



Contribution of Silvopastoral Systems toward a Sustainable Livestock Farming in the Amazonian Foothills

Martha Del Río¹, Michelle Bonatti^{1,2}, Tatiana Rodríguez¹, Marcos Lana³, Stefan Sieber^{1,2}

¹Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF), Müncheberg, Germany ²Humboldt-Universität zuBerlin, Agricultural Economics, Berlin, Germany ³Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Dept. of Plant Production Ecology, Sweden

Background and Objective

- Silvopastoral systems (SPS) are multifunctional arrangements integrating crop, livestock, and forest.
- SPS have been adopted in tropical areas to improve animal welfare and to generate new economic, environmental, and climatic benefits.
- In Colombia, agricultural land has been predominantly used for the livestock sector.
- The Amazonian foothill, specifically the department of Caquetá had 8 % of cattle herds and was the fifth department for dairy production.
- It is particularly important to implement SPS to protect the Amazonian forest and to avoid extensive cattle ranching in this zone.
- This study analyzed the promotion of SPS as strategies for sustainable land management in order to identify economic, social, and environmental benefits, drivers and hinders factors, and negative externalities of them



Figure 2: Map of Caqueta. © CC BY-SA 3.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php? curid=17366499

Silvopastoral system: model for animal production resilience



Figure 3: Model of silvopastoral systems for the resilience and the adaptive capacity to climate Change. © Solorio, S.F.J. *et al.* (2017)

Material and Methods

ha % of total area Fodder ha ha by erosion National 114,074,971 39,239,481 34.4% 22,946,697 192,175 409 Caqueta 9,010,823 1,484,010 16,5% 1,039,056 45,591 22,69		Total Area	Land for Agricultural Use			Deforestation Land Degradation	
Caqueta 9,010,823 1,484,010 16,5% 1,039,056 45,591 22,69			ha		Fodder ha		•
	National	114,074,971	39,239,481	34.4%	22,946,697	192,175	40%
(25.170)	Caqueta Department	9,010,823 (7.9%)	1,484,010	16.5%	1,039,056	45,591 (23.7%)	22.6%

	Households	Cattle Production orientation					
	depend on livestock	Heads of cattle	Dairy system	Mixed system (beef + milk)	Beef system		
National	633,84	1 29,301,39	2 12.1%	6 45.2%	б 42.7%		
Caqueta Department	20,737 (3%) 2,198,256 (8%	6) 4.6%	6 71.1%	<i>6</i> 24.4%		

- Contribution analysis (CA) is a theory-based approach used to evaluate programs in complex and dynamic settings.
- CA focus on examining supportive conditions or alternative explanations which affect program achievement and outcomes.
- CA aims to demonstrate how a program is expected to achieve results.

in the Colombian Amazonian foothills.



Figure 1. SPS Arrangement in Caqueta. © Cattle ranch in Caqueta. Project: Paisajes sostenibles para la amazonía.

clusions

The implementation of SPS strategy has had a boom in the region thanks to the fact that different projects have been aligned around this strategy. It is not the result of a single project.

Guiding questions for CA

- 1. Project adoption status.
- 2. Economic, social and environmental benefits of the implementation.
- 3. Positive and negative external factors that may affect the project's scope.
- 4. Negative externalities generated by the implementation.
- 5. farmers' suggestions and advice for successful implementations.



• CA on SPS were developed with cattle farmers and other stakeholders in Caquetá using in-depth semi-structured interviews and two workshops (n=40).

Results

- Main Economic benefits of SPS are: better feeding for cattle, higher dairy production, greater diversification on the farm, higher farm economic valuation, lower loss of the herd.
- Main Social benefits of SPS are: Greater welfare and life quality for producers, community management of natural resources, new trainings and knowledge, social awareness of the importance of buffer zones and greater engagement of the ranchers with the farm.
- Main environmental benefits of SPS are: Efficiency in water use, greater availability of organic fertilizers and microorganisms, improved soil protection, landslide prevention, more shade, and less soil compaction.
- Positive driver: The empowerment of both, men and women to work together in the different tasks of this type of system.
- Hinder factors: The lack of resources to replicate the strategy in larger areas of the farm, the lack of livestock water supply systems, and shortages of electric fences and fuel needed to pump water to paddocks.

- Livestock genetic breeding without good grassland management does not generate high profits.
- The sequence of implementation of the different SPS practices in each farm should be prioritized taking into account the particular needs of the farm.
- renewable energies are necessary for the proper functioning of the system.
- The silvopastoral arrangements generate more food for the cattle but also allow to recover the soil by establishing live fences and buffer zones.

© Martha Del Río. Cattle ranchers – Albania Caqueta.

Negative externality: Misappropriation of community resources such as water

leterences

- Biggs JS, Farrell L, Lawrence G, et al. A practical example of Contribution Analysis to a public health intervention. Evaluation. 2014;20:214–229.
- Solorio SFJ, Wright J, Franco MJA, et al. Chapter 11. Silvopastoral Systems: Best Agroecological Practice for Resilient Production Systems Under Dryland and Drought Conditions. In: Ahmed M, Stockle CO, editors. Quantif Clim Var Adapt Mitig Agric Sustain. Springer International Publishing Switzerland; 2017. p. 233– 250.

