



UNIVERSITY

Comparison of ecosystem services value of conventional and organic farms in Fariman city, Iran

*Naghmeh Mobarghaee Dinan, Mansoure Mahlouji rad, Hooman Liaghati, Reihaneh Rasoolzadeh

* Contact Information: N_mobarghaee@sbu.ac.ir

INTRODUCTION

Valuation of ecosystem services is one of the most effective ways to focus on these services and to help planners adopt appropriate approaches to sustain these services. Although organic farming concentrates on maintaining and protecting the ecological balances of agro-ecosystems, the share of organic agriculture is insignificant in Iran (less than 1%). Therefore, the present study aims to evaluate the value of agro-ecosystem services under two different conditions - conventional and organic management - in Fariman city locating in northeastern Iran.



METHODS

The value of agro-ecosystem services was evaluated under two different management systems namely conventional and organic for wheat and potato according to three different scenarios.

In these scenarios it was assumed that 10%, 25% and 50% of the conventional farm area (total cultivated area of wheat was 10.000 ha and of potato 800 ha) would be replaced by an organic production system.

Agro-ecosystem services were divided into two main groups; 1) market services (primary and secondary productions) 2) non-market services (pest control, soil production , carbon sequestration and

soil fertility). Note: Data is collected from executed experiments under real conditions during the growing seasons of 2011 and 2012.

RESIDETS

From the results, the conventional potato system had a higher market value than the organic system (3,000 \$/Y/ha Vs. 2,800 \$/Y/ha), but the value of non-market services in the conventional system (42 \$/V/ha) was less than for the organic one (113.66 \$/Y/ha).

Table 1. The amount and estimated price	es of	required factors for valuating ecosy	stem services in
---	-------	--------------------------------------	------------------

	conventio	onal and organic	potato farms		DOM: NOTING	
Paramotor	Amount Conventional Organic		Unit price (\$)	Value (\$ ha-1 year-1)		
Farameter				Conventional	Organic	
Yield (kg/ha)	5600	6000	0.1	3,000	2,800	
Herbicide (kg/ha)	1///	0	0.55	0.66	0	
Pesticide (lit/ha)	1.5	0	0.50	1,000	0	
Urea (kg/ha)	5	18	0.02	18	0	
Labor(Day)	400	0	1	15	20	
Manure (ton/ha)	20	20	0.22	4.15	4.17	
Earthworm(kg/ha)	3222	3666	0.06	20	23.7	
Straw yield (ton/ha)	6844	7333	2.24	3,45	3.22	
Straw Carbone (ton/ha)	0.41	0.44	0.03	0	0.66	
Water for pest control(m ³)	0	100	0.05	2.35	66.39	
N (kg/ha)	0	828.30	0.06	0.06	0.7	
P (kg/ha)	3.08	18.67	0.06	2.15	1.75	
K (kg/ha)	25.05	35.91	0.066	16.697	23.93	
Table 2 Caling and a long of a second and a second and for a second and the secon						
lable 2. Esti	nated value of eco	osystem services n	or potato farms in	one nectare (\$)	S. AND	
Factors	organ	ic	conventional			
Primary production		2,80	D	3,000		
Secondary production		0		0		
Pest control		0	S. 1231-11-3	14		
Soil production		23.5	23.56		20	
Carbon sequestration		3.10		3.36		
Nutrient supply and Soil fertility		87		4.64		
market		2,80	D	3,000		
Non-market		113.6	6	42		
total	A LOS DORAS AND	2 912	66	3 0/2		

Table 3. The amo	unt and estimated p	rices of requi	red factors for	valuating	ecosystem
	services in conventi	ional and org	anic wheat far	ns	

		Amount		Unit price	Value (\$ ha-1 year-1)	
	Yield (kg/ha)	Convention al	Organic	(\$)	Conventional	Organic
		5600	6000	0.035	196	210
	Herbicide (kg/ha)	1	0	0.13	0.13	0
	Pesticide(lit/ha)	1.5	0	0.14	0.21	0
	Urea (kg/ha)	5	18	1	5	18
	Labor (day)	400	0	0.02	10.66	0
	Manure (ton/ha)	20	20	0.20	4.173	4.17
	Earthworm (kg/ha)	3222	3666	0.006	21.48	24.44
	Straw yield (kg/ha)	6844	7333	0.005	29.088	31.16
	straw carbon (ton/ha)	0.41	0.44	2.24	0.919	0.98
V	water to pest control (m3)	0	100	0.003	0	0.33
Λ.	N (kg/ha)	0	828.30	0.05	0	44.17
	P(kg/ha)	3.08	18.67	0.06	0.20	1.24
	K(kg/ha)	25.05	35.91	0.06	1.66	2.39
1	Table 4. Estimated v	em services for wheat		farms in one hectare (\$)		
1	Factors		Orga	anic	Conventional	
Ge	Primary production		184			70
1.	Secondary production		21.66			9
Ch.	Pest control Soil production		0 13			13
					12	
	Carbon sequestration	on	1.0)1		0.8
	Nutrient supply and s fertility	Soil	40.	33		1.2
1	market	A COLUMN A	205	66	U.S. MAR	79
5	Non-market		54.	34		27
14	total	State of the local division of the	26	0	7110	106

for wheat , market and non-market values of organic farms were higher than for conventional farms. So, the total value of ecosystem services of organic and conventional systems were about 260 \$/ha/year and 106 \$/ha/year, respectively. Results illustrate that the value of non-market services rises along with the increasing area of organic farms. When 50% of farm area is cultivated under organic system, total non-market values of potato and wheat will reach to 22,960 \$/y and 186,613 \$/y , respectively.

Finally, according to the results and obtained benefits, developing and promoting organic agriculture in Iran is extremely recommended.



CONCLUSIONS

This study showed that organic management systems of potato and wheat farms provide more ecosystem services, especially non-market services, in comparison with conventional systems. However, in some cases, loss of yield and market value reduced the total value of organic agricultural services, but it should be noted that the movement towards organic and sustainable farming provides both -market services as well as market services such as environmental protection and healthy food production

REFERENCES

- Christie, M. and Rayment, M., 2012. An ecinimic assessment of the ecosystem service benefits derived from SSSI biodiversity conservation policy in England and Wales.
- Ecosystem Services. 1, 70-84.
 Wright, W. C., Eppink, F. V., & Greenhalgh, S. (2017). Are ecosystem service studies presenting the right information for decision making?. Ecosystem Services, 25, 128-139.
 Sandhu, H.S., Wratten, S.D., Cullen, R., 2010. Organic agriculture and ecosystem services. Envir. Sci. Polic. 13, 1-7.
- Ruhl, J. B. (2016). Adaptive management of ecosystem services across different land use regimes. Journal of environmental management, 183, 418-423.