ISSN 1020-4555

Integrated Crop Management Vol. 13–2010

An international consultation on integrated crop-livestock systems for development

The Way Forward for Sustainable Production Intensification

Integrated Crop Management Vol.13-2010

An international consultation on integrated crop-livestock systems for development

The way forward for sustainable production intensification

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2011

ISBN 978-92-5-106839-7

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The added value of integrating crops and livestock has been understood and practiced by farmers for thousands of years. So, some might ask, what is new about this and if there is merit in FAO raising awareness, and indeed in promoting investment in research and development on integrated production of crops and livestock. The reality is that agriculture production methodologies are changing and must do so to sustainably meet expanding global production needs and the urgent need for a more environmentally friendly agriculture.

The urgency to promote productive agricultural systems that can better adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change is being better understood, and solutions are being demanded. Some agricultural practices are climate change negative, such as the heavy methane emissions from flooded rice systems and from ruminant livestock grazing on low quality range browse, or such as intensive tillage, which often results in greater losses of soil organic matter, poor soil structure and available soil moisture, and increased runoff and soil erosion. While other production practices such as Conservation Agriculture (CA) – based on minimal soil disturbance, organic soil cover, and crop rotations or associations -- has proven in most cases to sequester additional carbon into the soil and frequently result in better soil health, productivity and profitability. Livestock on improved pastures derived from CA-based crop-pasture rotations not only produce more meat per unit of pasture, they produce more per unit of greenhouse gas emission.

A new kind of sustainable intensified agriculture based on CA is emerging and new production systems often also include trees grown as hedge rows to control grazing and provide habitats and fuel, or include trees as strip crops with annual crops rotated in adjacent strips. Trees in crop-livestock systems often add significant synergistic values. Innovations that can strengthen the multi-dimensional role of integrated crop-livestock-trees systems and their resilience are taking place and there is a need to share this knowledge more efficiently and to build jointly owned research and development programmes to achieve critical mass of expertise and financial resources focused on helping farmers in major agro-ecologies.

The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department of FAO (AG), consisting of four technical divisions, is fully aware of the innovations emerging in Brazil and in the Consultative Group of International Agriculture Research System, and elsewhere, and of the need to take stock on what is new and to determine how best the Department and its partners (internationally) can contribute to enabling better global agriculture and

especially to assist smallholder producers to harness the benefits of "new forms" of integrated crop-livestock production systems.

This proceeding of the electronic and face-to-face Consultation held early in 2010 is just a first step. AG is committed to facilitate effective development, focused on sustainable production intensification of crops and of livestock and their integrated systems – at the farm level and also area-wide integration --such as at the community or watershed levels. We look to Embrapa, IFAD, World Bank, IICA, the CGIAR and many others to join with FAO to help set up a facility and shared program of work to move a better agriculture forward and to do so quickly; as every day is a hungry day for over a billion people.

Modibo Traore
Assistant Director General
Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Technical Consultation on *Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems for Development* reported in this document was the culmination of a collaborative process in which FAO, IICA, EMBRAPA and IFAD and many individuals from a number of organizations participated over several months to ensure its success.

The Consultation process was initiated by the Office of the Assistant Director General of the Agriculture Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization (AG-FAO) of the United Nations. The process comprised two parts – an electronic Consultation during February and March 2010 in which some 300 individuals from a number of organizations participated, and a face-to-face Technical Consultation that was held at the EMBRAPA Maize and Sorghum Institute in Sete Lagaos, Brazil, from 23-26 May 2010. Institutions that helped to plan and organize the Consultation included: FAO, IICA/PROCITROPICOS, EMBRAPA, IFAD, FARA, ICRAF, ILRI, CGIAR-SLP. They all deserve special acknowledgment and thanks for their unwavering technical support and for providing working facilities in Rome and Sete Lagaos during planning and implementation. The electronic Consultation moderating team comprised Eric Kueneman, Amir Kassam, Theodor Friedrich and Constance Neely with website support competently provided by Petra Staberg.

FAO underwrote the basic cost of the Consultation and provided funds for the electronic Consultation with assistance from IFAD, and covered the cost of facilitators and speakers from Latin America, Asia and Africa, and from FAO, and for IICA and EMBRAPA to organize and implement the face-to-face Consultation in Sete Lagaos, Brazil. In FAO, several Divisions (including AGP, AGA, AGS, AGN, NR, FO, FAO-IAEA Joint Division) assisted in the planning and organization of the Consultation process, and helped in its implementation.

Technical support from FAO, IICA, EMBRAPA, IFAD, ILRI and CGIAR-SLP to the Consultation process and their national and international connections with the integrated crop-livestock constituency were invaluable to the success of the Consultation. FAO's various technical contributions were competently handled a Task Force involving Eric Kueneman (convener), Simon Mack, Henning Steinfeld, Doyle Baker, Theodor Friedrich, Caterina Batello, Irela Mazar, Olaf Thieme, Amir Kassam with support from Shivaji Pandey, Peter Kenmore, Geoffrey Mrema, Samuel Jutsi, Ezzeddine Boutrif and Ming-Long Nguyen. Technical and organizational support from IFAD was provided by Shantanu Mathur with support from

Antonio Rota. From EMBRAPA, support and assistance was provided by many colleagues but in particular by Vera Maria Carvalho Alves, José Heitor Vasconcellos, Derli Prudente Santana, Antonio Alvaro Corsetti Purcino, Tania Mara Assuncao Barbosa, Paolo Galerani, Luiz Carlos Balbino and Luciano Nass. From IICA, Jamil Macedo, Markus Ascher, Marcin Rojas and Monica Tollini provided the necessary help, and they together with colleagues from EMBRAPA took charge of all the local organization and arrangements, and running the Consultation in Sete Lagaos. Without their moral and technical support and their cooperation, the face-to-face Consultation would not have been possible. Special thanks also go to Carlos Sere and Shirley Tarawali from ILRI, and to Bruno Gerard from CGIAR-SLP, as well as to Ademir Caligari from IAPAR, for their support and advise throughout the Consultation process.

Very special thanks must go to Eric Kueneman, Amir Kassam, Theodor Friedrich, Constance Neely and Jamil Macedo for their dedicated and unstinting support to the cause, and for their help with planning the Agenda of the electronic consultation and Technical Consultation in Sete Lagaos.

There are many people who deserve to be thanked for their contribution to the Consultation process through their presentations or serving as working group or session chairs or conveners, or as rapporteurs or as drafting team liaison persons. They all deserve a special expression of appreciation.

The Consultation secretariat in FAO and in IICA assisted participants with their travel, visa and hotel arrangements, and was ably managed – before, during and after the meeting -- by Jamil Macedo, Monica Tollini, Dulcie Mendoza, Chiara Ventura and Jocelyn Buckingham.

Grateful thanks go to Eric Kueneman, Amir Kassam, Theodor Friedrich and Constance Neely for overseeing all aspects of the Consultation planning and implementation process, and for compiling this Consultation report in collaboration with colleagues in FAO, EMBRAPA, IICA and IFAD.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AfDB	African Development Bank
ATMA	Agricultural Technology Management Agency
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CBOs	Congressional Budget Office or Central Bank of Oman or Communication by Objectives
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COAMO	Cooperativa Agropecuária Mourãoense
CoP	Community of Practice
EMATER	Instituto Paranaense de Assistência Técnica e Extensão Rural
EMBRAPA	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária
EPAMIG	Empresa de Pesquisa Agropecuária de Minas Gerais
ERA-ARD	European Agricultural Research-Agricultural Research for Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FES	Economic and Social Function of the land
GAP	Good Agricultural Practices
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IAPAR	Instituto Agronômico do Paraná
ICAR	Indian Council of Agricultural Research
ICRAF	International Centre for Agroforestry Research
IC-LS	Integrated crop-livestock systems
IC-LSD	Integrated Crop Livestock Systems for Development
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
INERA	Institut National de l'Environnement et des Recherches Agricoles
INIA	Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agraria
INIAP	Instituto Nacional Autónomo de Investigaciones Agropecuarias
INTA	Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria
MOSHPPA	Modern Sustainable Highly Productive and Profitable Agricultural model
NAR	Nucleic Acids Research
NATP	National Agricultural Innovation Project
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PISA	Produção Integrada de Sistemas Agropecuários
PROCITROPICO	Programa Cooperativo de Investigación y Transferencia . de Tecnología para los Trópicos Suramericanos
R&D	Research & Development
SLP	Systemwide Livestock Programme
UFPR	Universidade Federal do Paraná

SUMMARY

A global electronic Consultation on Integrated Crop Livestock Systems for Development (IC-LSD) was held from 1 February to 7 March 2010 and involved over 400 subscribers. The outcome of the electronic Consultation served as an input into the stakeholder Technical Consultation held at the Embrapa Maize and Sorghum Institute in Sete Lagaos, Minas Geráis, Brazil, from 23 to 26 March 2010, co-organized by FAO, Embrapa, IICA and IFAD, and included one full day field trip to see innovative action on integrated crop-livestock systems in central or southern Brazil.

The electronic Consultation and each of the three working groups during the Workshop covered the same agenda comprising of the four topics discussed during the electronic Consultation, namely:

1. Promising integrated crop-livestock systems and innovations that merit mainstreaming and scaling, and the tactics for implementation.
2. Input and output market linkage development for promising crop-livestock systems and associated input and output supply chain processes and public-private service providers for different production systems and diverse markets.
3. Political will, and policy and institutional support for the adoption and enabling the spread of innovations and practices associated with promising crop-livestock systems for food and nutritional security.
4. Research needed to generate knowledge and innovative practices to underpin farmer adoption and scaling of promising crop-livestock systems for sustainable production intensification.

About 70 public, private and civil sector stakeholders across the above four themes primarily from Asia, Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean participated in the Technical Consultation. The importance given to integrated crop-livestock systems for development was visible in the participation from the main partner organizations, particularly FAO's Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department (FAO/AG) and Embrapa.

The meeting confirmed the importance of the role of integrated crop-livestock systems for sustainable development. Integrated crop-livestock systems (IC-LS), implying a diverse range of integrated ecological, biophysical, socio economic conditions, have been a foundation of agriculture for hundreds of years. In recent decades, there have been practical innovations in integrated production systems based on Conservation Agriculture (CA) that harness synergies between the production sectors of crops, livestock and agroforestry that ensure economic and ecological sustainability while providing ecosystem services. Such IC-LS increase environmental resilience through increased

biological diversity, increased water infiltration and runoff/erosion control, effective/efficient nutrient cycling/recycling, improved soil health, provide ecosystem services, enhance forest and watershed preservation and contribute to adaptation and mitigation of climate change. Within the economic and production dimension, CA-based IC-LS enhance livelihood diversification and potential efficiency through optimization of production inputs including labour, offer resilience to economic stresses, and reduce risks. From a socio-cultural perspective, these systems are meant to assist farmers to diversify and meet their livelihood aspirations, ensure equitable social dynamics, particularly for elders, women and youth, and increase nutrition security and food safety while meeting consumer choice and demand.

There are multiple ways in which integration can be interpreted and implemented. Integration can be on-farm as well as on an area-wide basis that may involve some specialisation. Successful integration involves an intentional integration that reflects a synergistic relationship among the components (the whole is greater than the sum of the parts) of crops, livestock and/or trees and that this synergistic relationship when appropriately managed results in enhanced social (including community), economic and environmental sustainability and improves the livelihoods of those farmers who manage them.

The existence of well established and functioning integrated crop-livestock systems were recognized in the three broad ecologies -- drylands and dry savannahs, moist savannahs and the forest margins -- including sometimes with trees, pasture and fish, resulting in ecological as well as economic benefits on the crop as well as on the livestock production side. EMBRAPA (often linked to Conservation Agriculture and trees), ILRI, the CGIAR Systemwide Livestock Programme (focusing on crop-livestock interactions and livestock feed management) and FAO (covering a full range of interests including food security, human nutrition, output value chains, and poverty alleviation etc) will reflect on their respective roles in partnerships activities, including the establishment of a common platform hosted by FAO/AG as recommended by the Technical Consultation. The Consultation called policy makers to introduce policies and measures revoking the trend for specialization and concentration of the production sectors, and return to closer crop-livestock integration for the demonstrated micro and macro economic benefits, considering particularly the environmental externalities, in addition to the material environmental advantages.

The meeting produced a number of recommendations for follow up actions. A Sete Lagaos Consensus was prepared and commented upon by the plenary with some immediate actions, including the hosting of a stakeholder platform on IC-LSD at FAO to promote the mainstreaming of IC-LS, particularly for small and medium size producers. Further to this, the participants elaborated on specific crop-livestock systems and suggested elements for a policy brief and follow up actions.

CHAPTER 1

Sete Lagaos consensus

Sete Lagaos "Consensus" on Integrated Crop-Livestock-Tree Systems for Sustainable Development (IC-LSD) 26 March 2010

Already, mixed production systems generate close to 50% of the world's cereals and most of the staples consumed by poor people: 41% of maize, 86% of rice, 66% of sorghum, and 74% of millet production. They also produce the bulk of livestock products in the developing world, that is, 75% of the milk and 60% of the meat, and employ many millions of people in farms, formal and informal markets, processing plants, and other parts of long value chains. Recognizing that 9 billion people will need to be provided for in a sustainable way by the year 2050, participants of the Sete Lagoas Consultation on integrated crop-livestock-tree systems for sustainable development (IC-LSD) reached consensus that small and medium scale farmers, in particular, can meaningfully benefit and contribute to food and nutritional security and sustainable development through improved production intensification, environmental quality and livelihoods.

Integrated crop-livestock system (IC-LSD), implying a diverse range of integrated ecological, biophysical, socio economic conditions, have been a foundation of agriculture for hundreds of years. In recent decades, there have been practical innovations that harness synergies between the production sectors of crops, livestock and agroforestry that ensure economic and ecological sustainability while providing ecosystem services. IC-LS increase environmental resilience through increased biological diversity, effective/efficient nutrient cycling/recycling, improved soil health, provide ecosystem services, enhance forest preservation and contribute to adaptation and mitigation of climate change. Within the economic and production dimension, the IC-LS enhance livelihood diversification and potentially efficiency through optimization of production inputs including labour, offer resilience to economic stresses, and reduce risks. From a socio-cultural perspective, these systems are meant to assist farmers to diversify and meet their livelihood aspirations, ensure equitable social dynamics, particularly for elders, women and youth, and increase nutrition security and food safety while meeting consumer choice and demand.

The group identified that there are multiple ways in which integration can be interpreted and implemented. Integration can be on-farm as well as

on an area-wide basis that may involve some specialisation. The participants recognized the importance of an intentional integration that reflects a synergistic relationship among the components (the whole is greater than the sum of the parts) of crops, livestock and/or trees and that this synergistic relationship when appropriately managed results in enhanced social, economic and environmental sustainability and improves the livelihoods of those farmers who manage them. Successful crop-livestock integration should be seen through the lens of nutrient use efficiency and nutrient cycling benefits, which are strong public goods issues. The successful integration should also be seen through the lens of arresting land degradation. In many fragile ecosystems, livestock is the main stay of livelihoods but at the same time free and uncontrolled grazing by livestock leads to pasture and land degradation. Under such cases the whole issue of mutually beneficial integration must be addressed at the community and regional level involving grazing management, species composition and matching stocking rate to carrying capacity.

Several types of IC-LS in the dryland ecologies, moist savannahs and forest margin environments within the lowland and highland socio-economic conditions were identified. These included crop-livestock systems with or without trees or aquaculture; agropastoral systems with or without trees; and landscape level sectoral activities that require functional re-integration of components. Small and medium holder systems that include animal traction were also highlighted as important. Note was also taken of the diversity of integrated systems and demand for livestock depending on the level of agricultural intensification and economic development of the region and countries.

All these systems require a holistic perspective, including support from public-private partnership, for harnessing their full benefits to the producers as well as consumers based on new business models according to markets and value chains, hold a high probability of successful adoption, and are multi-functional. Successful scaling up depends upon strong farmers organizations, community empowerment and multi-stakeholder and inter-institutional approaches; requires participatory approaches to knowledge exchange, capacity development, and appropriate, adaptive and relevant inter-disciplinary research; and the presence of an enabling policy environment that includes functioning input and market chains and accessible financial facilities with incentives that promote adoption.

The Consultation participants urged future actions in terms of the diversity of systems and approaches that include:

- FAO to host a global partnership platform for a 'community of practice' for stakeholders working under a commonly defined set of goals and regional and system specific priorities to: promote and advance integrated crop-livestock-tree systems, in hot spots where there is good potential, through enhanced awareness creation, knowledge exchange and management, capacity development, research, development actions, and advocacy.

- Work in equitable and empowering partnerships leading to regular communication to promote multi stakeholder dialog, including the voices of small farmers' organizations
- Catalysis of inter-institutional communication among agriculture, livestock, forestry and environment agencies, the civil society partners including the private sectors, and national and international decision-making bodies to facilitate coordination of support for the promotion and intensification of IC-LS.
- Strengthen national agricultural research and extension institutions for working on IC-LSD.
- Facilitation of collaborative pilot projects that build upon existing institutional efforts.
- Advocate for public and private investments in the supporting structures, including through the involvement of NGOs, necessary for promoting and scaling of IC-LS practices. This should be supported by effective policy dialogue that gets policy-makers engaged and involves an analysis of policy issues and measures.
- Promote collective action by small and medium producers to enhance competitiveness, the capture of economies of scale and sustainability.

Specific suggested next steps:

- Review evidence of successful (and unsuccessful) integration including those of small and medium holders and highlight lessons learned and disseminate case study results through state of the art documents that describe factors leading to integration, body of evidence that makes the case in regional and specific settings on what are the priority quick wins, where smallholders would likely have a real advantage. A network for monitoring environmental services, including methodology development, should be established.
- Ensure coverage of knowledge and information in a portal clearing house and build in multiple language capabilities as soon as possible.
- Enhance the inclusion of farmers, private sector, development practitioners, local authorities, and others to ensure a broader regional and stakeholder representation.
- Promote innovation platforms that link various actors (e.g. food processors, market managers, financiers, transport providers etc) across value chains.
- Consider sub-theme working groups in subject areas such as joint project preparation, scaling strategies, advocacy, on-farm operational research and monitoring, global and local policies.
- Conservation Agriculture based production systems seem to be top priority for many agroecologies for developing synergies between livestock and the CA practices. Pilot studies need to be initiated under different ecologies, for example, drylands, moist savannahs, irrigated/intensive production and hilly regions etc., to illustrate how functional biomass can be managed in a win-win manner.

CHAPTER 2

Context and process

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE

There are already over 1 billion (about 15% of the human population) people hungry and living in poverty, and 75% of them as well as other less poor but vulnerable people live in rural areas and depend on farming for their livelihoods, with the majority relying on small scale crop-livestock systems, including those that are integrated with long haul pastoral systems. Food (primary and secondary), feed, fibre and fuel needs must be met from agriculture of a still expanding population that is expected to grow from the current 6.7 billion to some 9.2 billion by 2050 while available land for expansion of agriculture will become economically and environmentally unattractive. To meet the food needs of the population in 2050, production will have to expand by 70% compared to what it was in 2000. It is expected that 90% of the expansion will be through production intensification (i.e., increase in output per unit area), and 10% will be from area expansion mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. At the same time there is a shift to increased consumption of meat and livestock products as living conditions of people improve, increasing additionally the stress on the agricultural resource base. For this reason the environmental footprint of crop as well as of livestock production has to be reduced to improve sustainability. This poses both a development challenge as well as opportunities for livestock producers in crop-livestock systems to contribute to both overall food security and alleviation of their poverty as well as of non-agricultural rural population due to increasing employment opportunities in the input supply and output value chains.

OBJECTIVES

Several of FAO's development partners have had recent intra-institutional consultations with primary focus on identification of priorities for research and the tactics to optimize their research processes with respect to the development of integrated crop-livestock production systems. This consultation process (both electronic and face-to-face) builds on these and other major stock-takings by pulling together ideas with a view to:

(a) assess what do we know about integrated crop-livestock systems for development, including where they are working or not working, and what can be done to harness the potentials of successful integrated crop-livestock systems for development through sustainable production intensification;

(b) define next steps for key stakeholders, and especially for the Agriculture Department and Consumer Protection Department of the FAO/AG and its national and international collaborators; and
(c) guide and empower FAO to better support member counties to harness the development potential of integrated crop and livestock systems as one important entry-point for sustainable agriculture intensification for poverty alleviation and environmental stewardship.

While many of the issues to be addressed are relevant for all types and scales of agriculture and food systems, the principle focus was on the needs and opportunities for family-farmers (small and medium-scale land holders) and the associated community and watershed-level development. The use of the concept of *integration* for the consultation was not restricted to only on-farm integration; it endorsed also the concepts of area-wide input supply and output value chains and outcome oriented multi-stakeholder innovation systems. In this context, the appraisal of an *innovation and the associated innovation system* also reflected on the issues related to the linking to the commercial and corporate sector (local, regional, and global) in order to strengthen the role of input supply and output value chain markets and the service providers while taking into consideration environmental and human health issues.

CONSULTATION PROCESS AND AGENDA

The consultation process comprised a wide electronic discussion from 1 February to 7 March 2010, followed by a small 4-day face-to-face workshop in Sete Lagaos, Minas Geráis, Brazil, from 23 to 26 March 2010 co-organized by FAO, Embrapa, IICA and IFAD, and will include one full day field trip to see innovative action on integrated crop-livestock systems in central or southern Brazil.

The Workshop Agenda comprised a 4-day meeting. The first half day was spent setting the context. The following one and half days were spent in three working groups examining the field evidence or 'proof of concept' from the developing regions – Latin America, Asia and Africa, as well as elsewhere to the extent that this was relevant -- of successful integrated crop-livestock systems for both crop intensification and sustainability, and the relevant features they have in common which are favourable for scaling. Cases of integrated crop-livestock systems from each region was discussed covering different agro-ecologic and socio-economic settings, each illustrating the basic principles and practices leading sustainable agricultural intensification

The electronic consultation and each of the three working groups during the Workshop covered the same agenda comprising of the four topics discussed during the electronic consultation, namely:

1. **Promising integrated crop-livestock systems and innovations that merit mainstreaming and scaling, and the tactics for implementation** (including:

technical designs of integrated systems and their economical, environmental and social dimensions; functional biomass production for multiple use; Farmer Field Schools, Farmers Clubs, Cooperatives, Associations etc for participatory farmer learning and adoption, and for economies of scale and competitiveness; knowledge services and communication needs, common resource management issues etc).

2. **Input and output market linkage development for promising crop-livestock systems and associated input and output supply chain processes and public-private service providers for different production systems and diverse markets (**including: constraints and opportunities in input supply chains covering production inputs of seeds, agro-chemicals, farm power, equipment and machinery, veterinary services, advisory and innovation systems on good farming practices, marketing infrastructure and organization forms etc; constraints and opportunities in output supply chains covering animals for meat, milk and other dairy products, hides and skins from cattle and small ruminants, and meat and eggs from poultry, and meat from pigs; and opportunities for processing in integrated production systems etc).
3. **Political will, and policy and institutional support for the adoption and enabling the spread of innovations and practices associated with promising crop-livestock systems for food and nutritional security** (including: sector policies, goals and strategies; strategic planning; enabling environment including infrastructure, credit, marketing, insurance, land tenure etc; tactics for action, incentives, regulations, strategic directions for change in extensive and intensive crop-pasture-livestock systems etc).
4. **Research needed to generate knowledge and innovative practices to underpin farmer adoption and scaling of promising crop-livestock systems for sustainable production intensification** (including: technical, biological, nutritional, landscape, economic, environmental and social dimensions of integrated systems and practices; on-farm and area-wide integration of crop-livestock systems; functional biomass production and prioritization of its multiple role and use; feed and nutritional formulations; animal health management; effective innovations systems and processes; linking research result to policymaking etc).

In addition to the topic-specific core issues and their interactions, the following two cross-cutting themes will also be addressed:

(i)Roles of stakeholders (public sector, private sector, civil Society -- NGOs and parliamentarians, international research and development institutions, including the FAO, donors, etc.); and

(ii)Capturing public goods and incentives for action (payment for environmental services, special market access based on adoption of good practices – including food safety and quality, global awards to private sector and civil society champions, etc).

The expected outcome of the consultation was the identification of principles, opportunities and issues and the way forward for stakeholders and FAO as defined in the objectives. The overall outcome of the Workshop was to identification of the elements of a Policy Brief and an Action Plan including a statement on the next steps.

The Background document prepared for the whole Consultation is provided in Appendix 1. The consolidated summary of the electronic consultation is presented in Appendix 2. The Workshop agenda is presented in Appendix 3.

VENUE AND ATTENDANCE

The Workshop was held in Sete Lagaos, Minas Geráis, Brazil, from 23 to 26 March 2010 co-organized by FAO, Embrapa, IICA and IFAD, and included one full day field trip to see innovative action on integrated crop-livestock systems in central or southern Brazil. About 70 public, private and civil sector stakeholders across the above four themes, and who have influence, commitment and capacity to make a difference, were invited (Appendix 4). The interests of a number of stakeholders cut across more than one topic.

CHAPTER 3

Consolidated outputs from "World Café" session and working groups

This section presents the consolidated outputs from the adapted world café session held on 26 March which was preceded by three working groups whose sessions were held from 23-25 March. The working groups considered specific IC-L Systems, and formulated elements for a policy brief and for an action plan. To set the stage, the context of the workshop's effort and the dimensions of integration were described in the plenary as follows.

Context of Sustainable Development and Focus of the Week's Efforts: Recognizing the 9 billion people will need to be provided for in a sustainable way by the year 2050, the expert Consultation was intended to provide guidance on promising Integrated Crop Tree Livestock Systems for Sustainable Development that could offer the greatest possible contribution toward this end. The scale parameters for the Consultation were on-farm within small and medium holder farms and integration at the community or watershed level. Immediate entry points within the broad range of IC-L Systems were identified for deeper discussion related to input and market chains, policy and institutions, and research and other efforts required for improving and scaling up these systems.

Dimensions of Integration: There are multiple ways in which integration can be interpreted. Integration can be on-farm as well as on an area wide. The participants recognized the importance of an intentional integration that reflects a synergistic relationship among the components (the whole is greater than the sum of the parts) of crops, livestock and/or trees and that this synergistic relationship results in enhanced social, economic/productive and environmental sustainability of the systems and improves the livelihoods of those farmers who manage them.

3.1 WORLD CAFÉ SUMMARY

An adapted "World Café" was used to gather ideas on the way forward. Key questions were framed around a) what IC-LS has to offer that is new; b) what might be put in place take the group and topic forward; and c) what are specific recommendations for the various organizers of the event.

What is new with IC-LSD?

"IC-LSD will lead to a new paradigm and revolution in agriculture reconciling increased productivity with environmental conservation"

IC-LS offers solutions to the global issue of feeding 9 billion people. There was a consensus among the group that IC-LS brings together the social, economic and environmental dimensions in a sustainable way. Through its practice (including conservation agriculture, no-tillage, crop rotations, farmer field schools, among others) of optimizing efficiency, productivity can be increased and the existing technology scaled up given an enabling environment. The focus should be on small and medium holder farmers, sustaining achievements and benefiting the rural sector. IC-LS are environmentally friendly systems and lend themselves to payment for environmental services schemes. Integration is not only a good idea – it is an imperative – it is a new multi-functionality. In this effort one must be willing to deal with complex trade-offs.

How can we best keep the stakeholder group/community working in a coherent manner to advance this effort?

"Think globally, act locally and consider the levels in-between"

The group needs to develop a platform (community of practice), with tangible goals, priorities and shared responsibilities, that can address – advocacy, capacity building, knowledge acquisition and sharing, and put in place pilot programs for scaling up the efforts. It was suggested that a global stakeholder forum (with FAO as host) be established with a vision and clear terms of reference and a plan of action and guidelines. The platform would provide a venue for communication for idea exchange and sharing best practices, strengthening of the international network and expanding the institutional partners, advance data and knowledge needed to implement IC-LS, stay apprised of new opportunities and ensure that the members are empowered and partnerships are equitable. It was suggested that organizations have individual focal points. Some additional activities included the establishment of national program to support IC-LS that will not change with changing political trends; educate stakeholders on agroecological and socio-environmental dimensions, bring extension agents in fully; identify value chain initiatives; identify the success factors of IC-LS and continue to have focused activities to keep the momentum going – including workshops, meetings/consultations, pilot projects, policy advice, policy maker fora, and keeping track of the state of the art of IC-LS. Investment into scaling "best-bet" good production practices needs to be a priority for most developing countries.

Are there important themes around which we should organize? Activities to initiate our work?

The participants discussed multiple ways to organize including: by regional subgroups or task forces that address specific needs; around knowledge sharing and capacity building; around different IC-LS (crop-livestock, livestock-forest, crop-livestock-forest, etc.); around policies, institutions, R&D, capacity building; around markets; or other domain teams.

Other activities that were identified included: awareness raising for donors and governments; work on how to implement IC-LS research and extension and technology transfer; consider capturing and compiling existing projects and best practices, sharing and advancing data management, and carrying out regional and global analyses (knowledge portal); carry out an assessment of impacts with local and global indicators (monitoring system and potentially standards setting); making progress on environmental services; develop a small holder participatory strategy for targeting their priorities; raise awareness on the importance of trees to the systems; focus on global and local policies; and develop joint projects.

What specific recommendations do you have for organizations that co-organized this event?

In general. Technical materials should be in multiple languages; present global experiences by region; listen to the small farmer organization on views and successful experiences; development clear milestones, indicators and targets; strengthen the networks to monitor and assess indicators related to environmental services; advocate for payment of environmental services; continue the network among research teams, development teams; exchange information and take it public.
For FAO and CGIAR. Identify specific locations and value chains where we can work together; be the driver behind 2-3 domain theme teams.
For SLP (Systemwide Livestock Programme). Contribute to knowledge and data sharing network; develop targeting based on system monitoring; work with dynamic drivers of change.
For IICA. Apply the ProLI network to IC-LS and expand to the Americas
For ERA-ARD. Take on the idea.
For Embrapa and others. Continue to work through LA Commission and widen the network and share R&D lessons.
For Brazilian NAR. Strengthen and promote exchange of on farm research and development and technology transfer within and among biomes. Focus on researchers, extension agents, farmers, and policy makers.
For the Donor Community. Get them informed and encourage them to support IC-LSD. FAO and the CGIAR should take a lead in raising awareness.

In Summary

A few take home messages from the Café discussion included:

- Form a broader CoP and identify clear goals, objectives, priorities and tangible activities and work within sub-working groups.
- Ensure that there is continued communication and opportunities to exchange ideas, a knowledge and information portal, and a focus on capacity development.
- Work at the local, national, regional and global levels and empower equitable partnerships among members.

3.2 WORKING GROUPS: OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

(a) Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems Typology

Types of broad level IC-LSD that were identified included:

- Integrated crop-livestock systems with or without trees
- Agropastoral systems with or without trees
- Landscape level sectoral activities (area and market integration) that require re-integration
- Smallholder systems that include animal traction

(b) Characteristics of Benefits/Attributes/Criteria of IC-LSD

Principles: The IC-LS are intended to enhance sustainable development and ensuring that the systems are environmentally sound, economically beneficial, and socially and culturally appropriate. To elaborate for clarity, these systems include the following characteristics:

Environmental/Biophysical Dimension: Increased biological diversity, effective/efficient nutrient cycling/recycling/waste re-use, improved soil health restore degraded lands, maintain and improve soil organic matter, increase renewable resources, provision of ecosystem services, use low carbon technologies, strive for carbon neutral or net carbon sinks, reduce the pressure on the resource base, enhance overall ecological resilience, minimizing pest and disease issues (plant health) species composition and appropriate stocking rate consistent with carrying capacity, protect and conserve the natural landscape. (multifunctional use).

Economic/Production Dimension: Reduced risk, resilient to economic stresses, diversification as a tool against vulnerable, production context, diversify sources of income, provide stable economic returns, optimization of inputs, are based on low inputs, return on production factors exceed opportunity cost, ensure adequacy of biomass and feeds, beneficial to crops and livestock

Social/Cultural Dimension: Empower communities, create job opportunities, attainment of livelihoods aspirations, equitable for stakeholders including women and youth, meet farmers needs, meet consumers needs, increase nutrition security, labour creation/utilization

In general these systems require a holistic vision, should be 'simple' and hold a high probability of successful adoption, and multi-functional.

(c) What has to be in place to achieve and/or scale up these systems

- ***Strong farmers' organizations and community empowerment.*** Community empowerment (political); farmers organization support, economy of scale (Coops. and FOs); partnership with different farmer associations.
- ***Multi-Stakeholder Approach.*** Identification and involvement of all stakeholders; private sector involvement, public-private partnerships create a multidisciplinary team (farmers, researcher, extension etc) to elaborate/ validate IC-LS under field conditions; inclusion of stakeholders across the value chain.
- ***Knowledge Exchange and Capacity Development.*** Know-how extension dissemination, farmer field schools as support for training knowledgeable, trained personal - capacity building technology transfer and logistic approaches suitable to IC-LS – at different levels from research through to extension, extension staff trained, extension support.
- ***Multi-disciplinary and adaptive research.*** Converging, on-far operational research that provides "proof of concept" and a benchmark for scaling, training and demonstration.
- ***Systematic approach*** for continuum of entry points.
- ***Markets.*** Input and output; production chain established commercial infrastructure.
- ***Incentives, funding.*** Donors with sufficient money for the programme and stakeholders with a strong institutional support credit and financing compatible with systems needs, incentives, tax reduction, crop/livestock insurance.
- ***Productive inputs.*** Quality seed availability at affordable cost; good selection of seeds and animals with high probability of adaptation.
- ***Enabling policy environment****, including policies and strategies that encourage private sector partners to invest in infrastructure and value chain development.*

3.3 ANALYSES OF SPECIFIC ECOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT FOR INTEGRATED CROP-LIVESTOCK SYSTEMS

Three sets of integrated systems were chosen by the working groups based on: the significant population and livelihoods they serve; the large areas of landscape they occupy and use; the important contribution they currently make to the local and national economies, and their large potential for contributing to poverty alleviation of small and medium size producers as well as for sustainable production intensification to meet future food demand. In addition to their importance, there are innovations and improved understanding regarding how to improve the productivity and sustainability

of these systems, particularly in terms of the primary production, the synergies that can be harnessed in integrated crop-livestock-tree systems for optimization and sustainability of resource use; and the introduction of Conservation Agriculture based crop-pasture-tree- livestock integration.

(a) Dryland IC-L Systems (including those in the dry tropical savannah environments in the tropics and summer rainfall sub-tropics, and dry and semi-arid Mediterranean-type environments)

Potential areas with similar ecology

- West Africa,
- North East Brazil,
- Middle East,
- South Asia,
- China,
- Chaco region (Bolivia and Paraguay)
- East Africa

Common characteristics of those regions

- Population pressure
- Bio-physical: water, land degradation (physical and chemical)
- Open to close (mobility)
- Poor market integration/information
- Poverty issues
- Food deficit
- Land tenure
- Infrastructure

Farm level constraints (wide range of characteristics)

- Problems people are facing:
- Overstocking
- Seasonal feed deficit
- Rainfall inter-seasonal variability
- Uncertainties (A distinctive feature of)
- Land degradation
- Un-sustainable management of communal resources
- Harmed by CC
- Limited livelihoods options

Whatever the choice(s), they should be underpinned in ecological grounding it we want them to be sustainable

Key constraints from input to output market infrastructure

- Information
- Market opportunities are not captured by farmers, lack of farmers groups
- Informal sector but not private sector
- Middle-men
- No grading system
- Quality control
- Transport
- Weaknesses in the private sector participation
- Input supply side
- Seasonal price fluctuations
- Electrification and rural energy

Market value chains

- Meat (WA)
- Milk (India),
- Cash crops,
- Spices & medicinal plants (India)
- Sesame (WA)

Input side

- Financial systems micro credit)
- Seeds
- Fertilizer
- Equipment
- Timely supply of inputs
- Phytosanitary and vet. products

Policy and institutions (National and Regional)

- Inventory credit (scheme in Burkina Faso, Mali & Niger)
- Subsidies/ incentives/payment for ecosystem services (PES)
- Trading
- Strong participation of community/civil society

Research

- Lot has been done but little has been adopted – WHY?
- Lack of adaptive research
- 'Community' of learning
- Community approaches
- Proof of concept
- Thematicians
- Dialogue with policy makers

- Biophysical challenge: functional biomass production and management; soil health; animals; sustainability
- Functional biomass research
- Water harvesting & efficient use

(b) Moist Savannah IC-L Systems (including those in the moist semi-arid savannah environments in the tropics and summer rainfall sub-tropics, and moist Mediterranean-type environments)

Description of the Regional Setting

- Challenge – increase, maintain overall system productivity sustainably
- Latin America – departure point are degraded cultivated pastureland
- Africa and South Asia – departure point from cereal producing areas (cereal-legume-livestock) with very integrated systems with potential to increase productivity

Input and output market linkages for promising ICLS and associated supply chain processes

- What are the requirements from animal side and marketing side (input side: machinery, seed availability, technical assistance, fertilizer, fencing, input dealers network, finance, infrastructure, collection points, delivery of materials, slaughter channels, commodity exchange between supply systems, specialized. Producers, market exchanges, contract laws,
- Animal side: feeding both on materials and combing things, breeds and delivery, vet services, specific technologies-silage, best use of available waste resources, crop residues, balancing feeds, more knowledge on information
- Requirement of organized network: producers, input output marketing side, contract and exchange, financing institution, supply chain in Brazil because of demand –minor participation in soybean case
- African contest: no till can control grazing without fencing (need living fence, agroforestry or may be community action to control grazing,
- South Asia main drivers are institutional processes, community markets,

What needs to be done to address these and who can do it?

- CA-based crop-livestock systems are very promising for the moist savannah biomes. Investment on scaling farmer know-how is essential in most developing countries.
- Institutional Market as the entry points: Direct market to create demand
- Capacity building (education of the farmers, dealers, and other stakeholders, linking people with private sector or dealers
- Public private partnership relating to investments - chilling plants
- Market information system and risk analysis, agro-climatic information for analysis capacity

- Create infrastructure- transportation of produce and storage
- Policy and institutional support for adoption and enabling the spread of promising ICLS for food and nutritional security

What changes can be made to overcome these constraints and by whom?

- Establishment of sustainable and effective insurance mechanism
- Incentives through payments of public goods on environmental services, differentiated taxing system
- Preferential market, procurements
- Integrated agricultural sector policies-local, regional and national level including extension and research
- Regulation on quality control measure on all inputs – feed, concentrate, seed, fertilizers - public investment
- Laws on property rights - land tenure
- Capacity to deal with international trade

Research needed to generate knowledge and innovative practices to underpin adoption and scaling

What are the main research priorities to advance IC-LS within the on-the-ground implementation and the input to market dimensions?

- Optimization of biomass
- climate change adaptation
- Advantage of IC-LS for nutrient/land/water use efficiency?
- Synergies of integration
- Interrelation between crops, animals and environment
- Indicators to assess the trade offs (social, economical, environmental)
- Evaluation of economic performance of production systems
- Risk, profitability
- Genetic research for the specific integration activities
- Quantification of environmental services
- Minimum crop residue requirements for soil health
- Institutional and social mechanisms for stakeholder dialogue, market access
- Monitoring, development and validation of production systems
- On-farm, adaptive research
- Use of legumes (animal nutrition, soil fertility/conservation)
- What/why disincentives for animal manure use (relative to inorganic fertilizer use)?

What are the gaps in evidence that are needed to inform positive change within policies and institutions?

- Empirical evidence of environmental, economic and social performance of production systems

- What/why disincentives for animal manure use (relative to inorganic fertilizer use)?
- Value of residue use/application for soil/pest/nutrient/fuel/feed?
- Advantage of ICLS for nutrient/land/water use efficiency?
- Synergies of integration?

(c) Humid Forest Margins (including very moist savannahs) IC-L Systems (including sub-humid derived savannah environments in the tropics and summer rainfall sub-tropics)

Focus

- Small/medium sized beef/dairy cattle and crops and native/regenerated forest within the Arc of Deforestation (Brazil and Amazon basin)
- Smallholder producers with dairy and small livestock (Eastern Africa)

Key Constraints

Amazonia forest system

- Value chain for crop production not well organized (though it is for cattle)
- Lacking in infrastructure to serve smallholders
- Shifting cultivation needs to be stabilised (rotation within property), productivity enhanced (via legumes, fodder plants and improved pasture, with better adapted plants and animals)
- Lack of seeds/seedlings for forest enrichment
- Need for quality control over products
- Tenure regularization and environmental regulation

Eastern Africa

- Technology not accessible / affordability to smallholders (better if organized in cooperatives)
- Lack of capital for investment (credit markets are not well developed for smallholders)
- Need to develop linkages between different actors in the chain (producers direct to traders and processors)
- Transportation facilities (e.g., for milk) insufficient
- Soil degradation, low productivity, but possible to overcome with greater market and technology access
- Land tenure constraints in some countries
- Policy and institutional support

vOrganizing the value chain (Amazon)

- Industry (linking farmers with traders and processors, in part through cooperatives)
- State government (extension support to farmer organization in cooperatives, technology, sanitary control and consistency)

- Seed/seedling supply (Create demand for reforestation, NGO experience in Xingu basin)
- REDD+ instruments to finance the shift
- Environmental and tenure restrictions for credit
- Complementary legal framework for implementation (e.g., fertilizer provision, tax or credit subsidies for integrated systems)

Policy / institutional support

Parallel structures not talking to each other (within the private sector and with public and other actors)

Need to connect the value chain as a whole

Strategies for integrating small-scale production into formal marketing systems

Research and knowledge generation

Amazonia forest system

Technology already available requires validation (knowledge diffusion), and further research within a process of trial and innovation with farmers.
Fodder plants
Native forest species, use and management
Quantification of environmental services
Domestication of plant species
Ecological-economic zoning
Education on integrated crop-livestock-forest systems
Research needs

Eastern Africa

Technologies better geared to smallholder intensive systems
Knowledge development for finance and credit products and services for smallholders

CHAPTER 4

Elements of a policy brief and an action plan

4.1 ELEMENTS OF A POLICY BRIEF

- Empirical evidence of current situation
- Benefits of IC-LS
- What is needed
- What is new in the systems
- Small and medium farmers already benefit from IC-LS and other small and medium farmers may benefit from adoption of IC-LS.
- IC-LS systems
- Sustainably increase production and productivity
- To benefit small farmer livelihoods
- To reduce poverty - prevent hunger
- Environment – increase carbon stock, reduce pollution and gas emission and increase livestock productivity
- Tremendous untapped potential of some regions (i.e., African moist savannah) to efficiently convert resources into grain and animal products
- Increase food supply and reduce deforestation
- Reducing the use of agro chemicals compared to similar productive system and nutrients
- Reduce migration
- Payments can reduce the degradation process
- Generate employment and income
- Policies, institutions, and research needed to support IC-LS
- Funding for long term research
- Funding for farmers, programs to implement IC-LS
- Pursue multi-stakeholder approaches
- Reasons for policy makers to buy in / support IC-LS – which are the problems those systems would address?
- Numbers of people
- Continuing to build on those promising systems, what are the associated policy and institutional constraints (at various scales)?
- Weak institution
- Sectorial policies – existing policies are not adequate
- Lack of integration in policies

- Lack of sector specific plan
- Market policy to facilitate access for small producers
- Weakness of stakeholders in professional associations

4.2 ELEMENTS OF AN ACTION PLAN

Drylands and Dry Savannahs

Scaling-up

Time frame
Empowering CBOs
Capacity building of all stakeholders
Funding
Community of practice

Policy and institutional support

Facilitate integration /coordination of institutions on crop & livestock.
Endorsement
Crop & livestock insurance
Empowering farmers' organizations
Research
Promote Multi-disciplinary teams (research, extension, development)

Moist Savannahs

- Increase awareness (FAO)
- Policies, institutions, and research needed to support IC-LS
  - Identify priority areas for action
  - Secure funding for long term research
  - Secure funding for farmers and programs to implement IC-LS
  - Pursue multi-stakeholder approaches
  - Generate technical support for stakeholder decision-making (Embrapa)
- Capacity building (Embrapa)
  - Tools for farmers to measure performance
- Build institutional integration (for pilot projects and demonstration farms) (Embrapa and others to help to build a network of institutions TBD)
- International exchange initiatives (researchers, extensions agents, producers)
- Build network to identify benchmarks for science, innovation and learning
- Develop and improve Public-Private Partnerships
- Engage private sector

Humid Forest Margins (and Very Moist Savannahs)

Priorities: What?

Identify stakeholders to lead local level discussions
Discussion with actors in chain to find weakest points
Strategic planning for intervention
Elaborate policy brief

Training in methods of technology transfer to small farmers
Capacity building for technology transfer

Responsibilities: Who?

Embrapa, NGOs, FAO, multi-stakeholder dialogue
Network among service providers
Leaders of program network
Technical school system, Ematers, NGOs

Possible Global Working Group Action Plan Activities

- Review of Evidence/Stocktaking of successful integration efforts Apparently there are some good experiences at ground level that need to be taken up as effective entry points.
- Clarity of typologies
- Clarity of definitions
- Develop a community of practice
- Get cracking on inclusion – farmers, private sector, NGOs working on integrated systems, local authorities
- Facilitate/catalyze discussions among agriculture (livestock-crop) and environment (forestry) agency actors (ministries). Facilitate integration /coordination of institutions on crop & livestock
- Create Pilots that integrate actors across value chains (innovation platform)
- Identify key subgroups that can address specific areas – agro-ecozones, advocacy, knowledge management, scales? Identify Champions.

We need to make sure we don't leave out Gender, Fish, Nutrition, Agroecology, Eco-Agriculture, Small scale farmers, local food systems, etc.

Appendix 1

Technical background document

An International Consultation on Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems for Development - The Way Forward for Sustainable Production Intensification

(Co-organized by the Agriculture & Consumer Protection Department of FAO in collaboration with Embrapa, IICA and IFAD)

CONTEXT

After years of neglect, crises responses to agriculture and food related issues are taking a significant part of the "centre stage" of the global development agenda. The drivers are well articulated in recent major studies.[1] Below are some of the key areas of concern.

There are already over 1 billion (about 15% of the human population) people hungry and living in poverty, and 75% of them as well as other less poor but vulnerable people live in rural areas and depend on farming for their livelihoods, with the majority relying on small scale crop-livestock systems. Food (primary and secondary), feed, fibre and fuel needs must be met from agriculture of a still expanding population that is expected to grow from the current 6.7 billion to some 9.2 billion by 2050 while available land[2] for expansion of agriculture will become economically and environmentally unattractive. To meet the food needs of the population in 2050, production will have to expand by 70% compared to what it was in 2000. It is expected that 90% of the expansion will be through production intensification (i.e., increase in output per unit area), and 10% will be from area expansion mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. At the same time there is a shift to increased consumption of meat and livestock products as living conditions of people improve, increasing additionally the stress on the agricultural resource base. For this reason the environmental footprint of crop as well as of livestock production has to be reduced to improve sustainability.

---

1 Bruinsma, J. (2009). The Resource Outlook to 2020: By how much do land, water and crop yields need to increase by 2050. Paper presented at the Expert Meeting on How to Feed the World in 2050. June 2009, FAO, Rome.

2 The planet also has large areas of degraded lands in some regions that could be recovered for sustainable intensification if there were the political-will to confront the landowners and to make the infrastructure and capacity building investments required.

This poses both a development challenge as well as opportunities for livestock producers in crop-livestock systems to contribute to both overall food security and alleviation of their poverty as well as of non-agricultural rural population due to increasing employment opportunities in the input supply and output value chains.

Demand for livestock food products – red and white meat, dairy products, eggs -- are expected to grow significantly, thus offering opportunities for income and employment generation for the small-scale producers in crop-livestock systems as well as from the specialised producers, both small and large intensive and extensive systems, of livestock products. And in addition, the conversion of land from agriculture into many alternate uses (e.g., urbanization on productive soils) will continue to reduce production potential. Clearly food security, food safely and quality challenges are increasing, as is the growing awareness of needs for effective education on diet and lifestyle changes related to health. Human, livestock and plant health issues and their interactions are of increasing concern globally, especially the cross-infections between humans and major livestock populations and the transborder movements of such infections. Environmental issues such as climate change with greenhouse gas emissions being both increased by several agricultural activities. On the other hand it is increasingly becoming better appreciated by the general public as well as by the producers that selected agricultural practices can greatly increase productivity and incomes while simultaneously reducing the impact of climate change-related economic, social and environmental effects, for example, minimising mechanical soil disturbance and increasing soil organic matter helps reduce effects of dry periods on crop productivity and farm output. Similarly, it is possible to increase biomass in quantity and quality, and thereby increase livestock output in small-scale integrated systems, with crop diversification involving high biomass producing legumes that also improve soil productive capacity. Further, these practices are suitable for rehabilitating degraded lands. What is not so obvious is how can applications of such better practices, often more knowledge-intensive, be scaled-up?

The list of development issues and opportunities goes on. Clearly, the need for introduction, adaptation and implementation of good farming practices with associated enabling environments and to address environmental and health issues linked to agriculture has never been greater due to the shear scale of livestock related agriculture that will be required to maintain local and international food security and livelihoods in sustainable ways. *Intensification of crop and livestock production, in smallholder crop-livestock systems as well as in other intensive or extensive systems, is essential to mitigate human suffering and providing time for needed social and economic changes. Harnessing the potential of* ***well-integrated crop and livestock systems*** *at various levels of scale (on-farm and area-wide), and that often have agro-forestry and forestry inputs, is one of the powerful entry points to address such needs, issues and opportunities.* The integration of crop and livestock production systems

increases the diversity, along with environmental sustainability, of both sectors. At the same time it provides opportunities for increasing overall production and economics of farming. This would reduce the preference for specialized livestock production systems, in view of their problems with environmental and economic sustainability.

GOAL AND SCOPE

Several of FAO's development partners, such as ILRI and Embrapa have had recent intra-institutional consultations with primary focus on identification of priorities for research and the tactics to optimize their research processes with respect to the development of integrated crop-livestock production systems.

This Consultation process (both electronic and face-to-face) will build on these and other major stock-takings by pulling together ideas with a view to:

(a) assess what do we know about integrated crop-livestock systems for development including where they are working or not working, and what can be done to harness their potentials for development through sustainable production intensification;

(b) define next steps for key stakeholders, and especially for the Agriculture Department and Consumer Protection Department[3] of the FAO and its national and international collaborators (e.g., IFAD, IICA, ICRAF); and

(c) guide and empower FAO to better support member counties to harness the development potential of integrated crop and livestock systems as one important entry-point for sustainable agriculture intensification for poverty alleviation and environmental stewardship.

While many of the issues to be addressed are relevant for all types and scales of agriculture and food systems, the principle focus will be on the needs and opportunities for family-farmers (small and medium-scale land holders) and the associated community and watershed-level development. The use of the concept of *integration*[4] for the consultation will not be restricted to only on-farm integration; it will also include "area-wide" integration of crops and livestock with input supply and output value chains[5] (beyond the farm)

[3] The Agriculture Department of FAO seeks to define its role and clarify the tactics to help its member countries harness the potential of old and new approaches to integrated production systems. The AG Department is comprised of 5 divisions: Plant Production and Protection; Animal Production and Health; Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries; Nutrition and Consumer Protection; Joint FAO/IAEA Division for Application of Nuclear Technologies in Agriculture and Food.

[4] *Integration* will be considered both in the context of *horizontal integration* (e.g. crops and livestock optimization together) or *vertical integration* of a subcomponent such as horticulture crops where value chain from production to post harvest handling, to processing, to the market and the consumer.

[5] The recent (May 2009) ILRI consultation on research for Sustainable intensification of crop-livestock systems at ILRI chose to characterize the crop-livestock integration as a sub-system of larger value chains, presumably both for the crops and for livestock. The success of the value chain and the sub-components (integrated systems) would be based on productivity, economic benefits to stakeholders, sustainability and its resilience.

towards outcome oriented multi-stakeholder innovation systems. In this context it is intended that the appraisal of an *innovation and the associated innovation system* also reflect on the issues related to linking the public and private sectors (local, regional, and global) in order to strengthen the role of input supply and output value chain markets and the service providers while taking into consideration environmental and human health issues.

Output value chains under consideration will include: Animals for meat, milk and other dairy products, hides and skins from cattle and small ruminants, and meat and eggs from poultry, and meat from pigs etc, and respective processing and linkages to markets.

Input supply chains will include: Production inputs of seeds, agro-chemicals, farm power, equipment and machinery, veterinary services, advisory and innovation systems on good farming practices etc, and the organization and infrastructural connection to the farm producers.

Crops for biomass and grain include: Pasture and range species; cereals, grain and oil-seed legumes, fibres, horticulture crops and perennial industrial crops such as oil palm, coffee, cacao, coconut etc, and their primary processing of products and by products.

Agro-ecologies include: Agroecosystems in the tropics, subtropics (summer rainfall and winter rainfall) and temperate areas in the developing regions of the world.

The Consultation will address, when appropriate the related issues in the context of promoting integrated systems such as (see also thematic groups in the next section):

- multiple demands of crops and their biomass, and soil and crop health related functions of rotations, associations and organic matter, and landscape level integration as well as animal health and nutrition as functions of the production system;
- how to scale-out? (merit of participatory approaches to foster farmers' interaction and learning, such as the farmer field school, farmers clubs and other approaches including structured extension in contract farming);
- demand and market driven and/or environment and health driven coupled to ensuring smallholder farm-level demand (linking to supply and output markets and services);
- infrastructure, incentives, credit, land tenure and insurance (policy and institutional support).

NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF THE CONSULTATION

The Consultation process will comprise a wide electronic discussion during February 2010, followed by a small 4-day face-to-face Technical Consultation in Sete Lagaos, Minas Geráis, Brazil, from 23 to 26 March 2010 co-organized by FAO, Embrapa, IICA and IFAD, and will include one full day field trip to see innovative action on integrated crop-livestock systems in central or southern Brazil.

There will be four thematic areas for discussion at the face-to-face Consultation. Each thematic area will be covered by a working group across a range of types (on-farm and area-wide) and scales of crop-livestock integration for sustainable production intensification in different agroecologies. The four complementary and inter-connected thematic areas will address:

1. **Promising integrated crop-livestock systems and innovations that merit mainstreaming and scaling, and the tactics for implementation** (including: technical designs of integrated systems and their economical, environmental and social dimensions; functional biomass production for multiple use; Farmer Field Schools, Farmers Clubs, Cooperatives, Associations etc for participatory farmer learning and adoption, and for economies of scale and competitiveness; knowledge services and communication needs, common resource management issues etc).
2. **Input and output market linkage development for promising crop-livestock systems and associated input and output supply chain processes and public-private service providers for different production systems and diverse markets** (including: constraints and opportunities in input supply chains covering production inputs of seeds, agro-chemicals, farm power, equipment and machinery, veterinary services, advisory and innovation systems on good farming practices, marketing infrastructure and organization forms etc; constraints and opportunities in output supply chains covering animals for meat, milk and other dairy products, hides and skins from cattle and small ruminants, and meat and eggs from poultry, and meat from pigs; and opportunities for processing in integrated production systems etc).
3. **Political will, and policy and institutional support for the adoption and enabling the spread of innovations and practices associated with promising crop-livestock systems for food and nutritional security** (including: sector policies, goals and strategies; strategic planning; enabling environment - infrastructure/credit/marketing/insurance/land tenure etc; tactics for action, incentives, regulations, strategic directions for change in extensive and intensive crop-pasture-livestock systems etc).
4. **Research needed to generate knowledge and innovative practices to underpin farmer adoption and scaling of promising crop-livestock systems for sustainable production intensification** (including: technical, biological, nutritional, landscape, economic, environmental and social dimensions of integrated systems and practices; on-farm and area-wide integration of crop-livestock systems; functional biomass production and prioritization of its multiple role and use; feed and nutritional formulations; animal health management; effective innovations systems and processes; linking research result to policymaking etc).

The above four interlinked themes will address, in addition to the topic-specific core issues and their interactions, the following two cross-cutting themes:

(i) Roles of stakeholders (public sector, private sector, civil Society -- NGOs and parliamentarians, international research and development institutions, including the FAO, donors, etc.); and

(ii) Capturing public goods and incentives for action (payment for environmental services, special market access based on adoption of good practices – including food safety and quality, global awards to private sector and civil society champions, etc).

The output from the electronic discussion in February will feed into the working group discussions at the face-to-face workshop in Brazil in March. The number of total participants for the face-to-face Technical Consultation will be limited to some 60 individuals, and will include experts from FAO and Brazil/Embrapa, CGIAR, regional and sub-regional organizations, developing and developed countries, and selected donors such as World Bank, AfDB, IFAD, IICA, Gates Foundations as well as private sector (e.g., Bunge, Yara) and NGOs (e.g., WWF, Heifer International) etc.

EXPECTED RESULTS/OUTPUTS

The consultation will formulate recommendations and the supporting rationale to foster government awareness and support, stakeholder action and international cooperation.

The outputs of the working groups (electronic and face-to-face) and plenary discussions will be organised to generate the elements of a Framework for Action (including consolidated recommendations) which will be the main output from the consultation.

The Framework elements will focus on the Role of Crop-Livestock Integration in Sustainable Agricultural Intensification for Development. The consultation will propose a mechanism for follow-up action to be facilitated by FAO in collaboration with partners and stakeholders.

Appendix 2

Consolidated summary of electronic consultation (1 February to 7 March 2010)

Summary Week 1/Theme 1
February 1-5, 2010

Building off of the background paper provided at the website http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/spi/iclsd, Theme 1 focused on **promising integrated crop-livestock systems and innovations that merit mainstreaming and scaling, and tactics for implementation**. This week's discussion was rich with interventions and reactions and responses. There were some 50 enthusiastic contributions bringing insights from countries in the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Europe, and North America. The following brief summary is meant to highlight the range of points that were brought into the discussion. The summary is not exhaustive and can not adequately capture the full richness of the discussion. That said all of the individual interventions can be found on the website as well as all of documents, photos and links that were submitted by participants. Further, the reflective thoughts of Andrew McMillan also provide a useful synthesis (Contribution 44).

This document is organized according to the questions that were used to prompt the discussion.

1) Do you believe that integrated crop-livestock systems are an answer for sustainable intensification? Do they have a place in our strategy for feeding 9 billion people in 2050?

There was a resounding yes in response to this question, which was almost always accompanied by various qualifiers and expanded ideas.

These integrated crop-livestock systems: must build off of their interdependencies; be managed for efficiency; take into consideration the application of technical principles; implemented for a profitable enterprise; allow for chemical fertilizers essential to increasing productivity, and using manures and organic matter as integral to the sustainability of any cropping system; ensure sustainability upon which the fate of human survival is dependent; have a clear market focus moving beyond the goal of food

security at the household level; are defined by trajectories that are regional, agroecologically specific and influenced by different scales (examples of South Asia where the bulk of meat and dairy comes from integrated systems yet these integrated systems are not well enabled in Europe); can be optimized to improve rural economies and agricultural-environmental impact; are recognized for their heterogeneity; require vastly different approaches for research and development better linked to policy, institutional and social dimensions that enable small holder market participation; provide resource efficient farming systems that dictate that resources be shared among components of a diversity of production systems; play a role in sustainable intensification and that should be a priority over area expansion; are here to stay while recognizing that they are in transition with different paths of intensification driven by internal and external factors; are a sustainable option as they mimic natural processes; and provide flexibility and resilience; scaling up to the landscape level are necessary steps to development; provide potential for adaptation and mitigation of climate change; require innovations to manage transitions; are potentially more robust in the face of global change and crises; are the systems upon which poor farmers are dependent; and must follow the Modern Sustainable Highly Productive and Profitable Agricultural model (MOSHPPA); among others.

2) What have we learned about integrated crop-livestock systems since the 1980's?

Colleagues offered up a broad range of existing examples of systems from various agroecologies and scales and with different component emphases and each with their opportunities and constraints. Examples included: crop-tree-livestock systems in Nepal, Bhutan, India; small holder farming systems in semi-arid Zimbabwe; small scale dairy in India and Tanzania; alley cropping in West Africa and Indonesia; use of fodder legumes of *Calliandra calothyrsus*; Zero tillage systems in tropical Brazil and Canada with cover crops; systems with high densities of trees in (sub-humid-humid) Southern Africa including conservation agriculture with Faidherbia albida (CA/Agroforestry/Evergreen Agriculture) in Africa; conservation agriculture in Madagascar; dual purpose crops such as cow-pea (West Africa) and potatoes (East Africa); integration of cotton, corn, sorghum and legumes with animal management in Burkina Faso and Mali; dairy systems on Reunion Island; zero tillage soybean utilizing *brachiaria* grass in the Cerrado of Brazil; Crop-livestock-tree systems using eucalyptus and teak; alfalfa in rotation with grain in Canada; Spanish 'dehesa'; "faxinal" system of Southern Brazil; no-till cassava in Paraguay. Colleagues identified that there are multiple ways to integrate crop and livestock systems - crop farmers can rent out their pasture rotation to livestock owners rather than own the livestock themselves as well as landless livestock keepers can link with crop producers – integration does not have to be at the farm scale but

can be across the community. Different scales make a difference – smallholders often have an advantage over large scale enterprises for dairy, but not so for pigs and poultry

3) What are the key benefits that arise from these systems? economically, environmentally, and socially? From a production standpoint, what are the gains in terms of functional biomass, multiple purpose production?;

Among the environmental, economic and social benefits related to integrated crop-livestock systems, the following were shared:

- From an *environmental perspective* colleagues noted the importance of the ecological resilience, ecosystem efficiency and recycling, building organic matter, carbon and water storage, the reduction in dependence on external inputs, reduction in pollution and erosion (CA/ground covers), the interdependence of cropping and livestock systems, and the increase in biological diversity as well as overall bio-diverse productivity.
- The systems are *socially* of value in rural areas as they are typically practiced in small-holder operations (where they are very much acceptable) but have not been promoted/enabled in larger scale farming systems, yet they exist. The systems often build upon traditional and indigenous knowledge. Livestock are considered an indicator of wealth. The systems also bring a diversified diet and increased nutrition to the household. Sustainable systems can decrease migration pressures.
- The systems are considered *economically profitable* and serve as a risk-averse strategy that enhances overall farm resilience in times of low crop yield, additional income from livestock products, reduced external inputs due to optimizing recycling of manure, tree and crop residues. It was expressed that economics will drive and the other co-benefits will come with the use of these integrated systems.

4) How are these innovations being scaled up? What are the mechanisms for sharing knowledge (Farmer Field Schools, Farmer Cooperatives, Farmer interest groups or associations)?

Colleagues generally highlighted the role and importance of innovative farmer leaders, women, community organizational/institutional strengthening, strong producer groups, farmer field schools, farmer participatory research, introduction to youth in schools, and training for community based expertise (e.g. community animal health workers), and efficient information technologies. It was noted that single technologies (e.g. alley cropping) are not likely to be scaled up without allowing for strong farmer involvement in the local discovery and adaptation processes, and integrating market, institutional, and policy dimensions with technological aspects. There need to be simultaneous engagement at a landscape level through collective action and farm level intensification through technology integration.

Further, it was suggested that a Global Crop Livestock Initiative could be put in place including an inventory/database of references and activities.

5) What are the key constraints to implementing integrated crop-livestock systems? What about constraints to scaling up/out?; 6) How best do we integrate these sustainable intensive production systems into a landscape scale approach?

- *Segregation of components and disciplines (hyper-specialization).* Farmers, scientists and development professionals recognized that our approach to agriculture tends to separate our crop production systems and our livestock production systems (and expertise) and that this has closed a window on systems and holistic thinking and subsequently undermined the success of integrated crop-livestock systems. Enhancing communication among disciplines was emphasized and ensuring that scientists are working directly with farmers. Rethinking participatory approaches, adaptive research, co-learning, and co-experimentation beyond plant, animal, field bases were suggested.
- *Regional Differences.* It was recognized that many systems are moving away from integration and in the direction of specialization (e.g. China, Vietnam) while it may actually take further (drastic) limitations from climate change or energy crises to encourage robust integrated systems in Europe.
- *Access to resources and productive inputs.* Land tenure is a critical constraint in terms of both farmer investments in improvements on land that is not guaranteed as well as movement of livestock (example from South Yemen). Further, benefits from integrated systems must be substantial enough for producers to adjust their systems to incorporate livestock or other infrastructure needs. Access to markets, knowledge, credit and seeds and in some cases subsidies were also highlighted. Conflict among land uses (including bio-fuel production) and issues of trespassing were raised. Once land is under irrigation in dry areas, it tends to be put under crops, relegating livestock to hill sides.
- *Policies*. Support tends to promote the status quo and international markets and taxation are promoting cropped areas (e.g. Argentina). Policies must shift from sectoral to integrated decision making. At present, there are no organized public-oriented initiatives to foster these systems.
- *Competition/tradeoffs of use of Crop Residue*. Crop residue has multiple uses. There continues to be a competition for crop residues (whether used for ground cover, soil improvement and nutrient cycling) or as fodder for livestock ('feed the soil or feed the animals"), cooking, fence, thatch, biochar, etc. Further choices of crop varieties may be based on grain or quantity and quality of crop residues for feed in these systems.
- *Labor.* There are potential labor constraints in the management intensive systems.

- *Limitation of natural resources.* In many cases, water is the limiting factor and existing land degradation (and subsequent low forage quality) is also considered as a constraint.
- *Livestock in 'the balance'.* Livestock are not looked upon favorably in society because of the potential of environmental issues. It was noted that it is important that whole farm systems are analyzed for net green house gas emissions/sequestration.

Summary Week/Theme 2
February 8-12, 2010

Building off of the background paper provided at the website http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/spi/iclsd, Week 2's discussions focused on supply and value chain dynamics and the actors associated with promising crop-livestock systems.

In our background paper, we identified a focus on: **input and output market linkage development for promising integrated crop-livestock systems and associated input and output supply chain processes and public-private service providers for different production systems and diverse markets** (including constraints and opportunities in input supply chains covering production inputs of seeds, agro-chemicals, farm power, equipment and machinery, veterinary services, advisory and innovation systems on good farming practices, marketing infrastructure and organization forms etc; constraints and opportunities in output supply chains covering animals for meat, milk and other dairy products, hides and skins from cattle and small ruminants, and meat and eggs from poultry, and meat from pig; and opportunities for processing in integrated production systems etc). That description is a mouthful but certainly did not deter our readers from responding.

This week's discussion included some 20 contributions that came from experiences in Australia, India, Mali, Sierra Leone, Uruguay, Kazakhstan, Canada, Sudan, Brazil, USA, Bangladesh, Niger, Chile, Colombia, Zimbabwe, and Ecuador among others that indicated regional and global applications. Many of the interventions were relevant to the previous week's theme (innovations) and others are readily segueing to next week's theme (policy and institutions). The following brief summary is meant to highlight the range of points that were brought into the discussion. As we noted last week, the summary is not by any means exhaustive and can not adequately capture the depth of the interventions. That said all of the individual interventions can be found on the website as a blog along with the documents, photos and links that were submitted by participants.

This week's summary is organized according to the questions that were used to prompt the discussion (as much as possible). A number of addition inputs are highlighted as well.

- ***Do integrated crop-livestock systems offer an advantage when it comes to incentives/rewards for good practice such as payment for environmental services or access to special markets? If so, what is your experience with these?***

There were not specific examples of incentives that are in place but there were examples of what integrated systems could offer. The Inland Valley System (IVS, West Africa) warrants incentives in that it can reduce the use of marginal fragile uplands and the inclusion of multi-purpose crops can which leave crop residues for livestock and reduce conflict. Payment for environmental services could be considered for protection of natural forests, increased soil organic matter and biota, and erosion control.

- ***Are there market (local, national, international) dependent value chain constraints (e.g. lack of local processing facilities, food quality/safety regulations, market access, etc.) that need to be addressed? Which are these and how have they been or might they be overcome?***

Urbanization and income growth has influenced the demand for livestock products in South Asian countries yet poor livestock keepers may not benefit from this given a lack of access to inputs, technology, credit, services and product markets. Lack of credit and insurance to support livestock are often not available. Markets that are not near by drive up marketing and transportations costs (reducing the price by 15% in some cases). Through Operation Flood, small holders can participate in commercial dairying through addressing production and institutional and marketing constraints. This applies also to growers' associations, cooperatives and contract farmers. Contract farming in was noted to increase profits over non-contract farming in India.

In Sudan, there is a growing domestic and export market for live sheep and meat and this has brought crop farms into sheep raising which in turn finances the crop production. Livestock becomes the financier. Livestock is also seen to create a financial buffer against crop failures.

Constraints to overcome, identified by the Panchayti Raj Institutions (PRIs), include better linkages for farmers with markets, insurance and banks to overcome associated vulnerabilities. Further as livestock production increases, there is an emphasis on indigenous breeds, feed and fodder resources and inputs such as veterinary services to equip livestock producers.

Constraints in southern USA include: lack of information needed for managing sophisticated/complex production systems; lack of field infrastructure (fencing water sources) and supply and delivery linkages; lack of information related to chemical usage for crop, animal and human health and safety; need

to balance year round forage supplies and labor; and need to develop market for alternative meet production (grain fed vs. pasture fed).

Constraints in Sierra Leone include: lack of knowledge on caretaking (housing, nutrition, and health care); lack of vaccines and persons that can vaccinate; and lack of feed either as fodder (tree sources particularly) or intensive feed. Farmer field schools with animal technicians are being used to try to address these. Inclusion of pictures in training packages for farmers and extension staff are critical.

In the Inland Valley Systems (IVS) crop-livestock enterprises in West Africa, the constraints identified included soil moisture and the availability of animal draught power to cultivate the soils. Often farmers can pool their resources to put draught teams together.

One intervention featured the multiple dimensions of integrated pasture-tree and pasture-crop systems in the Ecuadorian Amazon. While they constitute the main production approach much expansion has been carried out through unsustainable practices that play a role in deforestation and climate change and have also instigated value chains in the region. The intervener queries whether intensification the way to reduce deforestation in the Amazon knowing that integrated systems can reduce environmental impact and green house effect. Intensification of pastures can reduce animal numbers and large areas of degraded pastures can be put in agroforestry. The diffusion of agroforestry technologies include climatic conditions, economic growth of urban centers, presence of agro-industry, manpower availability, capital and credit, producer organization and incentives. Education is critical and the State and international cooperation have an essential role to transform to alternative systems "with shade" and develop markets for environmental services (and carbon) that come from the forest. This intervener also emphasized that the commercial economies have negative effects on the marginal sector – thus preferential attention should be given to institutional structure, research, extension and the farmer promotion.

Two colleagues provided diagrams of the inter-related supply chains of crop and animal production systems (graphics should be viewed in blog).

- Sims highlighted the inputs (products and services) that each provides to the system (from livestock, agroforestry, and conservation agriculture) as well as the outputs for value chains (food crops, fibre products, meat, wool, eggs, vermicompost, honey, etc.). This system highlighted the complementarity of CA and AF – for efficiency of natural resource use, provision of favorable production environments, profitable production systems and environmental protection and management.
- Twomlow offered up another graphic (adapted from Thomas 2003) that depicted biophysical constraints and interrelationships with production systems, households and communities with the natural resources management as the central feature. The crop-livestock project elements

increased the inputs and flexibility of production systems, which in turn contribute to NR sustainability. Constraints are identified in production systems (e.g. drought, low productivity of rangelands, low diversification); household community (e.g. low investments, infrastructure, cohesion); and socioeconomic factors that influence community and production systems (lack of credit, subsidies, insurance). Interventions are required to strengthen institutions, empowerment of communities, provide conservation techniques, and enhance crop-livestock systems.

Integrated systems have enabled improvements in quality of meat and milk at competitive costs – this is derived from combining perennial and annual forage species, management tactics, pasture fertilization and animals with high genetic potential. Pasture finishing is satisfying requirements and markets. In South Brazil, over the last 10 years, area under crop-livestock systems has doubled and the integration of forage and cover crops have increased the profitability (net income) while diminishing risks.

It was noted that the global economy is influenced by crop-livestock systems (noting an example where Chilean farmers directed their crop-livestock systems toward European markets until quotas were imposed and the integrated crops livestock systems became less viable. This example was used to show that beyond innovative systems (breed, traceability, welfare for specific markets), government and political support must be associated with the innovation in order for the integrated systems to be improved. Further, farmer training must be done by well motivated and paid professionals that can address the reality of these systems.

- ***Who are the input supply chain and output value chain actors and how do they inter-relate? Who drives the chains (farmers, input providers, markets, government, etc)? How equitable are the benefits to different actors along the input supply chain and output value chain? Are there examples of input chain and output value chain actors working together to gain more competitiveness and sustainability or stability?***

It was noted that private sector should be the main actor in supply of inputs and purchasing, transporting, storing and processing of outputs from the systems. All actors need to make a living (partial or full) from the supply chain activities. The public sectors' role is to fulfill extension, training and PES.

In India, working with clustered groups of villages who wish to work for the common cause (building on the PRIs and self-help groups and women self-help groups) increases the representation of women and more marginalized members of society and assists with the implementation of project interventions and direct linkages with relevant line agencies. Cluster approaches can sustain projects even when donor funding is absent. Action research on crop-livestock-fish integration has also worked with

the Directorate of Research on Women in Agriculture to insure women's perspectives are addressed in technology development.

- ***Might we see a shift toward greater local/national sustainable markets in light of decreasing availability and increasing costs of transport fuel, climate change, food insecurity, etc.?***

The main challenge will be from feeding the growing urban population and most of the food will come from medium and large farms which are in continuous grain accompanied by land degradation. The key role of pastures by fixing and recovering soil carbon balance will be crucial given increasing nitrogen fertilizer and petrol prices/shortages.

The IVS in West Africa is typically situated near large cities and towns and pressure toward intensification will increase with increasing numbers of people who are migrating to cities. Food security will be an important driver as well as meeting the demands for richer consumers.

A historical view of livestock integration in Uruguay demonstrated that ley farming took place in degraded grassland ecosystems introducing legumes and ultimately rotation of perennial pastures with grain crops. By the 90s, 90% of grain crops were in rotation with pasture one out of four years. Most recently these well integrated systems on larger scale farms have been undermined by continuous soybean production despite rising meat prices. The integrated systems continue on medium and small farms.

Integrated systems are on the rise in India to reduce farmer dependence on grain crops and allowing for additional sources of income.

Markets were noted as playing a large role in driving the intensification/specialization of crop-livestock systems and these are diverse across and within regions. A table showed the intensification gradient (extensive to intensive) by elements of integrated systems (feed, power, finance, market orientation, evolution, costs, innovations) – provided by Bruno - source Erenstein and Thorpe, 2009. Increasing overall demand for livestock products, urbanization, niche markets at diverse scales are emerging and within changing environments that must be addressed (e.g. equity, conflict over resource use, land deals and environmental challenges).

In Asia, projections suggest that demand for maize will be faster than for wheat because of the demand for livestock and poultry feed as well as increasing demand for food (rapid population growth, rising price of wheat and rice) and bio-fuel. This is expected to be a main driver toward shift in food consumption patterns in poverty stricken areas – driven by increased demand for raising livestock.

A new article in Science magazine offered up by colleagues in the CGIAR (Herrero *et al.*) was shared which uplifted the importance of mixed crop-livestock systems for food security. Two quotes here: "According to the CGIAR analysis, the world's one billion poor people (those living on less than

1$ a day) are fed primarily by hundreds of millions of small holder farmers (most with less than 2 ha of land, several crops, and perhaps a cow or two) and herders (most with fewer than five large animals) in Africa and Asia. Furthermore, mixed crop-livestock systems could be the key to future food security; two-thirds of the global population already live in these systems, and much of the future population will occur there. Already mixed systems produce 50% of the world's cereals and most of the staples consumed by poor people". And, "Faced with population growth and climate change, small holder farmers could be the first targets for policies to intensify production with carefully managed inputs of fertilizer, water and feed to minimize waste and environmental impacts, supported by improved access to markets, new varieties, and technologies."

Additional Inputs:

Gender equity. Several colleagues pointed to the importance of gender issues and analysis and women's role in farming systems (historically and with women's self help groups in Asia).

Alley Cropping Lessons Learned. It was stressed that participatory approaches will not succeed if it does not meet the farmers need. The intervention noted that beyond scarcity of labor, the farmers did not see the direct benefit such as lack of commercial return from alley cropping e.g. environmental benefit alone is not sufficient. However the commercial value of livestock in small holder systems over the past 10-15 years has increased the interest as there is a practical application of tree legumes for livestock (citing *Leucaena* with grain crops in Australia).

Benefits. Increasing organic matter and biological fixation of legumes to support crop nutrition is a clear benefit. The intervention highlighted that fertilizers are much less effective at reversing land degradation. Another intervention noted that precious bi-produce of manure may exceed the value of meat or dairy animal products particularly on subsistence farms.

Area-wide integration. We were reminded of the fact that integration can take place on farm within the same management unit. Rather functional integration can readily be across a community or landscape.

Carrying capacity. Promoting integration of livestock calls for understanding the capacity for providing forage and essential feeds from the land base. Further, imported feed impacts livestock production as well as manure chemistry which has environmental outcomes. In nutrient poor environments, improvements in livestock productivity enhance manure quality and have a positive impact on crops and pastures. Assessment of tradeoffs must be carried out.

What did we learn? One intervention stressed the fact that we need to review what we did learn in the 70s, 80s and 90s as some of ideas emerging were core decades ago. However, there may well be socio-economic conditions that have

changed which may augment the capacity to implement these systems now. A literature search to map new directions is needed and brought forward in multiple messages.

From land degradation to sustainable production. A case from Kazakhstan was presented to demonstrate different methods for converting abandoned land into pastures. Some successful outcomes pointed to the practice of sowing annual forages instead of follow to produce green forage, hay and grain as well as the 'green conveyor approach for the production of annual forages as well a perennial ones to prolong availability of forages. Crested wheatgrass and sainfoin was a successful mix in Central Kazakhstan (legumes were difficult in the north) and in Canada alfalfa can replace the sainfoin.

Crop residue. Several contributors raised the issue of conflict over the use of residues. Integration of livestock requires the provision of fodder production through partial harvesting, separate fodder banks, or improved fallows. The intervention from Sudan noted that 'crops and horns never co-exist' as in this country the migratory, semi-migratory and agro-sedentary systems are present.

More Examples of ICLS. Additional examples of integrated crop-livestock systems included honey bees in Ghana and Rice-Duck cultivation in Japan, Korea, Philippines and Vietnam – a win-win for sustainable crop intensification.

Getting the meaning. One colleague noted that there are many wrong ways to intensify agriculture and that we need to be clear that agricultural intensification protects (rather than increase) productivity and prolongs good yields, reduces yield variability and production costs, while increasing food security and respecting the natural capacity of the environment and addressing cultural differences. The intensification of CA needs to integrate crop with livestock to preserve and strengthen diversification. And, a final quote "Seems difficult? Nobody said it would be easy!!"

Summary Week/Theme 3
February 15-19, 2010

Building off of the background paper provided at the website http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/spi/iclsd, discussions during Week 3 focused on those policies and institutional supports that must be in place to enable the adoption and spreading of innovations and practices associated with promising crop-livestock systems for food and nutritional security.

This week's discussion included some 22 contributions that came from experiences in India, Burkina Faso, Iran, Zimbabwe, Canada, Sudan, Brazil, the USA, Chile, Bolivia, Cameroon, Ethiopia, and Ghana among others that indicated regional and global relevance. The following brief summary is meant

to highlight a range of discussion points. As we noted in previous weeks, the summary is not intended to be exhaustive and cannot adequately capture the depth of the interventions and shared materials. All of the individual interventions can be found on the website as a blog along with the documents, photos and links that were submitted by participants.

This week's summary is organized according to the questions that were used to prompt the discussion.

From your perspective and in the context in which you are working, what are the top one-two (1-2) institutional and/or political constraints that undermine the uptake, implementation or spread of integrated crop-livestock systems?

In response to this query, a number of constraints were mentioned and several were reiterated time and again. Participants spoke to: disincentives or the lack of support to adopt new technologies or innovate or lack of demonstrations effective to motivate farmers to change; disincentives towards the commonly integrated farming systems, which then led to their disintegration and specialization in the recent past and which still continues; the predominant institutional view that a quick-fix approach can overcome any problem; lack of information, social support networks, physical resources, marketing support, insurance and financial credit limit (lack of understanding of lenders); challenges stemming from the lack of suitable alternative markets within a reasonable distance as well the weak association between different components of the value chain; issues around large landholdings and land tenure/ insecurity that prioritize specialized crop farming for local consumption and export or threaten pasture areas or livestock keepers trying to trek animals.

A constraint mentioned repeatedly was around the compartmentalization of crop/agriculture and livestock activities (breeding and agriculture) within government ministries and departments, extension agencies, researchers leading to a lack of a systems perspective/approach ("systems specialists") in research and development including differential intervention needs. There is still a lack of participatory approaches among extension staff and insufficient attention to linking forward to markets and coupling technologies with income-generating commodities.

Further colleagues spoke to a lack of political will/support from top leaders or public initiatives that foster the understanding of importance of integrated crop-livestock systems in enhancing the livelihood of resource poor farmers; institutional and policy silos between producers (different groups), conservation organizations, agricultural NGO, private sector investors, district and national government agencies, among others.

What can/might be done to address these constraints and who (or who together) can make that happen?

Colleagues offered up a number of recommendations to address constraints. Opportunities were raised around: raise political support and financing for integrated crop-livestock strategies that contribute to resolving larger ecosystem-level challenges and opportunities, like watershed restoration, habitat restoration for threatened biodiversity, and carbon sequestration; more influence from researchers and government extension encouraging farmers to adopt alternative production systems. Awareness raising and education were highlighted in terms of strong farmer-led organizations (e.g. conservation tillage alliances, those innovational agricultural schemes) with educational support networks (e.g. extension and research teams working towards similar goals; technical teams to bank managers; and changes in curricula) that could provide a great deal of technical and social support to encourage change and resulting benefits (e.g. in and around these schemes and in the suburbs of large cities) as well as better communication, transparency and confidence are necessary between the producers and processors. Incentives were raised around market conditions including credit; production contract, incentives for quality, good agricultural practices, animal welfare, soil health, are also required.

To address issues of compartmentalization, it was suggested to move toward one platform for all the service providers related to crops and livestock (systems) and innovation platforms that bring diverse actors together for joint action. The institutional dimension to provide incentives for innovation needs effective networks and alliances to put technology into use, recognizing that innovation occurs, emergent behaviours arise, and these represent changes to social institutions. It was suggested that at various levels, there could be better dialogue and join work among different disciplines and stakeholders. Partnerships need to be built among the stakeholders for that better coordination and communication is prerequisite that build upon honest and visionary leadership to bring about change.

To address specific institutional issues around pastoral systems, one colleague suggested delimitation of large areas for livestock keepers, better and more complementary ways of managing pastoral resources and fodder; as well as ensuring that decision makers realize the importance of mobility for animal feeding and the protection of pastoral spaces.

Another intervention noted that increased energy costs could actually promote the shift towards more local food production systems and another suggested the usefulness of constructing a typology of crop-livestock systems for each country for better targeting of technology and development. One intervention summarized that farmers organizations and an appropriate political environment are key elements.

If you had 5 minutes with a/your Minister of Agriculture (or Livestock, Finance, etc), what message would you want to deliver? What about 5

minutes with the head of national or international farmers' organizations? Any thoughts to share with a relevant private sector representative (inputs, processors, buyers, etc.)?

Below, we have placed the 'messages' according to the audience.

Messages for the Ministries:

- The economical and environmental benefits of ICLS (with examples and case studies including political benefit), and that dissemination depends on long-term investments in technical knowledge/assistance and financial access/stimulus.
  -From the perspective of the sustainable national development, the reversion of the big large and unproductive agricultural lands is the most important strategy to reduce the poverty and to guaranty the environmental sustainability. This strategy will allow the intensification of the land use and, in the medium term the development of crop-livestock integrated systems of production.
- What is your planed strategy to maintain farmers on their landscape while increasing productivity in quality and quantity, without deteriorating the environment?
- Policies can affect the balance between production and environmental quality. Strategies should be considered that emphasize the long-term sustainability of a region by balancing production and environmental quality, not just focusing on the short-term needs of a selected portion of the population.
- Extension officers need more than technical skills - they are well placed to act as facilitators of innovation by bringing in private sector players, market actors etc to stimulate innovation - but they need to be capacitated and mandated in this direction.
- Put an environment/pollution tax on industrial systems and provide incentives for mixed systems in peri-urban or hinterlands. Use the tax for building infrastructure to link hinterland producers with urban /demand centres.
- Bulk supply of inputs to farmers through farmer association would save on cost of inputs. Bulk purchase of produce by processing industry again through farmers association would save on marketing and transaction costs.
- Dans les zones de savanes subhumides de l'Afrique de l'Ouest, on aurait tout à gagner en renforçant encore plus l'intégration de l'agriculture et de l'élevage. L'agriculture bénéficie de la présence de l'élevage à travers la traction animale, la fumure organique, l'épargne/trésorerie sur pieds et l'élevage bénéficie de l'agriculture à travers les résidus de cultures (ressource fourragère de saison sèche), le recul de certaines maladies comme la trypanosomose...
- Put additional funding into research, education and extension on conservation agriculture and low input crop production systems. We as agricultural producers have been encouraged for years to rely on chemistry to provide

solutions to our production practices and we have paid a huge price for this method of production. If government support programs were designed more to support beneficial innovation in our production practices and our public research and extension dollars should be directed at conservation agriculture and integrated pest and fertility management techniques. (The message would be similar for the farm organization leadership.)

- Crop-livestock integration is important as a way forward to environmentally friendly and sustainable agricultural system which should be promoted, made top priority of Government's agricultural policy and cause MoFA and its technical departments to provide position papers for consideration (justifiable documents for his/her consideration must be included).
- Faced with the pressure on space and with the number of animals involved, transhumance seems to be a guarantee for (i) the sustainability of the agro-pastoral systems of the Mbororo stockbreeders and thus (ii) the supply of livestock products to urban consumers, whose needs increases each year. This mobility makes it possible to develop in the course of years a diversity of the agro-climatic situations and natural recourses. In order to be sustainable, however, these systems based on mobility must be better managed. The practice of pastoralism as a socio-economic activity and way of life must be guaranteed. This passes through the sensitization and the popularization of the laws and regulations for the determination of the status of spaces of pasture and the tracks of cattle and the promotion of a policy of regional planning. Stockbreeders must take part in decision-making relating to land.
- Assure market for small and marginal farmers, Credit Card for taking loan from banks for purchase of inputs required for integrated crop-livestock innovations to landless and poor people. Promote agro-processing and input delivery at cluster level through SHGs/CBOs.
- Link integrated crop-livestock system with Food for Work programme.
- Incentives to deforest are major that those to preserve, and only the legislation can do little to help to stop the intensive expansion of forest destroy. This condition limits the intensification of the systems of production, and obviously, limits the development of agricultural systems more friendly with the rural development and the preservation of our lands forest. Integrated crop-livestock systems are one of them that have the major efficiency in the utilization of the factors of production, and it may have important potential to increasing the food national safety.
- A change in the parameters of measurement of the Economic and Social Function of the land (FES) must incorporate the productivity of agricultural or livestock activities. And this may be the route for the break of the extensive unproductive systems and give step to more efficient systems in the use of the agricultural or livestock factors of production. The smallholding and the unproductive big large agricultural lands have given place to the stagnation of the development of the crop-livestock integrated systems of production.

Moreover, that condition was the principal topics for the irrationality management of our natural resources, stimulated the degradation of soils and permitted the increasing of illegal market of lands. In the other hand, these conditions was the principal roots of our social tensions and was the principal limiting to access to the food national safety.

- In Bolivia, the rate of national livestock extraction has a range among 12 to 14 %, the first one is proper of South American camels, and the second is representative of meat bovine production. This value is together of Paraguay's value the lowest in the world. It is lower than the world average of 20 %, than that of the CAN of 16 %, than that of the MERCOSUR of 18 % or than that of the EU 15 of 36 %. In other hand, the performance or yield of the canal, this is minor to 52 % and the sacrifice age, product of slow rates of growth, is near to 4 years. Certainly, to improve these parameters of production should be one of the policies of the sector; the low production performance has a linear relation with the equitable access to the land and with two tied factors: the reduction of the poverty and the environmental sustainability.

Messages for Farmers' Organizations:

- Farmer organizations could work together so that the agricultural systems of a region are diverse and vibrant, rather than manipulated by a dominant few at the expense of others.
- What are the minimal conditions required to implement an ICLS? And secondly, which are the bottlenecks you visualize on the system?
- Organize meetings/workshop of their members where experts including myself could address the larger group on the crop-livestock system set up, implementation and benefits. From there they could be a pressure/advocacy group for government's support for the programme. Messages for Private Sector:Private agricultural industries could offer a suitable suite of alternative technologies to meet the diversity of needs within a region.

The livestock production systems have an average of productivity of 16 kg of corporal mass per hectare. This low production is determined by the application of a system of extensive managing that is reflected in degradation of forage recourses, capacity of carrying low and equal to 0.2 UA bovine per hectare. With this low productivity, the strategy is to access large lands. And, the most important are to access lands of low cost or zero cost. Only in this condition the livestock systems offers utilities.

What policy or institutional support or changes have you witnessed or read about that led to demonstrated success in the uptake, implementation or spread of integrated crop-livestock systems? Are there successes in other fields that might be applied in this situation?

In response to this question, participants named some examples and also expanded a bit on what has to be in place to have successful systems in place.

Examples that colleagues felt could inform the debate included:
The use of sorghum for poultry feed in Asia promoted through an institutional innovation/coalition approach including crop scientists, poultry nutritionists, feed industry, credit agencies, input dealers (including seed), farmers, farmers' federation, poultry producers, and poultry federation.

The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) is experimenting institutional innovations under National Agricultural Innovation Project (NATP) for enhancing the livelihood security of rural poor so that it (ICAR) becomes a dynamic innovation system capable of responding to the present as well as the future needs of agriculture research and development. The emphasis is on improving and developing the most suitable integrated farming system models in the less favourable environments and regions and groups through action research so that the livelihood of the rural poor improves through assured food, nutrition, employment and income.

Several technologies refined under Institute Village linkage programme of NATP (such as backyard poultry rearing, integrated farming systems, strategic feed supplementation, etc) are up scaled at sate level through Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) far wider and faster impact.

Through the Landscape Measures Initiative (www.landscapemeasures.org), Ecoagriculture Partners and numerous partners have begun compiling and further developing tools and methods for analyzing, planning, design and monitoring of such participatory landscape initiatives.

CLFIS is a strategy of sustainable agricultural production which integrates crop, livestock and forest activities on a same area, applying agricultural techniques such as crop rotation, succession, double cropping, and intercropping, searching for synergistic effects among the components of the agroecosystems, contemplating environment aspects, human value, and economical viability. The project uses categories for different agroecological zone in Brazil including: crop-livestock integration; crop-livestock-forest integration; and livestock forest integration.

The regional COAMO's experience (Cooperativa Agropecuária Mourãoense Ltda – Campo Mourão – Paraná) where in 5 years have reached an adoption level of 1980 stakeholders working with ICLS. Its success was based on field demonstrations and knowledge spread by 200 agronomists, trained by a partnership with Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR) and IAPAR (Instituto Agronômico do Paraná), and supported by private enterprises as well.

Another is the PISA (Produção Integrada de Sistemas Agropecuários em Microbacias Hidrográficas). It aims to promote sustainable agricultural development having ICLS as one of its main pillars.

Additional suggestions and insights included: a systematic review of the various models that are being experimented with for multi-stakeholder innovation and action platforms, and lessons learned about their development

and management (and financing) and to pull together the methods being used in crop-livestock integration programs at landscape scale, and make them more widely available through diverse platforms, including the Landscape Measures Resource Centre; the importance of personal desired of individuals to make necessary changes toward a sustainable rural community; ensuring that universities, research institutions and agricultural government supporters are sympathetic with the System Approach; fully taking on board the coalition approach (with forums and capacity building) where in all the potential stakeholders (players /actors) are brought on a common platform; stockbreeders have to invent new forms of social and professional organization in order to have the capacity to defend their interests, to communicate with the authorities, the better organized communities of farmers and organizations working for development; and policies must be started to advance ICLS through effective regulations and the offer to (small to medium) farmers of alternatives models. Further, one intervention noted that in order to develop sustainability ecological crop- livestock productions is necessary to participate in the markets of just prices the following are necessary: a) prohibition of the use of transgenic seeds; b) prohibition of the production of agro bio fuels; and c) to satisfy, as the first priority, the necessity of internal market, and newly later to satisfy the external demand.

Summary Week/Theme 4
February 22-26, 2010

Building off of the background paper provided at the website http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/spi/iclsd, the discussions during February 22-26 (Week 4) focused on the research needed to generate knowledge and innovative practice to underpin farmer adoption and scaling of promising crop-livestock systems for sustainable production intensification. Looking back over the previous weeks, we were keen to identify key research gaps within on the ground implementation, input and market chains and the policy dimensions.

This week's discussion included some 20 rich contributions that came from experiences in Zimbabwe, Brazil, Kenya, the USA, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, Cameroon, and Ghana among others that provided regional examples and/or global relevance.

As we noted in previous weeks, the summary is intended to highlight points made within the discussions. It is not a synthesis nor is it exhaustive by any means. All of the individual interventions can be found on the website as a blog along with the documents, photos and links that were submitted by participants.

This week's summary is organized according to the questions that were used to prompt the discussion. Our thanks to those who brought additional

points made in support of the previous week's topics and these will be added to earlier summaries.

To the responses:

A few comments permeated the conversation including:

- *Practice to Policy.* Several colleagues pointed out that the number of interventions to the e-conference declined as the discussion shifted to policy and institutional and raised the questions as to whether this was indicative of the challenges of working fully within both the practice and policy/ institutions realms. Further many colleagues noted the critical importance of ensuring that policy makers have evidence to support innovations in ICLS for sustainable outcomes.
- *Inclusion.* Most participants indicated the importance of *strong inclusion of all of the relevant actors particularly farmers and pastoralists* but also the range of intermediary actors including those from extension agencies, universities, NGOs, local authorities, public-private fora, socio-economic institutions, researchers from various disciplines, state decision makers, consumers, private sector and processors, among many others. The role of farmer's organizations was noted as of primary importance such that they can negotiate with agricultural government institutions and the bank actors, in order to participate in defining politics and financial support to the rural sector. Further, with increasingly public concern about the way the food is produced and its effects on the environment, consumers associations play another important role in to the dissemination of the benefits to implement IC-LS.
- *All dimensions.* In general, colleagues pointed out that a focus on production alone is not appropriate. Rather we need to take into account the social, cultural, and economic dimensions and particularly the issue of managing risk.
- *Communication.* Communication and adequate dissemination were highlighted as critical to getting better results in adoption and scaling than historically have been the case.
- *Multi-stakeholder innovation platforms.* There is increasing interest in establishing multi-stakeholder innovation platforms (e.g. the Sub Saharan Africa Challenge Programme (FARA) and ILRI pilots). The success of the innovation platforms, and their ability to scale-up, will ultimately be determined by the ability to learn how to engage the value chain actors efficiently and cost effectively. It will also require change agents who are skilled facilitators among value chain actors.

- If you could secure funding to carry out research on the gaps associated with integrated crop-livestock systems - from your perspective and context - what would you identify as the most critically needed research associated with:

a) On the ground implementation of integrated crop livestock systems? With which actors might you partner to carry this out?

- *Multiple options.* Test a few well-designed ex-ante formulated options that include technical, environmental and socio-economic components. Avoid "packages" but rather opt for the two to three options tried under the same conditions. Don't be closed to rejected options.
- *Build on what we know and what works.* Build on what is known elsewhere that would be relevant for production and environmental conditions and market options. The importance of examining available information or conducting a fresh study on what has been done before (indigenous knowledge), what worked for the rural farmers and why they were involved in a specific production system as opposed to others.
- *Environmental benefits characterization.* Successful identification of the key limiting elements of systems within the region must first be identified and the research hypotheses should center on how best to optimize crop-livestock balance to meet the opportunities offered within a particular landscape/ area setting. An ideal research focus would characterize the production potentials of multiple facets of a system approach and determine the suite of environmental benefits that might be obtained, as well as identify the turning points where systems might fail and contribute to environmental degradation if not functioning properly.
- *Economic outcomes.* Economic outcomes must be a key element of the research to continuously modify systems in partnership with producers to eventually obtain a robust set of efficient practices that can be selected for a particular region. Research recommendations should be shared among regions to characterize ecosystem services provided by ICLS to identify unique niche opportunities.
- *Several Country specific ideas were put forward:*
  - *From Canada – evidence of economic benefits.* The most critically needed research to fill gaps in the crop livestock systems in Western Canada would be an economic assessment demonstrating the benefits to farmers over the long term. Most importantly, the policy makers need to understand the importance of innovation and sustainability of these systems.
  - *A series of suggested research activities from Cameroon* included those related to valorisation of animals and management of soil fertility, fodder, residue, integration of legumes, timing of pastoral grazing release on crop systems, biomass transfers, stock density, better safeguarding of landscapes/great spaces and agreements among state actors for livestock moments.
  - *From Bolivia, the focus was on:* a) increasing the crop production not only the grain but also the straws; b) developing nutritional strategies for improvement the utilization of low –quality roughages and straws

by ruminants for productive purpose; c) optimizing the availability of nutrients from the fermentative digestion, microbial growth in the rumen and rumen metabolism.
  - *From Brazil it was recommended to address the p*roblems associated with the existing harsh climatic conditions and soil quality have been observed in the Mid-North.
- *Risk Management and Innovations.* "Production" is not synonymous with "profit" and/or "risk management". Minimizing risk, and then optimizing production within the risk constraint sphere, will be an approach more likely to resonate with poor farmers. Tom Thurow presented a gradient of conditions around minimizing risk and optimizing production/profit and sensitivity studies are needed of the reliability of the innovation under variable conditions/assumptions over time).
- *Extending the messages.* The potential to have increased production/profit/risk management would be greater had there been better application of what was known 20 years ago about mixed farming systems. Innovations were never effectively disseminated. Rhetoric of extension agencies (often at all levels) must match the needs of diverse clients. Indigenous knowledge was replaced with new knowledge" and that useful risk-averse methods were ignored.

b) The human and social dimensions of these systems? With which actors might you partner to carry this out?

- *The right practices/products for the users.* Are children and women equipped to undertake the activities involved in integration? Is the addition of livestock to on-going cropping or horticultural or gardening system going to increase the work load of a category of household members? Are the benefits worthwhile in comparison with labour inputs? On the demand side, are consumers ready for products coming from integrated systems? Are they prepared to pay additional for what is perceived by producers as better products from integrated systems?
- *Supporting farmers' goals.* This human social dimension should focus on how to promote adoption of truly sustainable ICLS in light of farmers' goals and what incentives and policy support will be needed.
- *Multiple dimensions.* Research questions will be related to those on markets, consumer preferences, household characteristics, environmental issues and concerns. Actors include socio-economic institutions and, public-private fora with interest in crop-livestock agriculture, urban/inner-town production systems, etc.
- Several country specific ideas were put forward including:
  - *From Cameroon* - safe the access and the sustainable exploitation by users, clarifying synergies of and incentives for the diversification of systems – between sedentary and pastoral land users.

- *From Bolivia* - The economy based on used of large and unproductive lands (latifundios) has reduced drastically the forest area, and resulted in inefficient land use (low cost and exportation of soybean or sugar). ICLS should allow for the rational use of the land based on ecological concepts and the democratic access to the poor people to it.
- *From western Canada – good alternative.* A crop-livestock system which can lower cost of production for both the livestock production and crop production is a practical and sustainable alternative for small and medium sized farms in western Canada. Data is needed to prove to policy makers that the current system of support programs need to be changed to encourage farmers to use the crop livestock integration practices that will lead them to sustainability.

c) Enhancing market chains or incentives to production? With which actors might you partner to carry this out?

- *Income matters.* Market constraints and politics have influenced the implementation of specialized crop or livestock systems rather than its integration. Farmers are looking not only to maximize production but also in some way to increase their income.
- *Engaging industrial actors.* The industrial actors like slaughterhouses, food processing companies, supermarkets and others, which are following consumers' expectations, are key actors in the added value chain. They should promote prices contracts (according to quantity and quality required) with the farmers and on the other hand, the government should have a policy of economic incentives to those ICLS, which are demonstrated to be less polluting to the environment.
- *Access to markets (and removing subsidies).* Enhance access of agricultural products of developing countries to the markets in the industrialized countries, especially those markets associated with organic or ecological products. The developed countries may have to look critically at and possibly remove the agricultural subsidy on their products.
- *Which comes first – markets or production systems?* Should markets drive the type of production system employed or should a sustainable production system influence how markets develop as a response? Can farmer activities to achieve sustainability override market prices, and if not, then how can policy instruments be used to support economic, environmental, and social sustainability? For market chain development to be successful it will require a grassroots movement, innovators in agricultural industry and well informed policy makers.
- *E*cosystem services. It is necessary that markets are developed for environmental services which can increase the income of innovative producers.
- *Storage.* Farmers are often encouraged to increase production with incentive packages, which increase production leading to seasonal glut on the market

with a fall in producer prices – overall a disincentive. Appropriate storage is needed.

- *Multi-stakeholder innovation platforms.* Belated recognition that those practices that did not get taken up tended not to add value to the input supply-production-processing-marketing value chain explains the recent increasing interest in establishing multi-stakeholder innovation platforms such as the Sub Saharan Africa Challenge Programme (FARA) and ILRI pilots. The success of the innovation platforms, and their ability to scale-up, will ultimately be determined by the ability to learn how to engage the value chain actors efficiently and cost effectively. It will also require change agents who are skilled facilitators who are able to help the value chain actors get the information they need, when they need it and in the form that is useful to them.
- *Analysing systems constraints.* There are integrated crop-livestock systems across a range of types (on-farm or area-wide) and scales in different agroecologies. Are there system-dependent input supply chain constraints (e.g. seeds of certain legumes, equipment and machinery for minimum soil disturbance and direct seeding, herbicides, livestock feed for specialized systems, etc.) that need to be addressed? Which are these and how have they been or might they be overcome?

- What are the gaps in evidence required to frame a policy intervention or to influence policies or institutional elements that can advance integrated crop-livestock systems?

- *Clarify policies that work against ICLS*. Research can analyze the current and past government policies that have worked against scaling up of ICLS and the design of "friendly" policies.
- *Research relevant to policy impacts on farming systems.* It is vital that integrated crop-livestock system research be specifically designed to be policy relevant.
- *Systems approach.* It is necessary to understand the System Analysis Approach at different levels.
- Addressing *broad sustainability goals.* Research information on the benefits of crop-livestock integration as a means of reducing rural poverty, rural-urban drift and environmentally sustainable production system could provide the necessary evidence which must be sold to policy maker for a change in policy direction. Nutrition objectives, concerns and considerations need to be more prominently taken into account by agricultural and rural development planners in guiding agricultural and poverty reduction policies and programmes. With only five years left until the 2015 deadline to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, it is clear that a focus needs to be on small and medium scale farmers.
- *Understanding and narrowing the "nutrition gap".* The gap between what foods are grown and available and what foods are needed for a healthy

diet – can only occur when national policy makers and members of the international development community recognize that attempts to reduce malnutrition solely via increased production of staple crops are not enough. Agricultural development policies and agricultural development programmes that address food *and* nutrition security are an essential step in reducing malnutrition; they enhance national prospects for improved labour productivity and economic growth, and increase the chances of long, healthy lives for even the most vulnerable.

- *In western Canada – the costs of support programs.* Governments in the developed countries will need significant proof showing the costs to the farming systems that have come as a result of the support programs they have put in place. The programs have guided farmers into specialized systems, which rely almost completely on commercial inputs.
- *In Ecuador – agroforestry.* Agroforestry activities fall between the Ministries of Atmosphere and Agriculture. Political reforms must be examined to promote the Agro-forestry as an integrated system, within a multipurpose strategy of resources, paying attention to the improvement of the institutional structure for the development of markets of tree products and support to the efforts of research, extension and promotion of farmers.

- How might the research community respond to the structural constraints of carrying out interdisciplinary, multi-institutional and multi-stakeholder efforts? What can donors do to assist in ensuring robust research efforts?

- *Just do it.* There are no easy solutions, but sometimes well-established researchers without regard to potentially political repercussions simply have to "just do it", because it's the right thing to do. Getting the right team for full cooperation under stressful conditions will not be easy. Securing funding for such broad goals is a challenge. Pursue robust research agendas to make progress in getting meaningful results.
- *Think and invest long term.* Research should have a longer-term vision of the possible futures of small scale crop-livestock enterprises and their evolving opportunities and constraints in response to a series of drivers. Most recent forward-looking publications have 2030-2050 horizons. What is our vision of the future of small-scale farms by then? What are the possible pathways out of poverty for small-scale farmers and their families? By 2050, it is imagined that many farming systems will have drastically changed and it is hoped that the next generations will have more livelihood options and off-farm opportunities. Donor institutions or organization including the FAO should be conscious of the work involved and the long-term time span required to carry out research effectively.
- *Let farmers critique.* A new paradigm shift is required where the range of actors is expanded, analyses of the research questions opened up for scrutiny and beneficiaries perspectives sought.

- *Research should help better targeting and setting of priorities.* Which priority systems do we want to support which criteria are needed? Some include: focus on small scale crop-livestock enterprises; addressing food security, nutrition security and poverty alleviation; systems with potential for quick and large returns (markets,…); chance of success (measured by livelihood, macro-economic indicators, environmental impact).
- *Adaptive research should provide the methods, approaches, and tools to put into better use past research findings, existing knowledge and ex-ante analyses. R*ealistic and workable assumptions for scaling-out need to be developed along with fostering institutional changes and integration of 'crop' and livestock related policies at local, national, regional and global levels.

- Please share any other thoughts on this topic or previous topics that will advance our discussions and thinking.

- *Food and nutritional security.* Food systems should be so designed and implemented that they address nutritional needs. The integrated crop-livestock sector offers practical opportunities for achieving this at national, sub-national and smallholder level; increasing the diversity of crops and of the livestock can close not only the production gap or the yield gap by symbiotic mutualism or literal cross-fertilization, but can also close the "nutritional gap" by providing a broader range of nutritious, micronutrient-rich, seasonally available supplies of a variety of diverse foods (including those of animal origin) whose consumption can optimize diets - very relevant both for net rural producers and consumers including smallholders.
- *Summary thoughts - Redirecting ICLS.* The various parties that shape the directions of agricultural development have succeeded in driving it down the wrong roads. These ICLS systems are disappearing very rapidly in developed countries and beginning to follow the same route in developing countries due to market forces and the policies and services put in place by governments are all pushing towards greater scale and specialization in farming (crops or livestock; large scale livestock operations). One of the reasons is that no one - other than future generations - has to pay for the negative externalities associated with much of the technology on which this "modernization" A second reason for what, on the face of it, would seem to be an undesirable development trajectory, is the now almost universal separation of "livestock" from "agronomy" (reflected in multiple international organizations as well). We are now left with a situation in which the principal guardians of the kinds of integrated crop-livestock systems that we would like to see expanded are farmers who, for one reason or another, have resisted the pressures to abandon them, and who have taken it upon themselves to experiment, innovate and, in some countries, become successful promoters of improved systems.
- *Potential next steps for FAO*. Perhaps one of the best things that FAO can now do is to support the emergence of strong associations experiment,

innovate and, in some countries, become successful promoters of improved systems of crop-livestock farmers around the world, helping them to make the case, nationally and globally, for policies and programmes that favour the expansion of integrated systems and encourage the sharing of experiences and innovations. As was the case in the follow-up to last year's workshop on Conservation Agriculture – in which most of the innovations have also come from farmers - a first step in this direction could be the incubation of a Community of Practice that would ultimately emerge as a self-sustaining institution run by its members.

Appendix 3

Workshop agenda and timetable

23-26 March 2010, Sete Lagaos, Minas Geráis, Brazil

Day 1: 23 March 2010 (Tuesday)
BLOCK I

08:00-08:30	Transport from hotels to Embrapa Conference Centre
08:30-09:00	Confirmation of registration and distribution of conference packages
09:00-10:00	**Session I: Welcome and background** **Session Chair: Tatiana Deane de Abreu Sá, Executive Director, Embrapa** i. Welcome: **Speaker -- Tatiana Deane de Abreu Sá, Embrapa & Jamil, Macedo, Executive Secretary, IICA-Procitropicos** ii. Background to the Workshop; Objectives of the Workshop, Process & Agenda, Expected Outcome: **Speaker – Eric Kueneman, Deputy Director, AGP, FAO** iii. Facilities, logistics and arrangements **– Jose Heitor, Embrapa Maize and Sorghum**
10:00-11:15	**Session II: Setting the context** **Session Chair: Jamil Macedo, IICA** Roundtable session: Global perspectives on Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems Roundtable: Shirley Tarawali, Bruno Gerard, Olaf Thieme, AK Misra, Hassan Mohammed Nur, Ali Nefazaoui, Judson Ferreira Valentim (**facilitated by Doyle Baker**) **Rapporteurs: Susan Minai & Gerarldo Martha**
11:15-11:30	*Coffee Break*
11:30-12:30	**Session II (Cont.): Setting the context** (i) Outcome of the electronic consultation: **Amir Kassam** (20 min) (ii) Facilitated discussion – Facilitator **Constance Neely** **Rapporteurs: Paulo Roberto Galerani & Minh-Long Nguyen**

12:30-13:00 **Session III: Working Group process**
Session Chair: Amir Kassam -- Explanation of the objectives and arrangements of the three parallel Working Group sessions
Presenters – Constance Neely and Theodor Friedrich

13:00-14:00 *Lunch break*

Day 1: 23 March 2010 (Tuesday)
BLOCK II
Three Working Groups each tackling four topics: (1) Promising integrated crop-livestock systems for scaling and tactics for implementation; (2) Input and output market linkage development; (3) Policy and institutional support for adoption and spread; (4) Research & science needed to generate knowledge and practices

14:00-15:30 **Session IV: Three Parallel Working Groups** (all with global responsibility)
Participants: public, private and civil society stakeholders generalised/mixed across four prime topics
Notes: Each working group to discuss all four topics with a focus on:

i. Principles, issues (including cross-cutting) & gaps
ii. Needs and opportunities for investment (nature of needs, providers of opportunities, investors in the opportunities)
iii. Cross-sector 'knowledge brokering'—local, national, regional, global
iv. Expressions of interest/commitments to an Action Plan (including next steps)

Working Group 1: **Co-Conveners: Bruno Gerard & Paulo Cesar Faccio de Carvalho; Rapporteurs: Irela Mazar & K.S. Ramachandra**
Working Group2: **Co-Conveners: Mohammad Ibrahim & Markus Ascher; Rapporteurs: Tito Diaz & Mohamed HamaGarba**
Working Group 3: **Co-Conveners: Judson Ferreira Valentim & Ali Nefzaoui; Rapporteurs: Mangi Lal Jat & Hassan Mohammed Nur**

15:30-16:00 *Coffee break*

16:00-17:30 **Session IV (cont.)**: Three Parallel Working Groups (begin drafting of main points)

17:30-18:00 Transport from Embrapa Conference Centre to hotels
20:00-22:00 Dinner & Speech (**Kepler Euclides Filho**, Executive Director of Embrapa; Vote of appreciation by **Eric Kueneman**, FAO)

Day 2: 24 March 2010 (Wednesday)
BLOCK II (cont.)
Three Working Groups each tackling four topics: (1) Promising integrated crop-livestock systems for scaling and tactics for implementation; (2) Input and output market linkage development; (3) Policy and institutional support for adoption and spread; (4) Research & science needed to generate knowledge and practices

08:30-10:30 **Session V: Chairs: Amir Kassam & Kepler Euclides Filho**
Presentation and plenary discussion of reports of Working Groups (20 min for each report and then 60 min for looking across groups)

i. Principles, issues (including cross-cutting) & gaps
ii. Needs and opportunities for investment (nature of needs, providers of opportunities, investors in the opportunities)
iii. Cross-sector 'knowledge brokering'—local, national, regional, global
iv. Expressions of interest/commitments to an Action Plan (including next steps)

10:30-11:00 *Coffee break and poster display*
11:00-13:00 **Session VI:** Parallel Working Group sessions continue as above (including preparing draft reports)
13:00-14:00 *Lunch and poster display*
14:00-15:30 **Session VI (cont.):** Parallel Working Group sessions continue as above (including preparing draft reports)
15:30-16:00 *Coffee break and poster display*
16:00-18:00 **Session VII: Chairs: Theodor Friedrich & Gerarldo Martha**
Presentation and plenary discussion of initial reports of Working Groups (i. – iv. as in Session V) (20 min for each report and then 60 min for looking across groups)

Action Plan Drafting Team to draft elements of the Action Plan in light of the presentations on Day 1 (am) and Working Groups' presentations on Day 1 (pm) & Day 2 (to work after hours and on Day 3) **(Drafting Team Coordinator: Constance Neely, with inputs from Working Group Co-Conveners and Rapporteurs)**

Day 3: 25 March 2010 (Thursday)
BLOCK III

08:00 – 09:00	Visit and discussion at Site 1
09:00 – 10:30	Transport from Site 1 to Site 2
10:30 – 11:30	Visit and discussion at Site 2
11:30 – 11:45	*Coffee Break*
11:45 – 12:00	Transportation to Site 3
12:00 – 13:00	Visit and discussion at Site 3
13:00 – 13:30	Transport to Restaurant
13:30 – 15:30	*Lunch*

Day 4: 26 March 2010 (Friday)
BLOCK IV
Three Working Groups to Discuss the draft Elements of the Action Plan, and Adoption of the Elements in Plenary

08:00 – 08:30	Transport from hotels to Embrapa Maize and Sorghum
08:30 – 09:00	Welcome remarks by **Vera Maria Carvalho Alves**, Center Director
09:00 – 11:00	Visit Embrapa Maize and Sorghum labs and field display
10:30-11:00	*Coffee*
11:00-13:00	**Session VIII: Chairs: Eric Kueneman & Judson Valentim** a. Plenary presentation of first draft of the elements of the Action Plan: **Presenter: Constance Neely - Drafting team convenor** b. Discussion
13:00-14:00	*Lunch (***Drafting committee to finalise the draft elements of Action Plan)**
14:00-15:00	**Session VIII (Cont.): Chairs: Eric Kueneman & Judson Valentim** Adoption of the draft elements of Action Plan
15:00-15:30	**Session IX: Chair Eric Kueneman** Wrap up and closure: Co-Organizers – Embrapa, IIICA, IFAD & FAO

Coordination of Workshop Secretariat and Contact persons in Sete Lagoas:
Jose Heitor Vasconcelos, Embrapa (heitor@cnpms.embrapa.br)
Tel. (55-31) 3027-1167
Tania Mara Barbosa, Embrapa (tania@cnpms.embrapa.br)
Tel. (55-31) 3027-1323
Jamil Macedo, IICA-Procitropicos (jamil.macedo@procitropicos.org.br)
Cell phone: (5561) 99634555
Maricin Rojas, IICA-Procitropicos (procitropicos@procitropicos.org.br)
Cell phone: (5561) 93338709

Appendix 4
List of participants

	Name	Country	Institution	E-mail	Phone
01	Anibal Pordomingo	Argentina	INTA	apordomingo@hotmail.com or apordomingo@anguil.inta.gov.ar	54-2954-495057 54-2954-432111
02	Ricardo Sager	Argentina	INTA	rsager@correo.inta.gov.ar	011-43384601
03	Nguyen Minh-Long	Austria	FAO/IAEA	m.nguyen@iaea.org	+4312600 21648
04	Ademir Calegari	Brasil	IAPAR	calegari@iapar.br	(5543) 3376-2000
05	Antônio Álvaro C. Purcino	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	chpd@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1105
06	Antônio Marcos Coelho	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	amcoelho@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1145
07	Décio Karam	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	karam@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1135
08	Derli Prudente Santana	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	chcn@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1107
09	Eduardo Malta Campos Filho	Brasil	Socio Ambiental	eduardomalta@socioambiental.org	(5566) 8414-0445
10	Evelin Oliveira Krebsky	Brasil		evelin.krebsky@yahoo.com	(5519) 3365-5106
11	Fernando Campos	Brasil	Embrapa	fernando.campos@embrapa.br	(5561) 3448-4401
12	Geraldo Martha	Brasil	Embrapa Cerrados	gbmartha@cpac.embrapa.br	(5561) 3388-9905
13	Ingrid Gruber Fermon Ribeiro	Brasil	Ministerio do Desenvolvimento Agrario	ingrid.ribeiro@mda.gov.br	(5561) 2020-0691
14	Ivo Marzall	Brasil	FAO	marzall@solar.com.br	(5561) 3577 1615 or 9956 9650
15	Jamil Macedo	Brasil	PROCITROPICOS/IICA	jamil.macedo@procitropicos.org.br	(5561) 3365-2907 or 3365-2908
16	João Kluthcouski	Brasil	EmbrapaEmbrapa Arroz e Feijão	joaok@cnpaf.embrapa.br	(5562) 3533-2110
17	John Landers	Brasil	APDC	john.landers@uol.com.br	(5561) 3366-5307
18	Jonas Bastos da Veiga	Brasil	Professor visitante da Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia (UFRA)	jonas.veiga@superig.com.br	(5591) 3246 3235 or 9982 4448
19	José Alberto de Ávila Pires	Brasil	EMATER/MG	xapeco@emater.mg.gov.br	(5531) 3349-8116
20	José Carlos Cruz	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	zecarlos@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1252
21	José Luis Coelho	Brasil	John Deere South America Regional Office	coelhojoseL@JohnDeere.com	(5551) 2103 5719
22	José Oscar Pacheco	Brasil	FAO	oscar.pacheco@fao.org	(5561) 30382276 9221-7897
23	Judson Ferreira Valentim	Brasil	Embrapa Acre	judson@cpafac.embrapa.br	(5568) 3212-3205 or 3212-3200
24	Kepler Euclides Filhos	Brasil	Embrapa	diretoria.kepler@embrapa.br	(5561) 3448-4353
25	Leonardo Simões de Barros Moreno	Brasil	Bunge fertilizantes S.A	Leonardo.moreno@bunge.com	(5511) 3741-2111
26	Luis Gustavo Barioni	Brasil	Embrapa Informática Agropecuária	barioni@cnptia.embrapa.br	(5519) 3211-5762

	Name	Country	Institution	E-mail	Phone
27	Luiz Carlos Balbino	Brasil	Embrapa	luizcarlos.balbino@embrapa.br	(5561) 3448-4520
28	Maria Celuta Machado Viana,	Brasil	EPAMIG	mcv@epamig.br	(5531) 3773-1980
29	Marcos Rugnitz Tito	Brasil	ICRAF	m.tito@cgiar.org	(6691) 3204-1108 3204-1239
30	Markus Ascher	Brasil	PROCITROPICOS/IICA	markus.ascher@procitropicos.org.br	(5561) 3365-2907 or 3365-2908
31	Mauricio Carvalho de Oliveira	Brasil	Ministerio de Agricultura	mauricio.oliveira@agricultura.gov.br	(5561) 2218-2417
32	Miguel Marques Gontijo Neto	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	mgontijo@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1250
33	Paulo Afonso Viana	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	pviana@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1196
34	Paulo Cesar Faccio de Carvalho	Brasil	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul	paulocfc@ufrgs.br	(5551) 3308-7000 Ramal: 7402
35	Paulo Herrman	Brasil	John Deere South America Regional Office	herrmannpaulor@johndeere.com	(5551) 2103 5719
36	Paulo Roberto Galerani	Brasil	Embrapa Soja	galerani@cnpso.embrapa.br	(5543) 3371-6000
37	Peter May	Brasil	ONG Amigos da terra	peter.may@amazonia.org.br	(5511) 3887-9369
38	Ramon da Costa Alvarenga	Brasil	Embrapa Milho e Sorgo	ramon@cnpms.embrapa.br	(5531) 3027-1251
39	Renato Serena Fontaneli	Brasil	Embrapa Trigo	renatof@cnpt.embrapa.br	(5554) 3316-5800
40	Rodrigo Matta Machado	Brasil	UFMG	mattamac@uai.com.br	(5531) 96361896 or 34092606
41	Rogério M. Maurício	Brasil	Universidad Federal de São João Del Rei	rogeriomauricio@ufsj.edu.br	(5532) 3379 2440
42	Salete Alves de Moraes	Brasil	Embrapa Semi Arido	salete.moraes@cpatsa.embrapa.br	(5587) 3862-1711
43	Sandra Aparecida	Brasil	Embrapa Pantanal	sasantos@cpap.embrapa.br	(5567) 3234-5800
44	Shirley Helena Mendes da Silva	Brasil	Secretaria de Extrativismo e Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável Ministério do Meio Ambiente	shirley.silva@mma.gov.br	(55)2028-1144 or 2028-1963
	Tatiana Deane de Abréu Sá	Brasil	Embrapa	diretoria.tatiana@embrapa.br	(5561) 3448-4401
45	Walfrido Albernaz Machado	Brasil	EMATER/MG	walfrido.albernaz@emater.mg.gov.br	(5531) 3774-1273
46	Souleymane Ouedrago	Burkina Faso	INERA/GRN-SP Ouest	soul_oueder@hotmail.com	+226 70 26 47 19
47	Tito Diaz	Chile	FAO - Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean	Tito.Diaz@fao.org	56-2-9232250

	Name	Country	Institution	E-mail	Phone
48	Miguel Ayarza	Colombia	Corpoica	mayarzam@gmail.com or mayarza@corpoica.org.co	00571- 80-5470 or 3202-727193
49	Muhammad Ibrahim	Costa Rica	CATIE		
50	Jorge Grijalva	Equador	INIAP – Estación Experimental Santa Catalina	jgrijalva55@hotmail.com	(593) 690 692
51	Bruno Gerard	Etiopia	International Livestock Research Institute	B.Gerard@CGIAR.ORG	+251 11 617 2108
52	Shirley Terawali	Etiopia	International Livestock Research Institute	s.tarawali@cgiar.org	+251 11 617 2221
53	Susan Minai	Etiopia	FAO	Susan.Minae@fao.org	
54	Constance Neely	EUA	FAO Senior Consultant, Land, Livestock, Livelihoods and Climate Change	clneely@earthlink.net	+1 706-540-2878
55	Arun Kumar Misra	India	Livestock Production and Management, Directorate of Research on Women in Agriculture	Mishraak17@yahoo.com	+91-674-2386220 Ext.-299 or 9938424708
56	K.S. Ramachandra	India	National Rainfed Area Authority	koodliramu@yahoo.co.in	(5511) 25842961
57	Mangi Lal Jat	India	CIMMYT-CSISA Hub Office	m.jat@cgiar.org	+91-9050009920
58	Amir Kassam	Italy	FAO	kassamamir@aol.com or Amir.Kassam@fao.org	+44(0)208 993 3426; or +44(0)7768011313
59	Doyle Baker	Italy	FAO	doyle.baker@fao.org	+0039 0657055095
60	Eric Kueneman	Italy	FAO	Eric.Kueneman@fao.org	(3906) 5705-4930
61	Henning Steinfeld	Italy	FAO AGAL	steinfeld.henning@fao.org	.+ 39 06 570 54751
62	Irela Mazar	Italy	FAO (AGN)	irela.mazar@fao.org	+39 06 57056152
63	Olaf Thieme	Italy	FAO Animal Production and Health Division	olaf.thieme@fao.org	+39-06-570-55418
64	Theodor Friedrich	Italy	FAO Plant Production and Protection Division	theodor.friedrich@fao.org	+39-0657055694
65	Hassan Mohammed Nur	Sudan	Federal Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries	hassanurnur@hotmail.com	+249-183-568753
66	Ali Nefzaoui	Tunisia	ICARDA/ North Africa Program	a.nefzaoui@CGIAR.ORG	++21671752134-71752099
67	Roberto Diaz	Uruguay	INIA	rdiaz@inia.org.uy	++598 5748000 Ext.1491
68	Mohamed HamaGarba	West Africa	FAO (AGPP)-Senegal	mohamed.hamagarba@fao.org	(221) 33 823 58 81/ 33 889 16 66

An international consultation on integrated crop-livestock systems for development

A new kind of sustainable intensified agriculture based on CA is emerging and new production systems often also include trees grown as hedge rows to control grazing and provide habitats and fuel, or include trees as strip crops with annual crops rotated in adjacent strips. Trees in crop-livestock systems often add significant synergistic values. Innovations that can strengthen the multi-dimensional role of integrated crop-livestock-trees systems and their resilience are taking place and there is a need to share this knowledge more efficiently and to build jointly owned research and development programmes to achieve critical mass of expertise and financial resources focused on helping farmers in major agro-ecologies.

The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department of FAO (AG), consisting of four technical divisions, is fully aware of the innovations emerging in Brazil and in the Consultative Group of International Agriculture Research System, and elsewhere, and of the need to take stock on what is new and to determine how best the Department and its partners (internationally) can contribute to enabling better global agriculture and especially to assist smallholder producers to harness the benefits of "new forms" of integrated crop-livestock production systems.

This proceeding of the electronic and face-to-face Consultation held early in 2010 is just a first step. AG is committed to facilitate effective development, focused on sustainable production intensification of crops and of livestock and their integrated systems – at the farm level and also area-wide integration -- such as at the community or watershed levels. We look to Embrapa, IFAD, World Bank, IICA, the CGIAR and many others to join with FAO to help set up a facility and shared program of work to move a better agriculture forward and to do so quickly; as every day is a hungry day for over a billion people.

ISBN 978-92-5-106839-7 ISSN 1020-4555

9 789251 068397

I2160E/1/04.11