety of approaches in order to meet sustainability and development**  
33 **goals.** The widespread application of these breakthroughs will depend on resolving concerns of  
34 access, affordability, relevance, biosafety, and the policies (investment and incentive systems)  
35 adopted by individual countries. There will be new genotypes of crops, livestock, fish, and trees to  
36 facilitate adaptation to a wider range of habitats and biotic and abiotic conditions. This will bring  
37 new yield levels, enhance nutritional quality of food, produce non-traditional products, and

1 complement new production systems. New approaches for crop management and farming  
2 systems will develop alongside breakthroughs in science and technology. Both current and new  
3 technologies will play a crucial role in response to the challenges of hunger, micronutrient  
4 deficiencies, productivity, and environmental protection, including optimal soil and water quality,  
5 carbon sequestration, and biodiversity. Ecological approaches to food production also have the  
6 potential to address inequities created by current industrial agriculture.

7  
8 **5. Transgenic approaches may continue to make significant contributions in the long term,  
9 but substantial increases in public confidence in safety assessments must be addressed.**

10 Conflicts over the free use of genetic resources must be resolved, and the complex legal  
11 environment in which transgenes are central elements of contention needs further consideration.

12  
13 **6. AKST can play a proactive role in responding to the challenge of climate change and  
14 mitigating and adapting to climate-related production risks.**

15 Climate change influences and is influenced by agricultural systems. The negative impacts of climate variability and projected  
16 climate change will predominately occur in low-income countries. AKST can be harnessed to  
17 mitigate GHG emissions from agriculture and to increase carbon sinks and enhance adaptation of  
18 agricultural systems to climate change impacts. Development of new AKST could reduce the  
19 reliance of agriculture and the food chain on fossil fuels for agrochemicals, machinery, transport,  
20 and distribution. Emerging research on energy efficiency and alternative energy sources for  
21 agriculture will have multiple benefits for sustainability.

22  
23 **7. Reconfiguration of agricultural systems, including integration of ecological concepts,  
24 and new AKST are needed to address emerging disease threats.**

25 The number of emerging plant, animal, and human diseases will increase in future. Multiple drivers, such as climate  
26 change, intensification of crop and livestock systems, and expansion of international trade will  
27 accelerate the emergence process. The increase in infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS, malaria etc.)  
28 as well as other emerging ones will challenge sustainable development and economic growth,  
29 and it will ultimately affect both high and low-income countries.

30  
31 **8. Improving water use in agriculture to adapt to water scarcity, provide global food  
32 security, maintain ecosystems and provide sustainable livelihoods for the rural poor is  
33 possible through a series of integrated approaches.**

34 Opportunities exist through AKST to increase water productivity by reducing unproductive losses of water at field and basin scales,  
35 and through breeding and soil and crop management. The poor can be targeted for increased  
36 benefit from the available water through systems that are designed to support the multiple  
37 livelihood uses of water, and demand led governance arrangements that secure equitable access

1 to water. Economic water scarcity can be alleviated through target water resources development  
2 that includes socioeconomic options ranging from large to small scale, for communities and  
3 individuals. Allocation policies can be developed with stakeholders to take into account whole  
4 basin water needs. Integration of food production with other ecosystem services in multifunctional  
5 systems helps to achieve multiple goals for example integrated rice/aquaculture systems or  
6 integrated crop/livestock systems. While the greatest potential increases in yields and water  
7 productivity are in rainfed areas in developing countries, where many of the world's poorest rural  
8 people live, equally important is improved management of large dams and irrigation systems to  
9 maintain aquatic ecosystems.

10  
11 **9. The potential benefits and risks of bioenergy are strongly dependent on particular local**  
12 **circumstances.** Research is needed on better understanding these effects and improving  
13 technologies. Expansion of biofuel production from agricultural crops (1st generation) may in  
14 certain cases promote incomes and job creation, but negative effects on poverty (e.g. rising food  
15 prices, marginalization of small-scale farmers) and the environment (e.g. water depletion,  
16 deforestation) may outweigh these benefits and thus need to be carefully assessed. Small-scale  
17 biofuels and bio-oils could offer livelihood opportunities, especially in remote regions and  
18 countries where high transport costs impede agricultural trade and energy imports. There is also  
19 considerable potential for expanding the use of digesters (e.g. from livestock manure), gasifiers  
20 and direct combustion devices to generate electricity, especially in off-grid areas and in  
21 cogeneration mode on site of biomass wastes generating industries (e.g. rice, sugar and paper  
22 mills). The next generation of liquid biofuels (cellulosic ethanol and biomass-to-liquids  
23 technologies) holds promise to mitigate many of the concerns about 1st generation biofuels but it  
24 is not clear when these technologies may become commercially available. Moreover,  
25 considerable capital costs, large economies of scale, a high degree of technological  
26 sophistication and intellectual property rights issues make it unlikely that these technologies will  
27 be adopted widely in many developing countries in the next decades. Research and investments  
28 are needed to accelerate the development of these technologies and explore their potential and  
29 risks in developing countries.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

1 **6.1 Improving Productivity and Sustainability of Crop Systems**

2 **6.1.1 Small-scale, diversified farming systems**

3 Considerable potential exists to improve livelihoods and reduce the environmental impacts of  
4 farming by applying existing AKST in smarter ways to optimize cropping and livestock systems,  
5 especially in developing countries.

6  
7 Small-scale diversified farming is responsible for the lion's share of agriculture globally. While  
8 productivity increases may be achieved faster in high input, large scale, specialized farming  
9 systems, greatest scope for improving livelihood and equity exist in small-scale, diversified  
10 production systems in developing countries. This small-scale farming sector is highly dynamic,  
11 and has been responding readily to changes in natural and socioeconomic circumstances  
12 through shifts in their production portfolio, and specifically to increased demand by increasing  
13 aggregate farm output (Toumlin and Guèye, 2003).

14  
15 Small-scale farmers maximize return on land, make efficient decisions, innovate continuously and  
16 cause less damage to the environment than large farms (Ashley and Maxwell, 2001). Yet they  
17 have lower labor productivity and are less efficient in procuring inputs and in marketing, especially  
18 in the face of new requirements regarding produce quality. Land productivity of small-scale farms  
19 was found to be considerably higher than in large ones in a comparison across six low-income  
20 countries (IFAD, 2001).

21  
22 AKST investments in small-scale, diversified farming have the potential to address poverty and  
23 equity (especially if emphasis is put on income-generation, value-adding and participation in  
24 value chains), improve nutrition (both in terms of quantity and quality through a diversified  
25 production portfolio) and conserve agrobiodiversity. In small-scale farming, AKST can build on  
26 rich local knowledge. Understanding the agroecology of these systems will be key to optimizing  
27 them. The challenges will be to: (1) to come up with innovations that are both economically viable  
28 and ecologically sustainable (that conserve the natural resource base of agricultural and non-  
29 agricultural ecosystems); (2) develop affordable approaches that integrate local, farmer-based  
30 innovation systems with formal research; (3) respond to social changes such as the feminization  
31 of agriculture and the reduction of the agricultural work force in general by pandemics and the  
32 exodus of the young with their profound implications for decision making and labor availability.  
33 Small-scale farming is increasingly becoming a part-time activity, as households diversify into off-  
34 farm activities (WDR, 2000; Ashley and Maxwell, 2001) and AKST will be more efficient, if this is  
35 taken into account when developing technologies and strategies for this target group.

36  
37 6.1.1.1 Research options for improved productivity

1 To solve the complex, interlinked problems of small farmers in diverse circumstances,  
2 researchers will have to make each time a conscious effort to develop a range of options. There  
3 will be hardly any “one-size-fits-all” solutions (Stoop and Hart, 2006; Franzel et al., 2004). It is  
4 questionable if AKST will have the capacity to respond to the multiple needs of small-scale  
5 diversified farming systems (Table 6.1, 6.2).

6

7 **[Insert Table 6.1]**

8 **[Insert Table 6.2]**

9

10 AKST options that combine short-term productivity benefits for farmers with long-term  
11 preservation of the resource base for agriculture (Douthwaite et al., 2002; Welches and Cherrett,  
12 2002) are likely to be most successful. In small-scale, diversified farming systems, suitable  
13 technologies are typically highly site-specific (Stoop and Hart, 2006) and systems improvements  
14 need to be developed locally, in response to diverse contexts.

15

16 *Integrated, multifactor innovations.* In the past, a distinction was made between step-wise  
17 improvements of individual elements of farming systems and “new farming systems design”.  
18 Stepwise improvement has had more impact (Mettrick, 1993), as it can easily build on local  
19 knowledge. Recently, successful innovations of a more complex nature were developed, often by  
20 farming communities or with strong involvement of farmers. Examples include success cases of  
21 Integrated Pest Management (6.4.3) as well alternative ways of land management such as the  
22 herbicide-based no-till systems of South America (Ekboir, 2003), the mechanized chop-and-  
23 mulch system in Brazil (Denich et al., 2004) or the Quesungual slash-and-mulch systems in  
24 Honduras (FAO, 2005).

25

26 In the future, research addressing single problems will probably become less relevant, as the  
27 respective opportunities for simple, one-factor improvements have been widely exploited already.  
28 It will be more promising to develop innovations that address several factors simultaneously (as in  
29 the above examples) and which will therefore be more context and site specific and more  
30 information-intensive.

31

32 This will ask for a change of emphasis in research for farming system optimization. Research  
33 needs to develop decision support tools that assist extension workers and farmers in optimizing  
34 specific farm enterprises. Such tools already exist for farm economics, site-specific nutrient  
35 management, crop protection and land use planning. Integrative approaches such as RISE  
36 (Response Inducing Sustainability Evaluation) (Häni et al., 2003), which combine economic,  
37 social and ecological aspects, aim at assessing and improving sustainability at the farm level.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

Two-thirds of the rural poor make their living in less favored areas (IFAD, 2001). They will continue to depend on agriculture. Returns on investment in AKST may be limited in these areas due to their inherent disadvantages (remoteness, low-fertility soils, climatic risks) and the highly diverse systems (Maxwell et al., 2001). On the other hand, the impact of innovations on poverty, equity and environmental health may be substantial. Recent examples show that improvements are possible in less favored areas, both for simple technological changes (e.g. more productive crop varieties) as well as for more complex innovations (e.g., the Mucuna cover crop system or the slash-and-mulch system in Honduras).

*Sustainable alternatives to shifting cultivation.* Shifting cultivation was the most widespread form of land use in the tropics and sub-tropics, but over the past decades, a transition occurred to managed fallows or continuous cropping with crop rotation in densely populated areas. Alternatives to slash-and-burn clearing have been developed, which better conserve the organic matter accumulated during the fallow periods. Managed fallows and sound rotations may enhance soil fertility regeneration and even produce additional benefits. This allows for extending cropping periods and reducing fallow periods without compromising sustainability. The resulting “offshoots” of shifting cultivation raise a number of issues to be addressed by AKST. Firstly, it will be important to understand the transition process, its drivers and the newly emerging problems in order to assist farmers. Secondly, for targeted up-scaling of local experiences, it will be crucial to examine the potentials and limitations of different offshoots of shifting cultivation (Franzel et al., 2004).

In less favored areas, low external input agriculture is the rule, as in these circumstances the use of mineral fertilizers and pesticides is risky and only profitable in selected cases (e.g. in high value crops). Most of the successful innovations developed for these areas built strongly on local knowledge.

Due to the site specificity of these innovations, transfer to other unfavorable environments has worked only to a very limited extent (Stoop et al., 2002). The challenge for AKST will be to find ways for combining local knowledge with innovations developed in similar other contexts to generate locally adapted new options. The question development agents will have to address is, under which circumstances they may scale up innovations *per se* and when they should focus on scaling-up innovation *processes* (Franzel et al., 2004). In the scaling-up process, it will be crucial that research and extension act in a careful, empirical and critical way (Tripp, 2006). If wide dissemination of innovations that were successful in a certain context is attempted, this may create exaggerated expectations and hence frustration, if these innovations are not adapted in

1 many other contexts. This happened for example with alley cropping (Carter, 1995; Akyeampong  
2 and Hitimana, 1996; Swinkels and Franzel, 2000; Radersma et al., 2004) or the system of rice  
3 intensification (SRI) developed in Madagascar (Stoop et al., 2002). Agricultural research and  
4 extension still largely works with technologies that rely strongly on external inputs, even in less  
5 favored areas (Stoop, 2002).

6  
7 Potential for innovation in low external input agriculture is highest if research focuses on  
8 understanding and building on local concepts of farming such as the exploitation of within-farm  
9 variation, or intercropping. However, if research and extension work with technologies that rely  
10 strongly on external inputs, farmers will seldom adopt the results (Stoop, 2002). A further  
11 challenge is the dissemination, as farmer-to-farmer diffusion is less important than commonly  
12 assumed for such innovations (Tripp, 2006).

13  
14 Low External Input Sustainable Agriculture (LEISA) comprises organic farming. Organic farming  
15 and conventional (non-labeled) LEISA can mutually benefit from each other. Organic farming with  
16 its stringent rules on external input use has to be even more innovative to solve production  
17 problems, sometimes opening up new avenues. Organic farming has the additional opportunity of  
18 deriving benefits from close links between producers and consumers. The challenge, however, is  
19 to exploit this potential.

20  
21 New low external input technologies have the potential to improve productivity while conserving  
22 the natural resource base, but there is no evidence that they are specifically pro-poor (Tripp,  
23 2006). An important concern in low external input farming is soil nutrient depletion. Across Africa,  
24 nutrient depletion is widespread, with average annual rates of 22 kg N, 2.5 kg P and 15 kg K per  
25 ha of arable land (Stoorvogel and Smaling, 1990). Low external input technologies aiming at soil  
26 fertility improvement can seldom reduce these rates (Onduru et al., 2006).

27  
28  
29 Protected cultivation systems. Protected cultivation of high value crops has expanded rapidly in  
30 the past decades (Castilla, Hernandez, and Abou-Hadid, 2004), especially in the Mediterranean  
31 basin (Box 6.1). At present, however, greenhouse production with limited climate control is  
32 ecologically unsustainable as it produces plastic waste and contaminates water due to intensive  
33 use of pesticides and fertilizers. Demand for innovation thus exists with regard to reducing  
34 environmental impact, as well as enhancing productivity, product quality and diversity.

35  
36 **Insert Box 6.1**

37

1 Scope exists to develop affordable plastic films that improve radiation transmission quantitatively  
2 and qualitatively. Multilayer, long-life, thermal polyethylene films can combine desirable  
3 characteristics of various materials such as anti-drop and anti-dust effects. Photosensitive films  
4 have the potential to influence disease and insect pest behavior by blocking certain bands of the  
5 solar radiation spectrum (Papadakis et al., 2000) or to limit solar heating without reducing light  
6 transmission (Verlodt and Vershaeren, 2000). Protected cultivation has its own, specific pest and  
7 disease populations as well as specific challenges related climate and substrate. Plant breeding  
8 for these specific conditions has the potential to reduce significantly the amount of pollutants  
9 released, while improving productivity. Grafting vegetables to resistant rootstocks is a promising  
10 option to control soilborne pathogens (Oda, 1999; Bletsos, 2005; Edelstein and Ben-Hur, 2006)  
11 and may help to address salt and low temperature stress (Edelstein, 2004), but needs further  
12 research to improve rootstocks. Pest and disease control with the use of antagonists has  
13 developed quickly in protected cultures in Northern Europe and Spain (Van Lenteren, 2000,  
14 2003). There are many site and crop specific possibilities for further development of non-chemical  
15 pest control for protected cultivation.

16

17 Production in low-cost greenhouses has the potential to increase productivity and income  
18 generation, to improve water use efficiency and reduce pollution of the environment. Variability in  
19 climatic and socioeconomic conditions will require the development of location-specific solutions.

20

21 *Post-harvest loss.* Although reduction of post-harvest losses has been an important focus of  
22 AKST and development programs in the past, in many cases the technical innovations faced  
23 sociocultural or socioeconomic problems such as low profit margins, additional workload or  
24 incompatibility with the existing production or post-production system (Bell, 1999). The  
25 divergence between technical recommendations and the realities of rural life translated in many  
26 cases into low adoption rates.

27

28 In specific cases, large shares of food produced are lost after harvest. Yet, the rationale for  
29 improvements in the post-harvest systems has been shifting from loss prevention (Kader, 2005)  
30 to opening new markets opportunities (Hellin and Higman, 2005). Making markets work for the  
31 poor (Ferrand et al., 2004) is emerging as the new rationale of development, reflecting a shift  
32 away from governmental operation of post-harvest tasks to enabling frameworks for private  
33 sector initiatives in this field (Bell et al., 1999).

34

35 *Ecological agricultural systems,* which are low external input systems that rely on natural and  
36 renewable processes, have the potential to improve environmental and social sustainability while  
37 maintaining or increasing levels of food production. There is now increasing evidence of the

1 productive potential of ecological agriculture (Pretty, 1999; Pretty, 2003; Pretty et al., 2006;  
2 Badgley et al., 2007; Magdoff, 2007).

3

4 Some contemporary studies also show the potential of ecological agriculture to promote  
5 environmental services such as biodiversity enhancement, carbon sequestration, soil and water  
6 protection, and landscape preservation (Culliney and Pimentel, 1986; Altieri, 1987; Altieri, 1999;  
7 Altieri, 2002; Albrecht and Kandji, 2003; Cardelli et al., 2004.)

8

9 There is now substantial scientific evidence to show that designing and managing agricultural  
10 systems based on the characteristics of the original ecosystem is not a threat to food security. A  
11 survey of more than 200 projects from Latin America, Africa, and Asia, all of which addressed the  
12 issue of sustainable land use, found a general increase in food production and agricultural  
13 sustainability (Pretty et al., 2003). Likewise, low external input crop systems, when properly  
14 managed, have demonstrated the potential to increase agricultural yield with less impact on the  
15 environment (Bunch, 1999; Tiffen and Bunch, 2002; Rasul and Thapa, 2004; Pimentel et al.,  
16 2005; Badgley, et al., 2007; Scialabba, 2007). A recent investigation comparing organic with  
17 conventional farming experiences from different parts of the world indicates that sustainable  
18 agriculture can produce enough food for the present global population and, eventually an even  
19 larger population, without increasing the area spared for agriculture (Pretty et al., 2003; Badgley  
20 et al., 2007).

21

22 In spite of the advantages of ecological agriculture in combining poverty reduction, environmental  
23 enhancement and food production, few studies address the issues of how to assess the tradeoffs  
24 (Scoones, 1998). Tradeoff analysis to assess dynamic relations between the provision of  
25 ecosystem and economic services can help to harmonize land use options and prevent potential  
26 conflict regarding the access to essential ecosystem services (Viglizzo and Frank, 2006).  
27 Methods are focused on the identification of tradeoffs and critical thresholds between the value of  
28 economic and ecological services in response to different typologies of human intervention.

29

30 In the same way, the concept of ecological agriculture needs a better understanding of the  
31 relationship among the multiple dimensions of rural development, i.e., agricultural productivity,  
32 environmental services, and livelihood. Such questions are still open for further elaboration and  
33 pose a challenge to AKST (Buck et al., 2004; Jackson et al., 2007).

34

35 6.1.1.2 Land use options for enhancing productivity.

36 Productivity of farming systems can be enhanced by more intensive use of space or time.

37 Intercropping (including relay intercropping and agroforestry) is a traditional form of such

1 intensification, widespread in food production in low-income countries, especially in less favored  
2 areas. Growing several crops or intercrops in sequence within a year offers the possibility to  
3 intensify land use in time. This intensification was made possible by changes in the crops and  
4 varieties grown (day-length-neutral or short-season varieties; varieties tolerant to adverse climatic  
5 conditions at the beginning or the end of the growing season) or in land management (no-till  
6 farming, direct seeding etc.). On the other hand, farmers quickly change to simpler cropping  
7 systems, if economic prospects are promising (Abdoellah, et al. 2006).

8

9 The development of new elements (crops or crop varieties, pest and land management options),  
10 which farmers then integrate according to a multitude of criteria into their farm systems will  
11 continue to enhance productivity. Similarly, agroforestry initiatives will be most successful, where  
12 research concentrates on developing a range of options with farmers (Franzel et al., 2004).

13

14 Intercropping has the potential to increase return to land by investing (usually) more labor. The  
15 challenge for AKST will be to strike a balance between a) understanding the interactions in highly  
16 complex intercropping and agroforestry systems (including learning from and with farmers) and b)  
17 developing options that farmers may add to their systems. Adding new elements may offer  
18 potential for farmers to participate in value chains and enhance income generation while ensuring  
19 subsistence. There exists considerable potential for AKST to develop germplasm of agroforestry  
20 species with commercial value (Franzel et al., 2004).

21

22 AKST has contributed substantially to intensification in time, especially in high potential areas.  
23 However, double or triple cropping in rice or rice-wheat production created new challenges on the  
24 most fertile soils (Timsina and Connor, 2001). In spite of such drawbacks, there is promise for  
25 further intensifying land use in time by optimizing rotation management and developing novel  
26 varieties that can cope with adverse conditions.

27

28 *Mixed farming.* In many low-income countries, integration of crop and livestock has advanced  
29 substantially for the past few decades. In densely populated areas, mixed farming systems have  
30 evolved, where virtually all agricultural by-products are transformed by animals (Toumlin and  
31 Guèye, 2003). With the demand for livestock products expected to surge in most low-income  
32 countries, potential for income generation exists. A major challenge for AKST will be to  
33 understand the tradeoffs between residue use for livestock or soil fertility and to optimize nutrient  
34 cycling in mixed systems.

35

36 *Improve sustainability through multifunctional agriculture and ecosystem services.* Ecosystem  
37 services are the conditions and processes through which natural ecosystems sustain and fulfill

1 human life (Daily, 1997) and can be classified in four utilitarian functional groups: a) provisioning  
2 (e.g. food, freshwater), b) regulating (e.g. climate and disturb regulation), c) cultural (e.g.  
3 recreation, aesthetic) and d) supporting (e.g. soil formation, nutrient cycling) (MA, 2005). Given  
4 that many ecosystem services are literally irreplaceable, estimations of socioeconomic benefits  
5 and costs of agriculture should incorporate the value of ecosystem services (Costanza et al.,  
6 1997). Because of the rapid expansion of agriculture on natural lands (woodlands, grasslands)  
7 and the trend to use more external inputs (Hails, 2002; Tilman et al., 2002), the negative impact  
8 of agriculture on ecosystem services supply will require increasing attention (Rounsevell et al.,  
9 2005).

10  
11 The construction of multifunctional agroecosystems can preserve and strengthen a sustainable  
12 flow of ecosystem services (Vereijken, 2002). They are best modeled after the structural and  
13 functional attributes of natural ecosystems (Costanza et al., 1997). Multifunctional  
14 agroecosystems will provide food and fiber, control disturbances (e.g. flood prevention), supply  
15 freshwater (filtration and storage), protect soil (erosion control), cycle nutrients, treat inorganic  
16 and organic wastes, pollinate plants (through insects, birds and bats), control pests and diseases,  
17 provide habitat (refugium and nursery), provide aesthetic and recreational opportunities (camping,  
18 fishing, etc.) and culture (artistic and spiritual). The evaluation of ecosystem services is an  
19 evolving discipline that currently has methodological shortcomings. However, methods are  
20 improving and site-specific valuation will be possible in the coming years. The application of  
21 tradeoff analysis to support the design of multifunctional rural landscapes will demand expertise  
22 on multicriteria analysis and participatory approaches.

23  
24 Frequently recommended measures (Wayne, 1987; Viglizzo and Roberto, 1998) for addressing  
25 multifunctional needs include a) diversification of farming activities in time and space rotational  
26 schemes, b) the incorporation of agroforestry options, c) conservation / rehabilitation of habitat for  
27 wildlife, d) conservation / management of local water resources, f) the enforcement of natural  
28 nutrient flows and cycles (exploiting biological fixation and bio-fertilizers), g) the incorporation of  
29 perennial crop species, h) the well-balanced use of external inputs (fertilizers and pesticides), i)  
30 the application of conservation tillage, j) biological control of pests and diseases, k) integrated  
31 management of pests, l) conservation and utilization of wild and under-utilized species, m) small-  
32 scale aquaculture, n) rainfall water harvesting.

### 34 **6.1.2 Achieving sustainable pest and disease management**

35 Agricultural pests (insect herbivores, pathogens, and weeds) will continue to reduce productivity,  
36 cause post-harvest losses and threaten the economic viability of agricultural livelihoods. New pest  
37 invasions, and the exacerbation of existing pest problems, are likely to increase with future

1 climate change. Warmer winters will lead to an expansion of insect and pathogen over wintering  
2 ranges (Garrett et al., 2006); this process is already under way for some plant pathogens  
3 (Rosenzweig et al., 2001; Baker et al., 2004). Within existing over winter ranges, elevation of pest  
4 damage following warm winters is expected to intensify with climate change (Gan, 2004;  
5 Gutierrez et al., 2006; Yamamura et al., 2006). Increased temperatures are also likely to facilitate  
6 range expansion of highly damaging weeds, which are currently limited by cool temperatures,  
7 such as species of *Cyperus* (Terry, 2001) and *Striga* (Vasey et al., 2005).

8  
9 Several current AKST strategies for managing agricultural pests could become less effective in  
10 the face of climate change, thus potentially reducing the flexibility for future pest management in  
11 the areas of host genetic resistance, biological control, cultural practices, and pesticide use  
12 (Patterson, 1999; Strand, 2000; Stacey, 2003; Bailey, 2004; Ziska and George, 2004; Garrett et  
13 al., 2006). For example, loss of durable host resistance can be triggered by deactivation of  
14 resistance genes with high temperatures, and by host exposure to a greater number of infection  
15 cycles, such as would occur with longer growing seasons under climate change (Strand, 2000;  
16 Garrett et al., 2006). Recent evidence from CO<sub>2</sub>-enrichment studies indicates that weeds can be  
17 significantly more responsive to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> than crops, and that weeds allocate more growth to  
18 root and rhizome than to shoot (Ziska et al., 2004). This shift in biomass allocation strategies  
19 could dilute the future effectiveness of post-emergence herbicides (Ziska and George, 2004;  
20 Ziska and Goins, 2006). Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> is also projected to favor the activity of *Striga* and other  
21 parasitic plant species (Phoenix and Press, 2005), which currently cause high yield losses in  
22 African cereal systems.

23  
24 In addition to range expansion from climate change, the future increase in the trans-global  
25 movement of people and traded goods is likely to accelerate the introduction of invasive alien  
26 species (IAS) into agroecosystems, forests, and aquatic bodies. The economic burden of IAS is  
27 US\$ 300 billion per year, including secondary environmental hazards associated with their  
28 control, and loss of ecosystem services resulting from displacement of endemic species  
29 (Pimentel et al., 2000; GISP, 2004; McNeely, 2006). The costs associated with invasive species  
30 damage, in terms of agricultural GDP, can be double or triple in low-income compared with high-  
31 income countries (Perrings, 2005).

#### 32 33 6.1.2.1 Diversification for pest resistance

34 To enhance the effectiveness of agroecosystem genetic diversity for pest management, some  
35 options include shifting the focus of breeding towards the development of multi- rather than  
36 single-gene resistance mechanisms. Other options include pyramiding of resistance genes

1 where multiple minor or major genes are stacked, expanding the use of varietal mixtures, and  
2 reducing selection pressure through diversification of agroecosystems.

3  
4 *Multigene resistance*, achieved through the deployment of several minor genes with additive  
5 effects rather than a single major gene, could become an important strategy where highly virulent  
6 races of common plant diseases emerge, as in the case of the Ug99 race of wheat stem rust for  
7 which major gene resistance has become ineffective (CIMMYT, 2005). Integration of genomic  
8 tools, such as marker-assisted selection (MAS) to identify gene(s) of interest, will be an important  
9 element of future resistance breeding. Future breeding efforts will need to include greater farmer  
10 involvement for successful uptake and dissemination, e.g., farmer-assisted breeding programs  
11 where farmers work with research and extension to develop locally acceptable new varieties  
12 (Gyawali et al., 2007; Joshi et al., 2007). Better development of seed networks will be needed to  
13 improve local access to quality seed.

14  
15 *Gene pyramiding* (or “stacking”) has the potential to become a future strategy for broadening the  
16 range of pests controlled by single transgenic lines. For example, expressing two different insect  
17 toxins simultaneously in a single plant may slow or halt the evolution of insects that are resistant,  
18 because resistance to two different toxins would have to evolve simultaneously (Gould, 1998;  
19 Bates et al., 2005). Though the probability of this is low, it still occurs in a small number of  
20 generations (Gould, 1998); the long-term effectiveness of this technology is presently not clear.  
21 The use of gene pyramiding also runs the risk of selecting for primary or secondary pest  
22 populations with resistance to multiple genes when pyramiding resistance genes to target a  
23 primary pest or pathogen (Manyangarirwa et al., 2006). Gene flow from stacked plants can  
24 accelerate any undesirable effects of gene flow from single trait transgenic plants. This could  
25 result in faster evolution of weeds or plants with negative effects on biodiversity or human health,  
26 depending on the traits (as reviewed by Heinemann, 2007). Finally, mixtures of transgenes  
27 increase the complexity of predicting unintended effects relevant to food safety and potential  
28 environmental effects ( Kuiper et al., 2001; Heinemann, 2007).

29  
30 *Varietal mixtures*, in which several varieties of the same species are grown together, is a well-  
31 established practice, particularly in small-scale risk-adverse production systems (Smithson and  
32 Lenne, 1996). While this practice generally does not maximize pest control, it can be more  
33 sustainable than many allopathic methods as it does not place high selection pressure on pests,  
34 and it provides yield stability in the face of both biotic and abiotic stresses. For example, varietal  
35 mixtures could play an important role in enhancing the durability of resistance for white-fly  
36 transmitted viruses on cassava (Thresh and Cooper, 2005). Research on varietal mixtures has  
37 been largely neglected; more research is needed to identify appropriate mixtures in terms of both



1 pest resistance and agronomic characteristics, and to backcross sources of pest and disease  
2 resistance into local and introduced germplasm (Smithson and Lenne, 1996).

3

4 In addition to varietal mixtures, future AKST could enhance the use of cropping system  
5 diversification for pest control through supporting and expanding, where appropriate and feasible,  
6 practices such as intercropping, mixed cropping, retention of beneficial noncrop plants, crop  
7 rotation, and improved fallow, and to understand the mechanisms of pest control achieved by  
8 these practices. The underlying principal of using biodiversity for pest control is to reduce the  
9 concentration of the primary host and to create conditions that increase natural enemy  
10 populations (Altieri, 2002). The process of designing systems to achieve multiple functions is  
11 knowledge intensive and often location specific. An important challenge for AKST will be to better  
12 elucidate underlying pest suppression mechanisms in diverse systems, such as through  
13 understanding how pest community genetics influence functional diversity (Clements et al., 2004).  
14 An equally important task will be to preserve local and traditional knowledge in diverse  
15 agroecosystems.

16

#### 17 6.1.2.2 Tools for detection, prediction, and tracking

18 AKST can contribute to development through the enhancement of capacity to predict and track  
19 the emergence of new pest threats. Some recent advances are discussed below.

20

21 *Advances in remote sensing.* Applications include linking remote sensing, pest predictive models,  
22 and GIS (Strand, 2000; Carruthers, 2003), and coupling wind dispersal and crop models to track  
23 wind-dispersed spores and insects (Kuparinen, 2006; Pan et al., 2006). Recent advances in  
24 remote sensing have increased the utility of this technology for detecting crop damage from  
25 abiotic and biotic causal factors, thus remote sensing has good prospect for future integration  
26 with GIS and pest models. The spread of these technologies to low-income countries will likely to  
27 continue to be impeded by high equipment costs and lack of training. The further development  
28 and dissemination of low-cost thermocyclers for PCR (polymerase chain reaction) techniques  
29 could help to address this need. In general, a lack of training and poor facilities throughout most  
30 of the developing countries hinders the ability to keep up with, let alone address, new pest  
31 threats.

32

33 *Advances in molecular-based tools.* Emerging tools such as diagnostic arrays will help to better  
34 identify the emergence of new pest problems, and to differentiate pathovars, biovars, and races  
35 and monitor their movement in the landscape (Garrett et al., 2006). Using molecular methods for  
36 pathogen identification has excellent potential in high-income countries.

37

1 *Advances in modeling pest dynamics.* Recent progress in developing new mathematical  
2 approaches for modeling uncertainties and nonlinear thresholds, and for integrating pest and  
3 climate models, are providing insights into potential pest-host dynamics under climate change  
4 (Bourgeois et al., 2004; Garrett et al., 2006). Increased computational power is likely to facilitate  
5 advances in modeling techniques for understanding the effects of climate change on pests.  
6 However, the predictive capacity of these models could continue, as it currently is, to be  
7 hampered by scale limitations of data generated by growth chamber and field plot experiments,  
8 inadequate information concerning pest geographical range, and poor understanding of how  
9 temperature and CO<sub>2</sub> interactions affect pest-host dynamics (Hoover and Newman, 2004;  
10 Scherm, 2004; Chakaborty, 2005; Zvereva and Kozlov, 2006). Greater focus on addressing these  
11 limitations is needed. Improved modeling capacity is needed for understanding how extreme  
12 climate events trigger pest and disease outbreaks (Fuhrer, 2003). Modeling pests of tropical  
13 agriculture will likely have the greatest impact on helping AKST to address food security  
14 challenges, as these regions will be most negatively affected by climate change. This will require  
15 a substantial investment in training, education, and capacity development.

16

17 *Prevention of invasive alien species.* The invasive alien species issue is complex in that an  
18 introduced organism can be a noxious invasive in one context yet a desirable addition (at least  
19 initially) in another (McNeely, 2006). International assistance programs (development projects,  
20 food aid for disaster relief, and military assistance) are an important means through which IAS are  
21 introduced into terrestrial and freshwater systems, as in the case of fast growing agroforestry  
22 trees, aquaculture species, and weed seed-contaminated grain shipments (Murphy and  
23 Cheesman, 2006). Addressing this problem will require much more detailed information on the  
24 extent of the problem, as well as greater understanding of vectors and pathways. Raising  
25 awareness in the international aid community, such as through toolkits developed by the Global  
26 Invasive Species Program (GISP, 2004) are an important first step, as are pre-release risk  
27 assessments for species planned for deliberate release (Murphy and Cheesman, 2006).

28

29 More rigorous risk assessment methods are needed to determine the pest potential of  
30 accidentally introduced organisms and those intentionally introduced, such as for food and timber  
31 production, biological control, or soil stabilization. Elements needed to build risk assessment  
32 capacity include broad access to scientific literature about introduced species, access to  
33 advanced modeling software and processing time, improved expertise for determining risks  
34 related to invasive characteristics, and development of public awareness campaigns to prevent  
35 introduction (GISP, 2004).

36

1 *Early detection of invasive alien species.* The capacity to survey for introduction of nonnative  
2 species of concern could be enhanced. Where resources for conducting surveys are limited,  
3 surveys can prioritize towards species known to be invasive and that have a high likelihood of  
4 introduction at high risk entry points, or areas with high value biodiversity (GISP, 2004). Develop  
5 contingency planning for economically important IAS.

6  
7 *Management of invasive alien species.* Current mechanical, chemical and biological control  
8 methods are likely to continue to be important in the future. In the case of biological control, the  
9 use of plant pathogens as natural enemies is emerging as an alternative or complement to  
10 classical biological control using arthropods, and it is being piloted in tropical Asia for controlling  
11 the highly damaging weed, *Mikania micrantha* (Ellison et al., 2005). Additionally, new and  
12 emerging genomic tools could aid IAS management, particularly for preventing the conversion of  
13 crops into weeds (Al-Ahmad et al., 2006).

14  
15 Basic quantitative data on the impacts and scale of the IAS problem is still lacking in many  
16 developing countries (Ellison et al., 2005). Gaining greater knowledge of the extent of the  
17 problem will require better cross-sectoral linkages, such as between institutions that serve  
18 agriculture, natural resource management, and environmental protection.

19  
20 Risk assessment for entry, establishment, and spread is a newly developing area for IAS (GISP,  
21 2004). For example, Australia recently instituted a weed risk assessment system based on a  
22 questionnaire scoring method to determine the weed inducing potential of introduced organisms.  
23 Risk assessment is only one tool of many, and will likely have limited utility given that the number  
24 of potentially invasive species far outstrips the ability to assess the risk of each one, and high-  
25 income countries are better equipped to conduct risk assessments than low-income ones. Full  
26 eradication is generally quite difficult to achieve, and requires a significant commitment of  
27 resources. Therefore prioritization of IAS management by potential impacts, such as to those that  
28 alter fundamental ecosystem processes, and to value of habitats is an important starting point .

### 29 30 **6.1.3 Plant root health**

31 The ability to address yield stagnation and declining factor productivity in long-term cropping  
32 systems will depend on efforts to better manage root pests and diseases primarily caused by  
33 plant-parasitic nematodes and plant-pathogenic fungi (Luc et al., 2005; McDonald and Nicol,  
34 2005). Soilborne pests and diseases are often difficult to control because symptoms can be hard  
35 to diagnose and management options are limited, such as with plant-parasitic nematodes.  
36 Nematodes prevent good root system establishment and function, and their damage can diminish  
37 crop tolerance to abiotic stress such as seasonal dry spells and heat waves, and competitiveness

1 to weeds (Abawi and Chen, 1998; Nicol and Ortiz-Monasterio, 2004). With future temperature  
2 increase, crops that are grown near their upper thermal limit in areas with high nematode  
3 pressure, such as in some cereal systems of South and Central Asia (Padgham et al., 2004;  
4 McDonald and Nicol, 2005), could become increasingly susceptible to yield loss from nematodes.  
5 Approaches for managing soil-borne pests and diseases are changing due to increasing pressure  
6 (commercial and environmental) for farmers to move away from conventional broad-spectrum soil  
7 fumigants, and greater recognition of the potential to achieve biological root disease suppression  
8 through practices that improve overall soil health.

#### 9 10 6.1.3.1 Low input options

11 Soil solarization, heating the surface 5-10 cm of soil by applying a tightly sealed plastic cover, can  
12 be a highly effective means of improving root health through killing or immobilizing soilborne  
13 pests, enhancing subsequent crop root colonization by plant-growth promoting bacteria, and  
14 increasing plant-available nitrogen (Chen et al., 1991). Biofumigation of soils is achieved by the  
15 generation of isothiocyanate compounds, which are secondary metabolites released from the  
16 degradation of fresh *Brassica* residues in soil. They have a similar mode of action as  
17 metamsodium, a common synthetic replacement of methyl bromide, and have been used to  
18 control a range of soilborne fungal pathogens including *Rhizoctonia*, *Sclerotinia*, and *Verticillium*  
19 (Matthiessen and Kirkegaard, 2006). For many plant parasitic nematodes, significant control is  
20 often achieved when solarization is combined with biofumigation (Guerrero et al., 2006).

21  
22 Soil solarization is an environmentally sustainable alternative to soil fumigation, though its  
23 application is limited to high value crops in hot sunny environments (Stapleton, et al., 2000), Soil  
24 solarization of nursery seedbeds is an important but underutilized application of this technology,  
25 particularly for transplanted crops in the developing world, where farmers contend with high  
26 densities of soil borne pests and have few if any control measures. Solarization of rice seedbed  
27 soil, which is commonly infested with plant parasitic nematodes, can improve rice productivity in  
28 underperforming rice-wheat rotation areas of South Asia (Banu et al., 2005; Duxbury and Lauren,  
29 2006). This technique has potential for broader application, such as in transplanted vegetable  
30 crops in resource-poor settings. Biofumigation using isothiocyanate-producing *Brassic*as has  
31 reasonably good potential for replacing synthetic soil fumigants, especially when combined with  
32 solarization. Commercial use of biofumigation is occurring on a limited scale. However, there are  
33 significant hurdles to the broad-scale adoption of *Brassica* green manures for biofumigation  
34 related to its highly variable biological activity under field conditions compared with *in vitro* tests,  
35 and to the logistical considerations involved with fitting *Brassic*as into different cropping systems  
36 and growing environments (Matthiessen and Kirkegaard, 2006). The repeated use of chemical  
37 replacements for methyl bromide and biofumigation an lead to a shift in soil microbial

1 communities resulting in enhanced microbial biodegradation of the control agent, which  
2 diminishes its effectiveness for root disease control (Matthiessen and Kirkegaard, 2006).

3

#### 4 6.1.3.2 Research needs and options

5 *Biological control.* Future nematode biocontrol could be made more effective through shifting the  
6 focus from controlling the parasite in soil to one of targeting parasite life stages in the host. This  
7 could be accomplished through the use of biological enhancement of seeds and transplants with  
8 arbuscular mycorrhiza, endophytic bacteria and fungi, and plant-health promoting rhizobacteria,  
9 combined with improved delivery systems using liquid and solid-state fermentation (Sikora and  
10 Fernandez, 2005; Sikora et al., 2005). Better biocontrol potential for both nematodes and fungi  
11 could also be achieved through linking biocontrol research with molecular biology to understand  
12 how colonization by beneficial mutualists affects gene signaling pathways related to induced  
13 systemic resistance in the host (Pieterse et al., 2001).

14

15 *Disease suppression.* Understanding the link between cultural practices that enhance soil health  
16 (crop rotation, conservation tillage, etc.) and the phenomena of soil disease suppressiveness  
17 would aid in developing alternative approaches to chemical soil fumigation, and could enhance  
18 appreciation of local and traditional approaches to managing soilborne diseases. Soil health  
19 indicators are needed that are specifically associated with soilborne disease suppression (van  
20 Bruggen and Termorshuizen, 2003; Janvier et al., 2007). Given the complex nature of soils, this  
21 would necessitate using a holistic, systems approach to develop indicators that could be tested  
22 across different soil types and cropping systems. Advances in genomics and molecular biology  
23 could aid in developing such indicators. Advances in the application of polymerase chain reaction  
24 (PCR)-based molecular methods of soil DNA may enable greater understanding of functional  
25 diversity, and relationships between soil microbial communities and root disease suppression  
26 linked to soil properties and changes in crop management practices (Alabouvette et al., 2004).

27

28 The loss of broad-spectrum biocides, namely methyl bromide, has created opportunities for  
29 investigating new directions in managing root diseases. Synthetic substitutes, such as  
30 chloropicrin and metam sodium, are generally less effective than methyl bromide, can cause  
31 increased germination of nutsedge and others weeds (Martin, 2003), and pose substantial health  
32 risks to farm workers and adjacent communities (MMWR, 2004).

33

34 Biocontrol of soilborne pests and pathogens will likely continue to succeed on the experimental  
35 level, and yet still have only limited impact on field-based commercial applications of biocontrol  
36 until impediments to scaling up biocontrol are addressed. These include the exceedingly high  
37 costs of registration, and lack of private sector investment (Fravel, 2005). The recent success in

1 scaling up nematode biocontrol using a nonpathogenic strain of *Fusarium oxysporum* to control  
2 the highly destructive *Radopholus similis*, causal agent of banana toppling disease (Sikora and  
3 Pokasangree, 2004), illustrate how the alignment of multiple factors— a very effective biocontrol  
4 agent, a highly visible disease problem with significant economic impact, and substantial private-  
5 sector investment— was necessary to allow for development of a potential commercial product.  
6 Long-term and stable organic production systems generally have less severe root disease  
7 problems than conventionally managed systems; however, the specific mechanisms that lead to  
8 soilborne disease suppression remain poorly understood (van Bruggen and Termorshuizen,  
9 2003). Given that soilborne pests and disease play a role in the productivity dip associated with  
10 the transition from conventional to organic production, greater attention towards developing  
11 indicators of root disease suppression would help to better address development and  
12 sustainability goals.

#### 14 **6.1.4 Value chains, market development**

15 Although reduction of post-harvest losses has been an important focus of AKST and development  
16 programs in the past, in many cases the technical innovations faced sociocultural or  
17 socioeconomic problems such as low profit margins, additional workload or incompatibility with  
18 the existing production or post-production system (Bell, Mazaud, and Mueck, 1999). The  
19 divergence between technical recommendations and the realities of rural life translated in many  
20 cases into low adoption rates.

21  
22 In specific cases, large shares of food produced are lost after harvest. Yet, the rationale for  
23 improvements in the post-harvest systems has been shifting from loss prevention (Kader, 2005)  
24 to opening new markets opportunities (Hellin and Higman, 2005). Making markets work for the  
25 poor (Ferrand et al., 2004) is emerging as the new rationale of development, reflecting a shift  
26 away from governmental operation of postharvest tasks to enabling frameworks for private sector  
27 initiatives in this field (Bell et al., 1999).

##### 29 6.1.4.1 Research and capacity development needs

30 Increasing attention is being placed on value and market-chain analysis, up-grading and innovation.  
31 Processing, transport and marketing of agricultural products are increasingly seen as a vertical integration  
32 process from producers to retailers, to reduce transaction costs and improve food quality and safety  
33 (Chowdhuri et al., 2005).

34  
35 In *market-chain analysis*, some of the challenges include improving small-scale farmer  
36 competitiveness and farmers' organizations (Biénabe and Sautier, 2005); institutional capacity

1 building (especially access to information) (Kydd, 2002); and the reinforcement of links and trust  
2 among actors in the market chain (Best et al., 2005).

3  
4 Demand driven production asks for improved market literacy of producers as a prerequisite for  
5 access to supermarkets, a challenge especially for small-scale (Reardon et al, 2004; Hellin et al.,  
6 2005). Building trust among the stakeholders in the market chain is a crucial component of  
7 vertical integration (Best et al., 2005; Chowdhury et al., 2005; Giuliani, 2007). It enhances  
8 transparency of the market chain and exchange of information. Typically, actors in the market  
9 chains are at first skeptical about information sharing; when they realize that all can benefit from  
10 more transparency along the market chain they more readily provide information. Maximizing  
11 added value at farm or village level is a promising option for small-scale farmers; rural  
12 agroenterprises and household level processing can increase income generation (Best, Ferris,  
13 and Schiavone, 2005; Giuliani, 2007).

14  
15 The creation of community-based organizations or farmers groups can result in economies of  
16 scale. Collectively, small-scale farmers are able to pool their resources and market as a group,  
17 hence reducing transaction costs (Keizer et al., 2007). It can improve their access to resources  
18 such as inputs, credit, training, transport and information, increase bargaining power (Bosc et al.,  
19 2002), and facilitate certification and labeling.

20  
21 Better market access is often a key concern of small-scale farmers (Bernet et al., 2005).  
22 Promising market options directly linked to rural poor small-scale producers and processors  
23 include fair-trade channels, private-public partnership, and the creation of local niche markets  
24 (eco-labeling, certification of geographical indications of origin, tourism-oriented sales outlets,  
25 etc.). Crops neglected so far by formal research and extension hold promise for up-grading value  
26 chains (Hellin and Highman, 2005; Gruère et al., 2006; Giuliani, 2007) in which small-scale  
27 farmers have a comparative advantage.

28  
29 *Value-chain analysis* investigates the complexity of the actors involved and how they affect the  
30 production-to-consumption process. It incorporates production activities (cultivation,  
31 manufacturing and processing), non-production activities (design, finance, marketing and  
32 retailing), and governance (Bedford et al., 2001). The analysis of livelihoods of small-scale  
33 producers, processors and traders and their current and potential relation to markets is a starting  
34 point in ensuring that markets benefit the poor. Analyzing the market chain and the requirements  
35 and potentials of all its actors allows for identifying interventions along the chain likely to provide  
36 benefits to low-income households (Giuliani, 2007).

37

1 Investments in value chain research have the potential to improve equity by opening up income  
2 opportunities for small-scale farmers. The challenge will be to make small-scale farmers  
3 competitive and to identify opportunities and develop value chains which build on their potential  
4 (labor availability, high flexibility). Increasing requirements of the market regarding food quality,  
5 safety and traceability will limit small-scale farmer participation in certain value chains. Further,  
6 access to market may be limited by inadequate infrastructure, such road systems and refrigerated  
7 transport and storage.

8  
9 Successes in value chain development have been achieved through an extensive consultation processes  
10 (Bernet et al., 2005) that generate group innovations based on well-led and well-structured participatory  
11 processes. These processes stimulate interest, trust and collaboration among members of the chain. The  
12 costs and benefits of such approaches will have to be carefully assessed to determine where investment  
13 is justified; e.g., investments for up-grading the market chain could be high compared with potential  
14 benefits for niche products with limited market volume.

## 15 16 **6.2 Improve Productivity and Sustainability of Livestock Systems**

### 17 **6.2.1 On-farm options**

18 *Mixed systems.* Mixed crop-livestock systems can contribute to sustainable farming (Steinfeld et  
19 al., 1997). Improving the performance of mixed crop-livestock production systems and promoting  
20 livestock production, particularly on small-scale farms can be attained by providing access to  
21 affordable inputs for small-scale livestock keepers. Along with inputs, adequate knowledge and  
22 technologies for on-farm nutrient cycling, on-farm production of feed and fodder, and the use of  
23 crop residues and crop by-products, can also provide benefits to small-scale producers.

24  
25 Intensifying the livestock component in these systems increases the availability of farm yard  
26 manure, leading to increased fodder production and increased crop yields. More research is  
27 needed on the storage and application of farm yard manure, the conservation of cultivated fodder  
28 and crop residues, and the use of crop by-products as animal feed.

29  
30 Livestock keeping can improve health and nutrition in many small households and generate  
31 additional income and employment (ILRI, 2006), even when households have limited resources  
32 such as land, labor and capital (PPLPI, 2001; Bachmann, 2004). Output per farm may be small,  
33 but the combined effect of many small-scale enterprises can be large, e.g., small-scale dairy in  
34 India (Kurup, 2000), piggery in Vietnam (FAO, 2006), and backyard poultry in Africa (Guye,  
35 2000).

36



1 *Extensive systems.* There is little scope for extensive livestock production systems to further  
2 extend the area presently being grazed without environmentally unsustainable deforestation  
3 (Steinfeld et al., 2006). In some areas even pasture land is decreasing as it is converted into crop  
4 land, often resulting in land use conflicts (ECAPAPA, 2005). Where pasture areas with open  
5 access remain more or less stable, productivity of land and ultimately of livestock is threatened  
6 due to overstocking and overgrazing.

7  
8 Livestock productivity can be increased through the improvement of pasture and rangeland  
9 resources and better animal health. Better animal health may require improved access to  
10 veterinary services, such as the establishment of systems of community based animal health  
11 workers (Leonard et al., 2003). Feeding conserved fodder and feeds (primarily crop by-products)  
12 may help overcome seasonal shortages, while planting fodder trees, more systematic rotational  
13 grazing and fencing may improve grazing areas. Tree planting may gain further importance when  
14 linked to carbon trade programs. Fencing, on the other hand, may not be socially or culturally  
15 acceptable, in particular in areas with communal grazing land (IFAD, 2002). Land use strategies  
16 that include participatory approaches are more effective at avoiding conflicts (ECAPAPA, 2005).

17  
18 Biological complexity and diversity are necessary for survival in traditional pastoral communities  
19 (Ellis and Swift, 1988). Long term conservative strategies often work best in traditional systems.  
20 The introduction of new breeding techniques (e.g., sexing of sperm straw) might cause a rapid  
21 increase in the number of cattle, but may also lead to the disappearance of local breeds and a  
22 reduction in the genetic diversity of rustic breeds of cattle, which are well adapted to extreme  
23 environments.

24  
25 The overall potential of pastoral grazing systems is high (Hesse and MacGregor, 2006); the  
26 primary issue is the environmental sustainability of these systems (Steinfeld et al., 2006). Hence  
27 options to improve productivity must focus more on the application of management than the  
28 technology (ILRI, 2006).

29  
30 *Intensive systems.* Increasingly, intensive livestock production trade is associated with a fear of  
31 contamination of air and water resources (de Haan et al., 1997; FAO, 2006). Future systems will  
32 need to consider human health aspects as well as the whole livestock food value chain (fodder  
33 and animal feed production, processing and marketing of products, etc). Since cross-regional  
34 functions such as assembly, transport, processing and distribution can cause other externalities,  
35 they must be assessed as part of an integrated system. Intensive systems are prone to disease  
36 and animals can spread zoonotic diseases like tuberculosis or bird flu that can affect humans  
37 (LEAD, 2000).

1

2 Improvements in intensive livestock production systems include locating units away from highly  
3 populated areas, and using management practices and technologies that minimize water, soil and  
4 air contamination.

5

### 6 **6.3 Breeding Options for Improved Environmental and Social Sustainability**

7 Climate change coupled with population growth will produce unprecedented stress on food  
8 security. Abiotic stresses such as drought and salinity may reduce yields worldwide by up to 50%  
9 (Jauhar, 2006). Increasing demand cannot always be met by increasing the land devoted to  
10 agriculture (Kumar, 2006), however, it may be possible to improve plant productivity. Traits that  
11 are the focus of abiotic stress resistance include optimized adaptation of temperature-dependent  
12 enzymes (to higher or lower temperatures), altering day-length regulation of flower and fruit  
13 development, optimization of photosynthesis including circumventing inherent limitations in C<sub>3</sub>  
14 and C<sub>4</sub> pathways in plants (Wenzel, 2006).

15

#### 16 6.3.1.1 Options for conventional plant breeding

17 The following options apply to plant breeding to help meet world demand for nutrition and higher  
18 yields in low external input production systems and lower resource demands in high external  
19 input production systems. However useful these innovations might be, biotechnology *per se*  
20 cannot achieve development and sustainability goals. Therefore, it is critical for policy makers to  
21 holistically consider biotechnology impacts beyond productivity goals, and address wider societal  
22 issues of capacity building, social equity and local infrastructure.

23

24 Modern, conventional and participatory plant breeding approaches play a significant role in the  
25 development of new crop varieties (Dingkuhn et al., 2006). The exodus of a specialist workforce  
26 in plant breeding (Baenziger et al., 2006), especially from the public sector, is a worrisome trend  
27 for maintaining and increasing global capacity for crop improvement. Critical to improved plant  
28 breeding is ensuring the continuity of specialist knowledge in plant breeding. Approaches that  
29 encourage research in the field and continuity of career structure for specialists are key to the  
30 continuation of conventional plant breeding knowledge.

31

32 There is a need for new varieties of crops with high productivity in current and emerging marginal  
33 and unfavorable (e.g. water stressed) environments; resource limited farming systems; intensive  
34 land and resource use systems; areas of high weed pressure (Dingkuhn et al., 2006); and  
35 bioenergy. Access will improve productivity, and decrease poverty and hunger by ensuring  
36 access to locally produced high quality seeds and farmer to farmer exchanges, encouraging local

1 knowledge, safeguarding intellectual property, and further exploiting the biological diversity of  
2 crop wild relatives.

3

4 Plant breeding is facilitating the creation of new genotypes with higher yield potentials in a greater  
5 range of environments (Dingkuhn et al., 2006; Hajjar and Hodgkin, 2007) mainly through  
6 recruiting genes from within the gene pool of interbreeding plants and also through biotechnology  
7 assisted hybridization and tissue regeneration (Wenzel, 2006).

8

9 Crop biodiversity is maintained both through *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation in the genomes of  
10 plants from which crops were derived, and in the genomes of crop relatives (Brush and Meng,  
11 1998). The value of traits sourced from wild relatives has been estimated at US \$340 million to  
12 the US economy every year (Hajjar and Hodgkin, 2007). Traits such as pest and disease  
13 resistance are usually determined by single genes. Wild relatives have so far contributed  
14 modestly as a source of genes for introduction of multigene traits, such as abiotic stress  
15 tolerances, but there is considerable diversity still to be tapped (Hajjar and Hodgkin, 2007).

16

17 In developing countries, public plant breeding institutions are common but their continued  
18 existence is threatened by globalization and privatization (Maredia, 2001; Thomas, 2005). Plant  
19 breeding activities differ between countries; public investment in genetic improvement may  
20 benefit from research units that include local farming communities (Brush and Meng, 1998).  
21 Moreover, differences in intellectual property protection philosophies could endanger *in situ*  
22 conservation as a resource for breeding. For example, patent protection and forms of plant  
23 variety protection place a greater value on the role of breeders than that of local communities that  
24 maintain gene pools through *in situ* conservation (Srinivasan, 2003).

25

26 Options for strengthening conservation in order to preserve plant genetic diversity include:

- 27 • Integrating material on the importance of biodiversity into curricula at all educational  
28 levels;
- 29 • Channeling more resources into public awareness at CGIAR and NGO system level;
- 30 • Facilitating national programs to conduct discussions with farmers about the long-  
31 term consequences of losing agrobiodiversity;
- 32 • Studying and facilitating the scaling up of indigenous agroecosystems that feature a  
33 high degree of agrobiodiversity awareness;
- 34 • Involving farmers in a fully participatory manner in research focused on  
35 agrobiodiversity conservation;
- 36 • Undertaking surveys of farmers and genebanks to establish which communities want  
37 their landraces back, and to find out if the landrace is still maintained in a genebank.

- 1           • Developing sustainable reintroduction campaigns.
- 2           • Developing a system whereby genebanks regenerate landraces and maintained
- 3           them in farmers' fields: a hybrid *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation system.
- 4           • Involving farmers in the characterization of landraces to increase exposure and
- 5           possible utilization of the material at farm level.
- 6           • Promoting the development of registration facilities that recognize a given landrace
- 7           as the indigenous property of a particular area or village to enhance the importance
- 8           of the landrace as an entity that is a part of local heritage.
- 9           • Developing and promoting viable and sustainable multistakeholder incentive
- 10          schemes for communities who maintain local material in their agroecosystem.

11

12          Provided that steps are taken to maintain local ownership and control of crop varieties, plant  
13          breeding remains a viable option for meeting development and sustainability goals. It will be  
14          important to find a balance between exclusive access secured through intellectual property (IP)  
15          mechanisms and the need for local farmers and researchers to develop locally adapted varieties  
16          (Srinivasan, 2003; Cohen, 2005). An initial approach could include facilitating NGOs to help  
17          develop the capacity of local small-scale farmers, and providing farmer organizations with  
18          advisers to guide their investments in local plant improvement.

19

#### 20          6.3.1.2 Optimize the pace and productivity of plant breeding

21          Biotechnology and associated nanotechnologies provide tools that contribute toward the  
22          achievement of development and sustainability goals. Biotechnology has been described as the  
23          manipulation of living organisms to produce goods and services useful to human beings (Eicher  
24          et al., 2006; Zepeda, 2006). In this inclusive sense, biotechnology includes traditional and local  
25          knowledge (TK) and the contributions to cropping practices, selection and breeding made by  
26          individuals and societies for millennia (Adi, 2006); modern biotechnology includes what arises  
27          from the use of molecular tools. Most obvious in this category is genetic engineering, to create  
28          genetically modified/engineered organisms (GMOs/GEOs) through transgenic technology by  
29          insertion or deletion of genes. It would also include the application of genomic techniques and  
30          marker assisted breeding or selection (MAB or MAS).

31

32          Combining plants with different and desirable traits can be slow because the genes for the traits  
33          are located in many different places in the genome and may segregate separately during  
34          breeding. Breeding augmented by molecular screening may yield rapid advances in existing  
35          varieties. This process, however, is limited by breeding barriers or viability in the case of cell  
36          fusion approaches, and there may be a limit to the range of traits available within species to  
37          existing commercial varieties and wild relatives. In any case, breeding is still the most promising

1 approach to introducing quantitative trait loci (Wenzel, 2006). Emerging genomics approaches  
2 are showing promise for alleviating both limitations.

3

4 *Genomics*. Whole genome analysis coupled with molecular techniques can accelerate the  
5 breeding process. Further development of approaches such as using molecular markers through  
6 MAS will accelerate identification of individuals with the desired combinations of genes, because  
7 they can be rapidly identified among hundreds of progeny as well as improve backcross  
8 efficiencies (Baenziger et al., 2006; Reece and Haribabu, 2007). The range of contributions that  
9 MAS can make to plant breeding are being explored and are not exhausted (e.g. Kumar, 2006;  
10 Wenzel, 2006). It thus seems reasonable that MAS has the potential to contribute to development  
11 and sustainability goals in the long term, provided that researchers consistently benefit from  
12 funding and open access to varieties. MAS is not expected to make a significant improvement to  
13 the rate of creating plants with new polygenic traits, but with future associated changes in  
14 genomics this expectation could change (Baenziger et al., 2006; Reece and Haribabu, 2007).

15

16 Regardless of how new varieties are created, care needs to be taken when they are released  
17 because they could become invasive or problem weeds, or the genes behind their desired  
18 agronomic traits may introgress into wild plants threatening local biodiversity (Campbell et al.,  
19 2006; Mercer et al., 2007).

20

21 MAS has other social implications because it favors centralized and large scale agricultural  
22 systems and thus may conflict with the needs and resources of poor farmers (Reece and  
23 Haribabu, 2007). However, breeding coupled to MAS for crop improvement is expected to be  
24 easily integrated into most regulatory frameworks and meet little or no market resistance,  
25 because it does not involve producing transgenic plants (Reece and Haribabu, 2007). Varieties  
26 that are developed in this fashion can be covered by many existing IP rights instruments (e.g.  
27 Baenziger et al., 2006; Heinemann, 2007) and would be relatively easy for farmers to experiment  
28 with under “farmers’ privilege” provided that suitable *sui generis* systems are in place ( Sechley  
29 and Schroeder, 2002; Leidwein, 2006). The critical limitation of MAS is its ultimate dependence  
30 on plant breeding specialists to capture the value of new varieties; unfortunately, current and  
31 projected numbers of these specialists is inadequate (Reece and Haribabu, 2007).

32

33 *Transgenic (GM) plants*. Recombinant DNA techniques allow rapid introduction of new traits  
34 determined by genes that are either outside the normal gene pool of the species or for which the  
35 large number of genes and their controls would be very difficult to combine through breeding. An  
36 emphasis on extending tolerance to both biotic (e.g., pests) and abiotic (e.g., water stress) traits  
37 using transgenes is relevant to future needs.

1

2 Assessment of transgenic (GM) crops is heavily influenced by perspective. For example, the  
3 number of years that GM crops have been in commercial production (approximately 10 years),  
4 amount of land under cultivation (estimated in 2007 at over 100 million ha) and the number of  
5 countries with some GM agriculture (estimated in 2007 at 22) (James, 2007) can be interpreted  
6 as evidence of their popularity. Another interpretation of this same data is that the highly  
7 concentrated cultivation of GM crops in a few countries (nearly three-fourths in only the US and  
8 Argentina, with 90% in the four countries including Brazil and Canada), the small number of  
9 tested traits (at this writing, mainly herbicide and pest tolerance) and the shorter-term experience  
10 with commercial GM cultivation outside of the US (as little as a year in Slovakia) (James, 2007),  
11 indicate limited uptake and confidence in the stability of transgenic traits (Nguyen and Jehle,  
12 2007).

13

14 Whereas there is evidence of direct financial benefits for farmers in some agriculture systems,  
15 yield claims, adaptability to other ecosystems and other environmental benefits, such as reduced  
16 alternative forms of weed and pest control chemicals, are contested (Pretty, 2001; Villar et al.,  
17 2007), leaving large uncertainties as to whether this approach will make lasting productivity gains.  
18 The more we learn about what genes control important traits, the more genomics also teaches us  
19 about the influence of the environment and genetic context on controlling genes (Kroymann and  
20 Mitchell-Olds, 2005; MacMillan et al., 2006) and the complexity of achieving consistent,  
21 sustainable genetic improvements. Due to a combination of difficult to understand gene by  
22 environment interactions and experience to date with creating transgenic plants, some plant  
23 scientists are indicating that the rate at which transgenic plants will contribute to a sustained  
24 increase in future global food yields is exaggerated (Sinclair et al., 2004).

25

26 Adapting any type of plant (whether transgenic or conventionally bred) to new environments also  
27 has the potential to convert them into weeds or other threats to food and materials production  
28 (Lavergne and Molofsky, 2007; Heinemann, 2007). This problem is particularly relevant to  
29 transgenes because (1) they tend to be tightly linked packages in genomes, making for efficient  
30 transmission by breeding (unlike many traits that require combinations of chromosomes to be  
31 inherited simultaneously), and (2) the types of traits of most relevance to meeting development  
32 and sustainability goals in the future are based on genes that adapt plants to new environments  
33 (e.g., drought and salt tolerance). Through gene flow, wild relatives and other crops may become  
34 more tolerant to a broader climatic range and thus further threaten sustainable production  
35 (Mercer et al., 2007). An added complication is that these new weeds may further undermine  
36 conservation efforts. The emergence of a new agricultural or environmental weed species can  
37 occur on a decade (or longer) scale. For example, it can take hundreds of years for long-lived

1 tree species to achieve populations large enough to reveal their invasive qualities (Wolfenbarger  
2 and Phifer, 2000). These realities increase uncertainty in long term safety predictions.

3

4 Transgene flow also creates potential liabilities (Smyth et al., 2002). The liability is realized when  
5 the flow results in traditional, economic or environmental damage (Kershen, 2004; Heinemann,  
6 2007). Traditional damage is harm to human health or property. Economic damage could occur if  
7 a conventional or organic farmer lost certification and therefore revenue because of adventitious  
8 presence. Environmental damage could result from, for example, harm to wildlife.

9

10 There are a limited number of properly designed and independently peer-reviewed studies on  
11 human health (Domingo, 2000; Pryme and Lembcke, 2003). Among the studies that have been  
12 published, some have provided evidence for potential undesirable effects (Pryme and Lembcke,  
13 2003; Pusztai et al., 2003). Taken together, these observations create concern about the  
14 adequacy of testing methodologies for commercial GM plants fueling public skepticism and the  
15 possibility of lawsuits. A class-action lawsuit was filed by USA consumers because they may  
16 have inadvertently consumed food not approved for human consumption (a GM variety of maize  
17 called Starlink) because of gene flow or another failure of segregation. The lawsuit ended with a  
18 settlement against the seed producer Aventis. This suggests that consumers may have grounds  
19 for compensation, at least in the USA, even if their health is not affected by the transgenic crop  
20 (Kershen, 2004).

21

22 Farmers, consumers and competitors, may be the source of claims against, or the targets of  
23 claims from, seed producers (Kershen, 2004; Center for Food Safety, 2005; Eicher et al., 2006).  
24 For example, when non-GM corn varieties from Pioneer Hi-Bred were found in Switzerland to  
25 contain novel Bt genes, the crops had to be destroyed, and compensation paid to farmers (Smyth  
26 et al., 2002).

27

28 Even if liability issues could be ignored, the industry will remain motivated to track transgenes and  
29 their users because the genes are protected as IP. Transgene flow can create crops with mixed  
30 traits because of “stacking” (two transgenes from different owners in the same genome) or mixed  
31 crops (from seed mediated gene flow or volunteers), resulting in potential IP conflicts. IP  
32 protection includes particular genes and plant varieties as well as techniques for creating  
33 transgenic plants and product ideas, such as the use of Bt-sourced Cry toxins as plant-expressed  
34 insecticides. Broad IP claims are creating what some experts call “patent thickets”; the danger of  
35 thickets is that no single owner can possess all the elements in any particular transgenic plant  
36 (Thomas, 2005).

37

1 Release of insect resistant GM potatoes in South Africa illustrates the complexity that IP and  
2 liability create for transgenic crops. The potato has elements that are claimed by two different  
3 companies. One of the IP owners has been unwilling to license the IP to South Africa for fear of  
4 liability should the potatoes cross into neighboring countries (Eicher et al., 2006).

5  
6 The harms associated with transgene flow might be addressed by a combination of physical and  
7 biological strategies for containment (for a comprehensive list, see NRC, 2004). However, no  
8 single method and possibly no combination of methods would be wholly adequate for preventing  
9 all flow even though for some genes and some environments, flow might be restricted to  
10 acceptable levels (Heinemann, 2007). Future strategies for containment involving sterilization  
11 (i.e., genetic use restriction technologies, GURTs) remain highly controversial because of their  
12 potential to cause both unanticipated environmental harm and threaten economic or food security  
13 in some agroecological systems ( Shand, 2002; Heinemann, 2007).

14  
15 For transgenic approaches to continue to make significant contributions in the long term, a  
16 substantial increase in public confidence in safety assessments will be needed (Eicher et al.,  
17 2006; Herrero et al., 2007; Marvier et al., 2007); conflicts over the free-use of genetic resources  
18 must be resolved; and the complex legal environment in which transgenes are central elements  
19 of contention will need further consideration.

20  
21 *Epigenetic modification of traits.* Epigenes are defined as units of inheritance that are not strictly  
22 based on the order of nucleotides in a molecule of DNA (Strohman, 1997; Heinemann and  
23 Roughan, 2000; Gilbert, 2002; Ashe and Whitelaw, 2007; Bird, 2007). A growing number of traits  
24 are based on epigenetic inheritance, although at present most of these are associated with  
25 disease, such as Mad Cow Disease and certain forms of cancer.

26  
27 In the future, it may be possible to introduce traits based on epigenes. For example, double-  
28 stranded RNA (dsRNA) is the basis of at least two commercial transgenic plants and is proposed  
29 for use in more (Ogita et al., 2003; Prins, 2003). Small dsRNA molecules appear to be the basis  
30 for the trait in “flavr savr” tomatoes—even though at the time of development the epigenetic  
31 nature of the modification was probably not known or fully understood (Sanders and Hiatt,  
32 2005)— and the basis for viral resistance in papaya (Tennant et al., 2001). In these cases, the  
33 epigene is dependent upon a corresponding change at the DNA level, but in time it will be  
34 possible to use the epigenetic qualities of dsRNA to infectiously alter traits without also altering  
35 the DNA content of the recipient genome using rDNA techniques. Such promise has already been  
36 demonstrated using nematodes where feeding, or soaking the worm in a liquid bath of dsRNA,  
37 was sufficient for systemic genetic modification of the worm and the stable transmission of the



1 epigene for at least two generations (Fire et al., 1998; Cogoni and Macino, 2000). The effects of  
2 dsRNA also can be transmitted throughout a conventional plant that has been grafted with a limb  
3 modified to produce dsRNA (Palauqui et al., 1997; Vaucheret et al., 2001; Yoo et al., 2004).

4  
5 *RNA-based techniques* will accelerate research designed to identify which genes contribute to  
6 complex traits and when and where in the organisms those genes are expressed (“turned on”).  
7 Generally, dsRNA causes transient, long-term, sometimes heritable gene silencing (turns genes  
8 “off”). While silencing that occurs by the general pathways controlled by dsRNA molecules are  
9 targeted to sequence matches between the dsRNA and the silenced genes, there are often  
10 effects on non-target genes as well. The number of genes simultaneously silenced by a single  
11 dsRNA (including the targets) can number in the hundreds (Jackson et al., 2003; Jackson and  
12 Linsley, 2004; Jackson et al., 2006), and a variety of dsRNAs with no sequence similarity can  
13 silence the same genes (Semizarov et al., 2003).

14  
15 Once established, the effects of dsRNA may persist in some kinds of organisms, being  
16 transmitted to offspring. The instigating event is the initial combination of genetic elements with  
17 similar DNA sequences, but the silencing effect may persist even in hybrids that retain a single  
18 copy of the gene.

19  
20 Furthermore, not all genes that are silenced remain so, nor are all plants grafted with tissues from  
21 silenced plants capable of acquiring the silenced phenotype. The science of infectious gene  
22 silencing is still young, leaving gaps in understanding how the molecules are transmitted and  
23 maintained, and in how the phenotype is regulated or reversed. If this or other epigenetic  
24 strategies for genetic modification are in time adopted, they must benefit from fundamentally new  
25 kinds of safety assessments in both their environmental and human health context. Importantly,  
26 these assessments should be conducted by competent researchers that are independent of the  
27 developing industry.

### 28 29 **6.3.2 Livestock breeding options**

#### 30 6.3.2.1 Technologies and research options

31 Technologies such as artificial insemination and embryo transfer, which are routine in  
32 industrialized countries have been successfully transferred and introduced in other parts of the  
33 world (Wieser et al., 2000). However, breeding technologies are not exploited to the extent  
34 possible because animals are not adapted to local conditions, logistical problems and poor  
35 support for breeding services and information management (Ahuja et al., 2000). There is scope to  
36 further develop conventional breeding technologies, in particular through North-South

1 cooperation. To be effective at meeting development goals breeding policies, programs and plans  
2 need to be location specific (Kurup, 2003; Chacko and Schneider, 2005).

3  
4 *Genomics*. Thus far the impact of genomics in livestock agriculture is limited to the use of  
5 transgenic animals such as chickens and cattle to produce pharmaceutical or therapeutic proteins  
6 in eggs and milk (Gluck, 2000). Genomics for diagnostics and animal vaccine development, and  
7 in feed production and formulation (Machuka, 2004) may further boost the livestock industry,  
8 although the competition from alternative sources will probably be strong (Twyman et al., 2003;  
9 Chen, 2005; Ma et al., 2005). Moreover, all these new technologies create safety risks and may  
10 not always increase sustainable production. Hence, applications should be thoroughly evaluated  
11 to ensure that they do not also undermine development and sustainability goals.

12  
13 *Transgenic livestock*. There are currently no transgenic food animals in commercial production  
14 and none likely in the short term (van Eenennaam, 2006). Over the next 10-50 years there is  
15 some potential for development and introduction of transgenic animals or birds with disease  
16 resistance, increased or higher nutritional value meat or milk production, or as biofactories for  
17 pharmaceuticals (Machuka, 2004). The science and technology is available, but the barriers  
18 include regulatory requirements, market forces and IP, safety concerns and consumer  
19 acceptance, i.e., the same range of issues as described for crops (Powell, 2003; van  
20 Eenennaam, 2006; van Eenennaam and Olin, 2006).

21  
22 Responding to the increased demand for livestock products without additional threats to the  
23 environment is a major challenge for agriculture and for AKST. One option for satisfying the  
24 additional demand for animal protein is to use meat from monogastric animals (pigs and poultry)  
25 and eggs. Feed conversion rates and growth for monogastric animals are better than for  
26 ruminants, which is one reason why the increasing demand for meat tends to be met with chicken  
27 and pork. This development may be positive with regard to the direct pressure on (grazing) land  
28 caused by ruminants, but has resulted in the establishment of large pig and poultry production  
29 units which are often placed in peri-urban areas. Large volumes of animal feed are produced  
30 elsewhere and transported, while disposal of waste from these large units has become an  
31 environmental issue (FAO, 2006). Although these large livestock farms may generate some  
32 employment opportunities, the capital required excludes most small-scale farmers. One approach  
33 to increase the total efficiency and sustainability of the intensive livestock production system is  
34 area-wide integration, i.e., the integration of production with cropping activities. The main  
35 objective is to link these specialized activities on a regional scale to limit their environmental  
36 damage and enhance social benefits (LEAD, 2000).

37

1 Recent outbreaks of diseases, including some that threaten human as well animal health,  
2 highlight the need to scrutinize large livestock units and their sustainability in wider terms with  
3 regard to environment and health (Steinfeld et al., 2006).

4  
5 For small-scale farmers in rural areas, local markets will remain the primary outlets for their  
6 products. These local markets may also provide opportunities for processed products. However,  
7 processing of meat and livestock products into high value niche produces for distant markets  
8 might be economically attractive. Some associated risks include the required investment in  
9 marketing for a successful enterprise may decrease the “additional” product value. In addition,  
10 rural processors may not be able to meet the quality standards to compete for distant urban or  
11 export markets (ILRI, 2006).

12  
13 Further extension of grazing land to produce meat from ruminants is not a sustainable way to  
14 meet the growing demand for meat and livestock products (Steinfeld et al., 2006). Therefore,  
15 pastoralists and rangelands livestock keepers will only benefit from an increased demand for  
16 livestock products if they are able to improve their present production systems by efficient use of  
17 existing resources, i.e. breed improvement (Köhler-Rollefson, 2003) improvement of animal  
18 health and disease control (Ramdas and Ghotge, 2005), of grazing regime and pasture  
19 management, including the planting of fodder trees, and if possible supplementary feeding during  
20 times of limited grazing. Where there is potential for mixed farming, policies need to facilitate the  
21 transition of grazing systems into mixed farming systems in the semi-arid and sub-humid tropics  
22 through integrating crops and livestock (Steinfeld et al., 1997).

## 23 24 25 26 **6.4 Improve Forestry and Agroforestry Systems as Providers of Multifunctionality**

### 27 **6.4.1 On-farm options**

28 The ecological benefits of low-input agroforestry systems are more compatible with small-scale  
29 tropical/sub-tropical farming systems than for large farms. However, the coincidence of land  
30 degradation and poverty is also greatest in the tropics and sub-tropics and there is therefore  
31 considerable relevance of agroforestry for the attainment of development and sustainability goals.

32 Disseminating and implementing a range of agroforestry practices, tailored to particular social  
33 and environmental conditions, on a wide scale will require large-scale investment in NARS,  
34 NARES, NGOs and CBOs, with support from ICRAF and regional agroforestry centers.

35 Rehabilitation of degraded land and improving soil fertility can be accomplished by promoting a  
36 range of ecological/environmental services such as: a) erosion control, b) nutrient cycling, c)  
37 protection of biodiversity in farming systems, d) carbon sequestration, e) promoting natural

1 enemies of pests, weeds and diseases, f) improving water availability, (g) protect biodiversity in  
2 farming systems and the restoration of agroecological function.

3

4 Agroforestry practices can also improve soil fertility in the future, which is crucial for achieving  
5 food security, human welfare and preserving the environment for smallholder farms (Sanchez,  
6 2002; Oelberman et al., 2004; Schroth et al., 2004, Jiambo, 2006; Rasul and Thapa, 2006). An  
7 integrated soil fertility management approach that combines agroforestry technologies –  
8 especially improved fallows of leguminous species and biomass transfer – with locally available  
9 and reactive phosphate rock (e.g. Minjingu of northern Tanzania) can increase crop yields  
10 several-fold (Jama et al., 2006).

11

12 Tree crops can be established within a land use mosaic to protect watersheds and reduce runoff  
13 of water and erosion restoring ecological processes as the above- and below-ground niches are  
14 filled by organisms that help to perform helpful functions such as cycle nutrients and water  
15 (Anderson and Sinclair, 1993), enrich organic matter, and sequester carbon. (Collins and  
16 Qualset, 1999; McNeely and Scherr, 2003; Schroth et al., 2004. Many of these niches can be  
17 filled by species producing useful and marketable food and non-food products, increasing total  
18 productivity and economic value (Leakey, 2001ab; Leakey and Tchoundjeu, 2001). A healthier  
19 agroecosystem should require fewer purchased chemical inputs, while the diversity alleviates  
20 risks for small-scale farmers. On large mechanized farming systems the larger-scale ecological  
21 functions associated with a land use mosaic can be beneficial.

22

23 As the science and practice of agroforestry are complex and comprise a range of disciplines,  
24 communities and institutions, strengthening strategic partnerships and alliances (farmers, national  
25 and international research organizations, government agencies, development organizations,  
26 NGOs, ICRAF, CIFOR, The Forest Dialogue, etc.) is crucial in order to foster the role of  
27 agroforestry in tackling future challenges. Local participation could be mobilized by incorporating  
28 traditional knowledge and innovations, as well as ensuring the scaling up and long-term  
29 sustainability of agroforestry.

30

31 Rights to land and trees tend to shape women's incentives and authority to adopt agroforestry  
32 technologies more than other crop varieties because of the relatively long time horizon between  
33 investment and returns (Gladwin et al., 2002). Agroforestry systems have high potential to help  
34 AKST achieve gender equity in property rights. This is especially true in customary African land  
35 tenure systems where planting or clearing trees is a means of establishing claims, on the trees,  
36 but also on the underlying land (Gari, 2002; Villarreal et al., 2006).

37

1 6.4.1.1 Reducing land degradation through agroforestry

2 Land degradation is caused by deforestation, erosion and salinization of drylands, agricultural  
3 expansion and abandonment, and urban expansion (Nelson, 2005). Data on the extent of land  
4 degradation are extremely limited and paradigms of desertification are changing (Herrmann and  
5 Hutchinson, 2005). Approximately 10% of the drylands are considered degraded, with the  
6 majority of these areas in Asia and Africa.

7

8 In all regions more threatened by deforestation, like the humid tropics, Latin America, Southeast  
9 Asia, and Central Africa, deforestation is primarily the result of a combination of commercial wood  
10 extraction, permanent cultivation, livestock development, and the extension of overland transport  
11 infrastructure (Zhang et al., 2002; Vosti et al., 2003; Nelson, 2005). Decreasing current rates of  
12 deforestation could be achieved by promoting alternatives that contribute to forest conservation.  
13 Methods may include improving forest management through multiple-use policies in natural  
14 forests and plantations of economic (cash) trees within forests (Wenhua, 2004) off-farm  
15 employment (Mulley and Unruh, 2004); and implementing an industrial development model,  
16 based on high-value added products.

17

18 Sustainable timber management implies ensuring forests continue to produce timber in long-term,  
19 while maintaining the full complement of environmental services and non-timber products of the  
20 forest. Although sustainable timber management sometimes provides reasonable rates of return,  
21 additional incentives are often needed as conventional timber harvesting is generally more  
22 profitable (Pearce and Mourato, 2004). Effective use of AKST supported by sustainable policy  
23 and legal systems and sufficient capacity is needed; the Chinese government's forest  
24 management plan implemented in 1998 offers a working example (Wenhua, 2004). However,  
25 local authorities are often inefficient in monitoring and enforcing environmental laws in large  
26 regions, as in Brazilian Amazonia where the construction of highways and the promotion of  
27 agriculture and cattle ranching facilitated the spread of deforestation. Off-farm employment can  
28 contribute significantly to forest conservation in the tropics, e.g., the tea industry in western  
29 Uganda (Mulley and Unruh, 2004).

30

31 **6.4.2 Market mechanisms and incentives for agroforestry**

32 Agroforestry is a method by which income can be generated by producing tree products for  
33 marketing as well as domestic use. There are many wild tree species that produce traditionally  
34 important food and non-food products (e.g. Abbiw, 1990). These species can be domesticated to  
35 improve their quality and yield and to improve the uniformity of marketed products (Leakey et al.,  
36 2005) and enhance farmers' livelihoods (Schreckenberget al., 2002, 2006; Degrande et al.,  
37 2006). Domestication can thus be used as an incentive for more sustainable food production,

1 diversification of the rural economy, and to create employment opportunities in product  
2 processing and trade. The domestication of these species previously only harvested as extractive  
3 resources, creates a new suite of cash crops for smallholder farmers (Leakey et al., 2005).  
4 Depending on the market size, some of these new cash crops may enhance the national  
5 economies, but at present the greatest benefit may come from local level trade for fruits, nuts,  
6 vegetables and other food and medicinal products for humans and animals, including wood for  
7 construction, and fuel.

8

9 This commercialization is crucial to the success of domestication, but should be done in ways that  
10 benefit local people and does not destroy their tradition and culture (Leakey et al., 2005). Many  
11 indigenous fruits, nuts and vegetables are highly nutritious (Leakey, 1999b). The consumption of  
12 some traditional foods can help to boost immune systems, making these foods beneficial against  
13 diseases, including HIV/AIDS (Barany et al., 2003; Villarreal et al., 2006). These new non-  
14 conventional crops may play a vital role in the future for conserving local and traditional  
15 knowledge systems and culture, as they have a high local knowledge base which is being  
16 promoted through participatory domestication processes (Leakey et al., 2003; World Agroforestry  
17 Centre, 2005; Garrity, 2006; Tchoundjeu et al., 2006; cf. also 6.2.1.4. and 6.2.1.6. ). Together  
18 these strategies are supportive of food sovereignty and create an approach to biodiscovery that  
19 supports the rights of farmers and local communities specified in the Convention on Biological  
20 Diversity.

21

22 A participatory approach to the domestication of indigenous trees is appropriate technology for  
23 rural communities worldwide (Tchoundjeu et al., 2006), especially in the tropics and sub-tropics,  
24 with perhaps special emphasis on Africa (Leakey, 2001ab), where the Green Revolution has  
25 been least successful. In each area a priority setting exercise is recommended to identify the  
26 species with the greatest potential (Franzel et al., 1996). Domestication should be implemented in  
27 parallel with the development of postharvest and value-adding technologies and the identification  
28 of appropriate market opportunities and supply chains. With poverty, malnutrition and hunger still  
29 a major global problem for about half the world population, there is a need to develop and  
30 implement a range of domestication programs for locally-selected species, modeled on that  
31 developed by ICRAF and partners in Cameroon/Nigeria (Tchoundjeu et al., 2006), on a wide  
32 scale. There will also be a need for considerable investment in capacity development in the  
33 appropriate horticultural techniques (e.g. vegetative propagation and genetic selection of trees) at  
34 the community level, in NARS, NARES, NGOs and CBOs, with support from ICRAF and regional  
35 agroforestry centers.

36

1 Agroforestry can be seen as a multifunctional package for agriculture, complemented by  
2 appropriate social sciences, rural development programs and capacity development. Better land  
3 husbandry can rehabilitate degraded land. For many poor farmers this means the mitigation of  
4 soil nutrient depletion by biological nitrogen fixation and the simultaneous restoration of the  
5 agroecosystem using low-input, easily-adopted practices, such as the diversification of the  
6 farming system with tree crops that initiate an agroecological succession and produce marketable  
7 products.

8

9 Over the last 25 years agroforestry research has provided some strong indications on how to go  
10 forwards by replanting watersheds, integrating trees back into the farming systems to increase  
11 total productivity, protecting riparian strips, contour planting, matching tree crops to vulnerable  
12 landscapes, soil amelioration and water harvesting. There are many tree species indigenous to  
13 different ecological zones, that have potential to play these important roles, and some of these  
14 are currently the subject of domestication programs. In this way, the ecological services  
15 traditionally obtained by long-periods of unproductive fallow are provided by productive  
16 agroforests yielding a wide range of food and non-food products. This approach also supports the  
17 multifunctionality of agriculture as these species and products are central to food sovereignty,  
18 nutritional security and to maintenance of tradition and culture. Additionally, women are often  
19 involved in the marketing and processing of these products. Consequently this approach, which  
20 brings together AST with traditional and local knowledge, provides an integrated package which  
21 could go a long way towards meeting development and sustainability goals. The challenge for the  
22 development of future AKST is to develop this 'Localization' package (Chap 3.2.4; 3.4) on a scale  
23 that will have the needed impacts.

24

25 This integrated package is appropriate for large-scale development programs, ideally involving  
26 private sector partners (building on existing models – e.g. Panik, 1998; Mitschein and Miranda,  
27 1998; Attipoe et al., 2006). Localization is the grassroots pathway to rural development, which  
28 has been somewhat neglected in recent decades dominated by Globalization. Programs like that  
29 proposed would help to redress the balance between Globalization and Localization, so that both  
30 pathways can play their optimal role. This should increase benefit flows to poor countries, and to  
31 marginalized people. There would be a need for considerable investment in capacity  
32 development in the appropriate horticultural and agroforestry techniques (e.g. vegetative  
33 propagation, nursery development, domestication and genetic selection of trees) at the  
34 community level, in NARS, NARES, NGOs and CBOs, with support from ICRAF and regional  
35 agroforestry centers.

36

1 By providing options for producing nutritious food and managing labor, generating income,  
2 agroforestry technologies may play a vital role in the coming years in helping reduce hunger and  
3 promote food security (Thrupp, 1998; Cromwell, 1999; Albrecht and Kandji, 2003; Schroth et al.,  
4 2004; Oelberman et al., 2004; Reyes et al., 2005; Jiambo, 2006; Rasul and Thapa, 2006; Toledo  
5 and Burlingame, 2006).

6  
7 Recent developments to domesticate traditionally important indigenous trees are offering new  
8 opportunities to enhance farmer livelihoods in ways which traditionally provided household needs  
9 (especially foods) as extractive resources from natural forests and woodlands (Leahey et. al.,  
10 2005; Schreckenberget. al., 2002, 2006). These new non-conventional crops may play a vital  
11 role in the future for conserving local and traditional knowledge systems, as they have a high  
12 local knowledge base which is being promoted through participatory domestication processes  
13 (Leahey et al., 2003; World Agroforestry Centre, 2005; Garrity, 2006)

## 14 15 **6.5 Sustainable Management of Fishery and Aquaculture Systems**

16 Globally, fisheries products are the most widely traded foods, with net exports in 2002 providing  
17 US\$17.4 billion in foreign exchange earnings for developing countries, a value greater than the  
18 combined net exports of rice, coffee, sugar, and tea (FAO, 2002). In spite of the important role  
19 that fisheries play in the national and local economies of many countries, fisheries around the  
20 globe are frequently overfished and overexploited as a result of not only weak governance, but of  
21 poor management, non-selective technology, perverse subsidies, corruption, unrestricted access  
22 and destructive fishing practices (FAO, 2002; World Bank, 2004). Reforming both the governance  
23 and management of these critical natural resources is essential to stable and long term economic  
24 development, future food security, sustainable livelihoods, poverty prevention and reduction,  
25 continuation of the ecosystem goods and services provided by these natural resources, and the  
26 conservation of biodiversity (Fisheries Opportunity Assessment, 2006; Christie et al., 2007;  
27 Sanchirico and Wilen, 2007).

### 28 29 **6.5.1 Governance and Management Options**

30 In most cultures, wild fisheries and marine resources are considered as common property and  
31 suffer from open, unregulated access to these valuable resources. The concept of land tenure  
32 and property rights has been instrumental in reforming terrestrial agriculture and empowering  
33 small-scale farmers. Similarly, the concepts of marine tenure and access privileges are needed to  
34 address the “wild frontier” attitude generated by open access to fisheries and to promote shared  
35 responsibilities and co-management of resources (Pomeroy and Rivera-Guieb, 2006; Sanchirico  
36 and Wilen, 2007). Several traditional management approaches, such as in the Pacific Islands,  
37 have evolved that are based upon the concept of marine tenure.

38



1 For fisheries, major goals of zoning are to (1) protect the most productive terrestrial, riparian,  
2 wetland and marine habitats which serve as fisheries nurseries and spawning aggregation sites,  
3 and (2) allocate resource use -- and thus stewardship responsibility -- to specific users or user  
4 groups. Appropriate zoning would allow for the most sustainable use of various habitats types for  
5 capture fisheries, aquaculture, recreation, biodiversity conservation and maintenance of  
6 ecosystem health. Future zoning for specific uses and user groups would also shift shared  
7 responsibility onto those designated users, thus increasing self-enforcement and compliance  
8 (Sanchirico and Wilen, 2007). The greatest benefit would be in those countries where  
9 government, rule of law and scientific management capacity is weak.

10  
11 Improving fisheries management is critical for addressing food security and livelihoods in many  
12 developing countries, where fishing often serves as the last social safety net for poor  
13 communities and for those who have no land tenure rights. Fisheries has strong links to poverty -  
14 at least 20% of those employed in fisheries earn less than US\$ 1 per day – and children often  
15 work in the capture and/or processing sectors, where they work long hours under dangerous  
16 conditions.

17  
18 *Tenure and access privileges.* Large-scale social and ecological experiments are needed to  
19 implement culturally appropriate approaches to marine tenure and access privileges that can be  
20 applied to both large-scale industrialized fisheries and small-scale artisanal fisheries (Fisheries  
21 Opportunity Assessment, 2006; Pomeroy and Rivera-Guieb, 2006). Rights-based or privilege-  
22 based approaches to resource access can alter behavioral incentives and align economic  
23 incentives with conservation objectives (Sanchirico and Wilen, 2007).

24  
25 *Seascape “zoning”.* As in terrestrial systems, zoning would protect essential and critical fisheries  
26 habitats that are necessary for “growing” fisheries populations and maintaining ecosystem health.  
27 The science of large-scale planning is relatively young and further research and implementation  
28 is needed. Future zoning should allow for the most sustainable use of various marine habitat  
29 types for capture fisheries, low trophic level aquaculture, recreation, biodiversity conservation and  
30 maintenance of ecosystem health. Ultimately, integrating landscape and seascape use designs  
31 are needed to conserve and protect ecosystem goods and services, conserve soils, reduce  
32 sedimentation and pollution run-off, protect the most productive terrestrial, wetlands and marine  
33 habitats, and promote improved water resources management.

34  
35 *Socioeconomic and environmental scenarios* could be developed that explore the potential  
36 tradeoffs and benefits from applying different management regimes to improve wild fisheries  
37 management. Scenarios can guide the application of science to management decisions for

1 reforming fisheries governance, both large-scale and small-scale fisheries, and incorporate  
2 cultural and traditional knowledge (Fisheries Opportunity Assessment, 2006; Philippart et al.,  
3 2007). The Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) approach in the Pacific builds upon cultural  
4 practices of setting aside specific areas as off-limits to fishing for rebuilding fisheries and  
5 biodiversity ([www.LMMAnetwork.org](http://www.LMMAnetwork.org)).

6  
7 *Ecosystem-based management approaches* focus on conserving the underlying ecosystem  
8 health and functions, thus maintaining ecosystem goods and services (Pikitch et al., 2004).  
9 Developing these approaches requires an understanding of large-scale ecological processes;  
10 identifying critical fisheries nurseries, habitats and linkages between habitats, such as between  
11 mangrove forests and coral reefs; understanding freshwater inflows into coastal estuaries and  
12 maintaining the quantity, quality and timing of freshwater flows that make wetlands some of the  
13 most productive ecosystems in the world; and how human activities, such as fishing, affects  
14 ecosystem function (Bakun and Weeks, 2006; Hiddinks et al., 2006; Lotze et al., 2006; Olsen et  
15 al., 2006; [www.worldfishcenter.org](http://www.worldfishcenter.org)). Ecosystem based fisheries management also requires  
16 protection of essential fish habitats and large-scale regional use planning.

17  
18 Ecosystem based fisheries management approaches are relatively new management tools.  
19 Given the ecological complexity of ecological systems, especially the tropical systems in many  
20 developing countries, the application of Ecosystem based fisheries management needs to be  
21 further developed and assessed. Major governance and ecological challenges exist as  
22 management is scaled up in geographic area. Institutional, governance and environmental  
23 challenges will require monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management (Christie et al., 2007).

24  
25 *Fisheries reserves.* The design and establishment of networks of fisheries reserves are  
26 necessary to improve and protect fisheries productivity, as well as improve resilience in the face  
27 of climate change and increasing variability. Well-designed and placed fisheries reserves, which  
28 restrict all extractive uses, are needed to rebuild severely depleted ecosystems and fisheries and  
29 to serve as “insurance” against future risks; however, critical science gaps will need to be  
30 addressed before fishery reserves can be effectively utilized (Gell and Roberts, 2003).

31  
32 *Multispecies approaches.* The concept of “maximum sustainable yield” and managing by a  
33 species-by-species or population-by-population approach has not proved effective for fisheries  
34 management given the complexity of ecosystems and food-webs. Overfishing and “fishing down  
35 the food web” has occurred, seriously threatening the future productivity of wild fisheries (Pauly  
36 et al., 2005). Non-linear, multispecies models which incorporate trophic levels, reproductive

1 potential and “maximum economic yield” need to be developed and applied for determining more  
2 sustainable levels, types and sizes of fish extracted (Pauly and Adler, 2005).

3  
4 *Environmentally friendly extraction technologies.* New technology is needed that selectively  
5 removes target species and size classes, thus reducing wasteful ‘bycatch’, allowing non-  
6 reproductive individuals to reach maturity, and protecting large individuals that disproportionately  
7 contribute to the next generation (Hsieh et al., 2006). Some advocate that destructive fishing  
8 practices - such as bottom-trawling and blast fishing – are illegal in some countries and should be  
9 prohibited and replaced with non-destructive methods (Bavinck et. al., 2005; Dew and  
10 McConnaughey, 2005).

11  
12 About 30% of capture fisheries are currently used to create “fish meal” destined for aquaculture  
13 and other livestock, and this percentage is expected to increase as aquaculture expands and  
14 more high-trophic level fish (such as salmon, grouper and tuna) are cultured and farmed. Ill-  
15 placed and designed aquaculture facilities have also reduced the productivity of wild fisheries and  
16 degraded environments through loss of critical habitats, especially mangrove forests and coral  
17 reefs; introduction of invasive species, pests and diseases; and use of pesticides and antibiotics.

18  
19 *Environmentally friendly and sustainable aquaculture.* While aquaculture is one of the fastest  
20 growing food sectors in terms of productivity, this achievement has been at great cost and risk to  
21 the health and well-being of the environment, as well as the well-being of small-scale fishers and  
22 farmers. The future of aquaculture is truly at a crossroads: the future direction of aquaculture will  
23 affect the health and productivity of wild fisheries, the survival of many livelihoods, and global  
24 food security (World Bank 2006).

25 The future contribution of aquaculture to global food security and livelihoods will depend on the  
26 promotion of more environmentally sustainable and less polluting culture techniques; the use of  
27 low-trophic level species, especially filter-feeding species; the use of native species; appropriate  
28 siting and management approaches; and inclusion and empowerment of small-scale producers  
29 (World Bank, 2006). The culture of local, native species should be promoted to decrease the  
30 displacement of native species by escaped exotics, such as tilapia. Proper siting of aquaculture  
31 facilities is crucial to reduce environmental impact and ensure long-term sustainability and  
32 profitability; improperly sited aquaculture facilities, especially for shrimp farms, have lead to the  
33 destruction of wetlands and mangrove forest that are vital to capture fisheries and the protection  
34 of coastal communities from storms, tsunamis and other coastal hazards. Enclosed, re-circulating  
35 tanks that are properly sited show great promise in meeting some of these objectives and in  
36 decreasing the pollution of wild gene pools through escapes of species used in aquaculture. A  
37 more balanced approach to aquaculture is needed that incorporates environmental sustainability,

1 integrated water resources management and equitable resources use and access to benefits  
2 ([www.ec.europa.eu](http://www.ec.europa.eu); [www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net); [www.worldfishcenter.org](http://www.worldfishcenter.org)).

3

4 Greater emphasis is needed to develop sound fisheries “growth” practices and approaches –  
5 such ecosystem based fisheries management, networks of reserves, new quota models and new  
6 extraction technology -- which will restore ecosystem productivity and resiliency. It is estimated  
7 that with proper fishing practices, capture fisheries production could be increased significantly,  
8 reversing present declines.

9

## 10 **6.6 Improve Natural Resource Management and Habitat Preservation**

### 11 **6.6.1 *The landscape management challenge***

12 Losing habitats is the greatest threat to biodiversity; over the past 50 years people have  
13 destroyed or fragmented ecosystems faster and more extensively than in any period in human  
14 history (MA, 2005). Rapidly growing demands for food, freshwater, timber, and fuel driving this  
15 change have put enormous pressure on biodiversity. The creation of more conservation  
16 management areas, promotion of local biodiversity, increased participatory approaches to natural  
17 resource management (e.g. GELOSE project, Madagascar) and a close collaboration between all  
18 relevant stakeholders in biodiversity management initiatives (Mayers and Bass, 2004) will be vital  
19 to addressing further loss of existing habitats.

20

21 Restoration of fragile habitats is a way of improving degraded ecosystems or creating new areas  
22 to compensate for loss of habitat elsewhere. Enhancing transboundary initiatives (e.g. Agenda  
23 Transandina for mountain biodiversity in the Andes) has multiple benefits to conserve and restore  
24 fragile habitats. The appropriate use of technology, such as remote sensing or GIS can improve  
25 monitoring of ecosystem fragmentation (e.g., INBio Costa Rica) and can help in the protection of  
26 large areas of native vegetation within regions to serve as sources of species, individuals and  
27 genes. Landscape management can also help maintain or re-establish connectivity between  
28 native habitats at multiple scales with large contiguous areas of native vegetation for as wide a  
29 group of plant and animal species as possible. Remaining areas of native habitat within the  
30 agricultural landscape (giving priority to patches that are large, intact and ecologically important)  
31 can be conserved while further destruction, fragmentation or degradation prevented.

32

33 Active management of landscapes and land uses will be required to maintain heterogeneity at  
34 both patch and landscape levels, making agricultural systems more compatible with biodiversity  
35 conservation. Threats to native habitats and biodiversity can be identified and specific  
36 conservation strategies applied for species or communities that are of particular conservation

1 concern. Areas of native habitat in degraded portions of the agricultural landscape can be  
2 restored and marginal lands taken out of production and allowed to revert to native vegetation.

3  
4 For freshwaters, some management options include:

- 5 • maintain or restore native vegetation buffers;
- 6 • protect wetlands and maintain critical function zone in natural vegetation;
- 7 • re-establish hydrological connectivity and natural patterns of aquatic  
8 ecosystems (including flooding);
- 9 • protect watersheds with spatial configuration of perennial natural, planted  
10 vegetation and maintain continuous year-round soil cover to enhance rainfall  
11 infiltration

12  
13 *Non-native, exotic species.* Species that become invasive are often introduced deliberately, and  
14 many of these introductions are related to agriculture, including plants and trees introduced for  
15 agricultural and forestry purposes and species used for biological control of pests (Wittenberg  
16 and Cock, 2001; Matthews and Brandt, 2006). Policy for control of invasive species is essential,  
17 but AKST must also develop a better understanding of when and how species become invasive  
18 and how to best monitor and control them. Improved prediction and early detection of pest  
19 invasions, appears to rely heavily on the scale and frequency of introductions (not particular  
20 phenotypic characteristics of the invader) (Lavergne and Molofsky, 2007; Novak, 2007). Since the  
21 scale of introduction is a critical factor, commercial trade in all living organisms, including seeds,  
22 plants, invertebrates and all types of animals has the greatest potential to augment the invasion  
23 potential of exotic species. The most promising mechanism for targeting this critical phase in  
24 invasion is an increase in the capacity of exporting and importing nations to monitor the content of  
25 agricultural goods. This cannot be done effectively by individual countries; collective action is  
26 needed, through UN or other international bodies with appropriate global capacity development,  
27 e.g., UN Biodiversity Convention and the Cartagena Protocol.

## 28 29 **6.6.2 Address poor land and soil management to deliver sustainable increases in** 30 **productivity**

31 The approach to addressing increased productivity will be distinctly different for fertile and low  
32 fertile lands (Hartemink, 2002).

### 33 34 6.6.2.1 Options for fertile lands

35 *On-farm, low input options.* The adoption of zero tillage prevents further water erosion losses,  
36 increases water use efficiency, soil organic carbon sequestration, and maintains good structure in

1 topsoil (Díaz-Zorita et al., 2002; Bolliger et al., 2006; Steinbach and Alvarez, 2006; Lal et al.,  
2 2007).

3

4 About 95 million ha are under zero tillage management worldwide (Lal et al., 2007) in countries  
5 with industrialized agriculture, but the land area may increase in response to fuel prices and soil  
6 degradation. Zero tillage has well known positive effects upon soil properties; one negative effect  
7 is increased greenhouse gas emissions ( $N_2O$ ,  $CH_4$ ) due to higher denitrification rates (Baggs et  
8 al., 2003; Dalal et al., 2003; Passianoto et al., 2003; Six et al., 2004; Steinbach and Alvarez,  
9 2006; Omonode et al., 2007). Tradeoffs between higher C sequestration and higher GHG  
10 emissions will need more assessment (Dalal et al., 2003; Six et al., 2004; Lal et al., 2007). Zero  
11 tillage can promote shallow compaction in fine textured topsoils (Taboada et al., 1998; Díaz-  
12 Zorita et al., 2002; Sasal et al., 2006) and no-till farming can reduce yield in poorly drained,  
13 clayey soils wet. Soil-specific research is needed to enhance applicability of no-till farming by  
14 alleviating biophysical, economic, social and cultural constraints (Lal et al., 2007).

15

16 Excessive soil compaction is of critical concern in industrial agriculture due to the use of heavier  
17 agricultural machines. A typical hazard is when high yielding crops (e.g. maize) are harvested  
18 during rainy seasons. Compaction recovery is not easy in zero tilled soils (Taboada et al., 1998;  
19 Díaz-Zorita, Duarte, and Grove, 2002; Sasal et al., 2006), which depend on soil biological  
20 mechanisms to reach a loosened condition. The alleviation and control of deep reaching soil  
21 compaction can be attained by adopting management strategies that control field traffic (Spoor et  
22 al., 2003; Pagliai et al., 2004; Hamza and Anderson, 2005; Spoor, 2006) and use mechanical  
23 (e.g. plowing) or biological (cover crop root channels) compaction recovery technology (Robson  
24 et al., 2002; Spoor et al., 2003).

25

26 A better understanding of biological mechanisms are needed, with particular focus on the role  
27 played by plant roots, soil microorganisms and meso- and macrofauna in the recovery of soil  
28 structure (Six et al., 2004; Taboada et al., 2004; Hamza and Anderson, 2005).

29

30 Increased botanical nitrogen-fixation can occur when legumes crops are rotated with cereals  
31 (Robson et al., 2002); green manure crops improve the N supply for succeeding crops (Thorup-  
32 Kristensen et al., 2003). In farms near animal production facilities (feed lots, poultry, pigs, dairy,  
33 etc.), organic animal manures may be a cheap source of essential plant nutrients and organic  
34 carbon (Edwards and Someshwar, 2000; Robson et al., 2002). The use of organic manures can  
35 be limited by problems associated with storage, handling, and transport (Edwards and  
36 Someshwar, 2000). In livestock grazing production systems, grazing intervals can be restricted

1 and seasonal grazing intensity altered to reduce soil physical damage (Taboada et al., 1998;  
2 Menneer et al., 2004; Sims et al., 2005).

3

4 Continuous crop removal may eventually deplete native soil supplies of one or more nutrients.  
5 Some predict depletion of easily accessible P by 2025 at present annual exploitation rates of 138  
6 million tonnes (Vance et al., 2003) while others estimate far less. Soil microbiology could  
7 potentially improve access to P, for example, through the use of P-solubilizing bacteria (Yadav  
8 and Tarafdar, 2001; Taradfar and Claassen, 2005) and arbuscular mycorrhiza (Harrier and  
9 Watson, 2003). However, the use of microbes in P delivery to plants is complex. A better  
10 understanding of root growth is the optimal balance among plant, soil and microorganisms  
11 (Vance et al., 2003).

12

13 More field research is required to optimize the selection and production of crop varieties/ species  
14 that enrich the diet with such elements as Ca, Zn, Cu, Fe etc. Given the usually substantial  
15 residual effects of most of fertilizer nutrients (except N), they should be considered as  
16 investments in the future rather than annual costs. Replenishment of nutrients such as P, K, Ca,  
17 Mg, Zn through the use of agricultural by-products and biosolids and substitution and recycling of  
18 phosphorus (P) sources has been recommended (Kashmanian et al., 2000).

19

20 Soil conservation practices can reduce soil losses by wind and water erosion. Strategies for  
21 controlling sediment loss include a) planting windbreaks and special crops to alter wind flow; b)  
22 retaining plant residue after harvesting; c) creating aggregates that resist entrainment, d)  
23 increasing surface roughness; e) improving farm equipment and f) stabilizing soil surfaces using  
24 water or commercial products (Nordstrom and Hotta, 2004).

25

26 Improved management practices to prevent sediment loss may be effective (Nordstrom and  
27 Hotta, 2004). Many management techniques do not require sophisticated technology or great  
28 costs to implement, but they may require farmer willingness to change practices. Barriers to  
29 adoption of conservation measures include start up or transition costs associated with new  
30 methods or equipment, inadequate education, reliance on past traditions, or a history of failed  
31 field experiments (Uri, 1999). Reluctance to implement soil conservation policies and practices  
32 can be overcome when severe erosion events associated with periods of drought remind society  
33 of the advantages of compatible methods of farming (Todhunter and Cihacek, 1999).

34

35 Shifting cultivation leads to deforestation and degradation, (Zhang et al., 2002). Most technical  
36 options to prevent agricultural expansion and abandonment are similar to those for preventing  
37 deforestation. They are also based on the promotion of off-farm employment (Mulley and Unruh,

1 2004), or the production of high-added value products combined with air transport. In order to  
2 increase farmers' natural capital and thereby increase long term flows of farm outputs, modifying  
3 the management of soil, water and vegetation resources, based on agroecology, conservation  
4 agriculture, agroforestry and sustainable rangeland and forest management, as well as wildlife  
5 biology and ecology has been supported (Buck et al., 2004).

6  
7 Cultivation of new lands in some biomes would neither compensate nor justify the loss of  
8 irreplaceable ecological services. Other biomes are less sensitive and would not be similarly  
9 affected. The functional complementation of biomes is an effective land use option to explore on  
10 a broad scale (Viglizzo and Frank, 2006). For example, agricultural expansion in South America  
11 (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia) was based on the replacement of natural forests by cattle  
12 ranching and soybean cropping (Cardille and Foley, 2003; Vosti et al., 2003; Etter et al., 2006;  
13 Pacheco, 2006). There are potential benefits to conservation management that arise from  
14 agricultural land abandonment or extensification. In China conversion of cultivated land has not  
15 always decreased national food security, since many converted lands had low productivity (Deng  
16 et al., 2006). Abandonment of agricultural land does increase the vulnerability of farmers. Positive  
17 outcomes in one sector can have adverse effects elsewhere (Rounsevell et al., 2006). Modern  
18 biomass energy will gain a share in the future energy market and abandoned agricultural land is  
19 expected to be the largest contributor for energy crops; the geographical potential of abandoned  
20 land for 2050 ranges from about 130 to 410 EJ yr<sup>-1</sup> and for 2100, from 240 to 850 EJ yr<sup>-1</sup>. At a  
21 regional level, significant potentials are found in the former USSR, East Asia and South America  
22 (Hoogwijk et al., 2005).

23  
24 *Large scale, high input options.* Large scale approaches to soil management are available and  
25 based on the replenishment of soil nutrients, site specific nutrient management and zero tillage.  
26 These approaches include: adoption of crop models to synchronize N supply with crop demand  
27 (Fageria and Baligar, 2005; Francis, 2005); adoption of precision agriculture and variable rate  
28 technologies for inputs such as nutrients, pesticides and seeds (Adrian et al., 2005); and  
29 improvement of N fertility for non-legumes by legume fixation, fertilizers, manures and composts.

30  
31 Nitrogen use efficiency is currently less than 50% worldwide, thus increasing N efficiency may  
32 reduce the use of N fertilizers (Sommer et al., 2004; Fageria and Baligar, 2005; Ladha et al.,  
33 2005). Deep rooting crops could potentially serve to redistribute N for crops in areas with nitrate  
34 polluted groundwater (Berntsen et al., 2006).

35  
36 Crop models assess tradeoffs among yield, resource-use efficiency and environmental outcomes  
37 (Timsina and Humphreys, 2006), but their effective adoption requires local calibration and



1 validation, improved farmer knowledge, cost-effective and user friendly techniques (Ladha et al.,  
2 2005). The adoption of precision and variable rate technologies by farmers is significantly  
3 affected by their perception of usefulness and net benefit (Adrian et al., 2005). To be of more  
4 benefit to farmers, crop models need to more effectively couple the spatial variability of crop  
5 yields and soil properties obtained by remote sensing and variable rate machinery needs  
6 improvement. Motivations for widespread uptake adoption of these technologies may come from  
7 environmental legislation and public concern over agrochemical use (Zhang et al., 2002).

8  
9 Efficient use of N fertilizer requires that the amount and timing of the fertilizer application be  
10 synchronized with the needs of the crop (Ladha et al., 2005). The availability of the soil to supply  
11 N to the crop is closely linked with soil organic matter; maintenance of soil organic matter is a key  
12 factor in maintaining N fertility (Robson et al., 2002). Legumes are grown in rotations both for the  
13 contribution to the residual N and for the value of the crop itself (i.e., forage or food). To  
14 encourage the adoption of modern agricultural technologies governments and others will need to  
15 ensure farmers have access to technical advice, economic incentives and public education  
16 programs.

17  
18 Whereas N efficiency and uptake is key for some regions, in others soil erosion control practices,  
19 such as contour cropping and terracing in soils of better quality (Popp et al., 2002), are more  
20 viable options. Soil erosion control can be costly, and hence, difficult to implement in developing  
21 countries (Wheaton and Monke, 2001). Governments can help by providing technical advice,  
22 economic incentives and public education programs (Warkentin, 2001). Land care schemes have  
23 been successfully adopted in several countries, and are effective in promoting 'land literacy' and  
24 good agricultural practices, including leys and crop rotations and growing cover crops (Lal, 2001).

#### 25 26 6.6.2.2 Options for low fertility lands

27 *Agroforestry*. In tropical areas, low fertility is often found in deforested areas, where critical topsoil  
28 has washed away. The replacement of traditional slash and burn cultivation by more diversified  
29 production systems based on forest products, orchard products, and forages and food products  
30 (Barrett et al., 2001; Ponsioen et al., 2006; Smaling and Dixon, 2006) and applying  
31 agroecological principles creatively (Altieri, 2002; Dalgaard et al., 2003) can improve soil fertility.

32  
33 The adoption of agroforestry can maintain land productivity, decrease land degradation and  
34 improve rural people's livelihood (Albrecht and Kandji, 2003; Oelberman et al., 2004; Schroth et  
35 al., 2004; Reyes et al., 2005; Jiambo, 2006; Rasul and Thapa, 2006). At the landscape scale, the  
36 spatial organization of tree and forest landscape elements can provide filters for overland flow of  
37 water and sediments as well as corridors for forest biota, connecting areas with more specific

1 conservation functions. At plot and regional scales, the relationship is more variable because  
2 watershed functions not only depend on plot-level land use but also on the spatial organization of  
3 trees in a landscape, infiltration, dry-season flow, and other factors (Van Noordwijk et al., 2007).

4  
5 Consecutive nutrient exports may lead to extremely low K and P levels (Alfaia et al., 2004), e.g.,  
6 decreased N and P availability with alley cropping (Radersma et al., 2004). Some crops, e.g.,  
7 sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) seem to be unsuitable for agroforestry (Pinto et al., 2005).  
8 Ecological agriculture could become an alternative if market distortions created by subsidies were  
9 removed, financial benefits were provided to resource-conserving farmers, and extension, credit,  
10 research were available (Rasul and Thapa, 2003). The adoption of integrated soil fertility  
11 management strategies at the farm and landscape scale requires consensus building activities  
12 (Barrios et al. 2006). However, promoting and supporting participatory technologies have limited  
13 impact when they are not grounded in participatory policy development and implementation (De  
14 Jager, 2005; Desbiez et al., 2004). Labor-intensive ecoagriculture will not succeed unless  
15 farmers and the agricultural sector have higher total factor productivity including total labor  
16 productivity (Buck et al., 2004).

17  
18 *Soil water conservation and storage.* The adoption of conservation agriculture is key to increasing  
19 water storage in marginal lands, and in most places suitable equipment is available (hand,  
20 animal-drawn, or tractor-drawn) for resource-poor farmers (Bolliger et al., 2006). Adoption of  
21 conservation agriculture also reduces soil erosion losses, (den Biggelaar et al., 2003) decreases  
22 siltation and pollution of water bodies, and has benefits for human health and biodiversity. Efforts  
23 to promote soil water conservation and storage will need to address site-specific conditions  
24 (Knowler and Bradshaw, 2007). Widespread implementation will require integration into  
25 institutions, incentive structures, and education (Molden et al., 2007) and extension outreach.  
26 Methods to be considered include (i) conservation agriculture, including the use of water-efficient  
27 crops; (ii) supplemental irrigation in rainfed areas; and (iii) water harvesting in drier environments  
28 (Goel and Kumar, 2005; Hatibu et al., 2006; Oweis and Hachum, 2006).

29  
30 *Soil amendments.* Municipal waste materials, composted or uncomposted (such as leaves and  
31 grass clippings, sludges, etc.), can be valuable soil amendments for farms near cities or towns  
32 and are inexpensive if transport costs are low (Smith 1996; Kashmanian et al., 2000). Municipal  
33 sludges can be also applied to crop land provided they possess the qualities needed by their  
34 potential users and do not possess toxins or heavy metals, such as nickel or cadmium (Smith,  
35 1996). Other developments such as N-fixation by non-legume crops (e.g. *Azospyrillum*), P  
36 solubilizing bacteria, and mycorrhizal associations in tropical cropping systems are expected to  
37 result from future biotechnology investigations (Cardoso and Kuyper, 2006).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

The high risk of crop failure from insufficient soil moisture hinders investments in soil fertility and tillage, which in turn diminishes the potential of soils to capture and retain water, therefore increasing the vulnerability to drought. A challenge for AKST will therefore be how to couple incremental improvements in crop water relations with low-cost investments to replenish soil fertility in order to break this cycle (Rockström, 2004; Sanchez, 2005). More widespread use of practices like green manuring, composting, farm yard manure management, and use of agricultural by-products and residues can guide decision-making.

### **6.6.3 Sustainable Use of Water Resources to meet on-farm food and fiber demands**

A major challenge over the next 50 years will be to meet food and fiber demand with minimal increases in the amount of water diverted to agriculture. Aquatic ecosystems and people whose livelihoods depend on them are likely to be the biggest losers as more and more fresh water is diverted to agriculture on a global scale.

AKST can provide options for improving water management in agriculture that can address the growing problem of water scarcity, ecosystem sustainability and poverty alleviation. Chapters 4 and 5 present projections concerning the land and water required at the global level to produce enough food to feed the world in 2050. These include reliance on various options including intensification and expansion of rainfed and irrigated agriculture and trade as entry points to reduce the need to expand water and land diverted to agricultural production. In an optimistic rainfed scenario, reaching 80% maximum obtainable yields, while relying on minimal increases in irrigated production, the total cropped area would have to increase by 7%, and the total increase in water use would be 30%, with direct water withdrawals increasing by only 19%. In contrast, focusing on irrigation first could contribute 55% of the total value of food supply by 2050. But that expansion of irrigation would require 40% more withdrawals of water for agriculture, surely a threat to aquatic ecosystems and capture fisheries in many areas.

The factors that contribute to optimistic and pessimistic estimates of total water needs are primarily differences in water productivity. Without gains in water productivity, water resources devoted to agricultural production will likely increase by 70-90%. On top of this is the amount of water needed to produce fiber and biomass for energy. The real world is more complex than the scenarios. Improvements will need to be made in water management across all agricultural systems, rainfed, irrigated, and combinations in between. It will be necessary to look beyond increasing water productivity to target poor people and ecosystems to benefit from these improvements. AKST will be needed that targets both physical (not enough water to meet all demands) and economic (not enough investment in water) water scarcity. Climate change and

1 bioenergy increase the scale of the challenge, by increasing pressures on resources, and by  
2 increasing climate variability, but do not alter the nature of the challenge.

3

#### 4 6.6.3.1 Managing evapotranspiration

5 Optimistic scenarios for mitigating increased water demand in agricultural systems require that  
6 water productivity be increased. This can be achieved with existing AKST, e.g., at the plot level in  
7 rainfed systems where evaporation can be very high and soil constraints are still significant, and  
8 at a system and basin level by reducing unproductive losses in landscapes. Crop breeding to gain  
9 increased benefit from water used and as yet unexplored opportunities to use precision water  
10 management to raise biomass/transpiration ratios are promising for intensive systems.

11

12 There is significant scope to reduce evapotranspiration (ET) per unit of yield by reducing  
13 evaporation and improving soil quality (Figure 6.1) (Molden et al., 2007). In many parts of the  
14 world, reducing evaporation and removing soil constraints are still important options for increasing  
15 water productivity. In very productive agricultural areas of the world, which produce most of the  
16 world's food, the historic sources of growth in water productivity – increased harvest index, soil  
17 nutrients- are being rapidly exhausted (Keller and Seckler, 2004). In contrast, currently areas with  
18 the greatest potential to increase water productivity in terms of ET are low production regions,  
19 especially sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia (Figure 6.2). These are also areas with high rates  
20 of poverty and high dependence of the poor on agriculture. Focus on these areas will both help  
21 reduce poverty, and also reduce the amount of additional water needed in agriculture.

22

23 **[Insert Figure 6.1]**

24 **[Insert Figure 6.2]**

25

26 Evaporation varies from 4 - 25% in irrigated systems (Burt et al., 2001), and from 30-40% and  
27 more in rainfed systems (Rockstrom et al., 2003) and depends on application method, climate  
28 and how much of the soil is shaded by leaves by the crop canopy; it can be very high in rainfed  
29 systems with low plant densities. Practices increasing water productivity such as mulching,  
30 plowing or breeding for early vigor of leaf expansion in order to shade the ground as rapidly as  
31 possible or longer superficial roots can reduce evaporation and increase productive transpiration.

32

33 Improvement of soil fertility can significantly improve transpiration efficiency and improving soil  
34 physical properties including infiltration and water storage capacity can reduce evaporation.  
35 Together these methods can result in 100% or larger increases in crop water productivity (Bossio  
36 et al., 2008). Recent examples of water productivity improvement potential through resource-  
37 conserving agricultural practices demonstrate this (Table 6.3). Only moderate effects on crop

1 water productivity should be expected from plant genetic improvements over the next 15 to 20  
2 years, because these gains have already been realized through breeding for increased harvest  
3 index in major grain crops. However harvest index gains through breeding strategies that target  
4 crops like millet and sorghum that have not received as much attention as the “green revolution”  
5 grains may be possible. An opportunity for improving value per unit of water also lies in  
6 enhancing nutritional quality of staple foods. Here perhaps biotechnology may offer significant  
7 potential over time (Molden et al., 2007). New precision approaches to water management, such  
8 as irrigation of partial root systems may hold promise for increasing production per unit of water  
9 transpired in specialized production systems (Davies et al., 2002).

10  
11 **[Insert Table 6.3]**

12  
13 Besides crop and field practices, there is significant scope for reducing evaporation at the basin  
14 and landscape scales (Molden et al., 2007). High evaporation rates from high water tables and  
15 waterlogged areas can be reduced by drainage, or reducing water applications, after ensuring  
16 that these are not wetland areas supporting other ecosystem services. In degraded arid  
17 environments, up to 90% of rainfall evaporates back into the atmosphere with only 10% available  
18 for transpiration. Water harvesting in dry areas is an effective method of making available the  
19 non-beneficial evaporation of rainwater for crop transpiration (Oweis, 1999). Micro and macro-  
20 catchment techniques capture runoff and make it available for plants and livestock before  
21 evaporation, increasing the availability of beneficial rainwater, nearly halving evaporation and  
22 quadrupling increase in transpiration.

23  
24 Another option is to increase the use of marginal quality water for agricultural production. While  
25 marginal-quality waters, (wastewater, saline or sodic water), potentially represent a valuable  
26 source of water for agricultural production, long term environmental and health risks are  
27 significant and must be mitigated. The prevalence of and opportunities for increasing, the use of  
28 marginal quality water in agricultural production was recently assessed (Qadir et al. 2007). Public  
29 agencies in several countries already implement policies on marginal-quality water. Egypt plans  
30 to increase its official reuse of marginal-quality water from 10% in 2000 to about 17% by 2017  
31 (Egypt MWRI, 2004). In Tunisia in 2003 about 43% of wastewater was used after treatment.  
32 Wastewater use will increase in India, as the proportion of freshwater in agricultural deliveries  
33 declines from 85% today to 77% by 2025, reflecting rising demand for freshwater in cities (India  
34 CWC, 2002).

35  
36 Worldwide, marginal-quality water will become an increasingly important component of  
37 agricultural water supplies, particularly in water-scarce countries (Abdel-Dayem, 1999). Water

1 supply and water quality degradation are global concerns that will intensify with increasing water  
2 demand, the unexpected impacts of extreme events, and climate change in resource-poor  
3 countries (Watson et al., 1998). State of the art systems to maximize use of saline drainage  
4 waters are currently under development in California and Australia (Figure 6.3) (Qadir et al.,  
5 2007). AKST development for sustainable use of marginal quality water is an urgent need for the  
6 future.

7

8 **[Insert Figure 6.3]**

9

#### 10 6.6.3.2 Multiple use livelihoods approach

11 Poverty reduction strategies entail elements primarily related to policy and institutional  
12 interventions to improve access for the poor to reliable, safe and affordable water. AKST  
13 contributes to increase the effectiveness agricultural water utilization by the poor. To secure water  
14 use rights now and in the future and to avoid or control the risks of unsustainable water  
15 management, it is important to understand water as a larger “bundle of rights” (water access and  
16 withdrawal rights, operational rights, decision making rights) (Cremers et al., 2005; Castillo et al.,  
17 2007). Policy and institutional interventions are described in later chapters; here the focus is on  
18 AKST options that can contribute to poverty alleviation in the future, namely, multiple use system  
19 design, small scale water management technologies, and sustainable development of  
20 groundwater resources, primarily aimed at small scale farming systems in tropical countries.

21

22 While most water use analysis focuses on crop production (particularly in irrigated systems), it is  
23 possible to increase the productivity of other components of mixed systems to provide greater  
24 overall benefit for the rural poor (Molden et al., 2007), improve health for the local population and  
25 increase biodiversity. The design, development and management of water resources  
26 infrastructure from a multiple use livelihoods perspective, can maximize the benefits per unit of  
27 water, and improve health. The integration of various water use sectors including crop, livestock,  
28 fisheries and biodiversity in infrastructure planning can result in increased overall productivity at  
29 the same level of water use, and can be compatible with improving health and maintaining  
30 biodiversity.

31

32 *Livestock.* Although there are few examples of research and assessments that attempt to  
33 understand the total water needs of livestock and how animal production affects water resources,  
34 a recent assessment (Peden et al., 2007) describes four entry points to maximize investment  
35 returns in water and livestock in mixed systems:

- 1 • improving the source of feeds; e.g., in low productivity mixed systems in Ethiopia,  
2 livestock water productivity increases as the share of animal diets composed of crop  
3 residues increases (Figure 6.4) (Peden et al., 2007);
- 4 • enhancing animal productivity through traditional animal science interventions in  
5 nutrition, genetics, veterinary health, marketing and animal husbandry;
- 6 • conserving water resources critically need for grazing management; and
- 7 • providing sufficient drinking water; water deprivation reduces feed intake and lowers  
8 production. For lactating cows water deprivation can greatly lower milk production  
9 (Staal et al., 2001).

10

11 While more research and site specific knowledge is needed, it is clear that securing improved  
12 outcomes in the development of agricultural water in the future will benefit from effective  
13 integration and consideration of animal use and their effect on water resources (Peden et al.,  
14 2007).

15

16 **[Insert Figure 6.4]**

17

18 *Fisheries.* Fisheries can be enhanced in many existing and planned water management  
19 structures such as small dams, reservoirs, and impounded floodplains through stocking with  
20 appropriate species, greatly increasing productivity. Stocking technologies have produced high  
21 yields in lakes (Welcomme and Barley, 1998); in dams and reservoirs in Thailand, Indonesia, the  
22 Philippines and Malaysia (Fernando, 1977), in China (De Silva, 2003), and India (Sugunan and  
23 Katiha, 2004); and in floodplains in Hungary (Pinter, 1983), Bangladesh (Ahmed, 1998), and India  
24 (Sugunan and Sinha, 2001). Species introductions, and other enhancement technologies, such  
25 as fish holes, drain-in ponds, dugouts and finger ponds also effectively increase production  
26 (Dugan et al., 2007). Improved stocking management can increase production in integrated  
27 agriculture-aquaculture systems; a widespread type is integration of fish into rice paddies. While  
28 typically rice paddies produce 120-300 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> of mixed fish which contribute directly to  
29 household diets, managed fish stocking and harvest can increase rice yields (due to weed control  
30 and the aeration of soils) by some 10% while producing up to 1,500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> fish (de la Cruz 1994;  
31 Halwart and Gupta, 2004).

32

33 *Health and water management systems.* Under conditions that allow control of water levels, such  
34 as irrigated areas, dry season irrigation in monsoon areas and on relatively free draining soils,  
35 water management techniques can bridge the gap between agricultural and health departments  
36 (Bakker et al., 1999). These techniques include alternate wet and dry irrigation; water saving  
37 irrigation technologies; modernization of infrastructure to minimize standing water and reduce

1 sites for disease vector breeding; and organizational initiatives such as Water Users Associations  
2 and improved extension services. Banning the use of the most toxic pesticides and promoting  
3 integrated pest management (IPM) is a high priority for preventing poisoning via water (Eddleston  
4 et al., 2002). In this case, human health and environmental interests (reducing pesticide loads)  
5 are complimentary. In addition, operation of existing dams can be re-optimized to improve health  
6 and environmental performance, such as to restore floodplain ecosystems, and new irrigation  
7 schemes can be planned and designed to minimize environmental impacts (Faurés, et al., 2007).

8  
9 *Biodiversity.* Water resources infrastructure and agricultural landscapes can be managed to  
10 maintain biodiversity and other ecosystem services beyond production of food and fiber. Water  
11 resources infrastructure can be planned and implemented in ways that minimize the impact on  
12 the native biodiversity. Biodiversity concerns need to be addressed from the earliest stages of  
13 project planning; e.g., situating infrastructure in such a way as to avoid harming critical habitats  
14 (Ledec and Quintero, 2003). At the landscape scale, the spatial organization of tree and forest  
15 landscape elements can provide filters for overland flow of water and sediments and corridors for  
16 forest biota, connecting areas with more specific conservation functions (Van Noordwijk et al.,  
17 2007). At plot and regional scales, the relationship is more variable because watershed functions  
18 not only depend on plot-level land use but also on the spatial organization of trees in a landscape,  
19 infiltration, dry-season flow, and other factors. Natural disturbance has a role in maintaining  
20 landscape biodiversity. Options for conserving biodiversity in irrigated agricultural systems include  
21 increasing water productivity and many water management designs and practices that support  
22 diverse landscapes, crops and connectivity for plant and animal movement (Molden and Tharme,  
23 2004).

24  
25 Traditional irrigation infrastructure development is one avenue for poverty alleviation; significant  
26 benefits have been demonstrated through a variety of primary and secondary effects of irrigation  
27 system development (Hussain, 2005; Castillo et al., 2007) and management strategies can  
28 improve equity in irrigation systems and can be complimentary to productivity enhancement  
29 (Hussain, 2005). As an example, land distribution that results in larger numbers of smaller holding  
30 can improve benefit sharing. Appropriate irrigation service charges can ensure adequate  
31 spending on operations and maintenance; this supports the poor, who tend to suffer the most  
32 when system level maintenance is inadequate.

### 33 34 6.6.3.3 Management and financing options

35 In order to maintain aquatic ecosystems, managers are increasingly pressed to maintain  
36 agricultural returns with reduced water delivery to irrigation systems. Reducing water delivered to  
37 irrigation requires two actions – a change in agricultural practice combined with a change in water



1 allocation (Molden et al., 2007). Increasing blue water productivity by reducing water deliveries to  
2 agriculture, yet maintaining output, is an important strategy to retain water in aquatic ecosystems,  
3 to reallocate supplies, and to help in more precise water management, giving water managers  
4 more flexibility to deliver water to where it is needed, when it is needed. Excessive deliveries  
5 generate excessive drainage that are hard to control, require energy for pumping, reduce the  
6 quality of water and water bodies can provide breeding ground for disease vectors. Moreover,  
7 there are high ecological benefits in keeping water in rivers.

8  
9 There are significant opportunities to improve irrigation water productivity through a combination  
10 of field and system management practices, and policy incentives that raise water productivity,  
11 manage salinity and increase yields (e.g. Van Dam et al., 2006). For example, there is substantial  
12 scope to reduce water deliveries to irrigation, especially to rice (Bouman et al., 2007). In addition  
13 to producing more food, there are ample opportunities in irrigation to generate more value and  
14 incur less social and environmental costs.

15  
16 Supplemental irrigation, the addition of small amounts of water optimally timed to supplement  
17 rain, is probably the best way to increase water productivity of supplies. In Burkina Faso and  
18 Kenya, yields were increased from 0.5 to 1.5-2.0 tonnes ha<sup>-1</sup> with supplemental irrigation and soil  
19 fertility management (Rockstrom et al, 2003). Yields can be further increased with deficit  
20 irrigation, where water supplied is less than crop requirements (Zhang, 2003). Increased  
21 precision in water management is more capital intensive and therefore particularly relevant to  
22 maintaining high productivity while decreasing water diversions. In Western Syria, yields  
23 increased from 2 to 5 tonnes ha<sup>-1</sup> with the timely application of 100 to 200 mm of water (Oweis et  
24 al., 2003). It must be noted, however, that precision and deficit irrigation increase risk, and  
25 therefore are most appropriate under conditions where access to water is assured, and can be  
26 carefully managed.

27  
28 A key point however, is that increasing productivity of water does not necessarily drive water  
29 savings; it may encourage increased water use because it is more productive (Ahmed et al.,  
30 2007). Thus changing allocation policies is also essential to realize reduced diversions of water.

31  
32 Reducing deliveries also does not necessarily save water and can have unintended detrimental  
33 side effects that can be understood by considering what happens to drainage flows. A common  
34 misperception is that because irrigation is typically 40 to 50% efficient at converting irrigation  
35 water into evapotranspiration, the focus should be on increasing efficiency and therefore reducing  
36 drainage flows (Seckler et al., 2003). Increasing efficiency can be a valuable objective for  
37 reducing uptake of water in the system and thus diminishing energy costs of pumping and

1 operation and maintenance. However, drainage water plays an important role. Because so much  
2 drainage flow is reused downstream, there is actually much less scope in saving water in  
3 irrigation than commonly perceived. In fact, in irrigated regions in dry areas it is common to  
4 document ratios of evapotranspiration to irrigation plus rain greater than 60% reaching to over  
5 100% when aquifers are mined. These areas include the Gediz basin in Turkey (Droogers and  
6 Kite, 1999), Egypt's Nile (Keller and Keller, 1995), Chistian sub-division in Pakistan and the  
7 Bhakra irrigation system (Molden et al., 2000), the Liu Yuan Ku irrigation system (Khan et al,  
8 2006), the Tunuyuan irrigated area in Argentina, the Fayoum in Egypt, and Nilo Coelho in Brazil  
9 (Bos, 2004). The perennial vegetation at Kirindi Oya has been shown to evapotranspire about the  
10 same volume of water as rice and generate valuable ecosystem services; giving a different  
11 picture (65% of inflows beneficially depleted) than if paddy rice were considered alone (22% of  
12 inflows depleted by rice) (Renaud et al., 2001). In these cases, the problem is not wastage, but  
13 that high withdrawals and ET rate reduce drainage and tend to dry up rivers and wetlands, and  
14 leave little to downstream use. It is important to consider each case from a basin perspective, i.e.,  
15 considering the quality and quantity of water and how drainage flows are used downstream.

16

17 Technologies such as treadle pumps, small diesel pumps, low-cost drip, and low-cost water  
18 storage can increase productivity and incomes for poor farmers (Sauder, 1992; Shah et. al.,  
19 2000; Keller et. al., 2001; Polak et. al., 2004). These approaches provide water at lower unit costs  
20 than large scale hydraulic infrastructure, and can be available immediately, without the long delay  
21 times of larger scale projects. Innovative development and marketing approaches that focus on  
22 increasing local private enterprise capacities and market promotion have been credited with  
23 successful dissemination to the poor (Shah, et al., 2000). Credit schemes focusing on women  
24 also can have a positive effect on poverty alleviation (Van Koppen and Mahmud, 1996). By  
25 improving the precision of water delivery, these technologies can also help to increase water use  
26 efficiency, under the right conditions. There are different niches where these technologies are  
27 useful. In general treadle pumps are most suitable when water tables are within 2-4 m of soil  
28 surface. This situation is common in monsoon Asia, and exists when treadle pumps are linked to  
29 rainwater harvesting structures, but is relatively rare outside wetland or direct pumping from lakes  
30 and water bodies in Africa.

31

32 *Groundwater resources.* Groundwater can provide flexible, on-demand irrigation to support  
33 diversified agriculture in all climate zones. Sustainable management requires that aquifer  
34 depletion be minimized and water quality be preserved. Overwhelming evidence from Asia  
35 suggests that groundwater irrigation promotes greater gender, class, and spatial equity than do  
36 large irrigation projects. Evidence from Africa, Asia, and Latin America also suggests that  
37 groundwater is important for poor farmers to improve their livelihoods through small scale farming

1 based on shallow groundwater (Shah et al., 2007). Small scale technologies (see above) can  
2 improve access of the poor to groundwater resources. In all parts of the developing world key  
3 common priorities for AKST are to improve the data base, upgrade the understanding of  
4 groundwater supply and demand conditions, and create effective programs for public education in  
5 the sustainable use of groundwater resources (Shah et al., 2007). Participatory approaches to  
6 sustainable groundwater management will need to combine supply-side AKST such as artificial  
7 recharge, aquifer recovery, inter-basin transfer of water, with demand-side AKST such as  
8 groundwater pricing, legal and regulatory control, water rights and withdrawal permits (see  
9 chapter 7), and promotion of water-saving crops and technologies.

10  
11 *Decreasing land degradation.* Water use efficiency, which is often as low as only 40%, in irrigated  
12 areas (Deng et al., 2006), can be increased. This is key to reducing recharge to naturally saline  
13 areas and water tables. Where soil salinity is high, leaching fractions must be applied to remove  
14 salt from the root zone, without adding it to groundwater or mobilizing it to the river system; this is  
15 difficult and requires well thought out, innovative drainage solutions. Recognized options for  
16 management of salinity risk, or to reduce existing areas of saline soil, are revegetation with  
17 alternative species, pumping to lower the water table and construction of ditch drains for control  
18 of surface water and shallow groundwater (Peck and Hatton, 2003).

19  
20 Management of salinity is complex and requires integrated solutions at catchment and basin  
21 scale with the key being to minimize mobilization of salt and reduce the amount for disposal –  
22 disposal through the stream system is undesirable, and environmentally costly. All options for  
23 management of salinity risk are constrained by the economics of dry land farming and pumping or  
24 drainage is further constrained by possible environmental impacts of disposal of saline water. In  
25 Australia, the bulk of effort has been directed at "living with saline land and water," with immense  
26 public and private investment in tree planting and the search for new low recharge farming  
27 systems (Peck and Hatton, 2003). Practices to improve water use efficiency include biological  
28 mechanisms of water-saving agriculture and irrigation technologies, including low pressure  
29 irrigation, furrow irrigation, plastic mulches, drip irrigation under plastic, rainfall harvesting and  
30 terracing (Deng et al., 2006).

### 31 32 **6.7 Using AKST to improve Health and Nutrition**

33 AKST can improve human health and nutrition through reductions in: (1) malnutrition and  
34 micronutrient deficiencies; (2) food contaminants; and (3) the emergence and re-emergence of  
35 human and animal diseases, including HIV/AIDS. Key driving forces over the coming decades for  
36 these challenges include not just AKST, but also demographic change; changes in ecosystem  
37 services; global environmental change; reductions in freshwater resources; economic growth and

1 its distribution; trade and travel; rate of technology development; governance; degree of  
2 investment in public health and health care systems; and others.

3

4 In addition, some food systems are not providing the range of nutrients needed to ensure  
5 adequate nutritional status. Approaches to improve dietary quality are needed to ensure  
6 adequate availability, accessibility, and utilization of foods with nutrients appropriate to the needs  
7 of the population.

8

### 9 **6.7.1 On-farm options for reducing malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies**

10 Integrated farm systems, based on a variety of foods, can help meet the challenge of  
11 micronutrient malnutrition (Tontisirin et al., 2002). Improving crop diversity is an important part of  
12 improving dietary diversity, and thereby dietary quality. The diversity of wild and cultivated  
13 traditional plant varieties in rural areas of low-income countries provides many opportunities to  
14 identify high quality, but underutilized, nutritious foods. Increased research on locally adapted  
15 traditional varieties could lead to the development of improved varieties that are higher yielding or  
16 more resistant to pests and abiotic stresses such as drought. Household processing of wild foods  
17 collected by subsistence farmers as part of a traditional diet would increase storage life and make  
18 additional foods available during periods when food is inadequate. For example, solar drying  
19 techniques have been used to preserve foods such as mangoes, bananas and sweet potatoes.

20

21 Possible improvement of these varieties through breeding is currently limited because private and  
22 public sector breeding programs rarely focus on minor crops. Identifying and exploiting the  
23 potential of these varieties will require increased research in both high- and low-income countries.  
24 In Kenya, when farmers produced underutilized leafy green vegetable varieties consumption was  
25 increased among farmers, and the producers found a market among middle and high income  
26 consumers who began to purchase these novel varieties (Frison et al., 2006). Once researchers  
27 identify health promoting compounds in indigenous and underutilized plants, plant breeders can  
28 develop varieties of these foods that can be produced and consumed by small-scale farmers as  
29 well as sold in high value niche markets. Beyond increasing the availability of diverse foods,  
30 preservation methods must be improved to reduce the loss of micronutrients (Ndawula et al.,  
31 2004).

32

33 In addition to increasing the range of plant foods in the diet, animal source foods, such as meat,  
34 milk, and insects from wild and domesticated sources can provide critical nutrients that may be  
35 completely unavailable in plant-based diets, such as vitamin B<sub>12</sub> (Neumann et al., 2002; for  
36 Kenyan example see Siekmann et al., 2003). An effective strategy to increase the intake of  
37 animal source foods could include the improved small-scale livestock production through the use

1 of appropriate breeds, disease prevention and control, and affordable high quality animal feeds  
2 (Brown, 2003).

3

4 Improving soil management practices, such as increasing the organic matter in the soil and  
5 mineral fertilizers (Sheldrick and Lingard, 2004), can improve food security and enable farmers to  
6 produce sufficient yields and allow for more crop diversification. These practices can optimize  
7 plant nutritional quality. For example, crops grown on zinc deficient soils often produce grains  
8 with low zinc concentrations and these seeds may produce plants with lower grain yields and  
9 poorer seed quality (Rengel, 2001). Soil management solutions have the advantage of providing  
10 a wide range of nutrients, while other approaches, such as fortification and supplements are  
11 limited to specific nutrients.

12

### 13 **6.7.2 Research needs for reducing malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies**

14 Biofortified crops developed through plant breeding can improve human nutrition. Biofortification  
15 has shown promise in feeding studies in the Philippines where iron biofortified rice consumption  
16 improved iron status in the study participants (Murray-Kolb et al., 2004). While conventional  
17 processed food fortification can work well to improve the availability of critical nutrients in the diet,  
18 rural subsistence producers may not have access to fortified foods. Thus, where food processing  
19 facilities are unavailable, biofortification can improve the availability of target nutrients. In addition,  
20 where government regulation and enforcement of food fortification is still in the nascent stages of  
21 development, biofortified crops can serve as a cost-effective source of micronutrients. Dietary  
22 quality can be improved by selection of crop varieties that are more nutritionally dense when  
23 these are substituted for less nutritious alternatives. Consumption of carotenoid-rich red palm oil  
24 in lieu of other vegetable oils has improved vitamin A status in Burkina Faso (Zagre et al., 2003),  
25 while lysine and tryptophan-rich maize may offer improved growth potential for undernourished  
26 children consuming diets with low protein quality (Graham et al., 1990).

27

28 While plant breeding efforts to biofortify staple crops are underway, plant-breeding programs can  
29 also target health-related qualities such as antioxidants in fruits or vegetables (HarvestPlus,  
30 2006). For example, plant breeders can select for high lutein content, an antioxidant with  
31 beneficial effects on eye health (Seddon, 2007) in carrots (Nicolle et al., 2004). Plant breeding  
32 can include traditional techniques and approaches using advances in biotechnology, such as  
33 rDNA. Conventional plant breeding methods have been used to develop biofortified crops and  
34 rDNA approaches have increased carotenoid content in rice (Beyer et al., 2002). While  
35 approaches using rDNA and similar techniques have the potential to contribute to developing  
36 nutritionally improved crop varieties, research, monitoring, and evaluation are needed to ensure  
37 there are no adverse unintended consequences to human and environmental health.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

#### 6.7.2.1 Reducing Food Contaminants

When present in food systems, heavy metals and other contaminants, veterinary drug residues, pesticide residues, pathogens, and the toxins produced by pathogens such as mycotoxins can cause a range of short- and longer-term adverse human health consequences.

*Good agricultural practices (GAPs)* can lead to safer use of pesticides and veterinary drugs. GAPs can also enable the management of risks associated with pathogen contamination of foods such as fruits and vegetables. FAO has developed guidance for governments and the private sector on conducting risk assessments and to implementing risk management options throughout food systems, including on-farm practices and in food processing facilities (FAO/WHO, 2006). Hazard analysis critical control point principles can be used to target issues of biosecurity, disease monitoring and reporting, safety of inputs (including agricultural and veterinary chemicals), control of potential foodborne pathogens, and traceability (Sanders, 2003; Olson and Slack, 2006). The development and adoption of GAPs for specific production systems and food safety/quality issues can be facilitated by approaches that involve broad participation. Plants can become susceptible to infection with the fungus that produces aflatoxins when they are exposed to water stress or insect damage (Dowd, 2003). There are readily available approaches management approaches (pre-harvest, harvest, and postharvest) to reduce aflatoxin (Mishra and Das, 2003); e.g., in tree nuts, peanuts, and cereals such as maize.

In addition, dietary approaches are being developed to counteract the effects of mycotoxins (Galvano et al., 2001). Additional research is needed to verify the detoxification ability of the proposed food components, their long-term efficacy and safety, and their economic and technical feasibility. To manage risks associated with pathogens such as *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in fruit and vegetable production, sanitation systems throughout the food production chain are integral to GAPs guidance for preventing the presence of these organisms (Fairbrother and Nadeau, 2006). Additional strategies are being developed to reduce foodborne pathogens, e.g., chlorate as a food supplement to prevent colonization of food-producing animals by *E. coli* and other pathogens (Anderson et al., 2005).

Achieving fuller deployment of GAPs to improve food safety and public health requires establishing effective national regulatory standards and liability laws that are consistent with international best practice, along with the necessary infrastructure to ensure compliance, including sanitary and phytosanitary surveillance programs for animal and human health, laboratory analysis and research capabilities, and training and auditing programs (Lupien, 2007). Challenges include harmonization of regulations establishing upper levels of intake of nutrients

1 and other substances (Bennett and Klich, 2003), and improving food safety without creating  
2 barriers for poor producers and consumers.

3  
4 *Heavy metal contamination* in soils affects the quality and safety of foods. For example, rice  
5 grains can accumulate cadmium (Cd) from Cd-contaminated soils, thereby exposing consumers  
6 to serious health consequences from consumption of locally produced rice (Chaney et al., 2004).  
7 Undernourished populations are particularly at risk, as iron and zinc deficiencies can cause  
8 increases in Cd absorption from the food supply (Anderson et al., 2004). While increased soil pH  
9 or maintaining soil flooding until grain maturation can reduce Cd levels in rice grains, yields can  
10 be affected (Chaney et al., 2004). Bioremediation with selected ecotypes of *Thlaspi caerulescens*,  
11 a hyperaccumulator of Cd, could effectively reduce levels in contaminated soil (Chaney et al.,  
12 2000). However, these wild ecotypes of *T. caerulescens* need to be improved for  
13 commercialization before practical applications of this technology would be available (Chaney et  
14 al., 2004).

### 16 **6.7.3 Reduce factors that facilitate the emergence and re-emergence of human and animal** 17 **diseases**

18 Communicable diseases are the primary cause for variations in life expectancy across countries  
19 (Pitcher et al., 2008). AKST is important for three broad categories of infectious diseases:  
20 diseases whose incidence is affected by agricultural systems and practices (e.g. malaria and  
21 bovine spongiform encephalopathy), foodborne zoonotic diseases, and epidemic zoonotic  
22 disease (e.g. avian influenza). For example, the expansion of irrigated agriculture, as a result of  
23 the need to further intensify food production and to better control water supplies under increased  
24 climate variability and change, is expected to contribute to an increased incidence of malaria in  
25 some areas and the rapidly increasing demand for livestock products could increase the  
26 likelihood of BSE to spread more widely.

27  
28 The geographic range and incidence of many human and animal diseases are influenced by the  
29 drivers of AKST. Currently, 204 infectious diseases are considered to be emerging; 29 in  
30 livestock and 175 in humans (Taylor et al., 2001). Of these, 75% are zoonotic (diseases  
31 transmitted between animals and humans). The number of emerging plant, animal, and human  
32 diseases will increase in the future, with pathogens that infect more than one host species more  
33 likely to emerge than single-host species (Taylor et al., 2001). Factors driving disease emergence  
34 include intensification of crop and livestock systems, economic factors (e.g. expansion of  
35 international trade), social factors (changing diets and lifestyles) demographic factors (e.g.  
36 population growth), environmental factors (e.g. land use change and global climate change), and  
37 microbial evolution. Most of the factors that contributed to disease emergence will continue, if not

1 intensify, this century (IOM, 1992). The increase in disease emergence will affect both high- and  
2 low-income countries.

3

4 Serious socioeconomic impacts can occur when diseases spread widely within human or animal  
5 populations, or when they spill over from animal reservoirs to human hosts (Cleaveland,  
6 Laurenson, and Taylor, 2001). Animal diseases not only affect animal and human health and  
7 welfare, they also influence perceptions of food safety, result in trade restrictions, adversely affect  
8 rural incomes and livelihoods, adversely affect non-livestock rural industries, have detrimental  
9 environmental effects, and adversely affect national economies for countries heavily dependent  
10 on agriculture Even small-scale animal disease outbreaks can have major economic impacts in  
11 pastoral communities (Rweyemamu et al., 2006).

12

### 13 6.7.3.1 On-farm options

14 The adoption integrated vector and pest management at the farm level, have been tested for  
15 reducing the persistence of human and animal diseases. These include environmental  
16 modification, such as filling and draining small water bodies, environmental manipulation, such as  
17 alternative wetting and drying of rice fields, and reducing contacts between vectors and humans,  
18 such as using cattle in some regions to divert malaria mosquitoes from people (Mutero et al.,  
19 2004; Mutero et al., 2006).

20

21 Specific farming practices can facilitate infectious disease emergence and reduce the incidence  
22 of certain diseases, such as malaria, in endemic regions (van der Hoek, 2004). However, the  
23 relationships between agriculture and infectious disease are not always straight-forward. For  
24 example, whereas rice irrigation increases breeding grounds for the mosquito that carries  
25 malaria, in some regions the prevalence of malaria in irrigated villages is lower than in  
26 surrounding villages because better socioeconomic conditions allow greater use of antimalarials  
27 and bed nets (Ijumba et al., 2002) and/or because the mosquito vector tends to preferentially feed  
28 on cattle (Mutero et al., 2004). However, in other regions, intensification of irrigated rice reduces  
29 the capacity of women to manage malaria episodes among children, leading to a higher  
30 prevalence of malaria (De Plaen et al., 2004). Therefore, greater understanding is needed of the  
31 ecosystem and socioeconomic consequences of changes in agricultural systems and practices,  
32 and how these factors interact to alter disease risk.

33

34 In areas affected by high rates of HIV/AIDS, labor-saving agricultural technologies and systems  
35 are needed to support sustainable livelihoods. Ensuring access to diverse diets can also reduce  
36 the adverse impacts of disease on livelihoods and health. Agroforestry interventions, in particular,



1 can improve communities' long-term resilience against HIV/AIDS and other external shocks in  
2 ways that agricultural interventions alone cannot (Gari, 2002).

3

4 In addition, improved agricultural information and knowledge exchange between experienced  
5 farmers and youth and widows is needed (Peter et. al., 2002). Agroforestry technology can  
6 respond to the cash, labor and shortages confronted by AIDS-affected communities, both in the  
7 short term and in the long term. Medicinal plants and trees often provide the only source of  
8 symptomatic relief available to the poor. Future agroforestry programs and forest policies in  
9 general should be reviewed to assess their effects on key determinants of HIV vulnerability  
10 (Swallow, 2003; Villarreal et al., 2006). Using less labor intensive crops that need fewer inputs  
11 can help households allocate labor more efficiently in food producing activities (Ngwira et al.,  
12 2001). While diversifying food crop production to reduce labor demands can be helpful, the  
13 nutritional quality of the total diet must be considered.

14

#### 15 6.7.3.2 Research and technological options beyond the farm

16 Resource poor farmers have limited resources to mitigate the spread of diseases. Controlling  
17 emerging infectious diseases requires early detection, through surveillance at national, regional,  
18 and international levels, and rapid intervention. For animal diseases, traceability, animal  
19 identification, and labeling also are needed. The main control methods for human and animal  
20 diseases include diagnostic tools, disease investigation facilities, and safe and effective  
21 treatments and/or vaccines. AKST under development can facilitate rapid detection of infectious  
22 pathogens, e.g., genetic tools were used in recent HPAI outbreaks to identify the viruses involved  
23 and to inform development of appropriate control programs (FAO/OIE/WHO, 2005). Syndromic  
24 surveillance of farm animals coupled with notification using internet-accessible devices is being  
25 used in some high-income countries to detect emerging diseases (Vourc'h et al., 2006).

26

27 The increasing importance of zoonotic diseases requires better integration of human and  
28 veterinary public health approaches for their detection, identification, monitoring, and control.  
29 Decreased funding in recent decades has eroded the required infrastructure and training  
30 underlying veterinary services and surveillance activities (Vallat and Mallet, 2006). Incentives to  
31 report cases of disease at the local and national levels and pay for culling of animals when  
32 appropriate could facilitate early identification of outbreaks. There is an urgent need to replenish  
33 basic capacity in many high income countries and to increase capacity in middle- and low-income  
34 countries. Linkage of regional and international organizations and agencies is critical. Improved  
35 understanding is needed of disease transmission dynamics in order to develop more effective  
36 and efficient diagnostic systems and interventions. Diagnostic systems should be designed to  
37 process large numbers of samples and identify multiple infectious agents.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

Although vaccines are a cornerstone of primary prevention, vaccine effectiveness is severely limited in remote rural areas with high infectious disease burdens, particularly Africa, South America, and Asia, due to the lack of vaccines, the lack of resources to afford vaccines, or the logistical problems of trying to use temperature-sensitive vaccines. Marker vaccines are needed so that vaccinated/treated animals can be distinguished from sub-clinically infected or convalescent animals in real time during epidemics (Laddomada, 2003).

The emergence and dissemination of bacteria resistant to antimicrobial agents is the result of complex interactions among antimicrobial agents (e.g. antibiotics), microorganisms, disease transmission dynamics, and the environment (Heinemann, 1999; Heinemann et al., 2000). The increasing incidence of antimicrobial resistant bacterial pathogens will limit future options for prevention and treatment of infectious diseases in animals and humans (McDermott et al. 2002). The World Health Organization has called for human and veterinary antimicrobial agents to be sold only under prescription, and for the rapid phase-out of antimicrobial agents used as growth promotants (WHO 2003). They also recommend that all countries establish monitoring programs for tracking antimicrobial use and resistance. Research on the use of other treatments, such as probiotics and vaccines, holds promise (Gilchrist et al., 2007). The ongoing costs of research and development, and challenges to delivery will prevent acute drug treatments from ever becoming a stand alone solution.

#### **6.7.4 Tackling persistent chemicals to protect human health and the environment**

Persistent chemicals include potentially toxic elements like heavy metals and organic pollutants that are normally present at relatively low concentrations in soils, plants, or natural waters, and which may or may not be essential for the growth and development of plants, animals, or humans (Pierzynski et al., 2000).

##### **6.7.4.1 On-farm options**

More effective and less costly *in situ* management strategies are available to mitigate the effects of persistent chemicals and to restore soil quality. The load of persistent chemicals such as fertilizer and pesticide residues, to ground- and surface waters can be significantly reduced by available technologies, such as precision agriculture. Restorative technologies like bioremediation and phytoremediation (plant based remediation) are costly and still in development. Basic research is needed on the factors affecting biotransformation processes (Adriano et al., 1999; Khan, 2005).

1 Intrinsic remediation using indigenous organisms can degrade industrial solvents (e.g., PCBs)  
2 and many pesticides on affected sites (Sadowski and Turco, 1999). *In situ* bioremediation can  
3 potentially treat organic and inorganic pollutants, clean soil without excavation and it is more cost  
4 effective than excavating and treating the soil on site bioremediation techniques. Such treatments  
5 remove the mobile and easily available fractions but cannot complete removal of all the  
6 contaminants (Doelman and Breedveld, 1999).

7  
8 Phytoremediation refers to the extraction of contaminants via root uptake to shoot biomass and  
9 has wide application in the remediation of surface-polluted soils. Further analysis and discovery  
10 of genes for phytoremediation may benefit from recent developments in biotechnology (Krämer,  
11 2005). Phytoremediation has potential risks, such as those associated to the use of transgenic  
12 techniques, release of nonindigenous species (potential weed) and transfer of toxic compounds  
13 to the other environmental compartments (Wenzel et al., 1999; Alkorta and Garbisu, 2001).

#### 14 15 6.7.4.2 Off-farm technology

16 More effective and sensitive technologies for identifying early effects of pollution on ecosystems  
17 can also be developed. Damage could be prevented if the source of the pollution and the  
18 presence of the pollutants could be identified at minimal concentrations. Preventing or limiting the  
19 flow of chemical pollutants into the environment should be more effective than limiting damage by  
20 remediation.

21  
22 New technologies that significantly increase awareness of biological impacts include biosensors  
23 and chemical approaches (Water Science and Technology Board, 2001; Heinemann et al., 2006).  
24 These approaches can also use indigenous organisms, e.g., ecotoxicological assessments of  
25 soils polluted with chromium and pentachlorophenol. The portal DATEST  
26 (<http://projects.cba.muni.cz/datest>) is a web-based engine that complements and stores  
27 information about a wide range of ecotoxicological tests and bioindication methods used in  
28 Ecological Risk Assessment (Smid et al., 2006).

### 29 30 **6.7.5 Information and knowledge systems**

#### 31 6.7.5.1 Traditional, local knowledge options

32 Traditionally, many innovations for improving AKST occurred at the community level, and were  
33 diffused through community institutions (Gyasi et al., 2004). Traditional communities have  
34 domesticated dozens of plant species, have bred and conserved thousands of crop varieties and  
35 animals, and have developed farming (cropping and animal) systems and practices adapted to  
36 specific conditions (Kaihura and Stocking, 2003). Tapping on those resources and capacities and  
37 giving them recognition as well as legitimacy is a key development goal. A focus on agroecology

1 can enrich the production and deployment of new farming practices and technologies that are  
2 environmentally, socially and culturally sustainable (Koontz, et al., 2004).

3  
4 Options for enhancing agricultural knowledge and innovation in local and indigenous societies  
5 include:

- 6 • Enhance local and traditional knowledge systems and grassroots innovation  
7 capacities;
- 8 • empower communities to access knowledge and to participate in innovation  
9 processes so they have more options to respond to future changes and to  
10 biodiversity and livelihood challenges (Colfer, 2005);
- 11 • develop a new agenda that builds on agricultural knowledge and innovation in local  
12 and indigenous societies: increase projects of international agricultural research  
13 institutions such as Bioversity International (formerly IPGRI);
- 14 • foster participatory agricultural and environmental research projects that bring  
15 together traditional and western science (Brookfield et al., 2003; Colfer, 2004),  
16 journals such as *Ethnoecologica*, and academic courses that include traditional and  
17 local knowledge.

18  
19 Farmer Field Schools (see Chapter 2) could play a vital part as a community-based initiative for  
20 participatory research, enabling farmers to define and analyze problems, and experiment with  
21 options. Seed fairs can facilitate the selection of varieties better adapted to local conditions  
22 (Orindi and Ochieng, 2005 and adaptation to climate change. The establishment of “lead farmers”  
23 and the implementation of various grassroots extension mechanisms could reinforce the role of  
24 communities in the production and diffusion of knowledge.

#### 25 26 6.7.5.2 Science and technology options

27 Advances in nanotechnology, remote sensing (RS), geographic information systems (GIS), global  
28 positioning systems (GPS) and information communication technology (ICT) can enhance  
29 progress in the application of precision and site-specific agriculture (PA).

30  
31 A concern in precision agriculture is the accessibility and affordability of the technology for small  
32 farming systems. This is not surprising considering that the general trend is that farmers with  
33 large farmlands of more than 300 ha, tend to be the first to invest in the new technology, whereas  
34 small farmers are more reluctant to invest in GPS equipment (Pedersen et al., 2004). A  
35 nationwide survey in the USA concluded that adoption of PA technologies was related to farm  
36 size and large farmers are the first to adopt (Daberkow and McBride, 2001). Adoption rate is also  
37 faster in regions with larger farm sizes and more specialized in certain cash crops (Blackmore,

1 2000; Fountas et al., 2005). Adoption is likely to continue in countries where labor is scarce, and  
2 vast tracts of land exist, with rates of adoption accelerating when commodity prices are high and  
3 interest rates low (Swinton and Lowenberg-DeBoer, 2001).

4  
5 Particularly for developing countries, the use of yield monitors, sensors, GIS and GPS, supported  
6 by advanced tools such as, computer, digital camera, image processing technique, laser  
7 technology, and network system appear too complex for small-scale farmers, particularly for  
8 those whose field operations are not mechanized. Nevertheless, since precision farming being a  
9 management approach not a technology, it can be applied to developing countries industrialized  
10 countries, but the implementation may be different (Griepentrog and Blackmore, 2004).

11  
12 Precision agriculture practices that can easily be adapted in developing countries include site  
13 specific nutrient management (SSNM) and simple integrated crop management (ICM) version like  
14 rice check (Lacy et al., 1999; Fairhurst et al., 2007; PhilRice, 2007). Thus, while the ownership of  
15 precision farming technologies is still an emerging option for small-scale agriculture, the adoption  
16 strategy can be adapted. Custom services can be used to help build precision farming  
17 databases while small-scale farmers gain experience with the spatial variability of their fields  
18 (Lowenberg-DeBoer, 1996).

#### 19 20 *6.7.5.2.1 Remote sensing technology.*

21 Remote sensing (RS) has a broad range of applications (urban and transportation planning,  
22 applied geosciences, land use, environmental change, etc.) in many countries, especially Europe  
23 and the United States where it is widely used, and can enhance agricultural planning for low  
24 productivity areas in developing countries.

25  
26 For agriculture, RS techniques play an important role in crop identification, crop area inventory,  
27 crop yield forecasting, crop damage detection, soil and water resources inventory, and  
28 assessment of flood damage (Syam and Jusoff, 1999; Van Neil and McVicar, 2001; Patil et al.,  
29 2002). It also provides required inputs for land and water resources development plans,  
30 wasteland mapping and reclamation, irrigation development, crop-yield and crop-weather models,  
31 integrated pest management, integrated nutrient management, watershed management,  
32 agrometeorological services, and more recently, precision farming (Patil et al., 2002). Remote  
33 sensing contributes to the information needs of precision agriculture (PA) in the assessment of  
34 soil and crop conditions using multispectral imagery (Barnes and Floor, 1996).

35  
36 Remote sensing is currently not widely applied in most developing countries because of  
37 timeliness, limited accessibility and cost of satellite data, and financial constraints in gathering

1 ground data that can be correlated to the remote sensing data. It has, however, potential in  
2 improving agricultural planning in developing countries particularly in addressing food security,  
3 poverty alleviation, and sustainable development issues.

4  
5 If combined with other sources of data (e.g., traditional method agrometeorological data  
6 collection) remote sensing can improve accuracy and effectiveness of various agricultural  
7 planning in developing countries. For example, RS estimates of crop yields and production of  
8 staple foods based on pre-harvest crop acreage and production can serve as input to a number  
9 of policy level decisions on buffer food stock (Van Neil and McVicar, 2001).

10  
11 Remote sensing data can provide a sampling frame construction for agricultural statistics, crop  
12 acreage estimation, and cropland data layer or map (Allen, Hanuschak, and Craig, 2002; Saha  
13 and Jonna, 1994; Rao, 2005). Mapping soils can reveal soil properties across production fields  
14 (Dalal and Henry, 1986; Shonk et al., 1991; Mzuku et al., 2005). Remote sensing information also  
15 aids analysis of soil degradation and risk of soil erosion in agricultural lands (Miller, 2002; Thine,  
16 2004).

17  
18 By combining RS with GIS techniques, and hydrologic modeling, irrigation management can be  
19 improved for more complex water management tasks such as irrigation system performance  
20 evaluation, snowmelt runoff forecasts, reservoir sedimentation and storage loss assessments,  
21 prioritization of watersheds and their treatment, environmental impact assessment of  
22 developmental projects, prospecting of under ground water, locale specific water harvesting and  
23 recharge, interlinking of rivers and monitoring of spatial and temporal distribution of rainfall  
24 (Thiruvengadachari and Sakthivadivel, 1996). Given more time and resources, applications of RS  
25 in agricultural planning can be greatly enhanced in developing countries.

26 Remote sensing can also be applied to global agroenvironmental health and resources  
27 monitoring and assessment. Remote sensing can be used to assess biodiversity through (1)  
28 direct mapping of individual plants or associations of single species in relatively large, spatially  
29 contiguous units; (2) habitat mapping and predictions of species distribution based on habitat  
30 requirements; and (3) establishment of direct relationships between spectral radiance values  
31 recorded from remote sensors and species distribution patterns recorded from field observations  
32 (Nagendra, 2001; Zutta, 2003; Rao, 2005).

33  
34 Satellite RS is increasingly becoming an important source of agrometeorological data (humidity,  
35 rainfall, temperature, wind, global radiation) as it can complement traditional methods of  
36 agrometeorological data collection (Sivakumar and Hinsman, 2004). Indian satellite systems, for  
37 example, operationally support disaster management by providing emergency communication

1 links, cyclone warnings, flood forecasting data, rainfall monitoring and crop condition  
2 assessments (Rao, 2005).

3

4 Remote sensing can be used to globally monitor and assess natural resources and ecosystem for  
5 sustainable development, providing more accurate and timely information on the condition and  
6 health of agroenvironmental resources. There are, however, some technical issues and  
7 limitations of current remote sensing technologies use (Table 6.4).

8

9 **[Insert Table 6.4]**

10

11 6.7.5.2.2 Information and communications technology (ICT)

12 ICT models can be mainstreamed and upscaled to enhance delivery of services and access to  
13 market.

14

15 *Market information.* In Uganda, ICT is providing farmers with reliable price data for better farm  
16 gate prices. A market information service network reaching over 7 million people each week uses  
17 conventional media, Internet, and mobile phones to enable farmers, traders, and consumers to  
18 obtain accurate market information. Over the past four years the number of markets dominated  
19 by farmers' associations has increased from 4 to 8 (Ferris, 2004).

20

21 *Weather forecasting.* In Africa, ICT is enabling more rapid dissemination of locally analyzed  
22 weather data. The European Meteosat Second Generation (MSG) satellite is providing detailed  
23 data and high-resolution spectral and spatial images that are expected to revolutionize the  
24 process of forecasting short-term extreme weather events, such as thunderstorms, fog and small  
25 but intense depressions that can lead to devastating storms, as well as other applications, e.g.,  
26 agrometeorology, climate monitoring, and natural resource management (Taube, 2006).

27

28 *Web-based marketing systems.* New business models are rapidly evolving that can suit the  
29 needs of small farmers, e.g. the [www.B2Bpricenow.com](http://www.B2Bpricenow.com) a free agriculture e-marketplace that  
30 provides updates via SMS messaging to farmers in the Philippines  
31 ([www.digitaldividend.org/pubs/pubs\\_01\\_overview.htm](http://www.digitaldividend.org/pubs/pubs_01_overview.htm)). In India, e-Choupal kiosks of the  
32 agriexporter ITC Limited and 'Parry's Corners' of EID Parry agricultural company provide farmers  
33 with valuable information, and allow them to sell their produce directly to these companies  
34 eliminating the middleman. E-commerce platform can also allow small farmers and farmer  
35 cooperatives to expand distribution channels for their produce (Ninomiya, 2004).

36

1 *E-consultation, advisory system and training.* ICT can provide farmers with electronic forums and  
2 e-consultations by email, or permit the participation of a wider electronic community in location-  
3 based seminars (Painting, 2006). Farmers can also access tools for both diagnosing field  
4 problems and making crop management decisions (e.g. TropRice-  
5 ([124.81.86.181/rkb/knowledgeBank/troprice/default.htm#Introduction\\_to\\_TropRice.htm](http://124.81.86.181/rkb/knowledgeBank/troprice/default.htm#Introduction_to_TropRice.htm)) and Rice  
6 Knowledge Bank-[www.knowledgebank.irri.org](http://www.knowledgebank.irri.org)). The so called “virtual academy for farmers” in the  
7 Philippines and India uses ICT through a virtual network that provides information on-demand,  
8 online-learning and content development of information based on farmers’ needs. Trained  
9 farmers and extension workers serve as resource persons in cyber communities thereby making  
10 ICTs accessible and user-friendly.

11 *E-governance.* India is enhancing rural development programs and improving the delivery of  
12 public services with the use of government computerization schemes, satellite communications,  
13 and distance education and training via the Internet. Some of these projects have been quite  
14 successful suggesting that the potential impact of IT on development can be enormous,  
15 particularly in terms of improved health, hygiene, nutrition, and education (Pigato, 2001  
16  
17 ICT can complement conventional methods to meet the growing demand of stakeholders in  
18 accessing improved technologies and timely information and support services, improving  
19 productivity and livelihoods in poor rural communities. Although ICT allows greater and faster flow  
20 of information, due to the technical and knowledge requirements, not all people have the same  
21 level of access. ICT can further widen the “digital divide” between developed and developing  
22 countries, as well as between rural and urban communities within a country (Herselman and  
23 Britton, 2002).

#### 24 25 6.7.5.2.3 Nanotechnology

26 Nanotechnology (see Glossary) may improve agriculture and resource management, particularly  
27 soil fertility, crop/animal production, pest management, veterinary medicine, product safety and  
28 quality, and farm waste management. Applications of nanotechnology in agriculture are rapidly  
29 expanding and developing (Binnig and Rohrer, 1985; Mills et al., 1997; Huang et al., 2001; Dutta,  
30 and Hofmann, 2004; Hossain et al., 2005; Graham-Rowe, 2006). Investment on nanotechnology  
31 R&D from both public and private sectors has been increasing (Kuzma and VerHage, 2006). The  
32 potential of nanotechnologies in terms of environmental impacts, including those with agriculture  
33 applications (waste management, water purification, environmental sensors, and agricultural  
34 pollution reduction) has been assessed (Defra, 2007).

35  
36 Biosensors developed into nanosensors expedite rapid testing and analysis of soil, plants, and  
37 water making nutrient and water management in the farm more efficient and less laborious (Birrel



1 and Hummel, 2001; Alocilja and Radke, 2003). Nanoporous materials such as zeolites can help  
2 release the right dosage of fertilizer at the right time owing to well-controlled stable suspensions  
3 with absorbed or adsorbed substances. Nanoelectrocatalytic systems could optimize purification  
4 of highly contaminated and salinated water for drinking and irrigation; and nanostructured  
5 materials may offer clean energy solutions through the use of solar cells, fuel cells, and novel  
6 hydrogen storage (Court et al., 2005).

7  
8 Nanomaterials can provide environmental filters or as direct sensors of pollutants (Dionysiou,  
9 2004). Nanoparticles have been used in photocatalysis that enhance degradation process in  
10 solid, farm or wastewater treatment (Blake, 1997; Herrmann, 1999). Air pollution could also be  
11 reduced (Peral et al., 1997) through on the use of photocatalysis for purification, decontamination,  
12 and deodorization of air.

13  
14 The integration of nanotechnology, biotechnology, and information and communications  
15 technology could revolutionize agriculture this century (Opara, 2004). These technologies could  
16 contribute to reducing hunger and improving nutrition by optimizing plant health and eliminating  
17 pathogens or other organisms that might contaminate food.

18  
19 Despite the rapidly expanding products and market of nanotechnology (nanotechnology food  
20 market in 2006 was about US \$7 billion in 2006 and may reach a total of \$20.4 billion by 2010  
21 (HKC, 2006), there are some biosafety and IPR concerns. Their application in agriculture will  
22 directly introduce them into ground and surface water catchments where they may accumulate in  
23 concentrations that may undermine the goals of food safety and environmental sustainability  
24 (ETC Group, 2005; NSTC, 2000). Nanomaterials are built from nanoparticles that may be too  
25 diverse for stereotypical risk assessments (Colvin, 2003). However, since nanoscale particles  
26 have minute dimensions in common, these can direct research to likely exposure routes. For  
27 example, their small size but large-scale release may lead to their accumulation in groundwater  
28 because even particles that are not soluble in water can form colloidal species that can be carried  
29 in water (Colvin, 2003).

30  
31 As with biotechnology, nanotechnologies are not evenly distributed: wealthier industrial nations  
32 produce and own the technologies. A single nanoscale innovation can be relevant for widely  
33 divergent applications across many industry sectors and companies, and patent owners could  
34 potentially put up tolls on entire industries. IP will play a major role in deciding who will capture  
35 nanotech's market, who will gain access to nanoscale technologies, and at what price (ETC  
36 Group, 2005).

37

1 6.7.5.3 Participatory approaches to AKST

2 Efforts to preserve natural resources and guarantee the provisioning of essential ecosystem  
3 services are frequently characterized by social, political and legal conflicts (Wittmer et al., 2006).  
4 Broad-scale approaches are necessary to face problems that extend beyond a local site and a  
5 short time span.

6  
7 The asymmetric administration of shared lands and natural resources is a potential source of  
8 conflict in many trans-boundary eco-regions of the world (Viglizzo, 2001). The cross-border  
9 externalization of negative environmental impacts due to asymmetries in land conversion and  
10 intensity of farming represents a challenge to neighboring countries. The problem may become  
11 critical in shared basins with interconnected rivers and streams where downstream countries  
12 often have to pay the cost of negative impacts that have not been properly internalized upstream.

13  
14 AKST can be employed to prevent or mitigate consequences of conflict over environmental  
15 resources, particularly through the use of participatory approaches supported to enhance the  
16 commitment of stakeholders to the decision-making process and to share the responsibility of  
17 managing common resources. Strategies include (a) developing stakeholder appreciation for  
18 importance of trans-boundary basin management (b) jointly designed land-use strategies to  
19 prevent potential conflicts due to negative externalities from neighboring areas, (c) environmental  
20 impact assessment for ex-ante evaluation of potentially conflicting projects, and (d) acceptance of  
21 third party independent arbitration to face current or potential conflicts when necessary.

22  
23 Agricultural and environmental conflicts are characterized by the interaction of both ecological  
24 and societal complexity (Funtowicz and Ravetz, 1994). Participatory approaches (De Marchi et  
25 al., 2000) and multicriteria analysis (Paruccini, 1994) can help resolve agroenvironmental  
26 conflicts. Multiple criteria analysis uses different approaches (normative, substantive and  
27 instrumental) to deal with different types and levels of conflict resolution; it can be a powerful  
28 analytical tool in cases where a single decision-making criterion fails and where impacts (social,  
29 ecological or environmental) cannot be assigned monetary values.

30  
31 Currently, most agricultural technology aims at resolving environmental problems that occur at  
32 the small spatial scale (e.g., the plot and farm level), but broad-scale technologies (Stoorvogel  
33 and Antle, 2001) are necessary to reveal impacts that are not perceived with site-specific studies.  
34 The importance of information technology increases as we scale-up to undertake problems that  
35 occur at broader geographical scales. The integration of maps, remote-sensing images, and data  
36 bases into geographic information systems (GIS) is needed to assess, monitor and account  
37 critical resources and large-scale agroenvironmental processes. This information base, coupled

1 to models and expert systems (De Koning et al., 1999), can help support the application of  
2 participatory approaches and multicriteria analysis to resolve present or potential conflicts.  
3 Likewise, these tools become tools to support decision-making on large-scale land-use policies  
4 and managerial schemes.

5  
6 The impact of climate change may exacerbate risks of conflict over resources and further  
7 increase inequity, particularly in developing countries where significant resource constraints  
8 already exist. An estimated 25 million people per year already flee from weather-related disasters  
9 and global warming is projected to increase this number to some 200 million before 2050 (Myers  
10 2002); semi-arid ecosystems are expected to be the most vulnerable to impacts from climate  
11 change refugees (Myers, 2002). This situation creates a very serious potential for future conflict,  
12 and possible violent clashes over habitable land and natural resources such as freshwater  
13 (Brauch, 2002), which would seriously impede AKST efforts to address food security and poverty  
14 reduction.

## 16 **6.8 Adaptation to Climate Change, Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases**

17 The effectiveness of adaptation efforts is likely to vary significantly between and within regions,  
18 depending on geographic location, vulnerability to current climate extremes, level of economic  
19 diversification and wealth, and institutional capacity (Burton and Lim, 2005). Industrialized  
20 agriculture, generally situated at high latitudes and possessing economies of scale, good access  
21 to information, technology and insurance programs, as well as favorable terms of global trade, is  
22 positioned relatively well to adapt to climate change. By contrast, small-scale rainfed production  
23 systems in semi-arid and subhumid zones presently contend with substantial risk from seasonal  
24 and interannual climate variability. Agricultural communities in these regions generally have poor  
25 adaptive capacity to climate change due to the marginal nature of the production environment  
26 and the constraining effects of poverty and land degradation (Parry et al., 1999).

27  
28 AKST will be confronted with the challenge of needing to significantly increase agriculture  
29 output— to feed two to three billion more people and accommodate a growing urban demand for  
30 food— while slowing the rate of new GHG emissions from agriculture, and simultaneously  
31 adapting to the negative impacts of climate change on food production. Agriculture will have to  
32 become much more efficient in its production if it is to accomplish this without significantly  
33 increasing its climate forcing potential. All of this will have to be achieved in a future where  
34 agricultural crops may be in direct competition with crops grown for energy purposes as well as  
35 without significant extensification and loss of biodiversity.

### 37 **6.8.1 AKST innovations**

1 6.8.1.1 Technological (high-input) options

2 *Modeling.* Climate simulation models indicate the intensification of the hydrologic cycle, climatic  
3 conditions which will significantly challenge efforts to control soil erosion and rehabilitate  
4 degraded lands even in well-endowed production environments (Nearing, 2004). Tropical soils  
5 with low organic matter are expected to experience the greatest impact of erosion on crop  
6 productivity because of the poor resilience of these soils to erosive forces, and the high sensitivity  
7 of yields to cumulative soil loss (Stocking, 2003; Nearing, 2004). Evidence of significant soil  
8 erosion can often be difficult to detect, and its impact on crop productivity can be masked by use  
9 of inorganic fertilizer (Knowler, 2004; Boardman, 2006). Extreme events, which significantly  
10 contribute to total erosion, are very likely to increase with climate change (Boardman, 2006), as  
11 will climate-induced changes in land use that leave soils vulnerable to erosion (Rounsevell et al.,  
12 1999).

13  
14 The improvement of soil erosion modeling capacity can address the role of extreme events in soil  
15 erosion and encompass the influence of socioeconomic factors on land use change (Michael et  
16 al., 2005; Boardman, 2006). One new technique estimates the impact of more frequent extreme  
17 events under different climate scenarios by using meteorological time series projections (Michael  
18 et al., 2005). The effects of extreme events on erosion can be more simply modeled with two-  
19 dimensional hill slope approaches (Boardman, 2006); GIS can be used to develop landslide  
20 hazard maps (Perotto-Baldiviezo et al., 2004).

21  
22 Recent developments in modeling techniques show potential for estimating the future impact of  
23 extreme events, through downscaling from General Circulation Models. Global climate models,  
24 however, they will continue to be limited by uncertainties (Zhang, 2005). The lack of quantitative  
25 data and the technological complexity of many contemporary models are likely to limit the  
26 applicability of soil erosion modeling in less developed steep land regions (Morgan et al., 2002;  
27 Boardman, 2006). Better field-level assessments of current erosion under different crops and  
28 management practices, and, where possible, through integrating GIS into land-use planning could  
29 help developing countries assess the impacts of climate change.

30  
31 Agroecological zone (AEZ) tools used by FAO (FAO, 2000) to determine crop suitability for the  
32 world's major ecosystems and climates has potential to enhance efforts to develop crop  
33 diversification strategies. The AEZ methodology, which combines crop modeling with  
34 environmental matching, allow as assessment of the suitability of particular crop combinations  
35 given future climate scenarios. However, the data sets that underlie AEZ need to be improved in  
36 order to realize the full potential of these tools for crop diversification. For example the current  
37 scale of the FAO world soil maps at 1:5,000,000 needs finer resolution (FAO, 2000).

1

2 *Early warning, forecasting systems.* Timely forecasts, including the starting date of the rainy  
3 season, average weather conditions over the coming season, conditions within the season that  
4 are critical to staple crops and animals, and appropriate responses can increase the economic,  
5 environmental, and social stability of agricultural systems and associated communities. Advances  
6 in atmospheric and ocean sciences, a better understanding of global climate, and investments in  
7 monitoring of the tropical oceans have increased forecasting skill at seasonal to interannual  
8 timescales. Early warning systems using seasonal forecasts (such as the FAO Global Information  
9 and Early Warning System) and monitoring of local commodity markets, are increasingly used to  
10 predict likely food shortfalls with enough advance warning for effective responses by marketing  
11 systems and downstream users.

12

13 Traditional coping mechanisms depend on the ability to anticipate hazard patterns, which are  
14 increasingly erratic with the advent of climate change. One option for improving early detection  
15 and warning would be to broaden the use of GIS-based methodologies such as those employed  
16 by the Conflict Early Warning and Response Network (CEWARN), the Global Public Health  
17 Information Network (G-PHIN).

18

19 Early warning systems are important because they help to untangle the multiple but  
20 interdependent crises that characterize complex emergencies, particularly in response to climate  
21 change. In other words, continuous information gathering serves to identify the socioecological  
22 ingredients of complex crises before they escalate into widespread violence. This means  
23 technological systems are also needed. To this end, the added value of technological early  
24 warning systems should therefore be judged on their empowerment of local people-centered  
25 systems that build on the capacity of disaster-affected communities to recover with little external  
26 assistance following a disaster. Further applied research is needed on local human adaptability in  
27 decentralized settings as well as self-adaptation in dynamic disaster environments.

28

29 Linking early warning to more effective response requires a people-centered approach to climate  
30 change (UN, 2006). The quest for early warning must be more than just an “exercise in  
31 understanding how what is happening over there comes be known by us over here” (Adelman,  
32 1998). Instead, the international community should focus on the real stakeholders and add to  
33 their capacity for social resilience. On the policy front, the lack of institutionalized early warning  
34 systems that survey the localized impact of climate change on ecological and political crises  
35 inhibits the formulation of evidence-based interventions (Levy and Meier, 2004). Regrettably, little  
36 collaboration currently exists between the disaster management and conflict prevention

1 communities despite obvious parallels in risk assessments, monitoring and warning,  
2 dissemination and communication, response capability and impact evaluation (Meier, 2007).

3  
4 Bringing climate prediction to bear on the needs of agriculture requires increasing observational  
5 networks in the most vulnerable regions, further improvements in forecast accuracy, integrating  
6 seasonal prediction with information at shorter and longer time scales, embedding crop models  
7 within climate models, enhanced use of remote sensing, quantitative evidence of the utility of  
8 forecasts for agricultural risk management, enhanced stakeholder participation, and commodity  
9 trade and storage applications (Giles 2005; Hansen, 2005; Hansen et al., 2006; Doblaz-Reyes et  
10 al., 2006; Sivakumar, 2006). For seasonal climate forecasts to be an effective adaptation tool,  
11 advances in forecasting skills need to be matched with better pathways for dissemination and  
12 application, such as by linking forecasts to broader livelihood and development priorities, and by  
13 training organizations, such as extension agencies, to facilitate the end users' ability to make  
14 effective decisions in response to forecasts (Ziervogel 2004; Garbrecht et al., 2005; Hansen  
15 2005; Vogel and O'Brien, 2006). Substantial investments by national and international agricultural  
16 and meteorological services are needed.

17  
18 *Improve crop breeding potential for drought, salinity and heat tolerance.* Abiotic stress of  
19 agricultural crops is expected to increase in most regions due to warmer temperatures,  
20 experienced both as episodic heat waves and mean temperature elevation, prolonged dry spells  
21 and drought, excess soil moisture, and salinity linked to higher evapotranspiration rates and salt  
22 intrusion. Expected temperature increases of 2-3 °C by mid-century could significantly impair  
23 productivity of important staple crops of the developing world, such as wheat, and in truly  
24 marginal areas, millet. One-third of irrigated agricultural lands worldwide are affected by high  
25 salinity, and the area of salt-affected soils is expected to increase at a rate of 10% per year  
26 (Foolad, 2004). The magnitude of these impacts could test our capacity to achieve breakthroughs  
27 in germplasm improvement equivalent to the challenge at hand.

28  
29 Advances in plant genomics, linked to the Arabidopsis model system, and the integration of  
30 genomics with physiology and conventional plant breeding could lead to the development of new  
31 varieties with enhanced tolerance to drought, heat, and salinity. Emerging genomic tools with  
32 future potential include whole-genome microarrays, marker-assisted selection using quantitative  
33 trait loci, bioinformatics, and microRNAs (Edmeades et al., 2004; Foolad, 2004; Ishitani et al.,  
34 2004; White et al., 2004; Denby and Gehring, 2005). Phenological adaptation, e.g., matching crop  
35 duration to available season length, is central to successful breeding efforts; thus conventional  
36 breeding, augmented with genomic tools, is a likely configuration of future plant breeding  
37 programs. An example of this would be the integration of phenotyping (differences in crop

1 germplasm performance under different stress environments) with functional genomic  
2 approaches for identifying genes and mechanisms (Edmeades et al., 2004; Ishitani et al., 2004).  
3 Improvement in seasonal forecasting and in the use of remote sensing and other observational  
4 tools could also be used to further support breeding programs, through better characterization of  
5 cropping environments.

6  
7 Future breakthroughs in understanding how crop plants respond to abiotic stress are very likely,  
8 given the scientific resources dedicated to investigating the *Arabidopsis thaliana*, a model system  
9 used for plant genetics and genomics studies with a small, completely sequenced genome and a  
10 short life cycle. For example, progress in genomics related to salt tolerance in *Arabidopsis*  
11 mutants has enhanced understanding of gene function, which could provide opportunities to  
12 exploit these mechanisms in crop species (Foolad, 2004; Denby and Gehring, 2005). However,  
13 direct extrapolation of single gene responses, gained through *Arabidopsis* studies, to functional  
14 abiotic tolerance of cultivated crop species could continue to be limited by differences in gene  
15 sequence between *Arabidopsis* and crop species (Edmeades et al., 2004; White et al., 2004).  
16 Moreover, gene expression in *Arabidopsis* changes when exposed to field conditions (Miyazaki et  
17 al., 2004, as reviewed by White et al., 2004), as would be expected given the influence of  
18 genotype by environment interactions. Genes for heat tolerance have been identified in a number  
19 of species, including rice, cowpea, and groundnut, which is likely to provide future opportunities  
20 for heat-tolerance breeding.

21  
22 Attaining more effective use of genomics for abiotic stress-tolerance breeding will depend on  
23 closer integration of this discipline with physiology, which could lead to better understanding of  
24 how genes confer changes in whole-plant biological function and agronomic performance  
25 (genotype-to-phenotype relationships) (Edmeades et al., 2004; White et al., 2004). However, the  
26 current imbalance between genomic research and field-based physiological studies, in favor of  
27 the former, could undermine future AKST progress towards developing new stress-tolerant  
28 germplasm. Lastly, the scope of abiotic stress research needs to be extended to include more  
29 investigations of stress caused by mineral deficiencies and toxicities (Ishitani et al., 2004), as  
30 these factors strongly influence root development with implications for tolerance to climatic  
31 extremes (Lynch and St. Clair, 2004). For example, many tropical agricultural soils have high  
32 levels of exchangeable Al which stunt root system development. Bringing mineral stress tolerance  
33 more closely into the realm of abiotic stress research, while increasing the complexity of the  
34 breeding challenge, could possibly avoid short-circuiting progress on drought, heat and salinity  
35 breeding efforts when scaling up to actual field conditions where multiple and complex stresses  
36 occur.

37

1 Technological breakthroughs in breeding for abiotic stress tolerance could ultimately be limited by  
2 a potential loss of crop wild relatives to climate change. In the next 50 years, 16 to 22% of  
3 species that are wild relatives of peanut, potato, and cowpea could become extinct as a result of  
4 temperature increases and shifts in rainfall distribution, and most of the remaining species could  
5 lose over 50% of their range size (Jarvis et al., 2008). These three crops are important for food  
6 security in low-income countries, and their wild relatives are a vital genetic resource for  
7 developing future drought and pest resistant crop varieties, as well as varieties with enhanced  
8 nutritional value. Greater efforts to collect seed for gene banks (*ex situ* conservation) and to  
9 target *in situ* conservation, such as through addressing habitat fragmentation, could help to  
10 mitigate these potential losses. Strengthening links between conservation, breeding, and farmers'  
11 groups is an important component of this effort. However, diversity for its own sake is not useful,  
12 as farmers retain varieties for specific traits, not for the sake of conservation (Box 6-2).

13

14 Agronomic and genetic improvement of underutilized (or 'lost') crops could provide a good  
15 opportunity to enhance agricultural diversification, particularly in Africa where approximately  
16 2,000 underutilized food species are consumed (NRC, 1996). Crops such as the legume  
17 Bambara groundnut (*Vigna subterranean*) and the cereal fonio (*Digitaria exilis* and *Digitaria*  
18 *iburua*) still figure prominently in the African diet. Fonio has very good prospects for semi-arid and  
19 upland areas because it is widely consumed, tolerates poor soil and drought conditions, matures  
20 very quickly (6-8 weeks), and has an amino acid profile superior to today's major cereals (NRC,  
21 1996). Unlocking the genetic potential of this cereal through conventional breeding and  
22 biotechnology to address low yields, small seeds, and seed shattering could help meet  
23 development and sustainability goals (Kuta et al., 2003; NRC, 1996). Similar potential exists for  
24 Bambara groundnut (Azam-Ali, 2006; Azam-Ali et al., 2001), which is still cultivated from  
25 landraces. Research needs for underutilized crops include germplasm collection, marker assisted  
26 breeding, assessments of agronomic characteristics and nutritional content, development of  
27 improved processing technologies, and market analyses. While these crops cannot replace the  
28 major cereals, their improvement could significantly enhance food security options for rural  
29 communities confronted with climate change.

30

31 Diversification of agriculture systems is likely to become an important strategy for enhancing the  
32 adaptive capacity of agriculture to climate change. Diversification strategies in the near term will  
33 need to be flexible, given that the disruptive impacts of climate change are projected to be  
34 experienced more in terms of increased variability, than as mean changes in climate. Therefore,  
35 improved skill in predicting how short-term climate phenomena, such as the El Niño Southern  
36 Oscillation and the North Atlantic Oscillation, affect seasonal and interannual variability, and the  
37 timely dissemination of forecasts will be essential for farmer decisions about whether to grow high



1 or low water-consumptive crops and use of drought-tolerant varieties (Adams et al., 2003; Stige  
2 et al., 2006).

3

4 **[Insert Box 6.2]**

5

6 6.8.1.2 On-farm (low input) options

7 The knowledge and tools currently available could be better deployed to reduce the vulnerability  
8 of rainfed agriculture to seasonal climate variability. For example, poor crop establishment is a  
9 significant but solvable constraint in semi-arid farming environments (Harris, 2006). Similarly,  
10 seasonal dry spells can be bridged using improved rainfall catchment and incremental amounts of  
11 fertilizer (Rockström, 2004). By focusing on the “manageable part of climatic variability”  
12 (Rockström, 2004), AKST could have a significant positive impact on improving the adaptive  
13 capacity of rainfed agriculture to climate change. It is also important to recognize that risk  
14 aversion practices are themselves an adaptation to climate variability, and to understand the  
15 functional linkages between existing coping strategies and future climate change adaptation.

16

17 The greatest period of risk in rainfed agriculture is the uncertainty around the timing of sufficient  
18 rainfall for crop sowing. High rainfall variability and poor quality seed leads to slow germination  
19 and emergence, causing patchy stands, and multiple and delayed replanting, making poor crop  
20 establishment a significant contributor to the productivity gap in semi-arid agriculture (Harris,  
21 2006). Emphasis can be put on targeting technologies and practices that reduce the exposure of  
22 sensitive crop growth stages to seasonal climate variability.

23

24 Options for addressing this challenge include improving farmer access to quality seed, adoption  
25 of improved crop establishment practices, and the use of healthy seedlings in transplant systems.  
26 Seed priming—soaking seeds in water for several hours but short of triggering germination — is  
27 an example of a simple but effective technology for improving crop establishment. Priming of  
28 some seeds results in more even and fuller stand establishment; and accelerates seedling  
29 emergence and improves early growth, often leading to earlier flowering and maturity, avoidance  
30 of late-season drought and improved yields (Harris et al., 2001; Harris, 2006). Experimental crop  
31 transplanting methods in millet-sorghum areas of Africa can also reduce planting risk; e.g.,  
32 staggered transplanting from seedling nurseries to allow for variable onset of the rainy season  
33 (Young and Mottram, 2001; Mottram, 2003; CAZS, 2006). This method, though more labor  
34 intensive, results in faster crop establishment with fewer gaps, and a harvest 2-3 weeks earlier  
35 than conventional seeding methods, leading to higher grain and stover yields.

36

1 By reducing crop establishment risk and decreasing the time to maturity, these technologies  
2 provide a small measure of flexibility to farmers in high-risk environments. Technologically simple  
3 approaches to improve crop establishment and seedling vigor generally have minimal downside  
4 risks, immediate and tangible benefits, and can be easily tailored to producer needs; thus, they  
5 are appropriate options for small-scale rainfed systems. Seed priming, which has been tested in a  
6 wide array of dryland cereals and pulses, consistently results in average 30% increases in yield  
7 with minimal farmer investment (Harris, 2006). Similar mean yield increases have been observed  
8 with seedbed solarization of rice nurseries, though with somewhat greater farmer investment in  
9 material and time. While these are simple technologies, they do require some local testing and  
10 training to ensure that proper techniques are followed. Millet transplanting systems show good  
11 potential, though labor shortages could be an issue in some regions. An analysis of the tradeoff  
12 between labor for transplanting versus the labor and extra seed required for multiple resowing of  
13 millet fields would help to clarify the issue of labor expenditure.

14  
15 *Soils.* Improved adoption of soil conserving practices can also mitigate the damaging effects of  
16 climate variability. Methods include the use of cover crops, surface retention of crop residues,  
17 conservation tillage, green manures, agroforestry, and improved fallow (Sanchez, 2000; Benites  
18 and Ashburner, 2003; Lal, 2005). Although these are very sound practices for soil protection,  
19 achieving broad-scale and long-term adoption of them will be a significant challenge given the  
20 current and likely future, disincentives to investment as described in the previous subchapter  
21 (Stocking, 2003; Knowler, 2004; Cherr et al., 2006; Patto et al., 2006). The resilience of  
22 conservation farming systems in the Central American highlands to recent El Niño drought  
23 (Cherrett, 1999), and to the catastrophic soil losses from Hurricane Mitch (Holt-Gimenez, 2001)  
24 provide strong evidence of conservation agriculture's potential as an adaptation response to  
25 increased rainfall variability and storm intensity with climate change.

26  
27 Long-term investment in rehabilitating degraded lands is another option for addressing the  
28 negative feedback between high rainfall risks and declining soil fertility. Recent evidence of  
29 revegetation and agricultural intensification in the Sahel, catalyzed by a crisis of diminished  
30 rainfall and declining yields (Herrmann et al., 2005; Reij et al., 2005; Tappan and McGahuey,  
31 2007; USAID, 2006), could inform future AKST efforts at integrating soil and water conservation  
32 and land reclamation into adaptation planning. Technologies and practices that were deployed in  
33 these areas to reclaim declining or abandoned land include rock lines, rock 'Vs', and manure-  
34 amended planting pits that were used to break soil crusts and enhance water capture and  
35 retention and farmer-managed natural regeneration of N-fixing trees to improve soil fertility. Soil  
36 reclamation using this method encompassed several hundred thousand ha in Burkina Faso and

1 Mali, and well over a million ha in Niger (Reij et al., 2005; Tappan and McGahuey, 2007; USAID,  
2 2006).

3

4 Important elements gleaned from these studies include:

- 5 • Legal code reforms that provided farmer, rather than government, ownership of trees  
6 was an essential precondition;
- 7 • The process was driven by both autonomous action and development assistance,  
8 with the former sometimes taking the lead and the latter following;
- 9 • By improving land and claiming ownership, women were one of the main  
10 beneficiaries, and improved household food security one of the most tangible  
11 outcomes;
- 12 • Investment in fertilizer occurred after farmers invested in measures to conserve soil  
13 moisture and increase soil organic matter.

14

15 AKST could play an important role in documenting the effectiveness of these practices for  
16 seasonal climate risk management, e.g., investigating how these soil improvement practices  
17 affect soil fertility, soil moisture retention, and crop yields over a range of variable rainfall years,  
18 as well as conducting detailed socioeconomic analyses of how the benefits are distributed in local  
19 communities. Local control of the resource base is necessary for creating the enabling conditions  
20 that spur local action towards natural resource improvements, and an understanding of this  
21 dynamic is needed to effectively support local initiatives. Stabilizing and improving the natural  
22 resource base of agriculture are essential preconditions for investing in technologies for long-term  
23 adaptation to climate change (Stocking, 2003; Sanchez, 2005).

24

25 *Reduction of greenhouse gas emission for agriculture.* Reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from  
26 agriculture could be achieved by better matching fertilizer application with plant demand through  
27 the use of site-specific nutrient management that only uses fertilizer N to meet the increment not  
28 supplied by indigenous nutrient sources; split fertilizer applications; use of slow-release fertilizer  
29 N; and nitrification inhibitors (DeAngelo et al, 2005; Pampolino et al., 2007). Another option to  
30 address N<sub>2</sub>O emissions would be the use of biological means to inhibit or control nitrification in  
31 soils. Gene transfer from species exhibiting biological nitrification inhibition to cultivated species  
32 could offer another way to reduce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions to the atmosphere and nitrate pollution of water  
33 bodies (Fillery, 2007; Subbarao et al., 2007).

34

35 Improved management of agriculture and rangelands targeted at soil conservation, agroforestry,  
36 conservation tillage (especially no-till), agricultural intensification, and rehabilitation of degraded  
37 land can yield C sequestration benefits (IPCC, 2000; Izaurrealde et al., 2001; Lal, 2004). Carbon

1 sequestration potential in soils is greatest on degraded soils (Lal, 2004), especially those with  
2 relatively high clay content (Duxbury, 2005; Lal, 2004).

3

4 Another promising approach would be to use plant material to produce biochar and store it in soil  
5 (Lehman, 2007a). Heating plant biomass without oxygen (a process known as low-temperature  
6 pyrolysis) converts plant material (trees, grasses or crop residues) into bioenergy, and in the  
7 process creates biochar as a co-product. Biochar is a very stable compound with a high carbon  
8 content, surface area, and charge density; it has high stability against decay, and superior  
9 nutrient retention capacity relative to other forms of soil organic matter (Lehmann et al., 2006).

10 The potential environmental benefits of pyrolysis combined with biochar application to soil include  
11 a net withdrawal of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, enhancement of soil fertility, and reduced pollution of  
12 waterways through retention of fertilizer N and P to biochar surfaces (Lehmann, 2007b). Future  
13 research is needed to more fully understand the effect of pyrolysis conditions, feedstock type, and  
14 soil properties on the longevity and nutrient retention capacity of biochar.

15

16 The robustness of soil carbon sequestration as a permanent climate change mitigation strategy  
17 has been questioned because soil carbon, like any other biological reservoir, may be reverted  
18 back to the atmosphere as CO<sub>2</sub> if the carbon sequestering practice (e.g., no till practice) were to  
19 be abandoned or practiced less intensively. Increasing soil organic matter through carbon  
20 sequestering practices contributes directly to the long-term productivity of soil, water, and food  
21 resources (IPCC, 2000; Lal, 2004). Thus, it would seem unlikely that farmers would suddenly  
22 abandon systems of production that bring so many economic and environmental benefits. Other  
23 reports suggest that certain soil carbon sequestering practices, such as no till, may increase N<sub>2</sub>O  
24 emissions (Ball et al., 1999; Duxbury, 2005). This outcome, however, may be location specific  
25 (e.g., humid climatic conditions) as revealed by a comprehensive review of Canadian  
26 agroecosystem studies (Helgason et al., 2005).

27

28 Globally, farmers continue to adopt no-till as their conventional production system. As of 2001,  
29 no-till agriculture had been adopted across more than 70 million ha worldwide with major  
30 expansion in South America (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay) (Izaurrealde and Rice, 2006).  
31 With an area under cropland estimated globally at 1.5 billion ha, there exists a significant potential  
32 to increase the adoption of no till as well as other improved agricultural practices, which would  
33 have other environmental benefits such as improved soil quality and fertility, reduced soil erosion,  
34 and improved habitat for wildlife. Much work remains to be done, however, in order to adapt no-till  
35 agriculture to the great variety of topographic, climatic, edaphic, land tenure, land size, economic,  
36 and cultural conditions that exist in agricultural regions of the world.

37

1 In developing strategies all potential GHG emissions need to be considered for example, efforts  
2 to reduce CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in rice can lead to greater N<sub>2</sub>O emissions through changes in soil  
3 nitrogen dynamics (Wassmann et al., 2004; DeAngelo et al., 2005; Yue et al., 2005; Li et al.,  
4 2006). Similarly, conservation tillage for soil C sequestration can result in elevated N<sub>2</sub>O emissions  
5 through increased fertilizer use and accelerated denitrification in soils (Ball et al., 1999; Duxbury,  
6 2005). However, one of the most comprehensive long-term studies of GHG emissions across  
7 several land use practices in Michigan (Robertson et al., 2000) revealed that no-till agricultural  
8 methods had the lowest Global Warming Potential when compared to conventional and organic  
9 agricultural methods.

10  
11 From a GHG mitigation standpoint, strategies that emphasize the avoidance of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>  
12 emissions have a permanent effect as long as avoided emissions are tied to higher productivity,  
13 such as through increased energy efficiency and better factor productivity (Smith et al., 2007).  
14 Indeed, many of the practices that avoid GHG emissions and increase C sequestration also  
15 improve agricultural efficiency and the economics of production. For example, improving water  
16 and fertilizer use efficiency to reduce CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions also leads to gains in factor  
17 productivity (Gupta and Seth, 2006; Hobbs et al., 2003) while practices that promote soil C  
18 sequestration can greatly enhance soil quality (Lal, 2005). Improved water management in rice  
19 production can have multiple benefits including saving water while maintaining yields, reducing  
20 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, and reducing disease such as malaria and Japanese encephalitis (van der Hoek  
21 et al., 2007). There is significant scale for achieving this 'win-win' approach, with the approach  
22 largely determined by the size and input intensity of the production system, e.g. N-fixing legumes  
23 in smallholder systems and precision agriculture in large systems (Gregory et al., 2000).

24  
25 There is potential for achieving significant future reductions in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rice through  
26 improved water management. For example, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from China's rice paddies have  
27 declined by an average of 40% over the last two decades, with an additional 20 to 60% reduction  
28 possible by 2020 through combining the current practice of mid-season drainage with the  
29 adoption of shallow flooding, and by changing from urea to ammonium sulfate fertilizer, which  
30 impedes CH<sub>4</sub> production (DeAngelo et al., 2005; Li et al., 2006). There is also potential to achieve  
31 CH<sub>4</sub> reduction through integrating new insights of how the rice plant regulates CH<sub>4</sub> production and  
32 transport into rice breeding programs (Wassmann and Aulakh, 2000; Kerchoechuen, 2005).

33  
34 Emerging technologies that could provide future options for reducing CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions  
35 from livestock include: adding probiotics, yeasts, nitrification inhibitors, and edible oils to animal  
36 feed that reduce enteric CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from livestock systems (Smith et al., 2007) and  
37 controlling methanogenic archae, microorganisms that live in the rumen and generate CH<sub>4</sub> during

1 their metabolism More extensive use of the antibiotic Rumensin® (monensin sodium), currently  
2 used to improve feed efficiency and prevent *Coccidiosis*, a parasitic intestinal infection, would  
3 improve energy utilization of feedstuffs through increased production of propionic acid by rumen  
4 microorganisms and reduce the production of CH<sub>4</sub>. However, because Rumensin is also toxic to  
5 methanogenic bacteria, it should not be fed to cattle whose waste is to be used for CH<sub>4</sub>  
6 generation.

7

8 *Seeds.* A viable option for small-scale production systems would be to refine and more widely  
9 disseminate the practice of adding small quantities of fertilizer to seed, such as through seed  
10 coating (Rebafka et al., 1993) or soaking/priming (Harris, 2006) methods. Addition of fertilizer P  
11 and micronutrients to seed, rather than soil, is an inexpensive but highly effective means for  
12 improving plant nutrition and increasing yield (> 30% average yield increase reported) on  
13 drought-prone, acidic, low fertility soils. Seed priming with dilute fertilizer has average benefit/cost  
14 ratios 20 to 40 times greater than that achieved with fertilizer addition to the soil.

15

16 This is could be an effective strategy for small-scale systems, though there are several  
17 impediments such as low availability of quality fertilizer in local markets, lack of extension  
18 services for conveying technical information, and inability of farmer to pay for fertilizer-treated  
19 seed. Imbedding these technologies within larger efforts to overhaul the seed sector, which could  
20 include credit for purchasing improved seed and information about improved crop establishment  
21 practices could facilitate farmer adoption of these technologies. These technologies also could be  
22 disseminated into local communities by targeting farmers that have made prior land  
23 improvements to increase soil water retention, and may therefore be less risk adverse.

24

25 *Water Resources and Fisheries.* While the broad implications of climate change on marine  
26 systems are known – including rising sea levels, sea surface temperatures, and acidification – the  
27 degree and rate of change is not known, nor are the effects of these physical changes on  
28 ecosystem function and productivity (Behrenfeld et al., 2006). To adjust and cope with future  
29 climatic changes, a better understanding of how to predict the extent of change, apply adaptive  
30 management, and assign risk for management decisions is needed (Schneider, 2006).

31

32 To ensure the survival of many communities, their livelihoods and global food security, new  
33 approaches to monitoring, predicting, and adaptively responding to changes in marine and  
34 terrestrial ecosystems need to be developed. Ecosystem resilience can be built into fisheries and  
35 essential fish habitats (including wetlands and estuaries) and approaches developed that reduce  
36 risk and ensure continuation of ecosystem goods and services (Philippart et al., 2007). Rising sea  
37 levels will alter coastal habitats and their future productivity, threatening some of the most

1 productive fishing areas in the world. Changes in ocean temperatures will alter ocean currents  
2 and the distribution and ranges of marine animals, including fish populations (di Prisco and  
3 Verde, 2006; Lunde et al., 2006; Sabates et al., 2006; Clarke et al., 2007). Rising sea surface  
4 temperatures will result in additional coral reef bleaching and mortality (Donner et al., 2005).  
5 Rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> will lead to acidification of ocean waters and disrupt the ability of  
6 animals (such as corals, mollusks, plankton) to secrete calcareous skeletons, thus reducing their  
7 role in critical ecosystems and food webs (Royal Society, 2005).

8  
9 Precautionary approaches to management of fish and freshwater resources are needed to reduce  
10 the impacts from climate change, including conserving riparian and coastal wetlands that can  
11 buffer changes in sea level rise and freshwater flows. Human-induced pressures on fish  
12 populations from overfishing must be reduced so that fish populations have a chance of  
13 withstanding the additional pressures from warming seas and changes in seasonal current  
14 patterns. Human demand for increasing freshwater supplies needs to be addressed through  
15 water conservation and water reuse, thus allowing environmental flows to maintain riparian and  
16 wetland ecosystems.

17  
18 Small-scale fishers, who lack mobility and livelihood alternatives and are often the most  
19 dependent on specific fisheries, will suffer disproportionately from such large-scale climatic  
20 changes. In Asia, 1 billion people are estimated to be dependent upon coral reef fisheries as a  
21 major source of protein, yet coral reef ecosystems are among the most threatened by global  
22 climate change. The combined effects of sea surface temperature rise and oceanic acidification  
23 could mean that corals will begin to disappear from tropical reefs in just 50 years; poor, rural  
24 coastal communities in developing countries are at the greatest risk and will suffer the greatest  
25 consequences (Donner and Potere, 2007; www.icsf.net). Climate change is a major threat to  
26 critical coastal ecosystems such as the Nile, the Niger and other low-lying deltas, as well as  
27 oceanic islands which may be inundated by rising sea levels. The environmental and  
28 socioeconomic costs, especially to fisheries communities in developing countries, could be  
29 enormous.

30  
31 Water related risk can be reduced through adaptation and adoption of strategies to improve water  
32 productivity in rainfed farming systems. These strategies entail shifting from passive to active  
33 water management in rainfed farming systems and include water harvesting systems for  
34 supplemental irrigation, small scale off-season irrigation combined with improved cropping  
35 system management, including use of water harvesting, minimum tillage and mulch systems,  
36 improved crop varieties, improved cropping patterns (Molden et al., 2007), and particularly  
37 mitigation of soil degradation (Bossio et al., 2007). These existing technologies allow active

1 management of rainfall (green water), rather than only managing river flows (blue water)  
2 (Rockstrom et al., 2006).

3

4 The scope for improvement is tremendous (Molden et al., 2007): rainfed farming covers most of  
5 the world croplands (80%), and produces most of the world's food (60-70%). Poverty is  
6 particularly concentrated in tropical developing countries in rural areas where rainfed farming is  
7 practiced (Castillo et al., 2007). Half of the currently malnourished are concentrated in the arid,  
8 semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas where agriculture is very risky due to extreme variability of  
9 rainfall, long dry seasons, and recurrent droughts, floods and dry spells (Rockstrom, et al., 2007).  
10 Current productivity is generally very low (yields generally less than half of irrigated systems and  
11 in temperate regions where water risks are much lower). Even in these regions, there is generally  
12 enough water to double or often quadruple yields in rainfed farming systems. In these areas the  
13 challenge is to reduce water related risks rather than coping with absolute scarcity of water. With  
14 small investments large relative improvements in agricultural and water productivity can be  
15 achieved in rainfed agriculture. Small investments providing 1000 m<sup>3</sup>/ha (100 mm/ha) of extra  
16 water for supplemental irrigation can unlock the potential and more than double water and  
17 agricultural productivity in small-scale rainfed agriculture, which is a very small investment  
18 compared to the 10000-15000 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> storage infrastructure required to enable full surface  
19 irrigation (Rockstrom et al., 2007). Provided that there are sufficient other factor inputs (e.g., N),  
20 the major hurdle for rain water harvesting and supplemental irrigation systems is cost  
21 effectiveness. Investment in R&D for low cost small scale technologies is therefore important to  
22 realize gains. This approach can address seasonal variability in rainfall (expected to increase with  
23 climate change) but have little impact in conditions of more severe inter-annual variability (very  
24 low rainfall), which can only be addressed by systems with storage (dams and groundwater) or  
25 buffering (lag in hydrologic response so that river flows are substantially maintained through  
26 drought periods).

27

28 Climate change will require a new look at water storage, to mitigate the impact of more extreme  
29 weather, cope with changes in total amounts of precipitation, and cope with changing distribution  
30 of precipitation, including shifts in ratios between snowfall and rainfall. Developing more storage  
31 (reservoirs and groundwater storage) and hydraulic infrastructure provides stakeholders with  
32 more influence in determining the precise allocation to desired activities including agriculture and  
33 hydropower production.

34

35 In the process of adapting to climate change multiple interests at the basin scale can be  
36 incorporated and managed, and tradeoffs with other livelihood and environmental interests  
37 included in the planning (Faurés et al., 2007). Storage will itself be more vulnerable to climatic



1 extremes resulting from climate change, and therefore be less reliable. Furthermore, it will have  
2 proportionately greater impacts on wetland and riverine ecosystems, which are already under  
3 stress. The arguments on the relative merits of further storage will become sharper and more  
4 pressing (Molden et al., 2007). The role of groundwater as a strategic reserve will increase (Shah  
5 et al., 2007) How to plan appropriate and sustainable storage systems that address climate  
6 change is a pressing need for future AKST development.

## 7 8 **6.8.2 Sustainable use of bioenergy**

### 9 6.8.2.1 Liquid biofuels for transport

10 Current trends indicate that a large-scale expansion of production of 1<sup>st</sup> generation biofuels for  
11 transport will create huge demands on agricultural land and water – causing potentially large  
12 negative social and environmental effects, e.g. rising food prices, deforestation, depletion of water  
13 resources (see Chapter 4) that may outweigh positive effects. The following options are currently  
14 being discussed as means to alleviating these problems.

#### 15 16 *Reducing land and water requirements through increasing yields of agricultural feedstocks.*

17 Efforts are currently focused on increasing biofuel yields per hectare while reducing agricultural  
18 input requirements by optimizing cropping methods or breeding higher yielding crops. For  
19 example, Brazil has been able to increase yields and reduce crop vulnerability to drought and  
20 pests by developing more than 550 different varieties of sugar cane, each adapted to different  
21 local climates, rainfall patterns and diseases (GTZ, 2005). Both conventional breeding and  
22 genetic engineering are being employed to further enhance crop characteristics such as starch or  
23 oil content to increase their value as energy crops. There is a great variety of crops in developing  
24 countries that are believed to hold large yield potential but more research is needed to develop  
25 this potential (Cassman et al., 2006; Ortiz et al., 2006; Woods, 2006). However, even if yields can  
26 successfully be increased, several problems will persist for the production of liquid biofuels on a  
27 large scale:

28  
29 Total land area under cultivation will still need to expand considerably in order to meet large-scale  
30 demand for biofuels and food production (Table 6.5).

#### 31 32 **[Insert Table 6.5]**

33  
34 Land availability and quality as well as social and environmental value and vulnerability of this  
35 land differ widely by country and region and needs to be carefully assessed at the local level  
36 (FAO, 2000; WBGU, 2003; European Environment Agency, 2006). Moreover, various studies  
37 predict that water will be a considerable limiting factor for which feedstock production and other

1 land uses (e.g. food production, ecosystems) would increasingly compete (Giampietro et al.,  
2 1997; Berndes, 2002; De Fraiture et al., 2007). In addition to these environmental problems,  
3 special care must be taken to avoid displacement and marginalization of poor people who often  
4 have weakly enforceable or informal property and land-use rights and are thus particularly  
5 vulnerable (Fritsche et al., 2005; FBOMS, 2006; The Guardian, 2007).

6  
7 Economic competitiveness will continue to be an issue. Even in Brazil, the world leader in efficient  
8 ethanol production, biofuels are competitive only under particularly favorable market conditions.  
9 To increase total land area under production, less productive areas would have to be brought into  
10 production, either for bioenergy feedstocks directly or for other agricultural crops which may be  
11 displaced on the most productive lands. This depends on economic incentives for farmers and  
12 investments in productivity enhancements and could have strong effects on agricultural systems  
13 and further accentuate food price effects.

14 Environmental concerns, associated with issues such as high-input feedstock production, the  
15 conversion of pristine land for agricultural production, the employment of transgenic crops, the  
16 depletion of water resources as well as the problematic resemblance of some biofuels feedstocks  
17 with invasive species (Raghu et al., 2006) need to be carefully assessed with special emphasis  
18 on the local context.

19  
20 *Producing biofuels from inedible feedstock and on marginal lands.* It is often argued that using  
21 inedible energy crops for the production of biofuels would reduce pressures on food prices.  
22 Moreover, many of these crops, e.g. *Jatropha*, poplar and switchgrass, could be grown  
23 productively on marginal land, without irrigation and potentially even contributing to environmental  
24 goals such as soil restoration and preservation (GEF, 2006; IEA, 2004; Worldwatch Institute,  
25 2006).

26  
27 *Inedible feedstocks:* Food price increases can be caused directly, through the increase in  
28 demand for the biofuel feedstock, or indirectly, through the increase in demand for the factors of  
29 production (e.g. land and water). For example, land prices have risen considerably in the US  
30 “corn belt” over the past years – an effect that is largely attributed to the increased demand for  
31 ethanol feedstocks (Cornhusker Economics, 2007; Winsor, 2007). Such factor price increases  
32 lead to increasing production costs of all goods for which they are used as inputs. Thus, using  
33 non-edible plants as energy feedstocks but growing them on agricultural lands may only have a  
34 limited mitigating effect on food prices.

35  
36 *Marginal lands:* Cultivating energy crops on degraded land or other land not currently under  
37 agricultural production is often mentioned as an option but it is not yet well understood. Several

1 key issues deserve further attention (i) The production of energy crops on remote or less  
2 productive land would increase biofuels production costs (due to lower yields, inefficient  
3 infrastructure, etc.), leading to low economic incentives to produce on these lands. In fact, while  
4 estimates of available marginal land are large, especially in Africa and Latin America (FAO, 2000;  
5 Worldwatch Institute, 2006), much of this land is remotely located or not currently suitable for crop  
6 production and may require large investments in irrigation and other infrastructure (ii)  
7 Environmental effects of bringing new stretches of land into production are problematic and need  
8 to be carefully analyzed, especially with regards to soil erosion, water resources and biodiversity.

9

10 *Development of next generation biofuels.* Significant potential is believed to lie with the  
11 development of new energy conversion technologies –next generation biofuels. Several different  
12 technologies are being pursued, which allow the conversion into usable energy not only of the  
13 glucose and oils retrievable today but also of cellulose, hemi-cellulose and even lignin, the main  
14 building blocks of most biomass. Thereby, cheaper and more abundant feedstocks such as  
15 residues, stems and leaves of crops, straw, urban wastes, weeds and fast growing trees could be  
16 converted into biofuels (IEA, 2006; Ortiz et al., 2006; Worldwatch Institute, 2006; DOE, 2007).  
17 This could significantly reduce land requirements, mitigating social and environmental pressures  
18 from large-scale production of 1<sup>st</sup> generation biofuels (Table 6.7). Moreover, lifecycle GHG  
19 emissions could be further reduced, with estimates for potential reductions ranging from 51 to  
20 92% compared to petroleum fuels (IEA, 2004; European Commission, 2005; GEF, 2005; Farrell  
21 et al., 2006). However there are also environmental concerns associated with potential over-  
22 harvesting of agricultural residues (e.g. reducing their important services for soils) and the use of  
23 bioengineered crops and enzymes.

24

25 The most promising next generation technologies are cellulosic ethanol and biomass-to-liquids  
26 (BTL) fuels. Cellulosic ethanol is produced through complex biochemical processes by which the  
27 biomass is broken up to allow conversion into ethanol of the cellulose and hemi-cellulose. One of  
28 the most expensive production steps is the pre-treatment of the biomass that allows breaking up  
29 the cellulose and removing the lignin to make it accessible for fermentation. Research is currently  
30 focused on how to facilitate this process, e.g. through genetically engineering enzymes and  
31 crops. BTL technologies are thermo-chemical processes, consisting of heating biomass, even  
32 lignin-rich residues left over from cellulosic ethanol production, under controlled conditions to  
33 produce syngas. This synthetic gas (mainly of carbon monoxide and hydrogen), is then liquefied  
34 e.g. by using the Fischer-Tropsch (FT) process to produce different fuels, including very high-  
35 quality synthetic diesel, ethanol, methanol, buthanol, hydrogen and other chemicals and  
36 materials. Research is also focusing on integrating the production of next generation biofuels with  
37 the production of chemicals, materials and electricity in biorefineries (Aden et al., 2002; IEA,

1 2004; GEF, 2006; Hamelinck and Faaij, 2006; IEA, 2006; Ledford, 2006; Ragauskas et al., 2006;  
2 Woods, 2006).

3

4 Next generation biofuels have to overcome several critical steps in order to become a viable and  
5 economic source of transport fuels on a large scale and be able to contribute to the development  
6 and sustainability goals. First, next generation biofuels technologies have not yet reached a stage  
7 of commercial maturity and significant technological challenges need to be overcome to reduce  
8 production costs. It is not yet clear when these breakthroughs will occur and what degree of cost  
9 reductions they will be able to achieve in practice (Sanderson, 2006; Sticklen, 2006; DOE, 2007).

10 The U.S. Department of Energy has set the following ambitious goals for its cellulosic ethanol  
11 program: reducing the cost per liter from US \$0.60 to 0.28 and capital investment costs from  
12 currently \$0.80 to 0.49 by 2012 (DOE, 2007). Second, even if these breakthroughs occur, biofuels  
13 will have to compete with other energy technologies that are currently being developed in  
14 response to high oil prices. For example, with regards to transport fuels, technological progress is  
15 currently reducing costs of conventional (e.g. deep sea) and unconventional (e.g. tar sands) oil  
16 production and also of coal and gas to liquid technologies. Third, while countries like South Africa,  
17 Brazil, China and India are currently engaged in advanced domestic biofuels R&D efforts, high  
18 capital costs, large economies of scale, a high degree of technical sophistication as well as  
19 intellectual property rights issues make the production of next generation biofuels problematic in  
20 the majority of developing countries even if the technological and economic hurdles can be  
21 overcome in industrialized countries.

22

### 23 6.8.2.2 Bioenergy and rural development

24 Living conditions and health of the poor can be considerably improved when households have the  
25 opportunity to upgrade from inefficient, polluting and often hazardous traditional forms to modern  
26 forms of energy. Through their importance for the delivery of basic human needs such as potable  
27 water, food and lighting, these modern energy services are among the primary preconditions for  
28 advancements in social and economic development (Barnes and Floor, 1996; Cabraal et al.,  
29 2005; Modi et al., 2006). Moreover, bioenergy and ancillary industries may promote job creation  
30 and income generation. However, the balance of positive and negative effects of different forms  
31 of bioenergy is subject to significant debate and is highly context specific. Careful assessments of  
32 local needs, economic competitiveness as well as social and environmental effects are needed to  
33 determine under which circumstances modern bioenergy should be promoted.

34

35 The domestic production of biofuels from agricultural crops (1<sup>st</sup> generation) is often credited with  
36 positive externalities for rural development through creating new sources of income and jobs in  
37 feedstock production and energy conversion industries (e.g. Moreira and Goldemberg, 1999; von

1 Braun and Pachauri, 2006; Worldwatch Institute, 2006). However, the actual effect of 1<sup>st</sup>  
2 generation biofuels production on rural economies is complex and has strong implications for  
3 income distribution, food security and the environment.

4  
5 Economically, the major impact of biofuels production is the increase in demand for energy crops.  
6 In fact, biofuels have historically been introduced as a means to counteract weak demand or  
7 overproduction of feedstock crops, e.g. this was a principal reason for Brazil to introduce its  
8 ProAlcool Program in 1975 (Moreira and Goldemberg, 1999). On the one hand, this additional  
9 demand can increase incomes of agricultural producers, increase productivity enhancing  
10 investments and induce dynamic processes of social and economic development (FAO, 2000;  
11 Coelho and Goldemberg, 2004; DOE, 2005; Worldwatch Institute, 2006).

12  
13 On the other hand, this needs to be evaluated against economic, social and environmental costs  
14 that may arise from large increases in biofuels production. First, even if biofuels can be produced  
15 competitively, at least part of the rise in agricultural incomes would represent a mere  
16 redistribution of income from consumers of agricultural products to producers. The extent of this  
17 redistribution depends on the degree to which food prices are affected. Second, in cases when  
18 biofuels are promoted despite having higher costs than petroleum fuels, an analogous  
19 redistribution from energy consumers to agricultural producers takes place. In both cases the  
20 effects on poverty are highly complex. Some rural poor may gain if they can participate in the  
21 energy crop production, biofuel conversion and ancillary sectors or otherwise benefit from  
22 increased economic activity in rural areas. This depends critically on aspects such as production  
23 methods (e.g. degree of mechanization) and institutional arrangements (e.g. structure of the  
24 agricultural sector, property rights of agricultural land and security of land tenure). Conversely,  
25 those rural and urban poor people who spend a considerable share of their incomes on energy  
26 and especially food are bound to lose if they have to pay higher prices. Food-importing  
27 developing countries would also suffer under globally rising food prices. Time lags in the  
28 response of producers to increased feedstock demand may lead price increases to be more  
29 accentuated in the short-term than in the medium to long-term.

30  
31 Biofuels are considerably more labor intensive in production than other forms of energy such as  
32 fossil fuels and thus they are often proposed as a means for improving employment in the  
33 agricultural sector as well as in other downstream industries that process by-products such as  
34 cakes and glycerin (Goldemberg, 2004; Worldwatch Institute, 2006). However, estimating actual  
35 effects on employment is highly complex. First, any newly created employment needs to be  
36 weighed against jobs that are displaced in other sectors, including jobs that would have been  
37 created in the feedstock production sector even in the absence of biofuels production. These

1 dynamics are complex and may involve very different industries, e.g. the livestock industry, food  
2 processors and other major user of agricultural crops (CIE, 2005).

3

4 Second, while bioenergy is labor intensive compared to other energy industries, it is not  
5 necessarily labor intensive compared to other forms of farming. In fact, energy crop production  
6 very often takes the form of large-scale mechanized farming. Thus, in cases where traditional  
7 farming is replaced by less labor intensive energy crop production, jobs may actually be lost.  
8 Similarly, no new jobs are created if biofuels production simply displaces other agricultural crops.  
9 It is unsure whether such job substitution is actually beneficial, especially considering that many  
10 jobs in feedstock production are temporary and seasonal (Fritsche et al., 2005; Kojima and  
11 Johnson, 2005; Worldwatch Institute, 2006).

12

13 Consequently, the overall effects on employment and incomes are highly complex and context  
14 specific and there is no consensus on magnitude or even direction of net effects. Even if in  
15 certain cases longer term dynamic effects may dominate for the economy as a whole, the  
16 considerable risks of welfare losses for certain stakeholders warrant careful consideration –  
17 especially with regard to the most vulnerable persons. More research is needed to develop and  
18 apply interdisciplinary tools that assess these issues more clearly (e.g. economic cost-benefit  
19 analysis).

20

21 *Development of small-scale applications for biodiesel and unrefined bio-oils.* The environmental  
22 and social costs of producing biofuels can be considerably lower in small-scale applications for  
23 local use due to more contained demands on land, water and other resources. At the same time,  
24 the benefits for social and economic development may be higher, especially in remote regions,  
25 where energy access and agricultural exports are complicated by high transport costs (Kojima  
26 and Johnson, 2005). Land-locked developing countries, small islands, and also remote regions  
27 within countries may fall into this category – if they can make available sufficient and cheap  
28 feedstock without threatening food security. Especially biodiesel offers potential in small-scale  
29 applications as it is less technology and capital intensive to produce than ethanol. Unrefined bio-  
30 oils offer similar benefits and their production for stationary uses such as water pumping and  
31 power generation is being analyzed in several countries, e.g. focusing on *Jatropha* as a feedstock  
32 (Indian Planning Commission, 2003; Van Eijck and Romijn, 2006). Such schemes may offer  
33 particular potential for local communities when they are integrated in high intensity small-scale  
34 farming systems which allow an integrated production of food and energy crops. More research is  
35 needed on the costs and benefits to society of these options, taking into consideration also other  
36 energy alternatives.

37

1 *Conduct R&D on electricity and heat generation technologies from biomass to improve*  
2 *operational reliability.* Some forms of bioelectricity and bioheat can be competitive with other off-  
3 grid energy options (e.g. diesel generators) and therefore are viable options for expanding energy  
4 access in certain settings. The largest potential lies with the production of bioelectricity and heat  
5 when technically mature and reliable generators have access to secure supply of cheap  
6 feedstocks and capital costs can be spread out over high average electricity demand. This is  
7 mostly the case on site or near industries that produce biomass wastes and residues and have  
8 their own steady demand for electricity, e.g. sugar, rice and paper mills. The economics as well  
9 as environmental effects are particularly favorable when operated in combined heat and power  
10 mode. Biomass digesters and gasifiers are more prone to technical failures than direct combustion  
11 facilities, especially when operated in small-scale applications without proper maintenance. More  
12 research and development is needed to improve the operational stability of these technologies as  
13 well as the design of institutional arrangements, including potential integration with biomass  
14 processing industries, livestock holdings and mixed farming. However, modern bioenergy is only  
15 one of several options available for advancing energy access and in each case local alternatives  
16 need to be compared regarding economic costs as well as social and environmental externalities  
17 (Table 6.6)

18

19 **[Insert Table 6.6]**

20