

EGF 2018



17TH - 21ST JUNE 2018 | CORK, IRELAND

Sustainable meat and milk production from grasslands

Edited by

B. Horan
D. Hennessy
M. O'Donovan
E. Kennedy
B. McCarthy
J.A. Finn
B. O'Brien



Volume 23
Grassland Science in Europe

Grazing for carbon

Van den Pol-van Dasselaar A.^{1,2}, Chabbi A.³, Cordovil C.M.D.S.^{4,5}, De Vliegheer A.⁶, Die Dean M.⁷, Hennessy D.⁸, Hutchings N.⁹, Klumpp K.¹⁰, Koncz P.^{11,12}, Kramberger B.¹³, Newell Price J.P.¹⁴, Poilane A.¹⁵, Richmond R.¹⁶, Rocha Correa P.F.¹⁷, Schaak H.¹⁸, Schönhart M.^{19,20}, Sebastià M.T.²¹, Svoboda P.^{22,23}, Teixeira R.F.M.²⁴, Van Eekeren N.²⁵ and Van Rijn C.H.²⁶

¹Aeres University of Applied Sciences, De Drieslag 4, 8251 JZ Dronten, the Netherlands; ²Wageningen University and Research, P.O. Box 9101, 6700 HB Wageningen, the Netherlands; ³INRA, Unité de Recherche Pluridisciplinaire Prairies et Plantes Fourragères, Centre de recherche de Poitou-Charentes Le Chêne, 86600 Lusignan, France; ⁴LEAF, Instituto Superior de Agronomia, Universidade de Lisboa, Tapada da Ajuda, 1349-017 Lisboa, Portugal; ⁵Reguenguinho Soc. Agrícola Lda, Quinta de Sancha-a-Cabeça, 7050-909 Montemor-o-Novo, Portugal; ⁶Flanders research institute for agriculture, fisheries and food, Burg. Van Gansberghelaan 92, 9820 Merelbeke, Belgium; ⁷Sociedade Agrícola Bove, Herdade das Defesinhas, 7350-901 Elvas, Portugal; ⁸Teagasc, Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Moorepark, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland; ⁹Department of Agroecology, Aarhus University, Blichers Allé 20, P.O. Box 50, Tjele 8830, Denmark; ¹⁰INRA, VetAgro-Sup, UMR Ecosystème Prairial, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France; ¹¹Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate, Költő u.21. 1121 Budapest, Hungary; ¹²MTA-SZIE Plant Ecology Research Group, Páter K u. 1. 2100 Gödöllő, Hungary; ¹³University of Maribor, Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Pivola 10, 2311 Hoče, Slovenia; ¹⁴ADAS Gleadthorpe, Meden Vale, Mansfield, Notts, UK, NG20 9PD; ¹⁵CAVEB, La Bressandière, Châtellon-sur-Thouet, 79205 Parthenay, France; ¹⁶Manor Farm, Chedworth, Gloucestershire, United Kingdom; ¹⁷University of Santiago de Compostela, Campus Terra, Lugo, Spain; ¹⁸Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, University of Goettingen, 37073 Goettingen, Germany; ¹⁹BOKU University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Feistmantelstr. 4, 1180 Vienna, Austria; ²⁰Edlerhof (www.edlerhof.at), Hinterlobming 6, 8713 St.Stefan, Austria; ²¹Group GAMES, Forest Sciences Centre of Catalonia & Univ. Lleida, Spain; ²²University of South Bohemia, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Agroecosystems, České Budějovice, Czech Republic; ²³Farm AGRO SVOBODA s.r.o, Dolní Dvořiště 232, Dolní Dvořiště; ²⁴MARETEC/LarSyS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal; ²⁵Louis Bolk Instituut, Kosterijland 3-5, 3981 AJ Bunnik, the Netherlands; ²⁶Boerderij Buitenverwachting, Vlietkade 2, 2355 CR, Hoogmade, the Netherlands

Abstract

The potential of grasslands as a carbon (C) sink in Europe is large despite the number of uncertainties related to the effect of grazing systems on C sequestration. The EIP-AGRI Focus Group (FG) ‘Grazing for Carbon’, a temporary group of 20 selected European experts from research and practice, shared knowledge and experience from different disciplines on the relationship between grazing and soil C. The FG explored grazing management strategies, drivers and barriers for different grazing systems, as well as tools and business models to support them successfully. The overall aim was to identify how to increase the soil C content in grazing systems. Six priorities were addressed: the effects and trade-offs associated with approaches to sequestering C in different grazing systems, the effect of grazing on C and soil nutrients, the role of plant mixtures and native species, general guidelines for optimal grazing, effective monitoring of soil C as a tool for soil quality evaluation and incentives to promote the adoption of grazing systems to optimise soil C content.

Keywords: carbon, focus group, grasslands, grazing, management, sequestration

Introduction

It is commonly understood that the potential of grasslands as a carbon (C) sink is large and promotes soil quality improvement by improving the organic matter content and thus soil physical properties. However, there are several, conflicting views with respect to the effects of grazing systems on C sequestration in Europe (e.g. Thornley and Cannell, 1997). It is currently unclear to what extent grazing systems can contribute to C sequestration and related greenhouse gas emission mitigation. The aim of this study was to explore the different existing grazing management systems with their respective drivers and barriers, and tools and business models to support them successfully. One way to establish and assess innovative grazing strategies that are promising for C sequestration is through multi-stakeholder approaches that unite experts from practice and from science.

The EIP-AGRI FG 'Grazing for Carbon' was established to assess how to increase the soil C content in grazing systems. Focus groups are temporary groups of 20 selected experts from research and practice throughout Europe. The experts' views and experiences were summarised into six thematic priorities: (1) the effects and trade-offs associated with approaches to sequestering C in different grazing systems; (2) the effect of grazing on C and soil nutrients; (3) the role of plant mixtures and native species; (4) general guidelines for optimal grazing, to be adapted and adopted in different parts of Europe; (5) effective monitoring of soil C as a tool for soil quality evaluation, and (6) incentives to promote the adoption of the best grazing systems. The topics were analysed through the drafting of 'mini-papers' encompassing a brief review of literature, ideas for operational groups (to be funded by rural development programs), research needs from practice and further developments.

To improve understanding of strategies towards better soil C management in grazed grasslands, a synthesis of empirical data of grazed grassland experiments conducted by the FG found sequestration to be $0.8 \pm 0.2 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ (rates ranging from losses to gains of more than $1 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ (e.g. Soussana *et al.*, 2010; Conant *et al.*, 2017)). Despite this, there is little information on region-specific appropriate grazing management practices that sequester C or, equally importantly, maintain the current C stocks in the soil. Good grazing management is usually good for the environment and for people (food quality, income), while poor grazing management increases risks of the degradation of natural resources and yields. Improved grazing management may increase soil C content, e.g. by adjusting animal stocking rates or periodically removing grazing livestock to prevent overexploitation. The effect may vary depending on the timing, frequency and intensity of grazing, as well as pedo-climatic factors.

Increased plant diversity (mixing plant species, legumes, functional types or traits) has been reported to enhance yield and soil organic C (e.g. Kirwan *et al.*, 2007; Fornara and Tilman, 2008). However, there is also uncertainty due to scarcity of biodiversity-function experiments including grazing and insufficient information about underlying mechanisms triggered by plant diversity and acting under different grazing managements.

To optimise grazing for C, guidelines are required. Currently, a range of grazing guidelines exist in Europe, from simple to complex, and they are better developed in some regions/grazing systems than in others. They focus on important issues like grazing infrastructure, herbage utilisation, regrowth intervals, stocking rate and measurement tools. However, grazing guidelines generally do not yet consider soil C sequestration.

Effective monitoring of soil C is required to document the provision of C sequestration services by farmers/land managers. There are two main viable ways to do this: (1) measure the soil organic C content or the soil organic matter directly over time and use these data to estimate the change in C stocks (gold

standard), and (2) register farm activities or indirect indicators of farm activities, calculate their potential for increasing C storage, and monitor only those activities. Usually the latter is a cheaper approach due to less intensive sampling, but it relies either on prior data or on modelling to identify relevant farming practices and quantify their effect. The two options are not mutually exclusive.

Incentives to promote the adoption of the best grazing systems must be targeted towards the appropriate stakeholders. Incentives can be policy driven (e.g. EU, national or regional policies, alleviating, simplifying actions), market driven (e.g. private production standards, voluntary C markets and funds, labelling) or farmer driven (e.g. influencing social norms and the mind-set of farmers by public campaigns; recognising the intrinsic value of C sequestration). Since improvements in grazing management and associated increases in C sequestration can be reversed, it is important that incentive schemes also take a long-term view. Finally, they may lead to more indirect valorisation by consumers, industries and distributor companies. Good examples of incentive schemes combine monetary and non-monetary compensation.

Conclusion

The strategy of the EIP-AGRI Focus Group, i.e. combining stakeholders from practice and science and from different disciplines in one group, has led to a clear overview of important issues with respect to C in grazing systems. Grazing systems are important for C storage. Optimal grazing management should be focused on additional C sequestration and on maintaining current C stocks.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on the work of the Focus Group 'Grazing for Carbon' (<https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/en/grazing-carbon>), which was organised by the European Innovation Partnership for Agricultural productivity and sustainability (EIP-AGRI) supported by the European Commission. The paper represents solely the views of the authors and the European Commission cannot be made responsible for its content.

References

- Conant R.T., Cerri C.E.P., Osborne B.B., and Paustian K. (2017) Grassland management impacts on soil carbon stocks: a new synthesis. *Ecological Applications* 27(2), 662-668.
- Fornara D.A. and Tilman D. (2008) Plant functional composition influences rates of soil carbon and nitrogen accumulation. *Journal of Ecology* 96, 314-322.
- Kirwan L., Lüscher A., Sebastià M.-T., Finn J.A., Collins R.P., Porqueddu C., Helgadottir A., Baadshaug O.H., Brophy C., Coran C., Dalmannsdóttir S., Delgado I., Elgersma A., Fothergill M., Frankow-Lindberg B.E., Golinski P., Grieu P., Gustavsson A.M., Höglind M., Huguenin-Elie O., Iliadis C., Jørgensen M., Kadziulienė Z., Karyotis T., Lunnan T., Malengier M., Maltoni S., Meyer V., Nyfeler D., Nykanen-Kurki P., Parente J., Smit H.J., Thumm U. and Connolly J. (2007) Evenness drives consistent diversity effects in intensive grassland systems across 28 European sites. *Journal of Ecology* 95, 530-539.
- Soussana J.F., Tallec T. and Blanfort V. (2010) Mitigating the greenhouse gas balance of ruminant production systems through carbon sequestration in grasslands. *Animal* 4, 334-350.
- Thornley J.H.M. and Cannell M.G.R. (1997) Temperate grassland responses to climate change: an analysis using the Hurley Pasture Model. *Annals of Botany* 80, 205-221.