

2007

THE STATE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

**PAYING FARMERS
FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
SERVICES**



Photos on cover and page 3: All photos are from FAO Mediabase.

Copies of FAO publications can be requested from:

SALES AND MARKETING GROUP
Communication Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

E-mail: publications-sales@fao.org
Fax: (+39) 06 57053360
Web site: <http://www.fao.org/catalog/inter-e.htm>

2007

FAO Agriculture Series No. 38

ISSN 0081-4539

THE STATE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2007

Produced by the
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of FAO concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

ISBN 978-92-5-105750-6

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to:
copyright@fao.org

Contents

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgements	x
Abbreviations and acronyms	xii
Explanatory note	xiv

PART I Paying farmers for environmental services

1. Introduction and overview	3
Ecosystem services and agriculture	4
The role of farmers	4
Payments for environmental services	7
Current experience with payments for environmental services	8
Implications for poverty	9
Main messages from the report	9
2. Environmental services and agriculture	12
How can agricultural producers generate environmental services?	13
Agriculture and climate change mitigation	14
Water quantity and quality	18
Biodiversity conservation	23
Importance of scale, location and coordination in supplying environmental services	28
Technical versus economic potential to supply environmental services	29
Conclusions	32
3. Demand for environmental services	33
Value and beneficiaries of environmental services	33
Who are the potential buyers?	36
Demand for three main environmental services	40
Farmers and landholders as buyers of services	45
Future developments affecting potential growth of PES programmes in developing countries	46
Conclusions	48
4. Supplying environmental services: farmers' decisions and policy options	50
The role of individual farmers' decisions	50
Constraints against the provision of environmental services	51
Policy options to shape farmers' incentives	58
Why payments?	60
Supply response to payments for environmental services	62
Conclusions	71
5. Designing effective payments for environmental services	73
What should payments be made for?	74
Who should be paid?	80
How much should be paid?	84
How should payments be made?	87
Reducing transaction costs	90
Establishing an enabling environment	92
Conclusions	95
6. Implications for poverty	97
The poor as suppliers of environmental services	98
Indirect impacts of PES programmes on the poor	107

Payments for environmental services and poverty reduction: where are the synergies?	108
Conclusions	109
7. Conclusions	111
The way forward	114

Part II
World and regional review: a longer-term perspective

Agricultural production	120
Food consumption	124
Agricultural trade	126
Food insecurity	130
Opportunities and challenges in the future	134

Part III
Statistical annex

Table A1 Total and agricultural population	139
Table A2 Land use	144
Table A3 Water use and irrigated land	149
Table A4 Production of cereals and meat	154
Table A5 Production of fish and forest products	159
Table A6 Value of agricultural exports and share in total exports	164
Table A7 Value of agricultural imports and share in total imports	169
Table A8 Share of processed food products in total food trade	174
Table A9 Per capita GDP and per capita agricultural GDP of the agricultural population	179
Table A10 Dietary energy, protein and fat consumption	184
Table A11 Number of undernourished and proportion in total population	189
Table A12 Life expectancy and child mortality	194

Glossary of terms	201
References	203
Special chapters of <i>The State of Food and Agriculture</i>	215
Selected publications of the FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division	217

TABLES

1. Potential carbon mitigation from land-use change, 2003–12	16
2. Indicators of freshwater provisioning services, 2010	20
3. Brief overview of hydrologic consequences associated with major classes of land cover and use change	22
4. Management options and coordination requirements for three environmental services	30
5. Indirect, option, and non-use values associated with environmental services	36
6. Environmental services and examples of buyers	37
7. Size of selected watershed service markets	44
8. Lack of information as an obstacle to adopting conservation agriculture	54

9. Financial performance and costs of selected agroforestry systems on poor land: modelling results for Sumatra, Indonesia over 70 years	69
10. Cost-effectiveness of the PES approach under different circumstances	70
11. Environmental service indices in the Silvopastoral Project in Colombia, Costa Rica and Nicaragua	78
12. Types of payments for biodiversity protection	93
13. People living on fragile land	98
14. Who are the poor?	103
15. Relative importance of different poverty reduction strategies by resource potential	104
16. Global growth rates for outputs of different agricultural commodities	121

BOXES

1. Ecosystem services, environmental services and externalities	6
2. Public goods	14
3. Landscape aesthetics	28
4. Demand for and supply of water services in Sukhomajri, India and New York, United States of America	34
5. The United States Conservation Reserve Program	38
6. Global Environment Facility and payments for environmental services	39
7. The Biodiversity and Wine Initiative in South Africa	40
8. Payments for reduced emissions from deforestation: what is the potential?	42
9. Environmental education and the supply of environmental services	55
10. Land tenure and environmental services: insights from the Philippines and Nepal	56
11. Can high-value agricultural exports enhance environmental services? One example	58
12. Biodiversity offset programmes around the world	62
13. Payments for restoring riparian areas in São Paulo, Brazil	74
14. The Regional Integrated Silvopastoral Ecosystem Management Project in Colombia, Costa Rica and Nicaragua	76
15. Payments for environmental services and the World Trade Organization Green Box provisions	79
16. The Payments for Environmental Services programme of Costa Rica: setting the baseline	81
17. China's Grain for Green programme	83
18. The political economy of targeting: the Payment for Hydrological Services Programme in Mexico	85
19. Measurement and targeting issues: the BushTender programme of Australia	86
20. Rules and modalities for afforestation and reforestation payments under the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol	90
21. Ecolabelling in fisheries	92
22. The Working for Water Programme in South Africa	97
23. Will the poor respond to payments for avoided carbon emissions? Evidence from Costa Rica	100
24. Reaching the poor with cash? Lessons from conditional cash transfers	106
25. A market for carbon offsets from the poor? Evidence from the Plan Vivo System	107
26. Can the poor benefit from payments for environmental services programmes? Evidence from the Silvopastoral Project in Nicaragua	109

FIGURES

1. Ecosystem services categories	5
2. PES programmes in the forest sector: breakdown by service	8
3. Above- and below-ground carbon sequestration	15
4. Changes in soil carbon for different cropping systems	19
5. Biodiversity impact of adopting silvopastoral systems in Esparza, Costa Rica	27
6. Share of bioenergy in total primary energy supply	43
7. Barriers to the adoption of improved management practices: permanent decrease in farm income	52
8. Barriers to the adoption of improved management practices: information and investment constraints	53
9. Dryland farming system types: a classification framework according to opportunity costs of land and labour	64
10. Level of carbon payments required to provide incentives for reducing emissions by avoided deforestation	67
11. Profitability and carbon sequestration in Cameroon	68
12. Carbon supply response in Nioro Region, Senegal	69
13. Key elements in PES programme design	75
14. Total and per capita agricultural production	120
15. Average growth rate in per capita agricultural value added, by region	121
16. Growth rate in per capita agricultural production in sub-Saharan Africa, 1990–2004	122
17. Meat production in developing countries	122
18. Per capita food consumption	124
19. Composition of food consumption in developing countries	125
20. Consumption of different food commodities in developing countries	126
21. Global agricultural exports	127
22. Agricultural imports and exports in developing countries	127
23. Agricultural trade balance of least-developed countries	128
24. Agricultural commodity prices	129
25. Income terms of trade for agriculture	130
26. Undernourishment in developing countries	131
27. Changes in number and proportion of undernourished people in subregions from 1990–1992 to 2001–2003	132
28. Per capita GDP and undernourishment (average 2001–2003)	133

MAPS

1 Potential to sequester additional carbon in soils	17
2 Potential to sequester additional carbon in soils on croplands	18
3 Croplands with high rates of human-induced erosion	23
4 Projected expansion of cropland and pasture, 2000–2010	26
5 Biodiversity hotspots in croplands poorly suited to rainfed agriculture	65
6 Projected expansion of cropland and pasture to lands poorly suited to rainfed agriculture, 2000–2010	66
7 Biodiversity hotspots in areas poorly suited to rainfed agriculture with high poverty rates	99
8 Highly degraded croplands with soil carbon sequestration potential and high poverty rates	101

Foreword

Despite unprecedented global economic growth, 1.1 billion people continue to live in extreme poverty and more than 850 million people suffer from chronic hunger while ecosystems are being threatened as never before. Poverty reduction, food security and environmental sustainability have all moved to the top of a crowded international agenda, as reflected in the Millennium Development Goals. At the same time, the close relationships among poverty, hunger and ecosystem degradation are becoming ever clearer. Most of the world's poor people live in rural areas, many of them in marginal environments, and depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. Agricultural development is therefore crucial for alleviating poverty on a large scale. Such development would also require that the natural resource base on which the poor depend for their livelihoods be preserved and enhanced.

Services provided by ecosystems are essential, not only for poverty reduction, but indeed for human survival. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, as well as reports arising from other more recent studies such as *Water for food, water for life* (Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture, 2007) and *Livestock's long shadow: environmental issues and options* (FAO, 2006a), have painted a stark picture of current ecosystem degradation and the potential consequences of a continuation of current trends.

Agriculture often lies at the centre of the complex set of problems surrounding ecosystem degradation. It contributes to the problems and suffers from many of the consequences, but at the same time it offers possible solutions. Modern agriculture has been very successful in providing the ecosystem services for which markets exist – crops, livestock, fish, and forest products – in ever greater quantities. But the expansion of these services has often been achieved at a high cost to other ecosystem services, such as regulation of climate, water and biodiversity, which are necessary to sustain human life.

Enhancing these services, while producing a further doubling of conventional output to meet the demands of a growing global population, is one of the great challenges facing world agriculture in the twenty-first century.

The State of Food and Agriculture 2007 highlights the potential of agriculture for enhanced provision of ecosystem services that are not usually compensated for by the market. When we think of farmers, we typically think of the food and fibre that they produce and that they either consume or sell on markets to generate an income. But the production processes can also result in impacts on other ecosystem services that are not traded in markets, referred to in this report as "environmental services". Some may be positive, such as groundwater recharge and scenic landscapes; others may be negative, such as water pollution by plant nutrients and animal waste, and soil erosion from poorly managed croplands or overgrazed hillsides. As agricultural production expands, these negative effects can develop into increasingly serious problems. A fundamental question concerns how farmers can be encouraged to reduce negative side-effects while meeting the growing demands for food and fibre. At the same time, changes in agricultural practices may also contribute to addressing environmental problems generated outside agriculture, for example, by offsetting greenhouse gas emissions from other sectors. A relevant question, therefore, is how farmers can be induced to increase their provision of this type of service.

Farmers constitute the largest group of natural resource managers on Earth. They both depend on and generate a wide array of ecosystem services. Their actions can both enhance and degrade ecosystems. Thus, understanding what drives their decisions is critical in designing new strategies that enhance ecosystem services and contribute to sustainable growth.

Paying farmers for the environmental services they provide is an approach that



has generated growing interest worldwide from policy-makers and non-governmental and private decision-makers. This strategy is akin to viewing environmental protection as a business transaction. This perspective is not without controversy, but it must be kept in mind that many services are degraded precisely because they are free to use but costly to provide.

Payments for environmental services have also attracted attention for their potential to mobilize new sources of finance to support sustainable environmental management in developing countries and to contribute to poverty reduction and agricultural development.

This report examines this approach to enhancing environmental services through the lens of managing agriculture to meet the agricultural and environmental demands of the future. In addition, it examines the potential of this mechanism to contribute also to poverty reduction. Of the numerous services to which agriculture can contribute, this report highlights three: climate change mitigation, enhanced quality and quantity of water provision and the preservation of biodiversity.

One of the points made in this report is that agriculture can be an important source of improvements in the environmental services provided to humanity by ecosystems. Agriculture employs more people and uses more land and water than any other human activity. It has the potential to degrade the Earth's land, water, atmosphere and biological resources – or to enhance them – depending on the decisions made by the more than 2 billion people whose livelihoods depend directly on crops, livestock, fisheries or forests.

Ensuring appropriate incentives for these people is essential. More and better information can influence farmers' decisions about their practices in ways that lead to environmental improvements, especially when changes in farming and land-management practices that enhance ecosystem services would also be profitable for the farmers themselves. However, should such changes imply a reduction in farmers' incomes, they will only be implemented through effectively enforced regulations or, voluntarily, when some form of

compensation is provided. In the latter case, payments to farmers from the beneficiaries can provide an answer. The relative merits and effectiveness of the different approaches vary for different environmental services. Key challenges in implementing the payments approach lie in creating a mechanism for valuing the relevant service where none exists, identifying how additional amounts of the service can be provided most cost-effectively, and deciding which farmers should be paid for providing more of it and how much they should be paid.

Payments for environmental services can increase the incomes of farmers who produce the services. Other poor households may also benefit, for example from increased productivity of the soils they cultivate or improved quality of the water they drink. But the distribution of benefits depends on who produces the environmental services and where. Environmental service payments can contribute to alleviating poverty, but such poverty-reducing effects are neither automatic nor universal. In some cases, payments may also have adverse impacts on poverty and food security, for example if they reduce agricultural employment or increase food prices. Furthermore, the administrative costs of payment schemes that fully integrate the poorest farmers may be large, while other barriers, such as absence of clearly defined property rights, may prevent the poor from participating. A major challenge is to design payment schemes in such a way as to avoid negative impacts on the poor and to enable poor farmers to participate.

In order to maximize the benefits in terms of enhanced provision of environmental services, minimize the costs in terms of foregone production and income and ensure the broadest possible participation by poor farmers, careful analysis of the underlying science – both natural and social sciences – will be required, as well as innovative institutions.

Confronting the interrelated challenges of eradicating poverty and hunger and preserving the world's ecosystems will continue to require purposeful and decisive action on a range of fronts. Payments for environmental services are not widely

implemented in developing countries at present, and much work remains to be done to unlock their full potential. In conjunction with other tools, however, they hold significant promise as a flexible approach to enhancing the role of farmers worldwide

in sustaining and improving the ecosystems on which we all depend. By clarifying the challenges that need to be addressed in implementing such an approach, it is my hope that this report will help illuminate the way forward.



Jacques Diouf
FAO DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Acknowledgements

The State of Food and Agriculture is prepared by FAO's Agricultural Development Economics Division under the overall supervision and guidance of Prabhu Pingali (director), Keith Wiebe (service chief), and Terri Raney (senior economist and editor). *The State of Food and Agriculture* External Advisory Board Chair Walter Falcon (Stanford University) provided valuable guidance. Slobodanka Teodosijevic provided research assistance and Paola di Santo, Marina Pelaghias and Paola Giondini (all of FAO) provided secretarial and administrative support.

Part I of *The State of Food and Agriculture 2007, Paying farmers for environmental services*, was written by a team led by Leslie Lipper (FAO) in association with Gerald Nelson (University of Illinois), with substantial contributions from Bernardete Neves, Terri Raney, Jakob Skoet, Keith Wiebe and Monika Zurek (all of FAO). Jakob Skoet wove these contributions together in the final draft.

Background papers were prepared by Jim Salzman (Duke University) on environmental services demand and programme design, by Sara Scherr and Jeffrey Milder (Ecoagriculture Partners) on smallholders and payments for environmental services, and by Randy Stringer (University of Adelaide), Erwin Bulte (then at Tilburg University) and David Zilberman (University of California at Berkeley) on payments for environmental services and poverty. The report also draws on studies on the potential demand for environmental services from developing countries commissioned under the Payments for Environmental Services from Agricultural Landscapes (PESAL) project funded by the FAO–Netherlands Partnership Programme. These include a study by Sissel Waage and colleagues (Forest Trends) on private-sector demand for environmental services and a study by Pablo Gutman and Sarah Davidson (WWF) on the Global Environment Facility and payments for ecosystem services. Insights were also drawn from the Roles of Agriculture

project managed by Takumi Sakuyama and Randy Stringer (then of FAO) and funded by the Government of Japan, and from work conducted under the Agricultural Development Economics Division's natural resource economics programme on the potential of payments for environmental services to reduce poverty, including working papers and unpublished materials from Nancy McCarthy (IFPRI), David Zilberman (University of California at Berkeley), Leigh Anderson (University of Washington), Oscar Cacho (University of New England) and Leslie Lipper (FAO).

Text boxes were prepared by the editorial team, external contributors as noted in the boxes, or FAO staff as follows: Box 8 was prepared by Heiner von Lüpke, Box 21 by William Emerson, and Box 24 by Benjamin Davis.

Additional text and/or background research were contributed by Astrid Agostini, Giacomo Branca, Timothy Dalton, Theodor Friedrich, Barbara Herren, Ingmar Jürgens, Pascal Liu, Ellen McCullough, Katia Medeiros, Mauricio Rosales and Heiner von Lüpke (all of FAO), and from Stefano Pagiola (World Bank), Brent Swallow (World Agroforestry Center), John Antle (University of Montana), Mauricio Bellon (Bioversity International), Sarah Carter (Plan Vivo), David Cooper (Convention on Biological Diversity), Muhammad Ibrahim (CATIE), Suzi Kerr (Motu Economic and Public Policy Research), Nancy McCarthy (IFPRI), Alexander Pfaff (The Earth Institute at Columbia University), Sven Wunder (CIFOR), David Zilberman (University of California at Berkeley), and Helena Carrascosa, Paulo Edgard Nascimento de Toledo and Roberto Resende (São Paulo State Environmental Secretariat).

The global and regional maps in Part I were generated by Renato Cumani with oversight from Leslie Lipper, John Latham and Freddy Nachtergaele and assistance from Pierre Gerber, Monica Petri, Mirella Salvatore and Keith Wiebe (all of FAO), and Gerald Nelson (University of Illinois). Patrizia

Monteduro and Jeroen Ticheler (FAO) assisted with publication of the maps on GeoNetwork and links to Google Earth.

Part I benefited greatly from review comments provided by Astrid Agostini, Caterina Batello-Cattaneo, David Boerma, Susan Braatz, Sumiter Broca, Jelle Bruinsma, Sally Bunning, Linda Collette, Jean-Marc Faures, Theodor Friedrich, Serge Garcia, Pierre Gerber, Barbara Herren, Peter Kenmore, Sasha Koo, Parviz Koohafkan, Eric Kueneman, Yianna Lambrou, Dominique Lantieri, John Latham, Pascal Liu, Paul Mathieu, Katia Medeiros, Jamie Morrison, Paul Munro-Faure, Freddy Nachtergaele, CTS Nair, Shivaji Pandey, José Antonio Prado, Mauricio Rosales, Lucilla Spini, Kostas Stamoulis, Pasquale Steduto, Henning Steinfeld, Alvaro Toledo, Jeff Tscharley, Heiner von Lüpke, Adrian Whiteman and Rolf Willmann (all of FAO), and from Hussein Abaza (UNEP), John Antle (Montana State University), Soledad Bastidas (UN Convention to Combat Desertification), Joshua Bishop (IUCN), Erwin Bulte (then at Tilburg University), David Cooper (Convention on Biological Diversity), Anabel Gonzalez (World Trade Organization), Larry Gorenflo (Conservation International), Jennifer Guiling (World Resources Institute), Pablo Gutman (WWF), Ulrich Hoffman (UNCTAD), David Huberman (IUCN), Muhammad Ibrahim (CATIE), Charles Iceland (World Resources Institute), Alain Lambert (UNEP), Wilfred Legg (OECD), Markus Lehmann (Convention on Biological Diversity), Stefano Pagiola (World Bank), Alice Ruhweza (Katoomba Group and Forest Trends), Jim Salzman (Duke University), Randy Stringer (University of Adelaide), Brent Swallow (ICRAF), Marca Weinberg (USDA), Jennifer Wong (UNFCCC), Sven Wunder (CIFOR) and David Zilberman (University of California-Berkeley). Their assistance and contributions are gratefully acknowledged.

Comments and guidance provided by *The State of Food and Agriculture* External Advisory Board members Walter Falcon (Stanford University, Chair), Bina Agarwal (University of Delhi), Kym Anderson (University of Adelaide), Simeon Ehui (World Bank), Franz Heidhues (Universität Hohenheim) and Eugenia Muchnik (Fundación Chile) are also gratefully acknowledged.

Part II, World and regional review: a longer-term perspective, was prepared by Terri Raney and Slobodanka Teodosijevic on the basis of a background paper by Mette Wik, Sumiter Broca and Prabhu Pingali. Commodity price data were provided by Ali Gürkan and Merritt Cluff of the FAO Trade and Markets Division. Other data came from the FAOSTAT statistical database, maintained by the FAO Statistics Division.

Part III, Statistical annex, was extracted from the *FAO Statistical Yearbook 2005–06* by Terri Raney and Slobodanka Teodosijevic. The FAO Statistics Division produces the *FAO Statistical Yearbook*, and their collaboration is gratefully acknowledged.

The expert contributions of the editors, designers, layout artists and reproduction specialists of the FAO Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch are also gratefully acknowledged.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ASB	Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn
CATIE	Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (Costa Rica)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	certified emission reduction
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CRP	Conservation Reserve Program (United States of America)
EU	European Union
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GDP	gross domestic product
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISRIC	International Soil Reference and Information Centre
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LULUCF	land use, land-use change and forestry
NGO	non-governmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PES	payment for environmental services (programme)
PSA	Pago de Servicios Ambientales – Payments for Environmental Services (Costa Rica)
PSAH	Pago por Servicios Ambientales Hidrológicos – Payment for Hydrological Services (Mexico)
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature (formerly World Wildlife Fund)

Explanatory note

The statistical information in this issue of *The State of Food and Agriculture* has been prepared from information available to FAO up to July 2007.

Dates and units

The following forms are used to denote years or groups of years:

2004/05 = a crop, marketing or fiscal year running from one calendar year to another

2004–05 = the average for the two calendar years

Unless otherwise indicated, the metric system is used in this publication.

“Billion” = 1 000 million

Maps

The State of Food and Agriculture 2007 includes a set of four global and four regional maps produced by FAO using geographic data layers generated internally as well as externally. The maps are composed of intersections of data layers representing indicators of environmental service supply, agricultural production and productivity and poverty. They are intended to give an indication of the spatial distribution of agro-ecological and socio-economic conditions relevant to the potential supply of environmental services. The resolution of the maps is 5 arc-minute. The low resolution precludes any definitive conclusions about the actual on-the-ground conditions in specific sites. However, the maps can provide a broad indication of the geographic distribution of selected indicators. The maps are made available for viewing on Google Earth via the FAO GeoNetwork and can be accessed using the URL for each map. JPEG images of the maps can also be downloaded from the GeoNetwork. Further technical information on the data layers used in constructing each map can be obtained from: http://www.fao.org/es/esa/en/pubs_sofa.htm

Statistical annex

The statistical annex contains a selection of data from the *FAO Statistical Yearbook 2005/06*. A mini-CD-ROM containing the full *Yearbook* is attached to the inside back cover of this report. A new edition of the *Yearbook* will be available in early 2008 and can be accessed at <http://www.fao.org/es/ess/yearbook>. The source for the data on food and agriculture is the FAOSTAT database (<http://faostat.fao.org>). More information on concepts, definitions, country notes, etc., can be found at the same address. Non-FAO sources are indicated in the notes on individual tables.