BioOne COMPLETE

Agroforestry Can Enhance Food Security While Meeting Other Sustainable Development Goals

Authors: Waldron, A., Garrity, D., Malhi, Y., Girardin, C., Miller, D. C., et al.

Source: Tropical Conservation Science, 10(1)

Published By: SAGE Publishing

URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1940082917720667

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use

Tropical Conservation Science
Volume 10: 1–6
© The Author(s) 2017
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1940082917720667
journals.sagepub.com/home/trc
SAGE

Agroforestry Can Enhance Food Security While Meeting Other Sustainable Development Goals

A. Waldron[1,2], D. Garrity[3], Y. Malhi[4], C. Girardin[4], D. C. Miller[5], and N. Seddon[1]

Abstract

To achieve global food security, we need to approximately double food production over the coming decades. Conventional agriculture is the mainstream approach to achieving this target but has also caused extensive environmental and social harms. The consensus is that we now need an agriculture that can "multi-functionally" increase food production while simultaneously enhancing social and environmental goals, as committed to in the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Farming also needs to become more resilient to multiple insecurities including climate change, soil degradation, and market unpredictability, all of which reduce sustainability and are likely to exacerbate hunger. Here, we illustrate how agroforestry systems can increase yield while also advancing multiple SDGs, especially for the small developing-world agriculturalists central to the SDG framework. Agroforestry also increases resilience of crops and farm livelihoods, especially among the most vulnerable food producers. However, conventional yield-enhancement strategies have naturally dominated the debate on food production, hindering implementation of more multifunctional alternatives. Governments and institutions now have the opportunity to rebalance agricultural policy and investment toward such multigoal approaches. In doing so, they could achieve important improvements on multiple international commitments around the interlinked themes of food security, climate change, biodiversity conservation, and social well-being.

Keywords

food, security, agroforestry, development, sustainable

A major challenge to global food security is the need to approximately double food production over the next few decades, especially due to rapidly growing demand from the developing world (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO], International Fund for Agricultural Development, & World Food Programme, 2015; Godfray et al., 2010; International Assessment of Agricultural Science & Technology for Development [IAASTD], 2009; The Government Office for Science, 2011; The Royal Society, 2009). To achieve yield increases, the use of chemical inputs, genetic improvement, and mechanization has now become conventional, thanks to their success in the past (with the important exception of Africa; IAASTD, 2009; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014; The Government Office for Science, 2011; The Royal Society, 2009). However, conventional agriculture has also been a principal cause of numerous social and environmental problems including climate change, loss of biodiversity and ecosystem integrity, land degradation, water insecurity, and disruption of social systems (Chappell & LaValle, 2009; Godfray et al., 2010;

[1]Biodiversity Institute, Department of Zoology, Oxford University, Oxford, UK
[2]Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, Singapore
[3]World Agroforestry Center, Nairobi, Kenya
[4]Environmental Change Institute, School of Geography and the Environment, Oxford University, Oxford, UK
[5]Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA

Received 30 May 2017; Accepted 30 May 2017

Corresponding Author:
A. Waldron, Biodiversity Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 2JD, UK.
Email: dbsasw@nus.edu.sg; anthonywaldron@hotmail.com

Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).
Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use

IAASTD, 2009; Maxwell, Fuller, Brooks, & Watson, 2016; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014; Pretty, Morison, & Hine, 2003; The Royal Society, 2009).

Consequently, there is now extensive consensus that we need to move away from the current, narrow focus on yield, and toward a more "multifunctional" agriculture that also respects (and preferably enhances) broader societal and environmental goals, under the rubric sustainable intensification (IAASTD, 2009; Godfray & Garnett, 2014; Pretty, 2008; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014; The Government Office for Science, 2011; The Royal Society, 2009). Indeed, the ongoing degradation of soils and ecosystems threaten the sustainability of food production itself, as does global environmental change (Amundson et al., 2015; Foley et al., 2011; Montgomery, 2007; Morton, 2007; Potts et al., 2010; Stern, 2007; Tan, Lal, & Wiebe, 2005; The Royal Society, 2009; Tscharntke et al., 2012). Here, we first suggest that the sustainable development goals (SDGs; Griggs et al., 2013; United Nations General Assembly, 2015) provide a broad and coherent framework for multifunctional agriculture, since this international agreement already combines food security (SDG2) with environmental, climate, and social goals and indeed emphasizes the need for a multigoal approach. We then describe how a highly multifunctional alternative already exists in agroforestry. We briefly explore how conventional agriculture tends to dominate in comparison to alternatives such as agroforestry, with multiple negative consequences. Finally, we outline considerations in creating a more appropriate balance of approaches.

One difficulty with a multigoal approach is that each agricultural option will affect each individual goal differently (and each actor will give different weight to the achievement of each goal). However, food is fundamental to human life, and so we assume that multigoal agriculture must first be able to increase yield sufficiently to meet the SDG of food security. Once that criterion is satisfied, the options that advance other SDGs most strongly (or compromise them least severely) would receive priority. In addition, each agricultural approach will affect the SDGs differently for different social groups and different geographies. Since food security and the SDGs in general are particularly relevant to the developing world (United Nations General Assembly, 2015), we focus our discussion on the small-scale agriculturalists who represent over 90% of developing-world farmers (Graeub et al., 2016; International Fund for Agricultural Development/United Nations Environment Programme [IFAD/UNEP], 2013) and also the majority of those living in poverty (World Bank, 2015).

Within that physical and human geography, one of the most multifunctional forms of agriculture is agroforestry: the combined production of trees and agricultural species on the same piece of land (see top photo in Figure 1; Garrity et al., 2010; Nair, 1993; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014). Although it has often been studied for its ecological benefits and peasant-farmer associations (Bhagwat, Willis, Birks, & Whittaker, 2008; Horlings & Marsden, 2011; Pretty et al., 2003; Shibu, 2009), scientific evidence now shows that the adoption of agroforestry can increase yields by a factor of two (average 96% in a multistudy review; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014), depending on crop type, local conditions, and level of expertise (Garrity et al., 2010; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014; Pretty et al., 2003; Waldron, Justicia, & Smith, 2015). These yield increases have been shown to reflect multiple ecosystem services provided by the trees, including enhanced soil nutrient status (e.g., through nitrogen fixation), reduced crop stress (e.g., through reduced temperature and rainfall extremes), reduced soil erosion (binding of soil by roots), and regulation of water supply (hydraulic uplift of deep water by tree roots; Garrity et al., 2010; Leakey, 2014; Pretty et al., 2003; Waldron et al., 2015). Furthermore, the yield improvements can be highly sustainable (secure) because agroforestry maintains soil fertility and can even restore degraded lands (Garrity et al., 2010; Leakey, 2014; Nair, 1993).

However, food security itself (SDG2) does not just depend on yield (FAO, 2008; World Bank, 2015). A further critical component is resilience to climate change and to shocks (sudden, large variations in weather, harvests, market prices, and input costs), which can cause major hunger crises (Chappell et al., 2013; Chuku & Okoye, 2009; FAO, 2008; Garrity et al., 2010; McMichael, 2009; Orr & Mwale, 2016; Thorlakson & Neufeldt, 2012; World Bank, 2015). Agroforestry increases crop resilience to several likely climate change effects, such as drought or higher temperatures, because it enhances water infiltration and storage while reducing evaporation and temperature extremes (Charles, Munishi, & Nzunda, 2013; Garrity et al., 2010). It also increases livelihood resilience because the provision of free ecosystem services by the trees reduces dependence on unpredictable, distant commodity markets; when harvests are poor, the trees also provide alternative sources of both income and food, for example, fruit, fodder, or fuel (Charles et al., 2013; Garrity et al., 2010; Thorlakson & Neufeldt, 2012).

In addition to advancing food security, agroforestry can also enhance multiple social dimensions of the SDGs. It provides a pathway out of poverty (a major driver of hunger itself; World Bank, 2015) because the combination of increased yield, low cost, and additional tree-based farm products can significantly increase net farm income (Miller, Munoz-Mora, & Christiaensen, 2017; Reyes, Quiroz, & Msikula, 2005; Waldron, Justicia, Smith, & Sanchez, 2012). In addition, farmer movements in the developing world have expressed a lack of equity and dignity (SDGs 10, 8, and 16) in the way their livelihoods can be negatively affected by distant supply-chain actors, and so have sought greater local

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use




Figure 1. Agroforestry (top photo), conventional agriculture (bottom photo), and the achievement of multiple goals. Twelve goals are shown, all related to food security (especially for developing-world agriculturalists) and to other sustainable development goals connected with agriculture. Arrows compare how agroforestry (lighter blue) and conventional intensification (darker red) affect each goal: Arrows pointing away from the circle center indicate a likely positive impact on the goal, vice versa for arrows toward the center. To reflect uncertainties, arrow heights are arbitrarily equal? = Alternative theories exist for some goals, for example, social equality and livelihood resilience. Some goals are also important to global society (e.g., climate change and biodiversity) and larger farmers using conventional intensification (e.g., yield and climate-smart crops).

control of food production (e.g., "food sovereignty"; Chappell et al., 2013; Desmarais, 2007; Whitmann, 2011), see also (Cook, Silici, Adolph, & Walker, 2015; Thorlakson & Neufeldt, 2012). In agroforests, the reduced dependence on external chemical inputs, plus the greater resilience to market fluctuations, can enhance this sense of control, equity, and dignity in work (Chappell et al., 2013; Thorlakson & Neufeldt, 2012). Furthermore, on-farm trees generate considerable fuel-wood, reducing the need to cut down natural forests and also saving smallholder family members (particularly women) from walking long distances (sometimes >20 km) in search of firewood, thus enhancing women's well-being and freeing them to educate and tend to children, provide farm labor, or produce other income (e.g., SDGs 3, 4, and 5; Kiptot, Franzel, & Degrande, 2014; Sharma et al., 2016; Thorlakson & Neufeldt, 2012). The on-farm supply of fuel-wood also represents an important, hunger-related form of energy security (SDG7) for rural communities, being cheap, readily available, and fundamental to extracting sufficient calories from food (Sharma et al., 2016).

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use

Agroforestry can also enhance several key environment-related SDGs. In addition to taking pressure off wood collection from natural forests (Sekhar, 2007), agroforests enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services (SDG15) by improving on-farm habitats and increasing landscape connectivity (Bhagwat et al., 2008; Clough et al., 2011; Schroth, Fonseca, & Harvey, 2004; Tscharntke et al., 2011). Agroforestry farms also make major contributions toward the mitigation of climate change (SDG13), for example, by adding 200 million tonnes of carbon annually to agricultural lands (Zomer et al., 2016). This figure does not account for any emission savings due to reduced off-farm tree felling and could be much higher if agroforestry were more widely implemented (Garrity et al., 2010; Minang, Duguma, Bernard, Mertz, & van Noordwijk, 2014; Shibu, 2009; Zomer et al., 2016).

In summary, agroforestry can offer a high-yielding system with multiple other SDG benefits. Many farms globally already have some trees (e.g., 46% of all farmland already has >10% tree cover; Zomer et al., 2016), and there is increasing realization (and take-up) of the benefits of introducing trees to low-yielding land (Garrity et al., 2010). Agroforestry techniques are therefore likely to be widely suitable across a large proportion of global farmland. There will of course be places where agroforestry cannot easily or efficiently be implemented, for example, where both the physical and cultural ground is not propitious to the introduction of new trees. Nevertheless, the same is true of conventional agriculture. For example, the high yields achieved by conventional Western agriculture require farmers to purchase a steady supply of inputs, which are accessible and subsidized in developed countries but often unaffordable for smallholders in more remote areas (IFAD/UNEP, 2013).

The key point is that, ideally, each agricultural approach should be implemented where it is most appropriate in a multigoal framework. This does not currently occur. Instead, many studies have shown how conventional approaches still dominate (including in the aid finance allocated to different food security options; Pingali, Spielman, & Zaidi, 2016), whereas agroforestry and similar nonmainstream approaches are underimplemented (Franzel, Denning, Lillesø, & Mercado, 2004; Horlings & Marsden, 2011; International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems, 2016; Pretty et al., 2003). Indeed, discussions of sustainable intensification itself have often focused on conventional yield enhancement (Cook et al., 2015; Horlings & Marsden, 2011; IAASTD, 2009; The Royal Society, 2009). More worryingly, conventional approaches to intensification continue to cause the removal of trees from existing agroforestry systems (Siebert, 2002; Waldron et al., 2015), just as tree cover has been lost from nonagroforestry agriculture (Fischer, Zerger, Gibbons, Stott, & Law, 2010).

The predominance of mainstream, conventional agriculture is unsurprising. Farming choices do not exist in isolation but depend upon an entire ''food regime'' of agribusiness, inputs, subsidies, markets, research and regulation, in which smallholders tend to have minimal influence, control, or lobbying power (McMichael, 2009). A whole set of institutions, regulations, and subsidies have been shaped around the conventional approach, making the implementation of alternatives such as agroforestry more difficult (Franzel et al., 2004; McMichael, 2009). Where political and financial interests exist, current power structures will also tend to resist change. However, if multiple agricultural options can deliver food security to a region, it makes little policy sense to choose those that will compromise soils, biodiversity and ecosystem services, climate, and even social capital more severely.

We suggest a target of ''high enough yield for food security, with maximal co-benefits,'' particularly in the developing world. We recognize that achieving maximum yield (rather than achieving sufficient yield to meet demand) has often been an economic goal, and that conventional agriculture may often be a stronger candidate for achieving this. However, whether we aim for sufficient or maximal yield, it is critical that any calculation of multigoal trade-offs considers historical context and potential, rather than being limited to a snapshot of the present day. Conventional agriculture was not always so productive, but became so due to half a century of intensive investment and research (Pardey, Beintema, Dehmer, & Wood, 2006; Pretty & Bharucha, 2014), and its incremental yield gains have slowed compared with earlier stages of development (IAASTD, 2009; The Royal Society, 2009). In addition, billions of additional dollars are now spent trying to improve conventional agriculture's poor environmental performance, with limited success (Kleijn et al., 2006; Monke & Johnson, 2010). In comparison, investment in agroecological systems has been an order of magnitude smaller (DeLonge, Miles, & Carlisle, 2016). The implication is that if greater investment were made in less-developed approaches such as agroforestry, yield could increase substantially, greatly reducing or even reversing any current yield gap with conventional agriculture and thus changing trade-off calculations.

In conclusion, we now have the opportunity to refocus both policy and finance, so that they better reflect an appropriate balance of agricultural solutions in a multigoal framework. For less-mainstream techniques such as agroforestry, such a rebalancing would bring large new investment, research, and institutional improvements, driving yields upwards. By assessing and capitalizing on this potential, we could significantly enhance global goals on food security, social well-being, and environmental integrity, as we have committed to under the SDGs.

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Amundson, R., Berhe, A., Hopmans, J. W., Olson, C., Sztein, A., & Sparks, D. L. (2015). Soil and human security in the 21st century. *Science*, *348*, 6235.

Bhagwat, S., Willis, K., Birks, H., & Whittaker, R. (2008). Agroforestry: A refuge for tropical diversity? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *23*, 261–267.

Chappell, M. J., & LaValle, L. A. (2009). Food security and biodiversity: Can we have both? An agroecological analysis. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *28*, 3–26.

Chappell, M. J., Wittman, H., Bacon, C. M., Ferguson, B. G., Barrios, L. G., Barrios, R. G., & Perfecto, I. (2013). Food sovereignty: An alternative paradigm for poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation in Latin America. *F1000Research, 61*. Retrieved from http://f1000r.es/23s.

Charles, R., Munishi, P., & Nzunda, E. (2013). Agroforestry as adaptation strategy under climate change in Mwanga District, Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. *International Journal of Environmental Protection*, *3*, 29–38.

Chuku, C. A., & Okoye, C. (2009). Increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability in sub-Saharan African agriculture: Strategies for risk coping and management. *African Journal of Agricultural Research Special Review*, *4*, 1524–1535.

Clough, Y., Barkmann, J., Juhrbandt, J., Kessler, M., Cherico, T., & Anshary, A. (2011). Combining high biodiversity with high yields in tropical agroforests. *PNAS*, *108*, 8311–8316.

Cook, S., Silici, L., Adolph, B., & Walker, S. (2015). *Sustainable intensification revisited*. London, England: IIED.

DeLonge, M. S., Miles, A., & Carlisle, L. (2016). Investing in the transition to sustainable agriculture. *Environmental Science and Policy*, *55*, 266–273.

Desmarais, A. (2007). *La via campesina: Globalization and the power of peasants*. London, England: Pluto Press.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2008). *An introduction to the basic concepts of food security*. Rome, Italy.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Fund for Agricultural Development, & World Food Programme (2015). *The state of food insecurity in the world 2015. Meeting the 2015 international hunger targets: Taking stock of uneven progress*. Rome, Italy: FAO.

Fischer, J., Zerger, A., Gibbons, P., Stott, J., & Law, B. S. (2010). Tree decline and the future of Australian farmland biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *107*, 19597–19602.

Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., & Zaks, D. P. M. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, *478*, 337–342.

Franzel, S., Denning, G. L., Lillesø, J. P. B., & Mercado, A. R. (2004). Scaling up the impact of agroforestry: Lessons from three sites in Africa and Asia. *Agroforestry Systems*, *61*, 329–344.

Garrity, D. P., Akinnifesi, F. K., Ajayi, O. C., Weldesemayat, S. G., Mowo, J. G., Kalinganire, A., . . . Bayala, J. (2010). Evergreen agriculture: A robust approach to sustainable food security in Africa. *Food Security*, *2*, 197–214.

Godfray, H., Beddington, J., Crute, I., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., . . . Toulmin, C. (2010). Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science*, *327*, 812–818.

Godfray, H. C. J., & Garnett, T. (2014). Food security and sustainable intensification. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *369*, 20120273.

Graeub, B. E., Chappell, M. J., Wittman, H., Ledermann, S., Kerr, R. B., & Gemmill-Herren, B. (2016). The state of family farms in the world. *World Development*, *87*, 1–15.

Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockstrom, J., Ohman, M. C., Shyamsundar, P., . . . Noble, I. (2013). Sustainable development goals for people and planet. *Nature*, *495*, 305–307.

Horlings, L. G., & Marsden, T. K. (2011). Towards the real green revolution? Exploring the conceptual dimensions of a new ecological modernisation of agriculture that could ''feed the world.''. *Global Environmental Change*, *21*, 441–452.

International Assessment of Agricultural Science & Technology for Development (2013). *Agriculture at a crossroads*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

International Fund for Agricultural Development/United Nations Environment Programme. (2013). *Smallholders, food security and the environment*. Retrieved from https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/666cac24-14b6-43c2-876d-9c2d1f01d5dd.

International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems. (2016). *From uniformity to diversity: A paradigm shift from industrial agriculture to diversified agroecological systems*. Retrieved from www.ipes-food.org.

Kiptot, E., Franzel, S., & Degrande, A. (2014). Gender, agroforestry and food security in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *6*, 104–109.

Kleijn, D., Baquero, R. A., Clough, Y., Díaz, M., De Esteban, J., Fernández, F., . . . Yela, J. L. (2006). Mixed biodiversity benefits of agri-environment schemes in five European countries. *Ecology Letters*, *9*, 243–254.

Leakey, R. R. (2014). The role of trees in agroecology and sustainable agriculture in the tropics. *Annual Review of Phytopathology*, *52*, 113–133.

Maxwell, S. L., Fuller, R. A., Brooks, T. M., & Watson, J. E. (2016). Biodiversity: The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers. *Nature*, *536*, 143–145.

McMichael, P. (2009). A food regime analysis of the ''world food crisis.''. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *26*, 281–295.

Miller, D. C., Munoz-Mora, J., & Christiaensen, L. (2017). Prevalence, economic contribution and determinants of trees on farms across Sub-Saharan Africa. *Forest Policy and Economics*. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2016.12.005.

Minang, P. A., Duguma, L. A., Bernard, F., Mertz, O., & van Noordwijk, M. (2014). Prospects for agroforestry in REDD+ landscapes in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *6*, 78–82.

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use

Monke, J., & Johnson, R. (2010). *Actual farm bill spending costs and cost estimates*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

Montgomery, D. R. (2007). Soil erosion and agricultural sustainability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *104*, 13268–13272.

Morton, J. (2007). The impact of climate change on smallholder and subsistence agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *104*, 19680–19685.

Nair, P. (1993). *An introduction to agroforestry*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media.

Orr, A., & Mwale, B. (2016). Adapting to adjustment: Smallholder livelihood strategies in southern Malawi. *World Development*, *29*, 1325–1343.

Pardey, P. G., Beintema, N., Dehmer, S., & Wood, S. (2006). *Agricultural research: A growing global divide?* Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Pingali, P., Spielman, D., & Zaidi, F. (2016). Agricultural research in Africa: Investing in future harvests. In J. Lynam, N. M. Beintema, J. Roseboom & O. Badiane, (Eds.), *Agricultural research in Africa: Investing in future harvests* (pp. 139–170). Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Potts, S. G., Biesmeijer, J. C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O., & Kunin, W. E. (2010). Global pollinator declines: Trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *25*, 345–353.

Pretty, J. (2008). Agricultural sustainability: Concepts, principles and evidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *363*, 447–465.

Pretty, J., & Bharucha, Z. P. (2014). Sustainable intensification in agricultural systems. *Annals of Botany*, *114*, 1571–1596.

Pretty, J. N., Morison, J. I., & Hine, R. E. (2003). Reducing food poverty by increasing agricultural sustainability in developing countries. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *95*, 217–234.

Reyes, T., Quiroz, R., & Msikula, S. (2005). Socio-economic comparison between traditional and improved cultivation methods in agroforestry systems, East Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. *Environmental Management*, *36*, 682–690.

Schroth, G., Fonseca, G., & Harvey, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Agroforestry and biodiversity conservation in tropical landscapes*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Sekhar, N. U. (2007). Traditional versus improved agroforestry systems in Vietnam: A comparison. *Land Degradation and Development*, *18*, 89–97.

Sharma, N., Bohra, B., Pragya, N., Ciannella, R., Dobie, P., & Lehmann, S. (2016). Bioenergy from agroforestry can lead to improved food security, climate change, soil quality, and rural development. *Food and Energy Security*, *5*, 165–183.

Shibu, J. (2009). Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: An overview. *Agroforestry Systems*, *76*, 1–10.

Siebert, S. (2002). From shade- to sun-grown perennial crops in Sulawesi, Indonesia: Implications for biodiversity conservation and soil fertility. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *11*, 1889–1902.

Stern, N. (2007). *The economics of climate change: The Stern review*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, Z. X., Lal, R., & Wiebe, K. D. (2005). Global soil nutrient depletion and yield reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, *26*, 123–146.

The Government Office for Science (2011). *Foresight. The future of food and farming. Final project report*. London, England.

The Royal Society (2009). *Reaping the benefits. Science and the sustainable intensification of global agriculture*. London, England.

Thorlakson, T., & Neufeldt, H. (2012). Reducing subsistence farmers' vulnerability to climate change: Evaluating the potential contributions of agroforestry in western Kenya. *Agriculture & Food Security*, *1*, 15.

Tscharntke, T., Clough, J., Bhagwat, S., Buchori, D., Holscher, D., Juhrbandt, J., . . . Wanger, T. C. (2011). Multifunctional shade-tree management in tropical agroforestry landscapes—A review. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *48*, 619–629.

Tscharntke, T., Clough, Y., Wanger, T. C., Jackson, L., Motzke, I., Perfecto, I., . . . Whitbread, A. (2012). Global food security, biodiversity conservation and the future of agricultural intensification. *Biological Conservation*, *151*, 53–59.

United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development,* A/RES/70/1. Retrieved from http://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html.

Waldron, A., Justicia, R., & Smith, L. (2015). Making biodiversity-friendly cocoa pay: Combining yield, certification, and REDD for shade management. *Ecological Applications*, *25*, 361–372.

Waldron, A., Justicia, R., Smith, L. E., & Sanchez, M. (2012). Conservation through Chocolate: A win-win for biodiversity and farmers in Ecuador's lowland tropics. *Conservation Letters*, *5*, 213–221.

Whitmann, H. (2011). Food sovreignty: A new rights framework for food and nature? *Environment and Society*, *2*, 87–105.

World Bank (2015). *Ending poverty and hunger by 2030. An agenda for the global food system*. Washington, DC: Author.

Zomer, R. J., Neufeldt, H., Xu, J., Ahrends, A., Bossio, D., Trabucco, A., . . . Mortimer, P. E. (2016). Global tree cover and biomass carbon on agricultural land: The contribution of agroforestry to global and national carbon budgets. *Scientific Reports*, *6*, 29987.

Downloaded From: https://complete.bioone.org/journals/Tropical-Conservation-Science on 29 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://complete.bioone.org/terms-of-use