

Agricultural innovations for sustainable crop production intensification

Michele Pisante,¹ Fabio Stagnari,¹ Cynthia A. Grant²

¹*Agronomy and Crop Sciences Research and Education Center, University of Teramo, Italy;*

²*Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Brandon Research Centre, Manitoba, Canada*

Abstract

Sustainable crop production intensification should be the primary strategic objective of innovative agronomic research for the coming decades. A range of often very location-specific options exists for farming practices, approaches and technologies that can strengthen sustainability and at the same time intensify crop production in terms of increased output and productivity (efficiency). The main challenge is to encourage farmers in the use of ecologically-appropriate technologies and practices and to ensure that knowledge about sustainable production practices is increasingly accepted, applied and innovated upon by farmers. There is a large but underutilized potential to integrate farmers' local knowledge with science-based formal knowledge. This integration aims at innovating improved practices and technological options through favourable institutional arrangements to foster an innovation system. The same holds true for the design, implementation and monitoring of improved natural resource management that links community initiatives to new external expertise and knowledge. A comprehensive effort should also be undertaken to measure different stages of the innovation system, including technological adoption, adaptation and diffusion at the farm level, and to investigate the impact of agricultural policies on technological change, technical efficiency and production intensification.

This paper provides a review of agronomic management practices supporting sustainable crop production systems and intensification, and testifying to developments in the selection of crops and cultivars. The paper also describes crop farming systems taking a predominant ecosystem approach and it discusses the scientific application of this approach for the management of pest and weed populations. In

addition, it reviews the improvements in fertilizer and nutrient management which are at the basis of productivity growth and it describes the benefits and drawbacks of irrigation technologies. Finally, it suggests a way forward based on seven changes in agricultural development that heighten the need to examine how innovation occurs in the agricultural sector.

Introduction

Over the last 40 years, world population has increased by more than 4 billion and in the next 40 years it is expected to increase from the estimated 7 billion in 2011 to around 9.1 billion in 2050 (Figure 1). Nearly all of this population increase will take place in the part of the world comprising today's developing countries, while the greatest relative population increase (120%) is expected in today's least-developed countries. This ever-growing population will lead to an increase in the global demand for food for at least 40 years to come. In order to meet the additional food demand – excluding additional demand for agricultural products used as feedstock in biofuel production – agricultural production must increase by 70% globally, and by almost 100% in developing countries. This increase is equivalent to an extra billion tonne of cereals and 200 million tonnes of meat to be produced annually by 2050, compared with the production between 2005 and 2007 (Bruinsma, 2009).

In the past, the primary solution to food shortages was to bring more land into agriculture and to exploit new fish stocks. In the future, our ability to produce food will be affected by growing competition for land, water, and energy, and by the urgent requirement to reduce the impact of the food system on the environment. The effects of climate change are a further threat to food security (Godfray *et al.*, 2010; Government Office for Science, 2011). The relationship between resource demand and supply is unbalanced. Yet, in the last 5 decades, though grain production has more than doubled, the amount of land globally devoted to arable agriculture has increased by only 9% (Pretty, 2008). In the last 50 years there has been a marked growth in food production which dramatically decreased the proportion of people seasonally or chronically hungry, despite the doubling of the total population (Figure 2).

Some new land could be brought into cultivation in Sub-Saharan Africa and South America, but the demand for land from other human activities makes this an increasingly unlikely and costly solution, particularly if protecting biodiversity and the public goods provided by natural ecosystems (for example, carbon storage in rainforest) are given higher priority (Balmford *et al.*, 2005). In recent decades, agricultural land that was formerly productive has been taken away by urbanization and other human uses, as well as by desertification, salinization, soil erosion, and other consequences of unsustainable land management. Further losses of agriculture's natural resource base, especially water loss which may be exacerbated by climate change, are likely to happen (IPCC, 2007). Recent policy decisions to produce first generation bio-

Correspondence: Prof. Michele Pisante, Agronomy and Crop Sciences Research and Education Center, Department of Food Science, University of Teramo, via Carlo R. Lerici 1, 64023 Mosciano S. Angelo (TE), Italy. Tel. +39.0861.266940 - Fax: +39.0861.266940. E-mail: mpisante@unite.it

Key words: agronomic practices, crop intensification, farming systems, sustainable agriculture.

Received for publication: 4 April 2012.

Accepted for publication: 28 July 2012.

©Copyright M. Pisante *et al.*, 2012
Licensee PAGEPress, Italy
Italian Journal of Agronomy 2012; 7:e40
doi:10.4081/ija.2012.e40

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License (by-nc 3.0) which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

fuels on good quality agricultural land have added to the competitive pressures (Fargione *et al.*, 2008). Thus, the most likely scenario is that more food will need to be produced from the same amount of (or even less) land (Godfray *et al.*, 2010).

The challenge of increasing food production, food security and farmer income is, then, to increase productivity. Productivity growth refers to the change in output/input ratios over time. Therefore, it is a resource efficiency indicator used per unit of output. However, over the last forty years much of the increase in productivity has been related to improved genetic resources, increased utilization of pesticides, increased input of agricultural mineral nutrients, increased use of mechanised farm power and fossil fuel and greater irrigation intensity (Figure 3).

To feed a growing world population, we have no option but to intensify crop production sustainably (FAO, 2011). A renewed focus on defining concrete actions to improve agricultural productivity growth on a sustainable basis is needed now. Intertwining challenges of climate change and competition for land, water, and energy require attention in the following areas: bridging the gap between actual and potential productivity levels in the agriculture of developing countries; investing in agricultural innovation, broadly defined; and improving national and international research collaboration (OECD, 2011).

The new paradigms of *sustainable crop production intensification* recognize the need for a productive and remunerative agriculture which at the same time preserves and enhances the natural resource base and environment, and positively contributes to harnessing the environmental services. Sustainable crop production intensification must not only reduce the impact of climate change on crop production but also mitigate the factors that cause climate change by reducing emissions and by contributing to carbon sequestration in soils. Intensification should also enhance biodiversity – above and below the ground level – in crop production systems so as to improve ecosystem services for a better productivity and a healthier environment.

A set of soil-crop-nutrient-water-landscape system management practices known as Conservation Agriculture (CA) has the potential to achieve all of these goals (Derpsch and Friedrich, 2010; Friedrich *et al.*, 2012). CA has the potential for managing decreasing soil productivity and for improving the resource-use efficiency and the natural resources base. Hence, it adapts to and mitigates climate change and leads to a more efficient use of inputs to reduce production costs. Integrated farming systems based on CA, irrespective of the location, management and socioeconomic conditions, must produce more for less to improve profitability and livelihood security for farmers.

In short, the globally-shared challenge is to ensure a more efficient use of available land and water resources as well as purchased production inputs. Thus, improving agricultural productivity is essential to increase global food supplies on a sustainable basis (OECD, 2011). Standard agronomic land, water and crop management practices supporting the intensification of sustainable crop production include: selection of crops and cultivars, efficient farming systems for crop establishment, plant protection, fertilizer and nutrient management, and sustainable crop rotations. When applied together, these practices collaborate to improve factor and overall productivity (FAO, 2011).

What is needed to support sustainable crop production systems?

Investments in knowledge – especially in the form of science and technology – have featured prominently and consistently in most strategies to promote sustainable and equitable agricultural development at the national level. In the long run, productivity growth requires innovation, *i.e.* a process of transforming knowledge into money




Figure 1. World population 1965-2050. Source: Population division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat (2007).




Figure 2. Changes in the relative global production of crops since 1961 (when relative production scaled to 1 in 1961). Source: FAOSTAT (2009). Available from: <http://faostat.fao.org/default.aspx>




Figure 3. Graphical illustration of productivity growth. Source: OECD (2011).

(whereas research is to transform money into knowledge) (Figure 4).

Agriculture should innovate to increase competitiveness by providing advantages in the market, but also to offer more cost-effective public goods. Innovation can be based on the result of scientific research about processes or the attributes of a product, the introduction of new or significantly improved goods or services, or the use of new inputs, processes, organizational or marketing methods (OECD and Eurostat, 2005). Scientific and technological knowledge and information add value to existing resources, skills, knowledge, and processes, leading to innovative or novel products, processes and strategies. These innovations can be simple, like changing the crops that are produced, or more complex, like developing a new business model with entirely different production technologies to satisfy different needs (e.g. from better production and productivity to more quality such as flavour, fragrance, or colour). Innovation produces better packaging that protects the nutritional content and also a cost system of *more for less* that allows establishment of more attractive prices. Economies of scale are also a component of productivity growth for individual firms (Latruffe, 2010).

The ability to innovate and to become more productive is partly affected by the farm itself and the farmer's engagement, but it can also be affected by the economic and political environment where the farm is operating (Porter *et al.*, 2007). Innovation is therefore central to development, and effective innovation systems include all the relevant stakeholders who can contribute to the discovery of underlying processes and principles, transforming the principles into technologies and practices and further adapting these to improve efficiency and performance. Governments have recognized that much of a firm's ability to innovate can be driven by public research, infrastructure, regulations, taxation, and other public policies that have both direct and indirect effects on the operating environment of firms (OECD, 2011). An examination of the agronomic innovations (crops and cultivars; farming systems for crop which take a predominantly ecosystem approach; management of pest and weed populations; fertilizer and nutrient management and irrigation technologies) over the past four decades and the impacts that they have had on crop productivity and the environment can help identify those areas where sustainable intensification of agri-

Innovation is transforming Knowledge into investment




Figure 4. Raffler's circle explaining the difference between research and innovation. Adapted from H. Raffler (VP Innovation of Siemens, unpublished).




Figure 5. Makeup of total food waste in developed and developing countries. Retail, food service, and home and municipal categories are grouped together for developing countries. Source: Godfray *et al.* (2010).

cultural systems may be done in the future.

The importance of innovations along the food chain and post-harvest handling and processing is also growing to meet consumers' demand for food quality, storability and convenience. Although data are scarce (Figure 5), roughly 30% to 40% of food in both developed and developing countries is doomed to be wasted mainly because of the lack of food-chain infrastructures and the lack of knowledge or investment in storage technologies in farms. In the developed countries, stricter food quality regulations, consumer preferences and food processing and packaging as well as modern urban life style are additional factors that contribute to food being wasted. Thus, there is a need for continuing research in post-harvest storage technologies (WRAP, 2008).

Crops and cultivars

Farmers will need a genetically diverse portfolio of improved crop varieties that are suited to a range of agro-ecosystems and farming practices, and are resilient to climate change. The Green Revolution succeeded in improving productivity by using conventional breeding to develop F1 hybrid varieties of maize and semi-dwarf, disease-resistant varieties of wheat and rice. These varieties could be provided with more irrigation and fertilizer (Evenson and Gollin, 2003) without the risk of major crop losses due to lodging (falling over) or severe rust epidemics. Increased yield is still a major goal, but the importance of greater water- and nutrient-use efficiency, as well as tolerance of abiotic stress, is also likely to increase (Godfray *et al.*, 2010). However, the heavy reliance on irrigation and intensive crop inputs, as well as the reduction in biodiversity associ-

ated with the replacement of local and varied landraces with cultivars that are released and grown over a wide geographical area, may lead to a reduction in the sustainability of crop production in the future. The high-yielding cultivars may also contain lower levels of trace elements than traditional crops or than lower yielding cultivars, due to their high carbohydrate production. Currently, the major commercialized genetically modified (GMO) crops involve relatively simple manipulations, such as the insertion of a gene for herbicide resistance or another for a pest-insect toxin. The next decade will see the development of combinations of desirable traits and the introduction of new traits such as drought tolerance. By mid-century, much more radical options involving highly polygenic traits may be feasible. Production of cloned animals with engineered innate immunity to diseases that reduce production efficiency may reduce substantial losses coming from mortality and sub clinical infections. Biotechnology could also produce plants for animal feed with modified composition that increase the efficiency of meat production and lower methane emissions (Godfray *et al.*, 2010). The issue of trust and public acceptance of biotechnology has been highlighted by the debate over the acceptance of GMO technologies. As genetic modification involves germline modification of an organism and its introduction in the environment and food chain, a number of particular environmental and food safety issues need to be assessed. Despite the introduction of rigorous science-based risk assessment, this discussion has become highly politicized and polarized in some countries, particularly in Europe. Our view is that genetic modification is a potentially valuable technology whose advantages and disadvantages need to be considered rigorously on an evidential, inclusive, case-by-case basis: Genetic modification should neither be privileged nor automatically dismissed (Godfray *et al.*, 2010).

Table 1. Effects on sustainability and ecosystem services of production system components applied simultaneously.

System component ▶	Mulch cover	Minimum or no-tillage	Legumes (to supply plant nutrients)	Crop rotation
Simulate optimum <i>forest-floor</i> conditions	✓	✓		
Reduce evaporative loss of moisture from soil surface	✓			
Reduce evaporative loss from soil upper soil layers	✓	✓		
Minimize oxidation of soil organic matter, CO ₂ loss		✓		
Minimize compactive impacts by intense rainfall, passage of feet, machinery	✓	✓		
Minimize temperature fluctuations at soil surface	✓			
Provide regular supply of organic matter as substrate for soil organisms' activity	✓			
Increase, maintain N levels in root-zone	✓	✓	✓	✓
Increase CEC of root-zone	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maximize rain infiltration, minimize run-off	✓	✓		
Minimize soil loss in run-off, wind	✓	✓		
Permit, maintain natural layering of soil horizons by actions of soil biota	✓	✓		
Minimize weeds	✓	✓		✓
Increase rate of biomass production	✓	✓	✓	✓
Speed the recuperation of soil-porosity by soil biota	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce labour input		✓		
Reduce fuel-energy input		✓	✓	✓
Recycle nutrients	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce pest-pressure of pathogens				✓
Re-build damaged soil conditions and dynamics	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pollination services	✓	✓	✓	✓

N, nitrogen; CEC, cation exchange capacity. Source: Friedrich *et al.*, 2009.

Production systems for better productivity

Current crop production systems vary widely. There are many production systems which take a predominantly ecosystem approach and which are not only productive, but also more sustainable than traditional production practices in terms of environmental impacts.

Conservation agriculture

Conservation agriculture (CA) is a method designed for resource-saving agricultural crop production whose aim is to achieve acceptable profits together with high and sustained production levels while simultaneously preserving the environment. Interventions such as mechanical soil tillage are reduced to an absolute minimum and external inputs, such as agrochemicals and nutrients of mineral or organic origins, are applied at the optimum level and in a way and quantity that does not interfere with, or disrupt, the biological processes (FAO, 2012). Healthy soils underpin CA, which in turn is characterized by three intertwined principles, namely: i) continuous minimum mechanical soil disturbance and no-till direct seeding; ii) permanent organic soil cover with crop residues and cover crops; iii) crop diversification with crop rotations and associations in case of annual crops or plant associations in case of perennial crops. CA facilitates good agronomy, such as timely operations, and improves overall land husbandry for rain fed and irrigated production and is complemented by other good practices, such as the use of quality seeds and integrated pest management. Benefits of CA, shown in Table 1, include improved moisture conservation and water infiltration, reduced run-off of pesticides and fertilizers, reduced consumption of fuel, improved organic matter content with associated carbon sequestration, improved diversity of soil, flora, and fauna, better wildlife habitat, better soil structure, reduced wind and water erosion, less labour and less investment in equipment (Cook, 2006; Huggins and Reganold, 2008; Stagnari *et al.*, 2009; Kassam *et al.*, 2012). CA has also proved to contribute to significant increases of crop production (40-100%) in many regions with decreasing needs for farm inputs, in particular power and energy (50-70%), time and labour (50%), fertilizer and agrochemicals (20-50%) and water (30-50%). Furthermore, in many environments soil erosion is reduced to a level below the soil regeneration one or it is avoided altogether, and water resources are restored in quality and quantity to levels recorded before the land was put under intensive agriculture (Montgomery, 2007; FAO, 2011).

A summary of numerous published studies comparing no-till to conventional tillage under natural rainfall conditions showed that, on average, no-till reduced soil erosion, water runoff and herbicide runoff by 92%, 69% and 70%, respectively (Royal Society of London, 2009). After an intense rainfall of 100 mm in 24 h, Chaves (1997) found that direct drilling reduced the peak flow by 86% and the weight of sediment leaving the catchment by 98%, compared to conventional till (Table 2). Improved planters and better herbicides led to the widespread adoption of CA in many parts of the world over the past 40 years. Conservation

agriculture is now practiced on some 125 million ha worldwide, or about 10% of the total crop land. Highest adoption levels (more than 50% of crop land) are found in Australia, Canada and the southern cone of South America. Its adoption is increasing in Africa, Central Asia and China (Pisante *et al.*, 2010; Friedrich *et al.*, 2012).

Such sustainable production systems are knowledge-intensive and relatively complex to learn and implement. They are dynamic systems, offering farmers many possible combinations of practices to choose from and adapt according to their local production conditions and constraints (Pretty, 2008; Kassam *et al.*, 2009, 2010; Godfray *et al.*, 2010; Pretty *et al.*, 2011). Modernization and transformation based on CA principles and practices (as well as on existing, though in transition, practices) require affordable sources of adapted good-quality seeds, affordable mineral fertilizer, as well as farm power, equipment and machinery, and pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, *etc.*).

Field operations required by each system are summarized in Table 3, together with the outcome of calculations on fuel energy requirement. Fuel energy requirement includes an appropriate allowance for the overhead energy used in equipment manufacture and maintenance.

Policy planning and investment are required to establish/strengthen the seed, fertilizer, pesticide, and farm equipment machinery sectors. In particular, national action plans for input supplies and services consistent with national crop sector strategies would be essential to ensure the delivery of sector development strategy, projects and campaigns (FAO, 2010). Limitations associated with CA are elaborated in (Shaxson *et al.*, 2008) and can include increased crop diseases and insect pests (Cook, 2006), development of herbicide-tolerant weeds, reliance on agrichemicals, excess moisture, cooler soils, initial increase in nutrient requirements, and requirement for specialized nutrient management to avoid immobilization and volatilization (Malhi *et al.*, 2001). Where livestock is part of the farming system, switching to CA from tillage agriculture requires a different way of

Table 2. Parameters of the MUSLE model, values of run-off and sediment load from conventional tillage and no-tillage.

Parameter	Description	CT	NT
CN	Runoff-generation factor	70	45
R (mm/24h)	Rainfall amount	100	100
K	Soil erodibility	0.0013	0.013
L	Slope-length factor	4	4
S	Slope-steepness factor	0.5	0.5
C	Factor for use/management of soil	0.3	0.05
P	Factor for mechanical practices	0.5	0.5
Q (m ³)	Runoff volume	326,000	45,000
Q (m ³ /s)	Peak flow	36.3	5
Y (t)	Sediment load	3198	58

CT, conventional tillage; NT, no-tillage. Adapted from Chaves (1997).

Table 3. Machinery operations and energy requirements for three tillage systems.

Operations Representative systems	Residue management	Tillage frequency, operations/crop			Herbicide spraying	Planting	Σ fuel energy MJ/ha
		Primary	Secondary	Seedbed			
TA conventional tillage, no herbicide		1	2	2	0	1	1941
CA reduced/zero, <1 tillage/crop	1	0.6	0	0	4	1	1116
CA permanent bed, minimum tillage		0.25	0	0	3	1	397

TA, tillage agriculture; CA, conservation agriculture. Source: Tullberg (2005).

managing the available functional biomass. This different management implies that the needs of both soil health and livestock feed requirement should be met, and that over time more residues should be allocated to cover the soil. This can be a challenge in certain dryland situations (Kassam *et al.*, 2012), but not in others (Landers, 2007; Owenya *et al.*, 2011).

Development of precision agriculture

Conventional crop management presumes uniformity. In order to manage spatial variability, it is necessary to adopt management practices that allow for the precise management of soils, crops, pests according to localized differences within a field. Innovative agricultural techniques, known as Precision Agriculture, Site-Specific Management, Precision Farming, refer to innovative agricultural techniques aiming at improving production and reducing environmental pollution through a more accurate management related to field variability (Basso *et al.*, 2005).

The site-specificity of precision agriculture is intuitively appealing and represents a means of improving the economic and environmental performance of the cropping system. Precision agriculture encompasses a broad array of topics ranging from variability of the soil resource base, weather, plant genetics, crop diversity, machinery performance, most physical, chemical, biological inputs used in crop production, and socio-economic aspects. A successful precision agriculture system depends on how well it can be applied to manage spatial and temporal variability in crop production and on what benefits it could bring. Before this system can be adopted effectively, it is fundamental to have a clear understanding of the in-field variability, which is not an easy task. For example, rather than nitrogen (N) applications based on yield goals and an estimation of N supply using soil tests and a uniform rate within a field unit, precision management applies variable rates across the field, according to the projected difference between N supply from the soil and N demand by the crop. The rate calculations were initially based on intensive soil sampling and analysis, using grids, soil types, landscape position, or some other method to divide the field into application units (Schlegel *et al.*, 2005). The development of continuous yield-sensor and differential GPS (DGPS) has been perhaps the most important and influential development in precision agriculture data collection. Yield rates vary spatially and maps produced by the yield monitors systems demonstrate the degree of within-field variability (Batchelor *et al.*, 2002; Basso *et al.*, 2007, 2011). The magnitude of this variability is a good indicator of how suitable it is to implement a spatially variable management plan. Technological improvements will follow an evolutionary process and new developments will continue to be adapted for making agricultural decisions. It is anticipated that investments in the development and diffusion of precision agriculture by the private sector will continue at a fast pace.

Organic farming

When practised in combination with CA, organic farming can lead to improved soil health and productivity, increased efficiency in the use of organic matter and energy savings. However, tillage-based organic production restricts the management options available to producers, often resulting in lower crop productivity due to excessive mechanical soil disturbance, nutrient deficiencies and weed, insect or disease problems where the cropping system is not adequately diversified and soil mulch cover is inadequate. Organic CA farming serves mainly niche markets and it is practised in parts of Brazil, Germany and the USA, and by some small-holder farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa (Badgley *et al.*, 2007).

Improvements in plant protection

Insect pest and disease control

Improvements in agro-ecosystem management can help avoid indigenous insect pest outbreaks, respond better to pest invasions and reduce risks posed from pesticides to both human health and the environment.

Integrated pest management (IPM) is an example of an ecosystem-based production practice involving the scientific application of ecosystem principles for the management of pest populations and aiming at avoiding their build up to damaging levels. IPM is based on understanding the way local agro-ecosystem works, the relationship between insect pests and their natural enemies, and the mechanisms regulating the balance between pest and predators (FAO, 2011).

Weed control

Before World War II, weed control relied primarily on non-chemical control mechanisms such as mechanical tillage, crop rotation, mowing, use of clean seed, field sanitation, delayed seeding, and the growth of highly competitive crops. Some selective broad-leaf herbicides were developed from the 1930s to the beginning of World War II, but the development and the widespread adoption of 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) in the mid- to late-1940s represented the beginning of the modern era of chemical weed control. Use of herbicides became a significant factor in crop production in the 1950s, with intense activity in herbicide development during the 1960s and 1970s. In Canada, herbicides account for approximately 80% of total pesticide sales (Holm and Johnson, 2009). Development of effective herbicides was one of the driving factors which guaranteed the development of reduced tillage and no-till production systems and contributed to the dramatic increase in agricultural productivity over the past 40 years. The requirements of herbicide manufacturing energy set out in Table 4 for herbicides commonly used in fallow situations are based on data from Zentner and colleagues' (2004) and Green's (1987) studies.

Table 4. Energy requirements of herbicide manufacture.

Commercial product	Herbicide/s	Manufacturing energy MJ/kg	Application rate kg/ha (label)	Manufacturing energy MJ/ha
2,4-D Amine	2,4-D	98	0.500	49
Atrazine	Atrazine	190	0.500	95
Spray Seed 250	Diquat	400	0.115	108.1
	Paraquat	460	0.135	
Round-up CT	Glyphosate	511	0.450	229.95

2,4-D, 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid; CT, conventional tillage. Adapted from Zentner *et al.* (2004) and Green (1987).

In the past 15 years there has been the rapid emergence of the use of GMO crops engineered to be resistant to specific herbicide modes of action. Although this use has provided huge benefits to producers in terms of the ease and effectiveness of weed control in specific crops, it has also caused consumer concerns as well as repeated applications of specific herbicide modes of action, particularly glyphosate in reduced tillage systems. Over-reliance on specific herbicide modes of action and failure to follow effective herbicide rotations has resulted in the development of herbicide-resistant weed populations. This, coupled with a lower rate of discovery of new herbicide modes of action since the 1970s and the increasing public perception that herbicides and/or GMOs may carry environmental or health risks, has increased the desire for reduced reliance on herbicides and increased adoption of integrated weed management.

Integrated weed management relies on understanding weed-crop interactions within the agro-ecosystem to improve crop competition through practices such as effective fertilization, manipulation of seeding timing, placement and density, diversified crop rotations and soil mulch cover, selection of vigorous crop cultivars, use of certified seed, and other traditional methods of field sanitation. Improved weed management and an improved understanding of weed ecology have played an important role in the adoption of no-till management (Derksen *et al.*, 1996, 2002). Further research and adaptation of diversified weed management practices will be important in the future to attain optimal crop production in a sustainable manner.

Improvements in fertilizer and nutrient management

Declining soil organic carbon status along with deficiency of macro- and micronutrients are major soil health problems, which limit productivity. Soils rich in biota and organic matter are the foundation of increased crop productivity. The best yields are achieved when nutrients come from a mix of mineral fertilizers and natural sources, such as manure and nitrogen-fixing crops and trees. Judicious use of mineral fertilizers saves money and ensures that nutrients reach the plant and do not pollute air, soil and waterways. Policies to promote soil health should encourage conservation agriculture and mixed crop-livestock and agro-forestry systems enhancing soil fertility. These policies

should remove incentives that encourage mechanical tillage and the wasteful use of fertilizers, and should inform producers about precision approaches, such as urea deep placement and site-specific nutrient management (FAO, 2011).

It is estimated that nearly 40% of the world's population is currently alive because of the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process for conversion of atmospheric N_2 to ammonia (Smil, 2002). In particular, the increases in crop production over the last 40 years have been driven by increasing inputs of fertilizers, especially N fertilizer (Tilman *et al.*, 2001, 2002). Though N fertilization is a crucial tool to produce crop and to avoid depletion of soil fertility, excess or poorly managed N can lead to environmental problems including soil and water acidification, eutrophication, formation of ground-level ozone and particulate matter, and loss of biodiversity. Direct nitrous oxide emissions for N applications as well as CO_2 emissions from the large amount of fossil fuel used in fertilizer production and transport can also contribute to climate change. The understanding and adoption of improved N management practices matching the rate, source, timing and placement of fertilizer application to the crop demand and the environmental conditions in the field, will reduce the risk of a negative environmental impact of fertilizers, and simultaneously it will improve the system productivity, the nutrient use efficiency and production economics (Snyder *et al.*, 2009). The use of soil testing to predict nutrient availability from the soil and select suitable nutrient application rates is an important starting point to reduce nutrient losses. However, soil analysis is not always as accurate as desirable in predicting the nutrient supply (Dinnes *et al.*, 2002). Further improvements in soil testing to predict N supply more effectively are needed. In particular, the potential mineralization in the growing season is needed to fine-tune N recommendation. The development of improved seeding and fertilizing systems that will place N in sub-surface bands to reduce losses by volatilization, immobilization, denitrification and leaching has played an important role in improving N use efficiency, particularly under reduced tillage systems (Grant *et al.*, 2001; Malhi *et al.*, 2001; Grant *et al.*, 2002a, 2002b). Adoption of CA management can be used to reduce nutrients loss by erosion. Montoya (1984) economically quantified the cost of nutrients lost by erosion, for crops of maize and wheat under CA

Table 5. Costs of nutrients lost by erosion from conventional tillage and direct drilling, for soybean, maize and wheat.

Systems/crops	Urea	Super phosphate (20% P_2O_5)	Cost US\$/ha Potassium chloride (60% K_2O)	Calcium dolomite	Total
Conventional soybean	5.98	0.03	3.11	0.23	9.35
Conventional maize	6.02	0.01	0.74	0.05	2.23
Conventional wheat	3.76	0.02	1.95	0.14	5.87
CA soybean	1.69	0.01	0.87	0.06	2.63
CA maize	0.34	0.00	0.17	0.01	0.53
CA wheat	2.62	0.01	1.38	0.10	4.11

CA, conservation agriculture. Adapted from Montoya (1984).

Table 6. Economy of irrigation water through soil covers.

Percentage of soil cover	Water requirement (m^3/ha^{-1})	Reduction in water requirement (%)	Number of times irrigated during season	Number of days between irrigations
0	2660	0	14	6
50	2470	7	13	6
75	2090	21	11	8
100	1900	29	10	9

Adapted from Pereira (2001).

and conventional tillage (Table 5). The losses under CA systems for soybean, maize and wheat were 28%, 24% and 72%, respectively, compared with the conventional system.

The recent development of a range of enhanced-efficiency fertilizers, such as nitrification inhibitors, urease inhibitors and polymer coated fertilizers, has provided producers with more options to improve nutrient use efficiency. These products work by controlling the release of the fertilizer into the soil solution to match the supply of N to crop demand or by slowing the chemical conversions of N to minimize N losses (Schlegel *et al.*, 1987; Hendrickson, 1992; Grant *et al.*, 1996; Rawluk *et al.*, 2001; Karamanos *et al.*, 2004; Frye, 2005; Watson, 2005; Grant and Wu, 2008; Grant *et al.*, 2010). Similarly, improved GPS tractor guidance systems, use of remote sensing or ground-based sensors that can assess the N status of the growing crop can be used to apply in-crop N applications, where required, more effectively (Schlegel *et al.*, 2005).

A key practice to avoid nutrient losses and improve nutrient use efficiency from the soil-plant system is to ensure that other crop-growth restricting factors are corrected to ensure optimal productivity, so the crop efficiently utilizes the nutrients that have been applied (Cassman *et al.*, 2003). Water supply, pH, nutrient, soil condition, diseases, insects, and weeds should all be managed effectively to ensure rapid crop emergence and avoid growth restrictions.

Improved irrigation technology

Use of management practices that collect and save water is the driving factor to avoid water losses and improve water use efficiency from the soil-plant system. The use of improved, drought-tolerant crop varieties and of conservation agriculture – which holds water better – will increase the water use efficiency in rain fed conditions. Maintaining high residue and adding organic matter while minimizing or eliminating tillage promotes maximum water conservation. In the Brazilian Cerrados less water was needed to irrigate the same crop when crop residue was left on the surface (Pereira, 2001; Table 6). The total area equipped for irrigation is now in excess of 300 million ha (AQUASTAT, 2011). Irrigation is a platform commonly used to identify where to concentrate inputs. However, making this *sustainable intensification* depends upon the location of water withdrawal and the adoption of ecosystem-based approaches, such as conservation agriculture, together with the other key inputs, healthy soils, improved genetic material, nutrient management and IPM, that are the basis of sustainable crop production. Surface irrigation by border strip, basin or furrow is often less efficient and less uniform than overhead irrigation (*e.g.* sprinkler, drip, drip tape). Micro-irrigation has been seen as a technological solution for the poor performance of field irrigation and as a means of saving water (FAO, 2011). There is also emerging research and development on precision irrigation. Automated systems have been tested using both solid set sprinklers and micro-irrigation. They used soil moisture sensing, and/or crop canopy temperature to define the irrigation depths to be applied in different parts of the field. Precision irrigation and precision fertilizer application through irrigation water are both future possibilities for field crops and horticulture, but salt management would be a critical factor in the sustainability of such production systems. The economics of irrigated agriculture still plays a major role in the use of sprinkler and micro-irrigation technologies, as well as in the automation of surface irrigation layouts. Rain guns provide one of the cheapest capital options for large area overhead irrigation coverage, but tend to incur high operating costs. Other overhead irrigation systems have high capital costs and are marginal in smallholder commercial cropping systems, without the support of production subsidies.

The service delivery of many public irrigation systems is poor owing to deficiencies in design, maintenance and management. There is much to do to modernize systems and their management: both institutional reforms and separation of irrigation service provision from broader supervision and regulation of water resources are required.

Drainage is an essential counterpart of irrigation, especially where water tables are high and soil salinity is a constraint. Investment will be required in drainage to enhance the productivity and sustainability of irrigation systems and to ensure good management of farm inputs. However, enhanced drainage increases the risks of pollutants being exported, causing degradation in waterways and connected aquatic eco-systems. Water management is a key factor in minimizing N losses and export from farms. In freely drained soils, nitrification is partially interrupted, resulting in the emission of N₂O, whereas in saturated (anoxic) conditions, ammonium compounds and urea are partially converted to ammonia, typically in rice cultivation. Atmospheric losses from urea, therefore, can occur as both ammonia and N₂O release over wetting and drying cycles in irrigation. Nitrogen is required in nitrate form for uptake at the root, but nitrate can easily move elsewhere in solution. The dynamics of phosphate mobilization and movement in drains and waterways are complex. Phosphate export from agriculture can occur in irrigated systems if erosive flow rates are used in furrow irrigation, or if sodic soils disperse. Phosphate, and to a lesser extent nitrate, can be trapped by buffer strips located at the ends of fields and along rivers, which prevent them from reaching waterways. Hence, a combination of good irrigation management, recycling of tailwater, and




Figure 6. Developments in the intensity of public research expenditure on agriculture in selected OECD countries (1992, 2000, and 2006). Public research expenditures are expressed as percentages of agricultural GDP. Source: OECD (2011).




Figure 7. Intensity of public research expenditure on agriculture (2006) expressed as a percentage of agricultural GDP (*Agriculture includes crop, livestock, hunting, forestry and fishing*). Source: OECD research database and IFPRI/ASTI database.

soil incorporation of phosphate can reduce phosphate export from irrigated lands close to zero.

The sustainability of intensified irrigated agriculture depends on minimizing off-farm externalities, such as salinization and export of pollutants, and maintenance of soil health and growing conditions. This should be the primary focus of farm level practice, technology and decision-making. Sustainable agriculture across a range of rain fed, improved rain fed and irrigated lands involves trade-offs in land use, water sharing in the broadest sense and the maintenance of supporting ecosystem services. These trade-offs are becoming more complex and have significant social, economic and political importance (FAO, 2011).

Towards an innovation systems approach

Future solutions will require a revolution in the social and natural sciences concerned with food production, as well as a breaking down of barriers between fields. The goal is no longer simply to maximize productivity, but to optimize across a far more complex landscape of production, environmental, and social justice outcomes.

Agriculture could be a major beneficiary of research undertaken in other areas of science or industries. The estimated benefits of agricultural research generally far exceed its costs, with the literature reporting annual internal rates of return that range between 20% and 80% (Alston, 2010). Figure 6 presents the evolution of public agricultural research expenditure as a percentage share of agricultural GDP in 1992, 2000 and 2006. In these countries (with the exception of Australia), the intensity of public research for agriculture has increased over time. To generate innovative solutions that are relevant, acceptable and attractive for local populations, research on sustainable crop production intensification practices must start at the local and national levels, with support from the global level. A wide diversity exists in the intensity of public research expenditure among OECD countries (Figure 7). Public agricultural research expenditure in the USA, Ireland, Iceland and Japan accounted for more than 3% of the agricultural GDP in 2006, whereas it accounted for less than 1% in Austria, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Turkey. Although formal research is central to innovation, it is increasingly recognized that it is not the only source of discovering new technologies for farmers and others. Many new technologies are created without basic science underpinning. More recently, the interactive relationships among basic science, applied science and technology development have been emphasized (OECD, 2009). The first and earlier view is that scientific research is the main driver of innovation, creating new knowledge and technology that can be transferred and adapted to different situations. This view is usually described as the *linear or transfer of technology* model. The second view (Figure 8), though not denying the importance of research and technology transfer, recognizes innovation as an interactive process. Innovation involves the interaction of individuals and organizations possessing different types of knowledge within a particular social, political, economic, and institutional context.

In the contemporary agricultural sector, competitiveness depends on collaboration for innovation. *Innovation systems* are increasingly viewed as networks of knowledge flows with important two-way flows of information (upstream and downstream) and spillovers of knowledge among the participants who are connected in formal and informal ways. This more systemic approach suggests that innovation policy goes far beyond research expenditures and involves a wide range of institutions that can affect incentives, knowledge sharing and the processes used for commercialization.

The process of innovation and productivity growth includes not only knowledge creation, but also the whole system of technological diffu-




Figure 8. Innovation systems in agriculture model: the role of market forces. Source: Arnold and Bell (2001).

A dynamic processes of interacting embedded in specific institutional and policy




Figure 9. Elements of an agricultural innovation system. Source: adapted from Arnold and Bell (2001:279).

sion, adoption processes, interactions and market adjustments. The market itself is not sufficient to promote interaction and the public sector has a central role to play. The evidence of linkages between research, productivity growth and competitiveness also stresses the need to adopt an approach more *innovation systems*-like in agriculture. A conceptual framework containing elements of an agricultural innovation system, as shown in Figure 9, could be developed as well as multiple indicators that would help assess the performance of each aspect of the innovation systems in agriculture across countries.

Knowledge, information, and technology are increasingly generated, diffused, and applied through the private sector. Exponential growth in information and communications technology (ICT), especially the Internet, has transformed the ability to take advantage of knowledge developed in other places or for other purposes. Following this trend, the knowledge structure of the agricultural sector in many countries is changing markedly (OECD, 2011). In light of the above, seven changes in agricultural development heighten the need to examine how innovation occurs in the agricultural sector:

Research is an important component – but not always the central component – of innovation.

Markets, not production, increasingly drive agricultural development.

The production, trade, and consumption environment for agriculture and agricultural products is growing more dynamic and evolving in unpredictable ways.

Knowledge, information, and technology are increasingly generated, diffused, and applied through the private sector.

has transformed the ability to take advantage of knowledge developed in other places or for other purposes.

The knowledge structure of the agricultural sector in many countries is changing markedly.

Agricultural development increasingly takes place in a globalized setting.

Concluding remarks

There is a huge, but underutilized potential to link farmers' local knowledge with science-based innovations, through favourable multi-stakeholder institutional arrangements that can foster innovation systems. The same holds true for the design, implementation and monitoring of improved natural resource management that links community initiatives to external expertise. Agricultural development increasingly takes place in a globalised setting. Hence, future work should take a closer look at institutional arrangements in agricultural innovation and knowledge systems, and it should examine the respective roles of governments and the private sector in strengthening innovation systems and facilitating technological adoption. In this respect, some measures to take are: presence of research collaboration across sectors, protection of intellectual property rights, and knowledge flow. A comprehensive effort should be undertaken to measure the different stages of the innovation system, for example by testing its technological adoption and diffusion at the farm level, and to investigate the impact of agricultural policies on technological change and technical efficiency. The nature of production systems has been transforming from high-disturbance production systems with a high environmental impact to low-disturbance agro-ecological systems where production technologies and practices are more in harmony with the ecosystem process and where both productivity and environmental services can be harnessed. Multi-stakeholder innovation systems have an important role to play in generating relevant technologies that can be adopted and adapted by farmers who must be an integral part of any effective innovation system.

References

- Alston J, 2010. The benefits from agricultural research and development, innovation, and productivity growth. OECD Food, agriculture and fisheries working papers, No.31. OECD Publ., Paris, France.
- AQUASTAT, 2011. AQUASTAT statistical database. Available from: <http://www.unwater.org/statistics.html>
- Arnold E, Bell M, 2001. Some new ideas about research for development. In: Partnership at the leading edge: a Danish vision for knowledge, research and development. Report of the commission of development-related research by Danida. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark, pp 279-319.
- Badgley C, Moghtader J, Quintero E, Zakem E, Chappell M, Aviles-Vazquez K, Samulon A, Perfecto I, 2007. Organic agriculture and the global food supply. *Renew. Agr. Food Syst.* 22:86-108.
- Balmford A, Green RE, Scharlemann JPW, 2005. *Global Change Biol.* 11:1594-601.
- Basso B, Bertocco M, Sartori L, Martin EC, 2007. Analyzing the effects of climate variability on spatial pattern of yield in a maize-wheat-soybean rotation. *Eur. J. Agron.* 26:82-91.
- Basso B, Ritchie JT, Cammarano D, Sartori L, 2011. A strategic and tactical management approach to select optimal N fertilizer rates for wheat in a spatially variable field. *Eur. J. Agron.* 35:215-22.
- Basso B, Sartori L, Bertocco M, 2005. *Agricoltura di precisione: concetti teorici ed applicazioni pratiche.* L'informatore Agrario, Verona, Italy.
- Batchelor WD, Basso B, Paz JO, 2002. Examples of strategies to analyze spatial and temporal yield variability using crop models. *Eur. J. Agron.* 18:141-58.
- Bruinsma J, 2009. The resource outlook to 2050: by how much do land, water and crop yields need to increase by 2050? Proc. FAO Expert. Meet. on How to Feed the World in 2050, Roma, Italy, 28:315-58.
- Cassman KG, Dobermann A, Walters DT, Yang H, 2003. Meeting cereal demand while protecting natural resources and improving environmental quality. *Annu. Rev. Env. Resour.* 28:315-58.
- Chaves HML, 1997. Efeitos do plantio direto sobre o meio ambiente. In: H.M. Saturnino, J.N. Landers (eds.) *O meio ambiente e o plantio direto goiano.* EMBRAPA-SPI, Goiânia, Brazil, pp 57-66.
- Cook RJ, 2006. Toward cropping systems that enhance productivity and sustainability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 103:18389-94.
- Derksen DA, Anderson RL, Blackshaw RE, Maxwell B, 2002. Weed dynamics and management strategies for cropping systems in the northern Great Plains. *Agron. J.* 94:174-85.
- Derksen DA, Blackshaw RE, Boyetchko SM, 1996. Sustainability, conservation tillage and weeds in Canada - Durabilité de l'agriculture, travail de conservation du sol et degré d'infestation par les mauvaises herbes. *Can. J. Plant. Sci.* 76:651-9.
- Derpsch R, Friedrich T, 2010. Sustainable crop production intensification – the adoption of conservation agriculture worldwide. pp 265-293 in Proc. 16th ISCO Conf., Santiago, Chile.
- Dinnes DL, Karlen DL, Jaynes DB, Kaspar TC, Hatfield JL, Colvin TS, Cambardella CA, 2002. Nitrogen management strategies to reduce nitrate leaching in tile-drained midwestern soils. *Agron. J.* 94:153-71.
- Evenson RE, Gollin D, 2003. Assessing the impact of the green revolution (1960 to 2000). *Science* 300:758-62.
- FAO, 2010. Statistical Development Series No.12, 2000 World Census of Agriculture, Main results and Metadata by Country (1996-2005). Available from: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1595e/i1595e.pdf>
- FAO, 2011. *Save and grow: a policymaker's guide to the sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Roma, Italy. pp 1-98.

- FAO, 2012. What is Conservation Agriculture? Accessed on 21st July 2012. Available from: <http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/1a.html>
- Fargione F, Hill J, Tilman D, Polasky S, Hawthorne P, 2008. Land clearing and the biofuel carbon debt. *Science* 319:1235-8.
- Friedrich T, Derpsch R, Kassam AH, 2012. Global overview of the spread of Conservation Agriculture. *FACTS Reports* 6:1-8.
- Friedrich T, Kassam AH, Shaxson TF, 2009. Agriculture for developing countries. Annex 2, Case study: conservation agriculture. Science and Technology Options Assessment (STOA) Project. European Parliament Ed., Karlsruhe, Germany. Available from: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/deve/studiesdownload.html?languageDocument=EN&file=30328>
- Frye W, 2005. Nitrification inhibition for nitrogen efficiency and environmental protection. pp 1-8 in Proc. IFA Int. workshop on enhanced-efficiency fertilizers, Frankfurt, Germany. Available from: <http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/HomePage/LIBRARY/Conference-papers/Agriculture-Conferences/2005-IFA-Agriculture-Workshop>.
- Godfray H CJ, Beddington JR, Crute IR, Haddad L, Lawrence D, Muir JF, Pretty J, Robinson S, Thomas SM, Toulmin C, 2010. Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science* 327:812-7.
- Government Office for Science, 2011. Foresight. The future of food and farming (2011). The Government Office for Science Ed., London, UK.
- Grant CA, Brown KR, Racz GJ, Bailey LD, 2001. Influence of source, timing and placement of nitrogen on grain yield and nitrogen removal of durum wheat under reduced- and conventional-tillage management. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 81:17-27.
- Grant CA, Brown KR, Racz GJ, Bailey LD, 2002a. Influence of source, timing and placement of nitrogen fertilization on seed yield and nitrogen accumulation in the seed of canola under reduced- and conventional-tillage management. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 82:629-38.
- Grant CA, Derksen DA, McLaren D, Irvine RB, 2010. Nitrogen fertilizer and urease inhibitor effects on canola emergence and yield in a one-pass seeding and fertilizing system. *Agron. J.* 102:875-84.
- Grant CA, Jia S, Brown KR, Bailey LD, 1996. Volatile losses of NH₃ from surface-applied urea and urea ammonium nitrate with and without the urease inhibitors NBPT or ammonium thiosulphate. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 76:417-9.
- Grant CA, Peterson GA, Campbell CA, 2002b. Nutrient considerations for diversified cropping systems in the Northern Great Plains. *Agron. J.* 94:186-98.
- Grant CA, Wu R, 2008. Enhanced-efficiency fertilizers for use on the Canadian prairies. *Crop Manag. Plant Management Network*. Available from: <http://www.plantmanagementnetwork.org/pub/cm/symposium/advanced/efficiency/>
- Green MB, 1987. Energy in pesticide manufacture, distribution and use. In: Z.R. Hinsel (ed.) *Energy in plant nutrition and pest control*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp 165-77.
- Hendrickson LL, 1992. Corn yield response to the urease inhibitor NBPT: fiveyear summary. *J. Prod. Agric.* 5:131-7.
- Holm FA, Johnson EN, 2009. The history of herbicide use for weed management on the prairies. *Prairie Soils Crops J.* 2:1-10.
- Huggins DR, Reganold JP, 2008. No-till: the quiet revolution. *Sci. Am.* 299:70-7.
- IPCC, 2007. Contribution of working group II to the fourth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Karamanos RE, Harapiak JT, Flore NA, Stonehouse TB, 2004. Use of N-(n-butyl) thiophosphoric triamide (NBPT) to increase safety of seed-placed urea. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 84:105-16.
- Kassam AH, Friedrich T, Shaxson F, Pretty J, 2009. The spread of conservation agriculture: justification, sustainability and uptake. *Int. J. Agr. Sustain.* 7:292-320.
- Kassam AH, Friedrich T, Derpsch R, 2010. Conservation Agriculture in the 21st Century: a paradigm of sustainable agriculture. pp 19-68 in Proc. Europ. Congr. on CA, towards agro-environmental climate and energetic sustainability, Madrid, Spain.
- Kassam AH, Friedrich T, Rolf Derpsch R, Lahmar R, Mrabet R, Basch B, Emilio J, González-Sánchez EJ, Serraj R, 2012. Conservation agriculture in the dry Mediterranean climate. *Field Crop Res.* 132:7-17.
- Landers J, 2007. Tropical crop-livestock systems in conservation agriculture: the Brazilian experience. *Integrated Crop Management*, Vol. 5., FAO, Roma, Italy.
- Latruffe L, 2010. Competitiveness, productivity and efficiency in the agricultural and agri-food sectors. OECD Food, agriculture and fisheries working papers, No.30. OECD Publ., Paris, France.
- Malhi SS, Grant CA, Johnston AM, Gill KS, 2001. Nitrogen fertilization management for no-till cereal production in the Canadian Great Plains: a review. *Soil Till. Res.* 60:101-122.
- Montoya L, 1984. Aspectos de economicidade do manejo do solo em plantio direto. IAPAR informe da Pesquisa, 57. Londrina, Brazil. 19 pp.
- Montgomery D, 2007. *Dirt, the erosion of civilizations*. University California Press, Berkeley, CA, USA.
- OECD, 2009. The organisation for economic co-operation and development (OECD) annual report, OECD Publ., Paris, France.
- OECD, 2011. Fostering productivity and competitiveness in agriculture, OECD Publ., Paris, France.
- OECD, Eurostat, 2005. Oslo manual: guidelines for collecting and interpreting innovation data. OECD Publ., Paris, France.
- Owenya MZ, Mariki WL, Stewart A, Friedrich T, Kienzle J, Kassam AH, Shetto R, Mkomwa S, 2012. Conservation agriculture and sustainable crop intensification in Karatu district, Tanzania. *Integrated Crop Management Vol. 15*. FAO Publ., Roma, Italy.
- Pereira MH, 2001. O sistema de plantio direto na palha: 25 anos da sua adocao no Brasil. In: F. Rasolo and M. Raunet (eds.) *Gestion agro-biologique des sols set des systemes de culture*. CIRAD Publ., Montpellier, France, pp 389-96.
- Pisante M, Corsi S, Amir K, Friedrich T, 2010. The challenge of agricultural sustainability for Asia and Europe. *TSR* 17:662-7.
- Porter ME, Ketels C, Delgado M, 2007. The microeconomic foundations of prosperity: findings from the business. The global competitiveness report 2007-2008. World Economic Forum.
- Pretty J, 2008. Agricultural sustainability: concepts, principles and evidence. *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B* 363:447-65.
- Pretty J, Toulmin C, Williams S, 2011. Sustainable intensification in African agriculture. *Int. J. Agr. Sustain.* 9:5-24.
- Rawluk CDL, Grant CA, Racz GJ, 2001. Ammonia volatilization from soils fertilized with urea and varying rates of urease inhibitor NBPT. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 81:239-46.
- Royal Society of London, 2009. Reaping the benefits: science and the sustainable intensification of global agriculture. Royal Society Publ., London, UK.
- Schlegel AJ, Grant CA, Havlin JL, 2005. Challenging approaches to nitrogen fertilizer recommendations in continuous cropping systems in the Great Plains. *Agron. J.* 97:391-8.
- Schlegel AJ, Nelson DW, Sommers LE, 1987. Use of urease inhibitors and urea fertilizers on winter wheat. *Fert. Res.* 11:97-111.
- Shaxson F, Kassam A, Friedrich T, Boddey B, Adekunle A, 2008. Underpinning conservation agriculture's benefits: the roots of soil health and function. pp 1-32 in Proc. FAO Workshop on Investing in Sustainable Crop Intensification: the Case for Improving Soil Health. Rome, Italy.
- Smil V, 2002. Nitrogen and food production: proteins for human diets. *Ambio* 31:126-31.
- Snyder CS, Bruulsema TW, Jensen TL, Fixen PE, 2009. Review of greenhouse gas emissions from crop production systems and fertilizer

- management effects. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 133:247-66.
- Stagnari F, Ramazzotti S, Pisante M, 2009. Conservation agriculture: a different approach for crop production through sustainable soil and water management: a review. In: E. Lichtfouse (ed.) *Organic farming, pest control and remediation of soil pollutants. Sustainable agriculture reviews 1*. Springer Science+Business Media B.V., Houten, The Netherlands, pp 55-83.
- Tilman D, Cassman KG, Matson PA, Naylor R, Polasky S, 2002. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. *Nature* 418:671-7.
- Tilman D, Fargione J, Wolff B, D'Antonio C, Dobson A, Howarth R, Schindler D, Schlesinger WH, Simberloff D, Swackhamer D, 2001. Forecasting agriculturally driven global environmental change. *Science* 292:281-4.
- Tullberg JN, 2005. The potential of conservation agriculture for the clean development mechanism. University of Queensland and CTF Solutions.
- Watson C, 2005. Urease inhibitors. pp 1-8 in *Proc. IFA Int. Workshop on Enhanced-Efficiency Fertilizers*, Frankfurt, Germany.
- WRAP, 2008. *The food we waste*. WRAP Ed., Banbury, UK.
- Zentner RP, Lafond GP, Derkesen DA, Nagy CN, Wall DD, May WE, 2004. Effects of tillage method and crop rotation on non-renewable energy use efficiency in the Canadian prairies. *Soil Till. Res.* 77:125-36.

Non-commercial use only