



ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN WELL-BEING

Desertification Synthesis



MILLENNIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT



Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Panel

HAROLD A. MOONEY (*co-chair*), Stanford University, United States

ANGELA CROPPER (*co-chair*), The Cropper Foundation, Trinidad and Tobago

DORIS CAPISTRANO, Center for International Forestry Research, Indonesia

STEPHEN R. CARPENTER, University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States

KANCHAN CHOPRA, Institute of Economic Growth, India

PARTHA DASGUPTA, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

RASHID HASSAN, University of Pretoria, South Africa

RIK LEEMANS, Wageningen University, Netherlands

ROBERT M. MAY, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

PRABHU PINGALI, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Italy

CRISTIÁN SAMPER, Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, United States

ROBERT SCHOLES, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South Africa

ROBERT T. WATSON, The World Bank, United States (*ex officio*)

A. H. ZAKRI, United Nations University, Japan (*ex officio*)

ZHAO SHIDONG, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Editorial Board Chairs

JOSÉ SARUKHÁN, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

ANNE WHYTE, Mestor Associates Ltd., Canada

MA Director

WALTER V. REID, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Malaysia and United States

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board

The MA Board represents the users of the findings of the MA process.

Co-chairs

ROBERT T. WATSON, *Chief Scientist*, The World Bank

A.H. ZAKRI, *Director*, Institute of Advanced Studies, United Nations University

Institutional Representatives

SALVATORE ARICO, *Programme Officer*, Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

PETER BRIDGEWATER, *Secretary General*, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

HAMA ARBA DIALLO, *Executive Secretary*, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

ADEL EL-BELTAGY, *Director General*, International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

MAX FINLAYSON, *Chair*, Scientific and Technical Review Panel, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

COLIN GALBRAITH, *Chair*, Scientific Council, Convention on Migratory Species

ERIKA HARMS, *Senior Program Officer for Biodiversity*, United Nations Foundation

ROBERT HEPWORTH, *Acting Executive Secretary*, Convention on Migratory Species

OLAV KJØRVEN, *Director*, Energy and Environment Group, United Nations Development Programme

KERSTIN LEITNER, *Assistant Director-General*, Sustainable Development and Healthy Environments, World Health Organization

ALFRED OTENG-YEBOAH, *Chair*, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, Convention on Biological Diversity

CHRISTIAN PRIP, *Chair*, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, Convention on Biological Diversity

MARIO A. RAMOS, *Biodiversity Program Manager*, Global Environment Facility

THOMAS ROSSWALL, *Executive Director*, International Council for Science - ICSU

ACHIM STEINER, *Director General*, IUCN - The World Conservation Union

HALLDOR THORGEIRSSON, *Coordinator*, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

KLAUS TÖPFER, *Executive Director*, United Nations Environment Programme

JEFF TSCHIRLEY, *Chief*, Environmental and Natural Resources Service, Research, Extension and Training Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

RICCARDO VALENTINI, *Chair*, Committee on Science and Technology, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

HAMDALLAH ZEDAN, *Executive Secretary*, Convention on Biological Diversity

At-large Members

FERNANDO ALMEIDA, *Executive President*, Business Council for Sustainable Development-Brazil

PHOEBE BARNARD, Global Invasive Species Programme, South Africa

GORDANA BELTRAM, *Undersecretary*, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Slovenia

DELMAR BLASCO, *Former Secretary General*, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, Spain

ANTONY BURGMANS, *Chairman*, Unilever N.V., Netherlands

ESTHER CAMAC-RAMIREZ, Asociación Ixä Ca Vaá de Desarrollo e Información Indígena, Costa Rica

ANGELA CROPPER (*ex officio*), *President*, The Cropper Foundation, Trinidad and Tobago

PARTHA DASGUPTA, *Professor*, Faculty of Economics and Politics, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

JOSÉ MARÍA FIGUERES, Fundación Costa Rica para el Desarrollo Sostenible, Costa Rica

FRED FORTIER, Indigenous Peoples' Biodiversity Information Network, Canada

MOHAMED H.A. HASSAN, *Executive Director*, Third World Academy of Sciences for the Developing World, Italy

JONATHAN LASH, *President*, World Resources Institute, United States

WANGARI MAATHAI, *Vice Minister for Environment*, Kenya

PAUL MARO, *Professor*, Department of Geography, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

HAROLD A. MOONEY (*ex officio*), *Professor*, Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, United States

MARINA MOTOVILLOVA, Faculty of Geography, Laboratory of Moscow Region, Russia

M.K. PRASAD, Environment Centre of the Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad, India

WALTER V. REID, *Director*, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Malaysia and United States

HENRY SCHACHT, *Past Chairman of the Board*, Lucent Technologies, United States

PETER JOHAN SCHEI, *Director*, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway

ISMAIL SERAGELDIN, *President*, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Egypt

DAVID SUZUKI, *Chair*, David Suzuki Foundation, Canada

M.S. SWAMINATHAN, *Chairman*, MS Swaminathan Research Foundation, India

JOSÉ GALÍZIA TUNDISI, *President*, International Institute of Ecology, Brazil

AXEL WENBLAD, *Vice President Environmental Affairs*, Skanska AB, Sweden

XU GUANHUA, *Minister*, Ministry of Science and Technology, China

MUHAMMAD YUNUS, *Managing Director*, Grameen Bank, Bangladesh

ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN WELL-BEING

Desertification Synthesis

A Report of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

Core Writing Team

ZAFAR ADEEL, URIEL SAFRIEL, DAVID NIEMEIJER, AND ROBIN WHITE

Extended Writing Team

GRÉGOIRE DE KALBERMATTEN, MICHAEL GLANTZ, BOSHRA SALEM, BOB SCHOLES, MARYAM NIAMIR-FULLER, SIMEON EHUI,
AND VALENTINE YAPI-GNAORE

Review Editors

JOSÉ SARUKHÁN AND ANNE WHYTE (CO-CHAIRS) AND MA BOARD OF REVIEW EDITORS

Suggested citation:

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Desertification Synthesis*.
World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.

Copyright © 2005 World Resources Institute

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this book
may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher: World
Resources Institute, 10 G Street NE, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20002.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data.

Ecosystems and human well-being : desertification synthesis : a report of the millennium ecosystem
assessment / core writing team, Zafar Adeel ... [et al.]. p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-56973-590-5 (alk. paper)

1. Sustainable development. 2. Desertification. I. Adeel, Zafar.

HC79.E5E297 2005

333.73'6--dc22

2005015614

Printed on recycled, acid-free paper 

Book design by Dever Designs

Manufactured in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Foreword	ii
Preface	iii
Reader's Guide	iv
Summary for Decision-makers	1
Key Questions on Desertification in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	3
1. How is desertification related to ecosystem services and human well-being?	4
Interlinkages	4
Manifestations of Desertification	6
2. Who is affected by desertification?	7
Geographical Extent of Desertification	7
Poverty and Vulnerability of the Affected Population	7
Regional and Global Consequences of Desertification beyond Drylands	8
3. What are the major causes of desertification?	9
Social, Economic, and Policy Factors	9
Globalization Phenomena	9
Land Use Patterns and Practices	10
4. How will different future development paths affect desertification?	11
Scenarios Approach	11
Key Findings from the MA Scenarios	12
Key Challenges for the Future	13
5. How can we prevent or reverse desertification?	14
Rationale	14
Prevention	14
Reversal of Land Degradation	16
6. What are the linkages among desertification, global climate change, and biodiversity loss?	17
7. How can we better understand the significance of desertification?	19
Monitoring, Baseline Development, and Assessment	19
Reducing Uncertainty	21
Appendix A. Present-day Drylands and Their Categories	23
Appendix B. Abbreviations and Acronyms	24
Appendix C. Assessment Report Tables of Contents	25

FOREWORD

Desertification is a concept used to grasp the more acute forms of the degradation of land-based ecosystems and the consequences of the loss of their services. Drought is the silent killer—the natural catastrophe that is only too easily forgotten. Experience shows that awareness of the implications of desertification and drought must be expanded and that policy orientation must be backed by robust monitoring systems and related findings.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment has made a significant and much appreciated contribution to this end. It carefully presents the critical importance of functional ecosystems for human well-being and sustainable economic growth. The case is particularly powerful for the drylands of the world. Populations in arid, semiarid, and dry subhumid climatic zones, which define the field of intervention of the UNCCD, are greatly affected by environmental vulnerability and poverty.

The Desertification Synthesis, based on a sound summary of scientific evidence, states that desertification must imperatively be addressed to meet the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations. Desertification must be fought at all levels, but this battle must ultimately be won at the local level. There is evidence that success is possible. All the while, this report makes it now clearer that this phenomenon is embedded in a global chain of causality and that its impact is felt far beyond the boundaries of affected areas. Desertification contributes significantly to climate change and biodiversity loss.

Diverse views exist on the complex relationship between climatic and anthropogenic causal factors of desertification. Work remains to be done in order to enhance the knowledge base that should produce policy-relevant findings and facilitate informed decision-making. The Committee on Science and Technology of the UNCCD should be able to contribute in this respect. In the meantime, this assessment portrays the magnitude of the challenge and invites the international community to focus on needed action.

Bonn, 19 February 2005

HAMA ARBA DIALLO

Executive Secretary of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

PREFACE

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was called for by United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan in 2000 in his report to the U.N. General Assembly, *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*. Governments subsequently supported the establishment of the assessment through decisions taken by four multilateral environmental conventions. The MA was initiated in 2002 under the auspices of the United Nations, with the secretariat coordinated by the United Nations Environment Programme, and governed by a multistakeholder board involving international institutions and representatives of governments, business, NGOs, and indigenous peoples.

The MA responds to governments' requests for information received through four multilateral conventions—the Convention on Biological Diversity, the U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, and the Convention on Migratory Species—and is designed to also meet needs of other stakeholders, including business, the health sector, NGOs, and indigenous peoples. The objective of the MA was to assess the consequences of ecosystem change for human well-being and to establish the scientific basis for actions needed to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems and their contributions to human well-being.

This synthesis report was developed during the period 2003–05. The preparatory work for the report and selection of a writing team was initiated in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, in August 2003, during a joint international workshop organized by the United Nations University, the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas, and the MA Secretariat. Production of the report was made possible through a team effort by a diverse group of experts, backstopped with logistical support by the MA Secretariat. The full writing team convened in Hamilton, Canada, in August 2004 and in Scheveningen, the Netherlands, in January 2005. An extensive external review was undertaken in coordination with the MA Board of Review Editors, which engaged external reviewers, government representatives, and the secretariats of key multilateral environmental conventions. The report was formally approved by the MA Board in March 2005.

The Desertification Synthesis is underpinned by the conceptual framework for the MA, which assumes that people are integral parts of ecosystems and that a dynamic interaction exists between people and other parts of ecosystems. The changing human condition drives—both directly and indirectly—changes in ecosystems, thereby causing changes in human well-being. At the same time, social, economic, and cultural factors unrelated to ecosystems change the human condition, and many natural forces influence ecosystems. Although the MA emphasizes the linkages between ecosystems and human well-being, it recognizes that people's actions stem also from considerations of the intrinsic value of species and ecosystems, irrespective of their utility for someone else.

This report presents a synthesis and integration of the findings of the four MA Working Groups (Condition and Trends, Scenarios, Responses, and Sub-global Assessments). It does not, however, provide a comprehensive summary of each of those Working Group reports, and readers are encouraged to also review those findings. It is organized around the core questions originally posed to the MA: How has desertification affected ecosystems and human well-being? What are the main causes of desertification? Who is affected by desertification? How might desertification affect human well-being in the future? What options exist to avoid or reverse the negative impacts of desertification? And how can we improve our understanding of desertification and its impacts?

31 March 2005

ZAFAR ADEEL
*Assistant Director at the United Nations University –
International Network on Water, Environment, and Health*

URIEL SAFRIEL
Professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem

READER'S GUIDE

This report synthesizes findings from the MA global and sub-global assessments on desertification and human well-being. All the MA authors and Review Editors have contributed to this draft through their contributions to the underlying assessment chapters on which this material is based.

Five additional synthesis reports were prepared for ease of use by other audiences: general overview, Ramsar Convention (wetlands), CBD (biodiversity), business, and the health sector. Each MA sub-global assessment will also produce additional reports to meet the needs of its own audience. The full technical assessment reports of the four MA Working Groups will be published in mid-2005 by Island Press. All printed materials of the assessment, along with core data and a glossary of terminology used in the technical reports, will be available on the Internet at www.MAweb.org. Appendix B lists the acronyms and abbreviations used in this report. Throughout this report, dollar signs indicate U.S. dollars and tons mean metric tons.

References that appear in parentheses in the body of this report are to the underlying chapters in the full technical assessment reports of each Working Group. Please see Appendix C for the tables of contents of those reports. To assist the reader, citations to the technical volumes generally specify sections of chapters or specific Boxes, Tables, or Figures, based on final drafts of the chapter. Some chapter subsection numbers may change during final copyediting, however, after this report has been printed.

In this report, the following words have been used where appropriate to indicate judgmental estimates of certainty, based on the collective judgment of the authors, using the observational evidence, modeling results, and theory that they have examined: *very certain* (98% or greater probability), *high certainty* (85–98% probability), *medium certainty* (65–85% probability), *low certainty* (52–65% probability), and *very uncertain* (50–52% probability). In other instances, a qualitative scale to gauge the level of scientific understanding is used: *well established*, *established but incomplete*, *competing explanations*, and *speculative*. Each time these terms are used they appear in italics.

SUMMARY FOR DECISION-MAKERS



ZAFAR ADEEL

Desertification is defined by the U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification as “land degradation in arid, semiarid and dry subhumid areas resulting from various factors, including climatic variations and human activities.” Land degradation is in turn defined as the reduction or loss of the biological or economic productivity of drylands. This report evaluates the condition of desertification in drylands, including hyper-arid areas, by asking pointed questions and providing answers based exclusively on the reports generated for the MA.

Desertification occurs on all continents except Antarctica and affects the livelihoods of millions of people, including a large proportion of the poor in drylands. Desertification takes place worldwide in drylands, and its effects are experienced locally, nationally, regionally, and globally. Drylands occupy 41% of Earth’s land area and are home to more than 2 billion people—a third of the human population in the year 2000. Drylands include all terrestrial regions where water scarcity limits the production of crops, forage, wood, and other ecosystem provisioning services. Formally, the MA definition encompasses all lands where the climate is classified as dry subhumid, semiarid, arid, or hyper-arid. Please see Appendix A for more details about their geography and demography.

Some 10–20% of drylands are already degraded (*medium certainty*). Based on these rough estimates, about 1–6% of the dryland people live in desertified areas, while a much larger number is under threat from further desertification. Scenarios of future development show that, if unchecked, desertification and degradation of ecosystem services in drylands will threaten future improvements in human well-being and possibly reverse gains in some regions. Therefore, desertification ranks among the greatest environmental challenges today and is a major impediment to meeting basic human needs in drylands.

Persistent, substantial reduction in the provision of ecosystem services as a result of water scarcity, intensive use of services, and climate change is a much greater threat in drylands than in non-dryland systems. In particular, the projected intensification of freshwater scarcity as a result of climate change will

cause greater stresses in drylands. If left unmitigated, these stresses will further exacerbate desertification. The greatest vulnerability is ascribed to sub-Saharan and Central Asian drylands. For example, in three key regions of Africa—the Sahel, the Horn of Africa, and Southeast Africa—severe droughts occur on average once every 30 years. These droughts triple the number of people exposed to severe water scarcity at least once in every generation, leading to major food and health crises.

Desertification is a result of a long-term failure to balance demand for and supply of ecosystem services in drylands. The pressure is increasing on dryland ecosystems for providing services such as food, forage, fuel, building materials, and water for humans and livestock, for irrigation, and for sanitation. This increase is attributed to a combination of human factors and climatic factors. The former includes indirect factors like population pressure, socioeconomic and policy factors, and globalization phenomena like distortions to international food markets and direct factors like land use patterns and practices and climate-related processes. The climatic factors of concern include droughts and projected reduction in freshwater availability due to global warming. While the global and regional interplay of these factors is complex, it is possible to understand it at the local scale.

The magnitude and impacts of desertification vary greatly from place to place and change over time. This variability is driven by the degree of aridity combined with the pressure people put on the ecosystem's resources. There are, however, wide gaps in our understanding and observation of desertification processes and their underlying factors. A better delineation of desertification would enable cost-effective action in areas affected by it.

Measurement of a persistent reduction in the capacity of ecosystems to supply services provides a robust and operational way to quantify land degradation, and thus desertification. Such a quantification approach is robust because these services can be monitored, and some of them are already monitored routinely.

Desertification has strong adverse impacts on non-drylands as well; affected areas may sometimes be located thousands of kilometers away from the desertified areas. The biophysical impacts include dust storms, downstream flooding, impairment of global carbon sequestration capacity, and regional and global climate change. The societal impacts relate notably to human migration and economic refugees, leading to deepening poverty and political instability.

Tailored to the degree of aridity, interventions and adaptations are available and used to prevent desertification and to restore, where needed, the capacity of the dryland ecosystems to provide services. Increased integration of land and water management is a key method for desertification prevention. Local communities play a central role in the adoption and success of effective land and water management policies. In this respect, they require institutional and technological capacity, access to markets, and financial capital. Similarly, increased integration of pastoral and agricultural land uses provides an environmentally sustainable way to avoid desertification. However, policies to replace pastoralism with sedentary cultivation in rangelands can contribute to desertification. On the whole, prevention is a much more effective way to cope with desertification, because subsequent attempts to rehabilitate desertified areas are costly and tend to deliver limited results.

Desertification can also be avoided by reducing the stress on dryland ecosystems. This can be achieved in two ways. First, by introduction of alternative livelihoods that have less of an impact on dryland resources. These livelihoods benefit from the unique

advantages of drylands: round-the-year available solar energy, attractive landscapes, and large wilderness areas. Second, by creation of economic opportunities in urban centers and areas outside drylands.

Scenarios for future development show that the desertified area is likely to increase, and the relief of pressures on drylands is strongly correlated with poverty reduction. There is *medium certainty* that population growth and increase in food demand will drive an expansion of cultivated land, often at the expense of woodlands and rangelands. This is likely to increase the spatial extent of desertified land.

The MA scenarios also show that coping with desertification and its related economic conditions will likely fare better when proactive management approaches are used. Proactive land and water management policies can help avoid the adverse impacts of desertification. These approaches may initially have a high cost due to technological development and deployment and may also have a slower rate of environmental improvement. Their long-term implementation may be facilitated by globalization trends through greater cooperation and resource transfer.

On the whole, combating desertification yields multiple local and global benefits and helps mitigate biodiversity loss and human-induced global climate change. Environmental management approaches for combating desertification, mitigating climate change, and conserving biodiversity are interlinked in many ways. Therefore, joint implementation of major environmental conventions can lead to increased synergy and effectiveness, benefiting dryland people.

Effectively dealing with desertification will lead to a reduction in global poverty. Addressing desertification is critical and essential for meeting the Millennium Development Goals successfully. Viable alternatives must be provided to dryland people to maintain their livelihoods without causing desertification. These alternatives should be embedded in national strategies to reduce poverty and in national action programs to combat desertification.



KEY QUESTIONS ON DESERTIFICATION IN THE MILLENNIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT

1. *How is desertification related to ecosystem services and human well-being?* 4
2. *Who is affected by desertification?* 7
3. *What are the major causes of desertification?* 9
4. *How will different future development paths affect desertification?* 11
5. *How can we prevent or reverse desertification?* 14
6. *What are the linkages among desertification, global climate change, and biodiversity loss?* 17
7. *How can we better understand the significance of desertification?* 19

1. *How is desertification related to ecosystem services and human well-being?*

Desertification is potentially the most threatening ecosystem change impacting livelihoods of the poor. Persistent reduction of ecosystem services as a result of desertification links land degradation to loss of human well-being.


Interlinkages

The basic materials for a good life for most dryland people have their origin in biological productivity. More people in drylands than in any other ecosystem depend on ecosystem services for their basic needs. Crop production, livestock and dairy production, growth of fuelwood, and construction materials all depend on plant productivity, which in drylands is constrained by water availability. Thus it is the dryland climate that constrains viable livelihood opportunities. Practices like intensified cultivation in areas that do not have an adequate level of supporting services (soil fertility, nutrients, and water supply) thus require adjustments in management practices or costly imports of nutrients and water (C22.5).

Fluctuation in the supply of ecosystem services is normal, especially in drylands, but a persistent reduction in the levels of all services over an extended period constitutes desertification. Large inter-annual and longer-term climatic variations cause fluctuations in crop, forage, and water yields. When the resilience of a dryland ecosystem is impaired and it does not return to the expected levels of service supply after the stress is removed, a downward spiral of degradation—in other words, desertification—may occur. Many mechanisms linked to this phenomenon have been documented for drylands: excessive loss of soil, change in vegetation composition and reduction in vegetative cover, deterioration of water quality and reduction in available quantity, and changes in the regional climate system. A schematic description of the pathways that lead to desertification is provided on the left side of Figure 1.1. The intensity and impact of these mechanisms vary from place to place and change over time; they depend on the level of aridity and the varying pressure exerted by people on the ecosystem's resources (C22 Figure 22.7; SaFMA).

Figure 1.1. SCHEMATIC DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PATHWAYS IN DRYLANDS (C22 Figure 22.7)

This is a schematic graphic showing how drylands can be developed in response to changes in key human factors. The left side of the Figure shows developments that lead to a downward spiral of desertification. The right side shows developments that can help avoid or reduce desertification. In the latter case, land users respond to stresses by improving their agricultural practices on currently used land. This leads to increased livestock and crop productivity, improved human well-being, and political and economic stability. Both development pathways occur today in various dryland areas.



Source: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

Measurement of persistent reduction in the capacity of ecosystems to supply services provides a robust and operational way to quantify land degradation and desertification. The international community, through the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, agreed to define desertification as land degradation in arid, semiarid, and dry subhumid lands. Land degradation is in turn defined as a persistent reduction of biological and economic productivity. It is therefore logical to measure productivity in terms of the “things that ecosystems provide that matter to people”—that is, ecosystem services. (See Table 1.1 for a list of key dryland ecosystem services.) Doing so makes degradation quantifiable in an operational way, since many of the ecosystem services are measurable and some are routinely monitored. Furthermore, such an approach is robust, because it is based on flow of services to a broad spectrum of people rather than a narrow range of beneficiaries (CF2, SAfMA).

The coping capacity of the affected population and the resilience of the ecosystem on which it depends determine the duration beyond which impaired services cause irreversible consequences. Dryland people have found ways of coping with periods of scarcity lasting up to several years. However, periods significantly longer than this can overwhelm their resources and adaptation strategies. Their capacity to cope with a shortage of services for extended periods can be increased by many factors, including demographic, economic, and policy factors (such as the ability to migrate to unaffected areas) and the time that has elapsed since the last stress period (C6).

A downward spiral of desertification may occur but is not inevitable, as shown on the right side of Figure 1.1. Understanding the location-specific interaction of socioeconomic and biophysical

processes is critical. Some earlier explanations of irreversible desertification may have their origin in two fallacies. First, the time scale over which desertification evaluations are conducted is often too short, and reliable long-term extrapolations cannot be obtained. It is also important to consider continuous changes in dryland processes resulting from climatic factors and human intervention. Second, the spatial scale of assessments is either too large to effectively capture local phenomena or too local to provide a regional or global perspective. For example, desertification assessments rely on evaluation of national, regional, and continental soil surveys, on models of carrying capacity, on experimental plot studies, on expert opinion, and on nutrient balance models. While each of these methods is sound in its own right, the findings cannot simply be scaled up or down in time and space (C22.4.1).

Degradation is possible and observed in hyper-arid areas, which are not formally included within the UNCCD. The hyper-arid zone does not fall within the scope of the convention based on the argument that deserts are naturally low in productivity and cannot be further desertified. However, even hyper-arid areas have measurable levels of ecosystem service provision and support a human population with low density but significant numbers. Desertification has also been observed in hyper-arid areas, where mechanisms of degradation are similar to those in other dryland areas (C22.4.1).

Inland water, urban, cultivated, and other systems are integral parts of drylands and thus are critically linked to desertification processes. There are many systems embedded within drylands that are essential for the viability of the system as a whole and for livelihoods based on drylands. (In the MA, “system” is used to

Table 1.1. KEY DRYLAND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (C22.2)

Provisioning Services <i>Goods produced or provided by ecosystems</i>	Regulating Services <i>Benefits obtained from regulation of ecosystem processes</i>	Cultural Services <i>Nonmaterial benefits obtained from ecosystems</i>
■ provisions derived from biological productivity: food, fiber, forage, fuelwood, and biochemicals ■ fresh water	■ water purification and regulation ■ pollination and seed dispersal ■ climate regulation (local through vegetation cover and global through carbon sequestration)	■ recreation and tourism ■ cultural identity and diversity ■ cultural landscapes and heritage values ■ indigenous knowledge systems ■ spiritual, aesthetic, and inspirational services
Supporting Services <i>Services that maintain the conditions for life on Earth</i>		
■ soil development (conservation, formation) ■ primary production ■ nutrient cycling		

describe reporting units that are ecosystem-based but at a level of aggregation far higher than usually applied to ecosystems. The system also includes the social and economic elements. For example, the MA refers to “forest systems,” “cultivated systems,” “mountain systems,” “urban systems,” and so on. Systems thus defined are not mutually exclusive, and are permitted to overlap spatially or conceptually.)

In particular, the inland freshwater ecosystems within drylands—rivers, lakes, impoundments, wetlands, and so on—with their high potential for providing ecosystem services are of critical importance. Cultivated lands are a substantial part of the dryland landscape; about 44% of all cultivated systems worldwide are located within drylands, especially in the dry subhumid areas. (See Figure 1.2.) Conversion of rangelands to cultivated lands, especially in arid and semiarid drylands, leads to trade-offs in long-term sustainability of services and livelihood generation for people. Although urban systems occupy a relatively small fraction (about 2%) of the area of drylands, they contain a large and rapidly increasing fraction (nearly 45%) of the dryland population. Significant fractions of coastal (9%) and mountain (33%) systems are classified as drylands, highlighting the need for integrated land and water management that gives due consideration to dryland perspectives (C26.1.2., C27).

Manifestations of Desertification

The manifestations of desertification are apparent in all categories of ecosystem services: provisioning, regulating, cultural, and supporting. Some of these services are typically measured and quantified, such as food, forage, fiber, and fresh water; others may be inferred or implied through qualitative analysis. As indicated earlier, management approaches that prevent, reduce, or reverse these manifestations of desertification are available and practiced (C22.2).


In desertified areas, people have responded to reduced land productivity and income by either increased use of other relatively marginal land (not yet degraded but having lower productivity) or by transforming more rangeland to cultivated land. Since policies to promote alternative livelihood opportu-

nities are commonly not in place, migration to unaffected areas subsequently occurs. Initially it is from rural to urban areas, and then to locations of greater economic opportunity in other countries. These migrations sometimes exacerbate urban sprawl and can bring about internal and cross-boundary social, ethnic, and political strife (C22.3.1).

Transformation of rangelands and silvo-pastoral dryland systems to croplands increases the risk of desertification due to increased pressure on the remaining rangelands or to the use of unsustainable cultivation practices. Although rangelands are resilient under traditional mobile grazing practices—commonly called transhumance—in response to seasonal changes, reduced transhumance leads to overgrazing and rangeland degradation. Removal of the rangeland vegetation cover takes place both by overgrazing of forage and by transforming rangelands to cultivated systems worldwide. Removal of vegetation cover when combined with unsustainable soil and water management practices in the converted rangelands brings about soil erosion, soil structure change, and soil fertility decline. Between 1900 and 1950, approximately 15% of dryland rangelands were converted to cultivated systems to better capitalize on the food provisioning service; a somewhat faster conversion has taken place in the last five decades during the Green Revolution (C22.ES, R6.2.2, C12.2.4).

In many semiarid areas, there is a progressive shift occurring from grassland to shrubland that exacerbates soil erosion. During the second half of the nineteenth century, large-scale commercial stockbreeding quickly spread over the semiarid drylands of North and South America, South Africa, and Australia. Both the kind of imported herbivore and type of grazing management (including fire prevention) were not adjusted to the semiarid ecosystems. The resulting disturbance was therefore a “transition trigger” that, combined with drought events, led to a progressive dominance of shrubs over grass (sometimes called “bush encroachment”). The transition from land fully covered by grasses to one covered by scattered bushes creates greater bare soil surfaces, which encourages increased runoff velocity, resulting in higher soil erosion (C22.4.1, R6.3.7).

Figure 1.2. LAND USES IN DRYLANDS



2. Who is affected by desertification?

Desertification occurs on all continents except Antarctica and affects the livelihoods of millions of people, including a large proportion of the poor in drylands. Assessments of the extent of desertification vary, but even by conservative estimates it ranks among today's greatest environmental challenges with serious local and global impacts.

Geographical Extent of Desertification

Desertification is occurring in drylands all over the world. Estimates for total global dryland area affected by desertification vary significantly, depending on the calculation method and on the type of land degradation included in the estimate (C22.4.1).

Despite the importance of desertification, only three exploratory assessments of the worldwide extent of land degradation are available. (See Key Question 7 for more on the specific limitations of each study.)

■ The most well known study is the Global Assessment of Soil Degradation from 1991 that estimated soil degradation based on expert opinion. It reported that 20% of the drylands (excluding hyper-arid areas) were suffering from human-induced soil degradation.

■ Another estimate from the early 1990s, based primarily on secondary sources, reported 70% of drylands (excluding hyper-arid areas) were suffering from soil and or vegetation degradation.


■ A partial-coverage assessment from 2003, developed as a desk study from partly overlapping regional data sets and remote sensing data, estimated that 10% of global drylands (including hyper-arid areas) are degraded.

Given the limitations and problems with each of the underlying data sets, the need for a better assessment is underscored. The actual extent of desertified area may lie between the figures reported by GLASOD and the 2003 study. That is, some 10–20% of drylands are already degraded (*medium certainty*). Based on these estimates, the total area affected by desertification is between 6 million and 12 million square kilometers. It follows that based on the total number of people threatened by desertification, this ranks among the greatest contemporary environmental problems (C22.3.1, C22.4.1).

Poverty and Vulnerability of the Affected Population

Dryland populations, at least 90% of whom live in developing countries, on average lag far behind the rest of the world in human well-being and development indicators. Compared with other systems studied in the MA, dryland populations suffer from the poorest economic conditions. The GNP per capita of OECD countries exceeds that of developing dryland countries almost by an order of magnitude. Similarly, the average infant mortality rate (about 54 per 1,000) for all dryland developing countries exceeds that for non-dryland countries (forests, mountains, islands, and coastal areas) by 23% or more. The difference is even starker—10 times higher—when compared with the average infant mortality rate in industrial countries. Two key indicators of human well-being in Asia are compared in Figure 2.1, in which drylands have the lowest GNP per capita and the highest infant mortality rates among the MA systems. It is found that the relatively low rate of water provisioning in drylands limits access to clean drinking water and adequate sanitation, leading to poor health (C22.ES, C22.6).

Figure 2.1. COMPARISON OF INFANT MORTALITY AND GNP PER PERSON IN DRYLANDS AND OTHER MA SYSTEMS IN ASIA (C22 Figure 22.12)



¹ Number of children less than one year old dying in a year, per 1000 live births during that year

Source: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment



SCOTT CHRISTIANSEN

Women often play a key role in water management in drylands (Mauritania)

The low level of human well-being and high poverty of dryland populations vary according to level of aridity and global region. This is further exacerbated by high population growth rates in drylands. For example, the population in drylands grew at an average rate of 18.5% during the 1990s—the highest growth rate of any MA system. A number of policy factors also contribute to the poor human well-being, such as political marginalization and the slow growth of health and education infrastructure, facilities, and services. The uneven level of these driving factors in various locations and at different times has diverse societal impacts across drylands. The worst situations can be found in the drylands of Asia and Africa; these regions lag well behind drylands in the rest of the world. (C22.6.2, C6.6).


Dryland populations are often socially and politically marginalized due to their impoverishment and remoteness from centers of decision-making. This holds true even in some industrial countries. As a consequence, these dryland populations are frequently unable to play a significant role in political decision-making processes. Their marginalization leads to reduced human security and increased vulnerability to factors of change, like drought (C22.6).

Regional and Global Consequences of Desertification beyond Drylands

Desertification has environmental impacts at the global and regional scale. Affected areas may sometimes be located thousands of kilometers away from the desertified areas. Desertification-related processes such as reduction of vegetation cover, for instance, increase the formation of aerosols and dust. These, in turn, affect cloud formation and rainfall patterns, the global carbon cycle, and plant and animal biodiversity. For example, visibility in Beijing is often adversely affected by dust storms originating in the Gobi Desert in springtime. Large dust storms emanating from China affect the Korean peninsula and Japan and are observed to even have an impact on North American air quality.

An increase in desertification-related dust storms is widely considered to be a cause of ill health (fever, coughing, and sore eyes) during the dry season. Dust emanating from the East Asian region and the Sahara has also been implicated in respiratory problems as far away as North America and has affected coral reefs in the Caribbean. (Dust storms can also have positive impacts, however; for example, air-transported dust deposits from Africa are thought to improve soil quality in the Americas). Finally, reduction of vegetation cover in drylands leads to destructive floods downstream and excessive clay and silt loads in water reservoirs, wells, river deltas, river mouths, and coastal areas often located outside the drylands (C22.5.2, C14 Box 14.4, C12.2.4, R11.3.2, R11.1.3).

The societal and political impacts of desertification also extend to non-dryland areas. Droughts and loss of land productivity are predominant factors in movement of people from drylands to other areas, for example (*medium certainty*). An influx of migrants may reduce the ability of the population to use ecosystem services in a sustainable way. Such migration may exacerbate urban sprawl and by competing for scarce natural resources bring about internal and cross-boundary social, ethnic, and political strife. Desertification-induced movement of people also has the potential of adversely affecting local, regional, and even global political and economic stability, which may encourage foreign intervention (C22.ES, C22.1.3, C22.6.1, C22.6.2).



DR. GAOMING JIANG, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A couple walks home during a dust storm in Xinlinhot (Inner Mongolia), P.R. China

3. *What are the major causes of desertification?*

Desertification is caused by a combination of factors that change over time and vary by location. These include indirect factors such as population pressure, socioeconomic and policy factors, and international trade as well as direct factors such as land use patterns and practices and climate-related processes.

Desertification is taking place due to indirect factors driving unsustainable use of scarce natural resources by local land users. This situation may be further exacerbated by global climate change. Desertification is considered to be the result of management approaches adopted by land users, who are unable to respond adequately to indirect factors like population pressure and globalization and who increase the pressure on the land in unsustainable ways. This leads to decreased land productivity and a downward spiral of worsening degradation and poverty (as illustrated in Figure 1.1). Where conditions permit, dryland populations can avoid degradation by improving their agricultural practices and enhancing pastoral mobility in a sustainable way. On the whole, the interaction between climatic factors and human responses can create a range of different outcomes. (See the discussion of MA scenarios in Key Question 4.) To counter the problems effectively, it is important—but difficult—to distinguish between those resulting from the natural conditions of dryland ecosystems and those caused by unsustainable management practices as well as broader economic and policy factors (C22.3.1).

Social, Economic, and Policy Factors

Policies leading to unsustainable resource use and lack of supportive infrastructure are major contributors to land degradation. Conversely, this makes public policies and physical infrastructure useful intervention points. Thus agriculture can play either a positive or a negative role, depending on how it is managed. This in turn depends on the socioeconomic resources available, the policies adopted, and the quality of governance. Local institutions, such as community-based land-use decision-making bodies and social networks, can contribute to preventing desertification by allowing land users to manage and use ecosystem services more effectively through enhanced access to land, capital, labor, and technology (C22.6.4).

Policies to replace pastoralism with sedentary cultivation in rangelands can contribute to desertification. Policies and infrastructure that promote farming in rangelands that cannot sustain viable cropping systems contribute to desertification. The majority of dryland areas (65%) are rangelands that are more suited to sustainable pastoralism than crop production. For example, nomadic pastoralism is a rangeland management practice that over the centuries has proved to be sustainable and suited to the ecosystem carrying capacity. Sedentarization of nomads in marginal drylands and other limitations to their transboundary

movement lead to desertification because they reduce people's ability to adjust their economic activities in the face of stresses such as droughts (R6.2.2, C22.3.2).

Land tenure practices and policies that encourage land users to overexploit land resources can be important contributors to desertification. When farmers and herders lose control or long-term security over the land they use, the incentives for maintaining environmentally sustainable practices are lost. Problems of water scarcity, groundwater depletion, soil erosion, and salinization have all been recognized as outcomes of deeper policy and institutional failures. Security of tenure does not necessarily imply private property rights; many long-established collective and community-based management practices have operated quite effectively. In successful communal systems, greater transparency and fairness in the allocation of resources to all stakeholders is essential. Private land tenure systems in drylands have been less successful in ensuring that pastoralists have access to various ecosystem services such as provisioning of water and pasture (C22.3.2, R17.3).

Globalization Phenomena

Many ongoing processes of globalization amplify or attenuate the driving forces of desertification by removing regional barriers, weakening local connections, and increasing the interdependence among people and between nations. Globalization can either contribute to or help prevent desertification, but it creates stronger links between local, national, sub-regional, regional, and global factors related to desertification. Studies have shown that trade liberalization, macroeconomic reforms, and a focus on raising production for exports can lead to desertification. In other cases, enlarged markets can also contribute to successful agricultural improvements. For example, a large share of the European Union flower markets is supplied with imports from dryland countries (such as Kenya and Israel) (C22.3.2).

Global trade regimes and linked government policies influence food production and consumption patterns significantly and affect directly or indirectly the resilience of dryland ecosystems. Improved access to agricultural inputs (like fertilizers, pesticides, and farm machinery) and export markets typically boosts productivity. Opportunities to gain access to international markets are conditioned by international trade and food safety regulations and by a variety of tariff and nontariff barriers. Selective production and export subsidies, including those embodied in the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy and the U.S. farm bill, stimulate overproduction of many food crops in those countries. Such distortions to international food markets drive down prices and have often seriously undermined the livelihoods of food producers in many poorer countries. In 2002, industrial

countries spent more than \$300 billion on their agricultural sectors—about six times the amount allocated to foreign assistance. Conversely, removal of international trade barriers without moderating national policies may also encourage unsustainable agricultural practices (C8.ES, C8.4.1).

Land Use Patterns and Practices

Land use changes are responses to changes in the provision of ecosystem services, and they also cause changes in this provision. Historically, dryland livelihoods have been based on a mixture of hunting, gathering, cropping, and animal husbandry. This mixture varied in composition with time, place, and culture. The harsh and unpredictable climate combined with changing socioeconomic and political factors has forced dryland inhabitants to be flexible in land use. Population pressure, however, has led to a growing tension between two main land uses: pastoral rangeland and cultivated land use. In some areas, this led to intercultural conflicts and desertification as herders and farmers claim access to and use of the same land. In other cases, it led to synergistic interaction and integration between the two land uses, with herders cultivating more land, farmers holding more livestock, and an increased exchange of services between the two groups. The synergistic behavior among pastoralists and farmers is driven by both governmental policies and favorable market opportunities; the two groups cooperate when it is in their own vested interests (see Key Question 5) (C22.5.1).

Irrigation has led to increased cultivation and food production in drylands, but in many cases this has been unsustainable without extensive public capital investment. Large-scale

irrigation has also resulted in many environmental problems—such as waterlogging and salinization, water pollution, eutrophication, and unsustainable exploitation of groundwater aquifers—that degrade the drylands' service provisioning. In such irrigation approaches, rivers are often disconnected from their floodplains and other inland water habitats, and groundwater recharge has been reduced. These human-induced changes have in turn had an impact on the migratory patterns of fish species and the species composition of riparian habitat, opened up paths for exotic species, changed coastal ecosystems, and contributed to an overall loss of freshwater biodiversity and inland fishery resources. On the whole, there is a decline in biodiversity and services provided by inland water systems in drylands, which further exacerbates desertification (C20.ES).

Frequent and intensive fires can be an important contributor to desertification, whereas controlled fires play an important role in the management of dryland pastoral and cropping systems. In both cases, the use of fire promotes the service of nutrient cycling and makes nutrients stored in the vegetation available for forage and crop production. For example, dryland pastoralists use controlled fire to improve forage quality, and dryland farmers use fire to clear new land for cultivation. Conversely, fires can be an important cause of desertification in some regions when they affect natural vegetation. Excessive intensity and frequency can lead to irreversible changes in ecological processes and, ultimately, to desertification. The consequences of such changes include the loss of soil organic matter, erosion, loss of biodiversity, and habitat changes for many plant and animal species (C22.3.3, C22.4.2, C22.5.1).



Water erosion and reduced soil conservation in semi-arid Burkina Faso negatively affects ecosystem services.

4. How will different future development paths affect desertification?

Population growth and increase in food demand will drive expansion and intensification of cultivated lands. If unchecked, desertification and degradation of ecosystem services in drylands will threaten future improvements in human well-being and possibly reverse gains in some regions.

Scenarios Approach

A better understanding of development options and management paradigms for the future can be achieved through scenario development. To make sound choices, we need to understand the consequences of alternative actions or inactions. This is facilitated by creating scenarios that are plausible and that tell stories about how the future might unfold, in both words and numbers. The MA scenarios were developed using established, peer-reviewed global models for quantitative projections


(such as land use change, carbon emissions, water withdrawals, and food production) and qualitative analysis. The quantitative models did not address thresholds, risk of extreme events, or impacts of large or irreversible changes in ecosystem services. Scenarios are not forecasts, projections, or predictions. They are intended to provoke questions, widen perspectives, illuminate key issues, and therefore support better-informed and rational decision-making. In so doing, they attempt to reduce uncertainty about future outcomes of management approaches (S6, S2).

The MA generated four scenarios that explore how combinations of policies and practices may affect changes in ecosystem services, human well-being, and desertification. (See Box 4.1.) The scenarios were developed with a focus on the likely conditions in 2050, although they include some information through the end of the century. They specifically address desertification and human well-being in drylands. These four scenarios were not

Box 4.1. MILLENNIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT SCENARIOS

The MA developed four scenarios to explore plausible futures for ecosystems and human well-being. The scenarios explored two global development paths (globalized versus regionalized societies and economies) and two different approaches for ecosystem management (reactive and proactive). In reactive management, problems are addressed only after they become obvious, whereas proactive management attempts to maintain ecosystem services for the long term. These scenarios were selected to explore contrasting transitions of global society up to the year 2050.

- **Globalized world with reactive ecosystem management;** with an emphasis on equity, economic growth, and public goods such as infrastructure and education (also called *Global Orchestration*);
- **Regionalized world with reactive ecosystem management;** with an emphasis on security and economic growth (also called *Order from Strength*);
- **Regionalized world with proactive ecosystem management,** with an emphasis on local adaptations and learning (also called *Adapting Mosaic*); and
- **Globalized world with proactive ecosystem management,** and an emphasis on green technologies (also called *TechnoGarden*).



designed to explore the entire range of possible futures; other scenarios could be developed with either more optimistic or more pessimistic outcomes (S8 Figure 8.5, S9).

Key Findings from the MA Scenarios


In all four scenarios, desertified area is likely to increase, though at different rates. Poverty and unsustainable land use practices continue to be the main factors driving desertification in the near future. The relief of pressures on drylands is strongly correlated with poverty reduction. Under all four MA scenarios, population growth and increase in food demand will drive an expansion of cultivated land, often at the expense of woodlands and rangelands. This is likely to increase the spatial extent of desertified land. No scenario indicates a reversal in the threat of desertification (S9, S8 Figure 8.5). (See Figure 4.1.)

In all the scenarios, climate change is linked to desertification, and the impacts of climate change vary according to region and the management approach adopted. Climate change is expected to affect the global hydrological cycle and local precipitation trends. The local manifestation of these global climate changes is strongly location-dependent. It is likely that extreme events will further intensify, bringing more floods and more droughts (S8 Figure 8.5, S14.4.4).

Coping with desertification and related economic conditions in drylands will likely fare better in a future where proactive management approaches are used. In a proactive approach, ecosystem management is aiming to be adaptive to changes and to make ecosystems more resilient, which is seen as also reducing the vulnerability of society to the disturbances caused by desertification. As a result, measures such as adaptations to climate change and non-expanding irrigation can jointly lead to

Figure 4.1. KEY DESERTIFICATION-RELATED FINDINGS OF THE MA SCENARIOS

Rates of change in the extent of desertified areas in the drylands: Solid lines indicate the best case; dashed lines indicate the worst case for desertification in each of the MA scenarios.



decelerated desertification rates. This approach might take some time to show its benefits, however, as the necessary changes in development and learning capacities first need to be further developed and improved. In contrast, under a reactive management regime, current pressures (climate change, overgrazing, and large-scale irrigation) on ecosystem services are likely to stay the same or intensify, leading to further desertification. The regionalized-reactive scenario demonstrates the greatest unsustainability of dryland development (S.SDM).

Globalization will not necessarily lead to increased desertification. Prospects for cooperation and resource transfers to support ecosystem management are better in this case due to the institutional reforms and the fast rate of technological development. In the globally proactive management scenario, policy reforms such as strengthening of property rights (either private or collective) as well as better integration of environmental issues lead to relatively less pressure in drylands. Market and policy failures can still pose risks of desertification, however. In contrast, in a fragmented world, the role of a global agreement is more limited either because of the diminished interest in resource transfers or because of the lack of interest beyond the national or regional boundaries (S14.ES, S14.4.3).

Key Challenges for the Future

Persistent, substantial reduction in the provision of ecosystem services as a result of water scarcity, intensive use of services, and climate change is a much greater threat in drylands than in non-dryland systems. The greatest vulnerability is ascribed to sub-Saharan and Central Asian drylands. For example, in three key regions of Africa—the Sahel, Horn of Africa, and Southeast Africa—severe droughts occur on average once every 30 years. These triple the number of people exposed to severe water scarcity at least once in every generation, leading to major food and health crises. Unconditional, free supply of food or water to the vulnerable dryland people can have the unintended effect of increasing the risk of even larger breakdowns of ecosystem services. Local adaptation and conservation practices can mitigate some losses of dryland services, although it will be difficult to reverse the loss of food and water provision services and the supporting biodiversity (S.SDM, C20.6, C7.3.4).

The projected intensification of freshwater scarcity will cause greater stresses in drylands. If left unmitigated, these stresses will further exacerbate desertification. Water scarcity affects approximately 1–2 billion people today, most of them in drylands. This leads to overexploitation of surface and groundwater resources and eventually magnifies problems related to desertification. Freshwater availability in drylands is projected to be further reduced from the current overall average of 1,300 cubic meters per person per year. While this average figure



DAVID NIEMEIJER AND VALENTINA MAZZUCATO

A farmer in semi-arid Burkina Faso who works as a blacksmith during the dry season

masks great variations, it is already well below the lowest threshold of 2,000 cubic meters required for human well-being and sustainable development (C7.ES, C24.ES, C22.ES).

The prospects for implementing the UNCCD differ significantly under the four MA scenarios. Implementation will be the most difficult in a regionalized-reactive world, while prospects improve in a more globalized world and with proactive ecosystem management. The four MA scenarios give an indication of how effectively the UNCCD directives can be implemented by the affected countries when operating under broadly different management approaches. In a regionalized world with only reactive environmental management, the scope for global environmental agreements is rather poor. In this reactive management mode, desertification will likely increase further before its impacts—massive famines and environmental and hunger refugees—trigger a significant response. A globalized world provides a more favorable situation for implementation of the UNCCD at the global scale through facilitation in the flow of resources and technologies, but here too it will depend which kind of overall management approaches are favored (S14.4.3).

5. *How can we prevent or reverse desertification?*

Effective prevention of desertification requires both local management and macro policy approaches that promote sustainability of ecosystem services. It is advisable to focus on prevention, because attempts to rehabilitate desertified areas are costly and tend to deliver limited results.

Rationale

Major policy interventions and management approaches are needed to prevent and reverse desertification. Assessment of future scenarios shows that major interventions and shifts in ecosystem management will be needed to overcome challenges related to desertification. As recognized by the UNCCD, such interventions are to be implemented at local to global scales, with the active engagement of stakeholders and local communities. Improved information generation and access, as noted in the final section, will help create enabling conditions for this implementation (S14.4.2, C6.6).

Societal and policy responses vary according to the degree of desertification that a society faces. This intensity of responses needs to be reflected accordingly in National Action Programmes stipulated by the UNCCD and their subsequent implementation. In areas where desertification processes are at the early stages or are relatively minor, it is possible to arrest the process and restore key services in the degraded areas. The adverse impacts of desertification on dryland ecosystem services and limited success in rehabilitation demonstrate that it is more cost-effective to prevent desertification (C22.3.2, C22.6, R17).

Addressing desertification is critical and essential to meeting the Millennium Development Goals. The human well-being of dryland people, about 90% of whom are in developing countries, lags significantly behind other areas. Approximately half of the people worldwide who live below the poverty line live in drylands. The combination of high variability in ecosystem conditions in drylands and high levels of poverty leads to a situation where societies are vulnerable to a further decline in human well-being. Addressing desertification therefore facilitates eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, as envisioned in the MDGs. This also complements directly the policies to be included in NAPs to combat desertification (C22.ES).

Prevention

The creation of a “culture of prevention” can go a long way toward protecting drylands from the onset of desertification or its continuation. The culture of prevention requires a change in governments’ and peoples’ attitudes through improved incentives. Young people can play a key role in this process. Evidence from a growing body of case studies demonstrates that dryland

populations, building on long-term experience and active innovation, can stay ahead of desertification by improving agricultural practices and enhancing pastoral mobility in a sustainable way. For example, in many areas of the Sahel region, land users are achieving higher productivity by capitalizing on improved organization of labor, more extensive soil and water conservation, increased use of mineral fertilizer and manure, and new market opportunities (C22.3.1).

Integrated land and water management are key methods of desertification prevention. All measures that protect soils from erosion, salinization, and other forms of soil degradation effectively prevent desertification. Sustainable land use can address human activities such as overgrazing, overexploitation of plants, trampling of soils, and unsustainable irrigation practices that exacerbate dryland vulnerability. Management strategies include measures to spread the pressures of human activities, such as transhumance (rotational use) of rangelands and well sites, stocking rates matched to the carrying capacity of ecosystems, and diverse species composition. Improved water management practices can enhance water-related services. These may include use of traditional water-harvesting techniques, water storage, and diverse soil and water conservation measures. Maintaining management practices for water capture during intensive rainfall episodes also helps prevent surface runoff that carries away the thin, fertile, moisture-holding topsoil. Improving groundwater recharge through soil-water conservation, upstream revegetation, and floodwater spreading can provide reserves of water for use during drought periods (C22.2.3, C22.4.3, C22.4.4, R6.2.2, R6.3.7).

Protection of vegetative cover can be a major instrument for prevention of desertification. Maintaining vegetative cover to protect soil from wind and water erosion is a key preventive measure against desertification. Properly maintained vegetative cover also prevents loss of ecosystem services during drought episodes. Reduced rainfall may be induced if vegetation cover is lost due to overcultivation, overgrazing, overharvesting of medicinal plants, woodcutting, or mining activities. This is usually coupled with the effect of reduced surface evapotranspiration and shade or increased albedo (C22.2.3, C22.2.2, C13 Box 13.1).

In the dry subhumid and semiarid zones, conditions equally favor pastoral and cropping land use. Rather than competitively excluding each other, a tighter cultural and economic integration between the two livelihoods can prevent desertification. Mixed farming practices in these zones, whereby a single farm household combines livestock rearing and cropping, allows a more efficient recycling of nutrients within the agricultural system. Such interactions can lower livestock pressure on rangelands through fodder cultivation and the provision of stubble to supplement livestock feed during forage scarcity (and immediately after, to allow plant regeneration) due to within- and between-years



climatic variability. At the same time, farmland benefits from manure provided by livestock kept on fields at night during the dry season. Many West African farming systems are based on this kind of integration of pastures and farmland (C22.2.6, R6.3.7).

Use of locally suitable technology is a key way for inhabitants of drylands at risk of desertification to work with ecosystem processes rather than against them. Applying a combination of traditional technology with selective transfer of locally acceptable technology is a major way to prevent desertification. Conversely, there are numerous examples of practices—such as unsustainable irrigation techniques and technologies and rangeland management, as well as growing crops unsuited to the agroclimatic zone—that tend to accelerate, if not initiate, desertification processes. Thus technology transfer requires in-depth evaluation of impacts and active participation of recipient communities (R.SDM, R17.2.4, R14.ES).

Local communities can prevent desertification and provide effective dryland resource management but are often limited by their capacity to act. Drawing on cultural history and local knowledge and experience, and reinforced by science, dryland communities are in the best position to devise practices to prevent desertification. However, there are many limitations imposed on the interventions available to communities, such as lack of institutional capacity, access to markets, and financial capital for implementation. Enabling policies that involve local participation and community institutions, improve access to transport and market infrastructures, inform local land managers, and allow land users to innovate are essential to the success of these practices. For example, a key traditional adaptation was transhumance for pastoral communities, which in many dryland locations is no longer possible. Loss of such livelihood options or related local knowledge limits the community's capacity to respond to ecological changes and heightens the risk of desertification (C22.ES, C22.6.4, R6.2.2, R17.3, R2.4.3).

Desertification can be avoided by turning to alternative livelihoods that do not depend on traditional land uses, are less demanding on local land and natural resource use, yet provide sustainable income. Such livelihoods include dryland aquaculture for production of fish, crustaceans and industrial compounds produced by microalgae, greenhouse agriculture, and tourism-related activities. They generate relatively high income per land and water unit in some places. Dryland aquaculture under plastic cover, for example, minimizes evaporative losses, and provides the opportunity to use saline or brackish water productively. Alternative livelihoods often even provide their practitioners a competitive edge over those outside the drylands, since they harness dryland features such as solar radiation, winter relative warmth, brackish geothermal water, and sparsely populated pristine areas that are often more abundant than in non-drylands. Implementation of such practices in drylands requires institution building, access to markets, technology transfer, capital investment, and reorientation of farmers and pastoralists (C22.4.4).

Desertification can also be avoided by creating economic opportunities in drylands urban centers and areas outside drylands. Changes in overall economic and institutional settings that create new opportunities for people to earn a living could help relieve current pressures underlying the desertification processes. Urban growth, when undertaken with adequate planning and provision of services, infrastructure, and facilities, can be a major factor in relieving pressures that cause desertification in drylands. This view is relevant when considering the projected growth of the urban fraction in drylands, which will increase to around 52% by 2010 and to 60% by 2030 (C22.5.2, C27.2.3).

Reversal of Land Degradation

The goal of rehabilitation and restoration approaches is to restore ecosystem services that have been lost due to desertification. This is achieved through a positive change in the interaction between people and ecosystems. Restoration is an alteration of a degraded site to reestablish a defined native ecosystem state and all its functions and services. Rehabilitation seeks to repair damaged or blocked parts or sectors of ecosystem functions, with the primary goal of regaining ecosystem productivity. Like the benefits of increased education or improved governance, the protection, restoration, and enhancement of ecosystem services tend to have multiple benefits (C2.2.3, CF.SDM).

Effective restoration and rehabilitation of desertified drylands require a combination of policies and technologies and the close involvement of local communities. Examples of measures

to restore and rehabilitate include establishment of seed banks, restocking of soil organic matter and organisms that promote higher plant establishment and growth, and reintroduction of selected species. Other rehabilitation practices include investing in land through practices such as terracing and other counter-erosion measures, control of invasive species, chemical and organic nutrient replenishment, and reforestation. Policies that create incentives for rehabilitation include capacity building, capital investment, and supportive institutions. Community involvement in conceptualization, design, and implementation is essential for rehabilitation approaches. For example, many of the policies for combating desertification tried in the Sahel during the 1970s and 1980s failed because they did not involve local land managers (C22.3.2, R2.4.3).

For desertified areas, rehabilitation strategies have a mix of positive and negative impacts on ecosystems, human well-being, and poverty reduction. The success of rehabilitation practices depends on the availability of human resources, capital for operation and maintenance, infrastructure development, the degree of dependence on external sources of technology, and cultural perceptions. Adequate access to these resources, combined with due consideration of the needs of local communities, can lead to successful rehabilitation of some ecosystem services and hence reduce poverty. Some success stories have been observed; for example, farmers in the Machakos (Kenya) restored degraded lands. This was achieved through access to markets, off-farm income, and technologies that increased land and labor productivity faster than population growth.

In cases where these conditions are not met, efforts to rehabilitate fail. For example, in response to the 1930s Dust Bowl in the United States, major policy interventions were introduced, including zoning laws for the most fragile areas, repurchases of submarginal private land, cash payments for leaving land fallow, and farm loans tied to approved land practices. These economic reforms, coupled with the migration of 1 million people in 1940–70, could not prevent the return of the problem as Dust Bowl II in the 1950s and Dust Bowl III in the 1970s. This demonstrates that restoring degraded dryland services may be difficult even with major policy and technological interventions (C5.ES, C5 Box 5.1, C22.3.2).



ZAFAR ADEEL

Terracing prevents further gully erosion and stores surface runoff for olive production (Tunisia)

6. What are the linkages among desertification, global climate change, and biodiversity loss?


Desertification is associated with biodiversity loss and contributes to global climate change through loss of carbon sequestration capacity and an increase in land-surface albedo.

Biological diversity is involved in most services provided by dryland ecosystems and is adversely affected by desertification. Most important, vegetation and its diversity of physical structure are instrumental in soil conservation and in the regulation of rainfall infiltration, surface runoff, and local climate. Different plant species produce physically and chemically different litter components and, together with a diverse community of

micro- and macro-decomposers, contribute to soil formation and nutrient cycling. The species diversity of vegetation supports both livestock and wildlife. All plants support primary production that ultimately provides food, fiber, and fuelwood and that sequesters carbon, thus regulating global climate. Excessive exploitation of vegetation leads to losses in primary production and hence also to reduced carbon sequestration. It is the disruption of the interlinked services jointly provided by dryland plant biodiversity that is a key trigger for desertification and its various manifestations, including the loss of habitats for biodiversity (C22.2.5, C4.1). (See Figure 6.1.)

Figure 6.1. LINKAGES AND FEEDBACK LOOPS AMONG DESERTIFICATION, GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE, AND BIODIVERSITY LOSS

The major components of biodiversity loss (in green) directly affect major dryland services (in bold). The inner loops connect desertification to biodiversity loss and climate change through soil erosion. The outer loop interrelates biodiversity loss and climate change. On the top section of the outer loop, reduced primary production and microbial activity reduce carbon sequestration and contribute to global warming. On the bottom section of the outer loop, global warming increases evapotranspiration, thus adversely affecting biodiversity; changes in community structure and diversity are also expected because different species will react differently to the elevated CO₂ concentrations.



Desertification affects global climate change through soil and vegetation losses. Dryland soils contain over a quarter of all of the organic carbon stores in the world as well as nearly all the inorganic carbon. Unimpeded desertification may release a major fraction of this carbon to the global atmosphere, with significant feedback consequences to the global climate system. It is estimated that 300 million tons of carbon are lost to the atmosphere from drylands as a result of desertification each year (about 4% of the total global emissions from all sources combined) (*medium certainty*) (C22.5.3, C12.2.4).

The effect of global climate change on desertification is complex and not sufficiently understood. Climate change may adversely affect biodiversity and exacerbate desertification due to increase in evapotranspiration and a likely decrease in rainfall in drylands (although it may increase globally). However, since carbon dioxide is also a major resource for plant productivity, water use efficiency will significantly improve for some dryland species that can favorably respond to its increase. These contrasting responses of different dryland plants to the increasing carbon dioxide and temperatures may lead to changes in species composition and abundances. Therefore, although climate change may

increase aridity and desertification risk in many areas (*medium certainty*), the consequent effects on services driven by biodiversity loss and, hence, on desertification are difficult to predict (C22.5.3).

Due to strongly interlinked issues and policies between desertification, biodiversity loss, and climate change, joint implementation of the UNCCD, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Framework Convention on Climate Change can yield multiple benefits. Environmental management approaches for combating desertification, conserving biodiversity, and mitigating climate change are linked in numerous ways. Typically, these issues were dealt with separately by different conventions and policy fora, which were negotiated and implemented independently of one another, often by different departments or agencies within national governments. Thus, joint implementation and further strengthening of ongoing collaborations can increase synergies and effectiveness (R13.2, R15.3.3).

7. How can we better understand the significance of desertification?

Understanding the significance of desertification is constrained by many uncertainties. Information gathering—long-term remote sensing and sub-national biophysical and socioeconomic data—enables development of a baseline and indicators of desertification. Such information helps us reduce uncertainties regarding the relationships among desertification, climate change, biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-being.

Monitoring, Baseline Development, and Assessment

Without a scientifically robust and consistent baseline of desertification, identifying priorities and monitoring the consequences of actions are seriously constrained. Three assessments of the global extent of land degradation give different figures: the UNEP/GLASOD report (1990), research work from Dregne and Chou in 1992, and a more recent assessment prepared for the MA by Lepers *et al.* in 2003 (C22.4.1). These assessments of land degradation all have major weaknesses. GLASOD was based on expert opinion only, with variability in quality and quantification. Dregne and Chou's assessment was based on secondary sources, which they qualified as follows: "The information base upon which the estimates in this report were made is poor. Anecdotal accounts, research reports, travelers' descriptions, personal opinions, and local experience provided most of the evidence for the various estimates." The most recent assessment by Lepers *et al.* has the benefit of combining multiple sources of information but it did not have complete spatial coverage and was limited to 62% of drylands, with some areas relying on a single data set. That assessment was qualified as "an exercise of compilation of data from a variety of sources, with different scales, legends, definitions, etc. We have done our best to standardize but, still, there are many inconsistencies and gaps." The shortcomings of these available assessments point to the need for a systematic global monitoring program, leading to development of a scientifically credible, consistent baseline of the state of desertification (C22.4.1).

Integrated use of satellite-based remote sensing or aerial photographs with ground-based observations can provide consistent, repeatable, cost-effective data on vegetation cover.

Drylands lend themselves readily to remote sensing because they are mostly cloud-free and hence a wide range of images are available. Continuity of observations is required to account for the high interannual variability of dryland ecosystem services. Valid interpretation of remote sensing imagery for desertification requires careful calibration and validation against ground measurements (such as vegetation cover, biological productivity, evapotranspiration, soil fertility, and compaction and erosion rates). Access to affordable satellite imagery, particularly in developing countries, is critical for effectively undertaking such integrated uses (S7.3.3).

Long-term monitoring is needed to distinguish between the role of human actions and climate variability in vegetation productivity. Impacts of human activities (such as overgrazing or soil salinization) and climatic variables (such as interannual variability in rainfall and drought events) on vegetation productivity are difficult to distinguish. One example of this is the repeated droughts and famine in the Sahel region. (See Box 7.1.) Quantifying such impacts requires an established baseline of vegetation productivity against which changes can be assessed. Such a baseline is often not available and is further complicated by year-to-year and even decade-to-decade fluctuations (C2.2.1).

Understanding the impacts of desertification on human well-being requires that we improve our knowledge of the interactions between socioeconomic factors and ecosystem conditions. The combination of factors affecting human well-being varies by location and aspect, as demonstrated by the example in Box 7.1. Health outcomes, for example, are the combined result of ecosystem condition, access to health care, economic status, and many other factors. A small increase in food prices resulting from lower yields will affect the well-being of many people. Tracing such impacts is often difficult, particularly in macro-scale analyses where the impacts of ecosystem change are often hidden by aggregation of data or hampered by lack of information. Analyses linking well-being and ecosystem condition are most easily carried out at a local scale, where the linkages can be most clearly identified (C2.ES).




Serious erosion is eating away at the land of a Bolivian farmer and will threaten his crops; erroneous plowing techniques often cause such erosion

Box 7.1. DROUGHTS IN THE SAHEL REGION: LESSONS LEARNED AND KNOWLEDGE GAPS

The Sahel region in Africa has been hit by a series of droughts and subsequent famines in the 1970s and 1980s (C5 Box 5.1, C22.6.4). These droughts are natural phenomena in the Sahel, and the consequent land degradation in the Sahel has further reduced regional rainfall (C13.6.1). More recently, the warming of the Indian Ocean is also thought to have contributed to these droughts.

Droughts in the Sahel reduced productivity, leading to low vegetation cover that increased albedo, reduced water recycling and monsoon circulation, thus decreasing precipitation. Reduced vegetation cover also led to soil erosion and further reduction of productivity. This vicious cycle further suppressed vegetation cover (C13 Box 13.1). Reduced vegetation cover could also be attributed to human activities such as unsustainable land use practices, including overstocking, overgrazing, deep ploughing, and monocropping (C5 Box 5.1). These practices—partly in response to droughts or increasing population density in the Sahel region—contributed to soil degradation, increased wind erosion, and higher levels of dust (C13.4.3). Thus it has been suggested that the combination of human and natural factors led to the severe loss of land productivity and subsequent famines. However, long-term remote sensing studies indicate extensive recovery of vegetation productivity after the droughts, suggesting that it was almost completely controlled by rainfall (C22 Box 22.2, C13.3.2, C19.2.3).

Because productivity was restored in many parts of the Sahel region, the relationship between famine, drought, and desertification is not clear. The complex interactions between regional and local biophysical conditions and human intervention make it difficult to determine cause-and-effect of desertification correctly. More reliable data in Sahel are needed to better understand the magnitude of desertification and to reduce uncertainties for policy-makers. It is clear, though, that the sustainability of livelihoods based on ecosystems experiencing serious droughts or desertification depends on appropriately tailored management approaches.



It follows that the gathering of information about socioeconomic factors related to desertification needs to be carried out at sub-national levels. The MA was able to gain specific insights into the correlation of human well-being to the level of aridity by disaggregating economic and well-being data like GNP per person, infant mortality, and the hunger rate in children under the age of five at the sub-national level. This enabled the categorization of these data according to the degree of aridity. National monitoring efforts that directly collect sub-national and perhaps household-level data are essential to our understanding of the impacts of desertification on human well-being (C22.6.1).

Reducing Uncertainty


There are considerable scientific challenges in detecting thresholds beyond which drylands systems would reach a critical or effectively irreversible change. This partly stems from our lack of understanding about the interactions between biophysical, social, and economic factors. Ecosystem conditions and factors affecting them are dynamic and change over time. This

complicates accurate predictions of policy outcomes and detection of irreversible thresholds (C22.6).

The impact of poverty reduction strategies on ecosystem services and desertification has not been fully explored by governments and the international community. More information is needed to assess the linkages between the policies for poverty reduction and combating desertification. Poverty-ecosystem links are typically ignored in poverty reduction policies. Even when these links are included, only the economic values are considered. Successful responses should include broader notions of poverty and should try to mainstream the role of ecosystem services in the main poverty reduction programs.

The contribution of dryland urban areas to desertification may be significant but is not known. Figure 7.1 shows the overlap of urban areas with the four dryland categories. The dependence of these cities on ecosystem services from drylands versus non-drylands is generally not well known. Understanding this dependence will also help determine the degree to which cities may relieve pressure on desertified areas through economic opportunities (C22.4.4).

Figure 7.1. OVERLAP OF URBAN AREAS WITH THE FOUR DRYLAND CATEGORIES





A Chinese farmer walks home after work,
Xinglungzhao forest station, P.R. China.




ICARDA

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A PRESENT-DAY DRYLANDS AND THEIR CATEGORIES

Drylands include all terrestrial regions where the production of crops, forage, wood and other ecosystem services are limited by water. Formally, the definition encompasses all lands where the climate is classified as dry subhumid, semiarid, arid or hyper-arid. This classification is based on Aridity Index values[†].



[†] The long-term mean of the ratio of an area's mean annual precipitation to its mean annual potential evapotranspiration is the Aridity Index (AI).

Notes: The map is based on data from UNEP Geo Data Portal (<http://geodata.grid.unep.ch/>). Global area based on Digital Chart of the World data (147,573,196.6 square km); Data presented in the graph are from the MA core database for the year 2000.

APPENDIX B

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

GLASOD	Global Assessment of Soil Degradation
GNP	gross national product
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NAP	National Action Programme
NGO	nongovernmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification



A jubilant Syrian farmer watering his field, with newly built water-delivery infrastructure in the background.

ZAFAR ADEEL

APPENDIX C

ASSESSMENT REPORT TABLES OF CONTENTS

Note that text references to CF, CWG, SWG, RWG, or SGWG refer to the entire Working Group report. ES refers to the Main Messages in a chapter.

Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A Framework for Assessment

CF.1	Introduction and Conceptual Framework
CF.2	Ecosystems and Their Services
CF.3	Ecosystems and Human Well-being
CF.4	Drivers of Change in Ecosystems and Their Services
CF.5	Dealing with Scale
CF.6	Concepts of Ecosystem Value and Valuation Approaches
CF.7	Analytical Approaches
CF.8	Strategic Interventions, Response Options, and Decision-making

Current State and Trends: Findings of the Condition and Trends Working Group

SDM	Summary
C.01	MA Conceptual Framework
C.02	Analytical Approaches for Assessing Ecosystem Conditions and Human Well-being
C.03	Drivers of Change (note: this is a synopsis of Scenarios Chapter 7)
C.04	Biodiversity
C.05	Ecosystem Conditions and Human Well-being
C.06	Vulnerable Peoples and Places
C.07	Fresh Water
C.08	Food
C.09	Timber, Fuel, and Fiber
C.10	New Products and Industries from Biodiversity
C.11	Biological Regulation of Ecosystem Services
C.12	Nutrient Cycling
C.13	Climate and Air Quality
C.14	Human Health: Ecosystem Regulation of Infectious Diseases
C.15	Waste Processing and Detoxification
C.16	Regulation of Natural Hazards: Floods and Fires
C.17	Cultural and Amenity Services
C.18	Marine Fisheries Systems
C.19	Coastal Systems
C.20	Inland Water Systems
C.21	Forest and Woodland Systems
C.22	Dryland Systems
C.23	Island Systems
C.24	Mountain Systems
C.25	Polar Systems
C.26	Cultivated Systems
C.27	Urban Systems
C.28	Synthesis

Scenarios: Findings of the Scenarios Working Group

SDM	Summary
S.01	MA Conceptual Framework
S.02	Global Scenarios in Historical Perspective
S.03	Ecology in Global Scenarios
S.04	State of Art in Simulating Future Changes in Ecosystem Services
S.05	Scenarios for Ecosystem Services: Rationale and Overview
S.06	Methodology for Developing the MA Scenarios
S.07	Drivers of Change in Ecosystem Condition and Services
S.08	Four Scenarios
S.09	Changes in Ecosystem Services and Their Drivers across the Scenarios
S.10	Biodiversity across Scenarios
S.11	Human Well-being across Scenarios
S.12	Interactions among Ecosystem Services
S.13	Lessons Learned for Scenario Analysis
S.14	Policy Synthesis for Key Stakeholders

Policy Responses: Findings of the Responses Working Group

SDM	Summary
R.01	MA Conceptual Framework
R.02	Typology of Responses
R.03	Assessing Responses
R.04	Recognizing Uncertainties in Evaluating Responses
R.05	Biodiversity
R.06	Food and Ecosystems
R.07	Freshwater Ecosystem Services
R.08	Wood, Fuelwood, and Non-wood Forest Products
R.09	Nutrient Management
R.10	Waste Management, Processing, and Detoxification
R.11	Flood and Storm Control
R.12	Ecosystems and Vector-borne Disease Control
R.13	Climate Change
R.14	Cultural Services
R.15	Integrated Responses
R.16	Consequences and Options for Human Health
R.17	Consequences of Responses on Human Well-being and Poverty Reduction
R.18	Choosing Responses
R.19	Implications for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals

Multiscale Assessments: Findings of the Sub-global Assessments Working Group

SDM	Summary
SG.01	MA Conceptual Framework
SG.02	Overview of the MA Sub-global Assessments
SG.03	Linking Ecosystem Services and Human Well-being
SG.04	The Multiscale Approach
SG.05	Using Multiple Knowledge Systems: Benefits and Challenges
SG.06	Assessment Process
SG.07	Drivers of Ecosystem Change
SG.08	Condition and Trends of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity
SG.09	Responses to Ecosystem Change and their Impacts on Human Well-being
SG.10	Sub-global Scenarios
SG.11	Communities, Ecosystems, and Livelihoods
SG.12	Reflections and Lessons Learned

Secretariat Support Organizations

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) coordinates the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Secretariat, which is based at the following partner institutions:

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Italy

Institute of Economic Growth, India

International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), Mexico (*until 2002*)

Meridian Institute, United States

National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Netherlands (*until mid-2004*)

Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), France

UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom

University of Pretoria, South Africa

University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States

World Resources Institute (WRI), United States

WorldFish Center, Malaysia

Maps and graphics: Emmanuelle Bournay and Philippe Rekacewicz, UNEP/GRID-Arendal, Norway

The production of maps and graphics was made possible by the generous support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway and UNEP/GRID-Arendal.

Photos:

Front cover:

■ ICARDA

Back cover:


■ JORGEN SCHYTTE/Peter Arnold, Inc.

Caption:

Use of solar energy for cooking and home lighting reduces reliance on firewood, and hence, reduces the threat of desertification (Tuareg village, Niger)



P. CENINI/FAO



ICSU
International Council for Science

IUCN
The World Conservation Union



UNITED NATIONS
FOUNDATION



WORLD
RESOURCES
INSTITUTE

ISBN 1-56973-590-5



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Land is an essential building block of civilization, yet its contribution to our quality of life is perceived and valued in starkly different and often incompatible ways. A minority has grown rich from the unsustainable use and large-scale exploitation of land resources with related conflicts intensifying in many countries. The world has reached a point where we must reconcile these differences and rethink the way in which we plan, use, and manage the land.

Our ability to manage trade-offs at a landscape scale will ultimately decide the future of land resources – soil, water, and biodiversity – and determine success or failure in delivering poverty reduction, food and water security, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. Indeed, integrated land and water management is recognized as an accelerator for achieving most of the Sustainable Development Goals.

While we are at a critical juncture, fast approaching and in some cases surpassing planetary boundaries, the evidence presented in this first edition of the *Global Land Outlook* demonstrates that informed and responsible decision-making, improved land management policies and practices, and simple changes in our everyday lives, can, if widely adopted, help to reverse the current worrying trends in the state of our land resources.

THE BIG PICTURE

The pressures on global land resources are greater than at any other time in human history. A rapidly increasing population, coupled with rising levels of consumption, is placing ever-larger demands on our land-based natural capital. This results in growing competition among land uses and its provisioning of goods and services.

In basic terms, there is increasing competition between the demand for goods and services that benefit people, like food, water, and energy, and the need to protect other ecosystem services that regulate and support all life on Earth. Terrestrial biodiversity underpins all of these services and underwrites the full enjoyment of a wide range of human rights, such as the rights to a healthy life, nutritious food, clean water, and cultural identity.

A significant proportion of managed and natural ecosystems are degrading and at further risk from climate change and biodiversity loss. From 1998 to 2013, approximately 20 per cent of the Earth's vegetated land surface showed persistent declining trends in productivity, apparent in 20 per cent of cropland, 16 per cent of forest land, 19 per cent of grassland, and 27 per cent of rangeland. These trends are especially alarming in the face of the increased demand for land-intensive crops and livestock.

Land degradation contributes to climate change and increases the vulnerability of millions of people, especially the poor, women, and children. Current management practices in the land-use sector are responsible for about 25 per cent of the world's greenhouse gases, while land degradation is both a cause and a result of poverty. Over 1.3 billion people, mostly in the developing countries, are trapped on degrading agricultural land, exposed to climate stress, and therefore excluded from wider infrastructure and economic development.

Land degradation also triggers competition for scarce resources, which can lead to migration and insecurity while exacerbating access and income inequalities. Soil erosion, desertification, and water scarcity all contribute to societal stress and breakdown. In this regard, land degradation can be considered a "threat amplifier," especially when it slowly reduces people's ability to use the land for food production and water storage or undermines other vital ecosystem services. This in turn increases human insecurity and, in certain circumstances, may trigger or increase the risk of conflict.

The scale of rural transformation in recent decades has been unprecedented in its speed and scale.

Millions of people have abandoned their ancestral lands and migrated to urban areas, often impoverishing cultural identity, abandoning traditional knowledge, and permanently altering landscapes.

AN EMERGING CONSENSUS

Higher temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, and increased water scarcity due to climate change will alter the suitability of vast regions for food production and human habitation. The mass extinction of flora and fauna, including the loss of crop wild relatives and keystone species that hold ecosystems together, further jeopardizes resilience and adaptive capacity, particularly for the rural poor who depend most on the land for their basic needs and livelihoods.

Our food system has put the focus on short-term production and profit rather than long-term environmental sustainability. The modern agricultural system has resulted in huge increases in productivity, holding off the risk of famine in many parts of the world but, at the same time, is based on monocultures, genetically modified crops, and the intensive use of fertilizers and pesticides that undermine long-term sustainability. Food production accounts for 70 per cent of all freshwater withdrawals and 80 per cent of deforestation, while soil, the basis for global food security, is being contaminated, degraded, and eroded in many areas, resulting in long-term declines in productivity.

Small-scale farmers, the backbone of rural livelihoods and food production for millennia, are under immense strain from land degradation, insecure tenure, and a globalized food system that favors concentrated, large-scale, and highly mechanized agribusiness. These farmers often have limited options to pursue alternative livelihoods.

The widening gulf between production and consumption, and ensuing levels of food loss/waste, further accelerates the rate of land use change, land degradation and deforestation. The rapid expansion of global value chains and associated trade in land commodities (and their "virtual" components) has shifted many natural resource pressures from the developed to developing countries, where the direct effects of land degradation are unevenly distributed, especially when there is excessive speculation and/or weak governance.

In order to hedge against future food insecurity and price volatility, large-scale land acquisitions or “land grabs” have increased dramatically since 2000, covering more than 42 million hectares dedicated to food, timber, and biofuel crops, primarily in Africa. About 25 per cent of global cropland area, and its associated use of water and other inputs, now produces commodities that are exported to land-poor but cash-rich countries.

SCENARIOS OF CHANGE

Except for some regions in Europe, the human use of the land before the mid-1700s was insignificant when compared with contemporary changes in the Earth’s ecosystems. The notion of a limitless, human-dominated world was embraced and reinforced by scientific advances. Populations abruptly gained access to what seemed to be an unlimited stock of natural capital, where land was seen as a free gift of nature.

The scenario analysis carried out for this *Outlook* examines a range of possible futures and projects increasing tension between the need to increase food and energy production, and continuing declines in biodiversity and ecosystem services.

From a regional perspective, these scenarios predict that sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa will face the greatest challenges due to a mix of factors, including: high population growth, low per capita GDP, limited options for agricultural expansion, increased water stress, and high biodiversity losses. The lack of economic and institutional means to cope with these factors will increase the risks of violent conflict and mass migration.

Other global land use scenarios suggest that management practices in a landscape context, accounting for interdependencies, are more significant determinants of shared environmental and food security outcomes than population and economic growth projections. These models imply that the perceived trade-offs are not simply a matter of the number of people but rather the predictable consequence of narrowly-focused and unsustainable land use planning, policies, and practices.

Land is finite in quantity, but the evidence presented in the *Outlook* suggests that with changes in consumer and corporate behavior, and sustainable management policies and practices, we still have sufficient land available to meet both the demand and the need for a wide array of goods and services. However, difficult choices and trade-offs will be necessary.

Long-term food and water security will require shifts away from resource-intensive production, carbon-intensive processing and transport, land-intensive diets (primarily from the increased demand for animal products and processed foods), and the current high levels of food waste, including post-harvest losses.

Effective response pathways therefore need to address the way we value and manage the quality of the land, striving to balance its biological and economic productivity. It is the sum total of our individual decisions – as consumers, producers, corporations, and governments – that has created a global land crisis. Like our response to climate change, a business-as-usual approach will be insufficient to address the magnitude of this challenge.

A MORE SECURE FUTURE

We already know much of what it takes to build a resilient planet for future generations – to harness the immense opportunities for sustainable growth provided by nature and ensure a more secure future. The question is: can we catalyze a shift from the current “age of plunder” toward an “age of respect” where we respect biophysical limits?

A new age of respect would require a transformation in the way we consume, produce, work, and live together to address major pressures on land resources and associated environmental issues. The condition of land resources is closely bound up with all aspects of human security now and into the future.

It is clear that the next few decades will be the most critical in shaping and implementing a new and transformative global land agenda. In much of the developing world, achieving more secure rights in terms of tenure, gender equity, and social justice, will be an essential step to improving the long-term stewardship of land resources.

For this new agenda to take hold and generate impacts at the scale needed, rights and rewards must be underpinned by responsibility. Security of tenure and appropriate incentives and rewards are needed to enable producers to adopt and scale up more responsible land management practices. Ultimately, how can we ignore the moral and ethical obligation to safeguard and preserve the land for future generations?

Part One of this *Outlook* takes a broad brush in painting the big picture while **Part Two** discussed some of the most pressing global issues that impact land use, demand, and condition as well as the responses needed to achieve the target of Land Degradation Neutrality, and the related objectives of poverty reduction, food and water security, biodiversity and soil conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable livelihoods.

Part Three highlights six response pathways that producers and consumers, governments and corporations can follow to stabilize and reduce pressure on land resources as well as illustrative case studies and key tools to help achieve success.

1. Multifunctional landscape approach: prioritizing and balancing different stakeholder needs at a landscape scale while incorporating site-level specificity on land use, demand, and condition so that a full range of goods and services are produced. Land use planning helps identify those land uses that best meet the demands of people while safeguarding soil, water, and biodiversity for future generations.

2. Resilience building: enhancing the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystems through a mix of conservation, sustainable management, and restoration of land resources. There are many tools and practices to safeguard healthy, well-functioning, and diverse natural and managed lands that can help to mitigate and adapt to climate change and other natural resource pressures.

3. Farming for multiple benefits: optimizing the most desirable suite of ecosystem services from food production activities. This requires a fundamental shift in agriculture practices to support a wider array of social, environmental, and economic benefits from managing land-based natural capital.

4. Managing the rural-urban interface: framing a new approach to spatial planning to minimize the impacts of urban sprawl and infrastructure development. Cities designed for sustainability in the wider landscape can reduce environmental costs of transport, food, water, and energy, and offer new opportunities for resource efficiency.

5. No net loss: providing incentives for the sustainable consumption and production of natural resources. Land degradation neutrality or no net loss of healthy and productive land means more services onsite and less negative environmental or social impacts offsite. For consumption, it means significantly reducing the current levels of food waste and loss.

6. Creating an enabling environment: providing the conditions necessary to scale local successes into large-scale, transformative initiatives. This includes fostering the underlying social and economic conditions and institutions, particularly those relating to stakeholder engagement, land tenure, gender equality, and the availability of sustained investment and infrastructure.

The numerous practices and progressive approaches highlighted in this *Outlook* serve as a timely reminder of proven, cost-effective response pathways that will shape a prosperous and more sustainable future based on rights, rewards, and respect for our precious land resources.



United Nations
Convention to Combat
Desertification

国連砂漠化対処条約(UNCCD):
土地に根差した生活を守る
(2016-2017)



過去2年間にわたり、国際連合砂漠化対処条約（UNCCD）は、その働きをフルに生かして、土地の劣化の中立性（Land degradation neutrality：LDN）の骨組みを作ってきました。LDNとは、世界中で土地の劣化、持続可能な管理と土地の回復をめぐる持続可能なバランスに達することを目指すという概念です。この取り組みは、持続可能な開発を目指す国際的な目標の中で目標15.3という形で承認されています。これは、ことによると「大変革をもたらす」動きとなり得ます。LDNはUNCCDにとって、基本原則となりつつあり、全ての国はLDNの自主目標を立てることが求められています。同時に、気候変動の適応策と緩和策において土地管理が果たす役割も、すでに認識されているのです。



この一連の流れは、世界が直面している課題全般との関わりのなかに捉える必要があります。2016年前半、壊滅的な干ばつにより、多くの地域で大混乱と深刻な食料危機が発生しました。土地の劣化は、現在では貧困と社会的不安定の根本原因と見なされており、資源不足の結果として困窮による移住や紛争にまで発展することも多い状況にあります。土地劣化は、あまりにも現実的でどこにでも起こる問題となりつつあります。今こそ緊急の対策が求められているのです。

今後2年間、UNCCDの締約国およびパートナーや関係者は、土地の劣化の中立性の達成に向けた対策を広範囲に実施し、私たちが直面する課題の多くに対して環境や社会のレジリエンス（復元力）を高めることに向けて進んでいきます。このパンフレットでは、締約国がその大きな目標を達する手助けをするための我々の支援計画を打ち出しています。

これは重要な旅路です。みなさんが私たちと共に歩むことを希望いたします。

モニーク バルビュー

国際連合砂漠化対処条約事務局長

目次

世界目標：土地の劣化の中立性.....	1
安定と機会のためのLDN.....	3
LDNのための知識.....	6
おわりに.....	8
リンクとお問合せ先.....	9
PHOTO CREDITS	10



© 2016 Secretariat of the United Nations
to Combat Desertification — All rights
reserved

United Nations Convention to Combat
Desertification
UN Campus, Platz der Vereinten Nationen
1, 53113 Bonn, Germany
Postal Address: PO Box 260129,
53153 Bonn, Germany
Tel. +49 (0) 228 815 2800
Fax: +49 (0) 228 815 2898/99
E-mail: secretariat@unccd.int

Web-site: www.unccd.int
The Global Mechanism of the UNCCD
website:
www.global-mechanism.org

<https://www.facebook.com/UNCCD>
<https://twitter.com/UNCCD>



15 LIFE ON LAND



世界目標：土地の劣化の中立性

土地の劣化の中立性（LDN）とは、シンプルな考え方でありかつ有力なツールでもある。それは、私たちが土地の使い方を改善し、一度は劣化させてしまった土地に命を取り戻すことによって、健全で生産性のある資源を十分に確保することを意味する。また、多くの人にとっては、経済、社会、政治を活性化し好機をつかむことでもある。活性化し好機をつかむことによって数多くの世界が直面している問題からの安定がもたらされるのだ。LDN は、極めて重要な世界目標であり、賢明な投資と見ることができる。

土地の劣化の中立性という考え方は、今では、持続可能な開発の世界目標のひとつである（<http://www.globalgoals.org/global-goals/life-on-land/> を参照）。

UNCCD 事務局と「地球機構（Global Mechanism : GM）（UNCCD の資金メカニズム）は、2030 年までに土地の劣化の中立性という概念を現実のものとするために、手を携えて協力している。私たちは、目標実現に向けて数多くの実際に役に立つツールを開発し、締約国や他の関係者に助言を行っている。私たちの目標は、特に LDN の独自の目標を定めた国において、実質的なプロジェクトの実施が加速され、現場で目に見える前向きな変化が生まれるのを目にすることである。

私たちは、土地問題を核としてシナジー（相乗作用）を生じさせようとしている。土地の劣化の中立性を測るための世界共通の指標が発表された。その指標とは土地利用・土地被覆変化、土地生産力、および地上部・地下部の炭素ストックである。LDN 達成への進捗状況やそのインパクトがわかりやすく理解され、また目に見えるように、パートナーシップを構築中である。その目的は、土地利用計画とそれにまつわる意思決定をより良いものとし、UNCCD および生物多様性条約（CBD）、国連気候変動枠組み条約（UNFCCC）、その他の国際政策プロセスのもとで LDN の進捗状況に関する報告を行うことだ。

まず現状をもとに基準値を設定し、その後に進捗状況を測ることは、投資を促し、気候変動と戦い、陸域生態系を健全にするための基本である。土地の劣化の中立性を達成し、劣化した土地を 2030 年まで毎年 1200 万ヘクタールずつ改良することは、確実に、気候変動に関する新たな協定（パリ協定）の達成を助けるだろう。気候変動に関する「各国が自主的に決定する約束草案」を提出した締約国 103 か国はすでに、気候変動の緩和策と適応策のいずれかに、土地利用分野を含めている。

2016 年、UNCCD はマラケシュで開催された気候変動枠組み条約（COP22）を目指して、土地と土壌の炭素吸収源としての役割や、気候変動に脆弱な社会の適応を助ける土地の劣化の中立性を提唱して来た。私たちは、「気候変動、砂漠化、土地劣化、持続可能な土地管理、食料安全保障、陸域生態系における温室効果ガスフラックスに関する IPCC 特別報告書」になっている。

私たちは、劣化した土地と陸域生態系の回復を早急に規模拡大する取り組みを支援し、気候変動適応策としての土地利用についての手引きを作成している。



UNCCD の関連研究者等で構成される「科学・政策インターフェイス」は、各国にとって LDN が実際のところ何を意味するのかについて、ガイダンスを策定している。一方で、これらの取り組みを条約の戦略的枠組みに組み入れるために、政府間作業部会が設置された。国際的に合意した目標である LDN は、地球全体のあらゆる陸域生態系における土地劣化対処を促進できる。LDN 達成には、土地の使い方を「劣化－放棄－移住」から「保護－維持－回復」へとパラダイムシフトする必要がある。



以上が、2016 年春に運用開始された「LDN 目標設定プログラム」を支える論拠である。LDN 自主目標の設定を確約した国の数は急速に増えており、このプログラムを通して、UNCCD の実行組織である地球機構 (GM) がそれらの国々を支援している。

2014 ～ 2015 年に 14 カ国で実施された LDN パイロットプロジェクトの成功例をもとに、このプログラムの主な目標が策定された。その目標とは、2030 年までに LDN を達成し、LDN への投資機会を明確にするために必要な国別の基準値、手段、および目標設定への支援である。

2030 年までに LDN を達成するには、土地の回復と劣化の回避に相当の資金を調達しなければならない。地球機構 (GM) は、ミローヴァ・ナティクス・グループと共同で、独立系投資ファンドの開発を主導し、これを調整している。このファンドは、混合資金を LDN に寄与し、信頼できるプロジェクトへと導くものだ。

LDN ファンドは、機関投資家やインパクト投資家、開発系金融機関、LDN にコミットする援助機関のために、官民パートナーシップという形で構築されている。土地に対する投資の規模と影響力を拡大するためには、他のファンドや金融機関と提携することが期待されている。

LDN ファンドの投資には、厳格な持続可能性基準と責任ある投資基準にならうことが要求される。投資の決定を行う際には、その都度、土地所有権と土地の保有条件、環境的および社会的保全が慎重に査定される。

LDN ファンドのビジョンは、毎年世界で 1200 ヘクタールずつ劣化している土地の回復のために、金融市場を開放することである。待望のプロジェクトがすでに形になりつつあり、2016 年の終わりにその一部が始動した。



安定と機会のためのLDN

LDN は、国際社会が直面する極めて大きな課題の多くについて、その解決策の重要な糸口となりうる。資源が劣化し、気候変動の影響が広がる世界では、極度の干ばつや鉄砲水、地滑り、砂嵐、砂塵嵐がむしろ、新たな日常となるだろう。人口増加と経済的チャンスの少なさが、困窮による人々の移住や天然資源をめぐる紛争に拍車をかけている。今ここで断固たる行動が必要である。土地劣化の中立性達成はその役に立ちうるのだ。

2016 年から 2017 年にかけて、私たちはとくに、干ばつ、砂塵嵐、および困窮による移住の問題を緩和するための解決策に取り組んでいく。

2016 年にいつになく強力なエルニーニョ現象が発生したため、干ばつと食料不足はさらに悪化した。今回のエルニーニョは、記録が残っている範囲で最強クラスである。UNCCD の第 12 回締約国会議における干ばつに関する重要な討議に従い、事務局はこの分野の取り組みを強化している。私たちは、締約国が予防的措置を取れるように、干ばつ管理計画と早期警報が LDN 政策サイクルに欠かせない要素となることを確実にする。

UNCCD は、ナミビア政府が主催し、2016 年 8 月 15 日から 19 日までウィントフックで開催された、アフリカの干ばつ政策を話し合う重要な会議も支援した。この会議で、私たちは、フィンランドのヴィッキ熱帯資源研究所（VITRI）と共同で、干ばつ・乾燥地の管理政策特別版に着手した。この会議の直後には、国家干ばつ管理政策のための能力育成作業の第 1 段階の総括と、次の段階の発足セッションが行われた。

UNCCD は、国レベルでの具体的な支援提供のために、世界気象機関（WMO）、国連食糧農業機関（FAO）、生物多様性条約（CBD）との協力を続けている。また、干ばつの際に被害を受けやすい人々を特定できる早期警報システムの開発にも焦点を置いている。そのシステムでは、持続可能な土地管理（Sustainable Land Management: SLM）のアプローチを用いることで、それらの人々の干ばつに対する抵抗力を強化しうるのだ。

最後に、UNCCD は、エチオピアとケニアにおける干ばつと食料不足について、ドイツ開発研究所（DIE）と共同で、パイロット研究プロジェクトに取り組んでいる。この目的は、干ばつに対する人々の抵抗力を向上させるための、現実的な政策オプションの決定をサポートすることだ。この作業の所見と結果は、2017 年の UNCCD 第 13 回締約国会議（COP13）に提出され、検討および決議されることになる。



安定と機会のためのLDN(続き)

砂塵嵐はこれまでも常に存在していた。しかし、土地が劣化すると、問題は悪化し、新たな発生地が現れる。劣化した土地が植物で覆われなくなり、土壌水分の多くが失われると、表土が風に飛ばされて海や大陸を横断する。このような砂塵嵐が生まれる側の土地は、肥沃な土壌の覆いをますます失う。砂塵が飛んでくる地域では、砂塵嵐が大気を汚染する可能性がある。それだけでなく、有害な産業汚染物質はさらに広く分散し、機械が詰まったり、健康に害を与えたりもする。年に何百万人も影響を受ける可能性もある。

UNCCD は、第 2 回国連環境総会 (UNEA-2) において、2016 年 5 月に公表された「砂塵嵐の全球評価」に関して、WMO および UNEP と連携を取っている。この評価によって、現在および将来の砂塵のホットスポット、および砂塵により影響を受ける人々が特定される。

UNCCD はパートナーと協力して、評価を分析し、政策措置を勧告することになる。その目的は、砂漠化による砂塵嵐の広がりを抑える自然のバリアを促進すること、被害を受ける地域の農業従事者の間で SLM(持続可能な土地管理) の導入とインセンティブを促進すること、砂塵嵐の影響に対処する方法について危険な状態にある住民を教育することである。政策は、2017 年の UNCCD 第 13 回締約国会議に提出され、検討されることになる。

土地の劣化は、困窮による移住を生み出す環境要因である。

絶望的な状況にある人々が移住を余儀なくされるとき、彼らが土地を放棄することは、その土地に残らざるを得ない最も脆弱な人々を、社会的・経済的にさらに孤立させる可能性がある。基本的な経験則として、不適切な土地利用と生産性の低下が気候変動によってさらに悪化するという状況において、農業従事者やその他の土地利用者は、次に利用可能な生産性のある土地へまず移動する。行き先は、多くの場合、森だ。世界全体で見て、森林伐採の 80% は、農業の拡大によるものである。その土地が使い尽くされれば、移住の圧力が加速する。

新たな移住パターンの原因として、自然資源の枯渇と、経済的によりよい将来を望む動機が増えている。(干ばつなどの)過酷ながらもゆっくりと進む自然災害、つまり暮らしや生態系に徐々に影響を及ぼすような事象が発生した場合、人々は別の土地へと移住する傾向にある。多くの人は、自分の居住地域内や近隣の都市に移動し予期せぬ都市化を押し進めたりするが、その一方で、土地の劣化の結果、今後 30 年間で 1 億 3500 万にもおよぶ人々が困窮による移住を余儀なくされる恐れがある。いかなる対応策も、気候変動と食料生産システム問題を考慮したうえで、それらの困窮による移住をせざるを得ない、また過激化思考に影響を受けやすい立場





にいる人々に対する、真に意味のある、安定した雇用を含まねばならない。自国や出身地においてよりよい安定と機会を提供することによって、移住という選択を減らし、将来の経済的な発展を構築することが可能になるはずである。

2016年から2017年にかけて、UNCCDは主なパートナーと共に、土地劣化・干ばつと移住の関係について、さらに明確な裏づけをすることによって、国の政策づくりを支援している。また、土地を基盤とした機会についてガイダンスを策定し、さらに、乾燥地における移住（転出）と土地劣化の関

連性を探り脆弱性および問題地域を示した詳細地図を作成している。

サハラ・サヘル地域における緑の壁イニシアチブ：ダカールからジブチまでの希望のリボン

サハラ・サヘル地域における緑の壁 (Great Green Wall) イニシアチブは、良く管理され、回復した土地がダカールとジブチの間に形成され、モザイク状に連なる様子を比喻した名前である。地球機構 (GM) は、アフリカ連合が率いるこのイニシアチブの経営参加パートナーとして、「FLEUVE」と呼ばれる欧州委員会が出資するプロジェクトを実施している。その目的は、持続可能な土地管理 (SLM) への投資を増やし、特に女性と若者向けに「グリーンな」雇用機会を提供するために、地域レベルで能力を育成することだ。

「緑の壁」の認知度を高めようと、地球機構は、アフリカ連合委員会と共に、啓発キャンペーンを先導している。キャンペーンの目的は、土地の回復に最大の投資を呼び込むことである。このキャンペーンは、パリで開催された気候変動枠組み条約のCOP21で、「バーチャルリアリティ経験」プロモーションでスタートした。「緑の壁」イニシアチブには開発パートナーから、今後5年間で40億ドルの支援を表明されている。



また、土地を基盤とした仕事の潜在的な機会を探ることは、イタリア政府が資金を提供するプロジェクト「西アフリカ：革新的資金調達メカニズムによる移住多発地域における持続可能な土地管理の推進」の目的でもある。これは、国際移住機関 (IOM) の技術支援を得て、地球機構が実施している。



LDNのための知識

土地の劣化の中立性（LDN）を実現するうえで、知識はその礎である。LDN を達成するには、正しい情報がすべての人に行きわたらなければならない。情報は、適切な人、すなわちその情報を最も必要としている人の手に入らなければならない。それが誰かと言えば、政策決定者であり、小規模農家である。特に女性が重要だ。

知識の伝達と能力育成がかつてないほど重要になっている。UNCCD はこれを実現させるため、独自のメカニズムとツールを駆使している。

UNCCD の「**能力育成マーケットプレイス**」は、自らの知識とニーズを共有する人々により広がり続けている。これをさらに成長させるために、ぜひあなたのサポートを！

COP は「**科学・政策インターフェイス**（Science-Policy Interface : SPI）」を設立した。目的は、政策立案者やその他の意思決定者に、最新の科学情報に基づいた最先端の政策提言を行うことである。この専門家集団は、UNCCD およびその他のプロセスに欠かすことのできない情報を提供している。この 2 年間で、土地の劣化の中立性について、およびモロッコ・マラケシュで開催された UNFCCC COP22 の準備段階で、気候変動の緩和策と適応策における土地の役割について、SPI が大きな成果を生み出すことが期待される。

「**科学知識提供ポータル**（Scientific Knowledge Brokering Portal : SKBP）」は、LDN の知識ハブである。持続可能な土地管理（SLM）に関するグローバルな知識と情報を、利用者に提供するのがその目的だ。世界最高水準の情報へのアクセスを提供することで、現地で砂漠化・土地劣化・干ばつ（desertification, land degradation and drought : DLDD）の問題に取り組む人々と地域社会をサポートすることを目指している。プロトタイプは完成しており、2015 年の COP12 で提示されている。「完全版」の開発は現在順調に進行している。専用の検索エンジン、双方向性のための数多くのオプション、ソリューション／技術への重点的取り組みが、豊富なベストプラクティス（良好事例）と組み合わせて、提供されることになる。5 つの新たな知識パートナーが互いに繋がり、LDN 目標の実行を支えることになる。2016 年末には、モバイルアプリケーション、ブランディングの変更、本格的な SKBP プロダクトがリリースされた。

さらに、2017 年には「**世界土地概況**（Global Land Outlook : GLO）」の第 1 版が、印刷物と電子版の両方でリリースされることになっている。GLO には、CBD（生物多様性条約）の「生物多様性概況（Global Biodiversity Outlook : GBO）」、UNEP（国連環境計画）の「世界環境概況（Global Environmental Outlook : GEO）」と同様、UNCCD の新たな旗艦刊行物になることが期待されている。

GLO は、戦略的なコミュニケーション基盤であり、出版物である。これにより、人間の福利

■ ■

にとって土地の質が最も重要であることを証明し、土地の転換や劣化、損失に見られる現在の傾向を評価し、それを推し進める要因を特定し、その影響を分析し、将来の課題と機会に対してシナリオを提供し、地球規模および国家規模の土地使用政策や計画、実践のための新たな変革的ビジョンを提示する。

GLO は、様々な国からの専門家やパートナーで構成された多様なグループをひとつにまとめ、持続可能な開発を背景として、土地資源の管理と回復に向けた将来の課題に取り組む。内容は以下が含まれる。

- ・ 食料、水、エネルギーの安全保障
- ・ 気候変動と生物多様性の保全
- ・ 都市・都市近郊の開発、インフラの開発
- ・ 土地の保有条件、ガバナンス、ジェンダー
- ・ 移住、紛争、人間の安全保障

GLO のデジタルプラットフォームに不可欠な部分は、UNCCD の「科学知識提供ポータル (SKBP)」への直接リンクと、SKBP からのサポートだろう。これにより利用者は、SKBP に含まれる適切な知識ベースから、高度なオプション検索ができるようになる。

上記以外で、GLO 第 1 版のユニークな機能は以下のとおり。

- ・ 作業報告書シリーズ — GLO 寄稿者に自らの分析をさらに拡散する幅広い機会を提供する補助刊行物
- ・ ベストプラクティス (良好事例) の普及 — 複数の開発目標を達成するために、持続可能な土地管理 (SLM) の実践を再現・拡大する、新しいビジョン
- ・ 土地管理指数 — 土地管理のより良い政策や計画、実践を支援するために既存の指標を使うことの有用性を探る仕組み



おわりに

世界はきわめて困難な問題に直面している。全ての住民が、力を奪われ、幻滅を感じ、土地を追われつつある。彼らの生存と将来の拠り所となる土地が、もはや彼らを養うことができないからだ。炭素排出量の差を埋めるか、あるいは気候変動に適応するための、全ての人々に十分な食料と水を供給するための、これから生まれる数十億の子供たちに有意義な機会を見出すための、脆弱な地域を安定させるための有効で現実的な計画がたとえあったとしても、健全で生産性があり、持続可能な方法で管理されている土地資源がなければ、計画はまったく現実的ではない。

世界の問題が複雑であるのと同じくらい複雑だが、LDN に投資して毎年少なくとも 1200 万ヘクタールの土地を回復させることは、それらの問題への解決に極めて重要な貢献となり得る。LDN ツールを使えば、地域社会や経済圏、そしてそれらを可能にする生態学的な環境を効果的に安定させることができるのだ。

機運は、土地への賢い投資にある。2016 年から 2017 年にかけて、UNCCD とそのパートナーは、優れた土地管理によって何を成し遂げることができるかを立証する。このパンフレットでは、持続可能な土地管理（SLM）について UNCCD を通して今まに行われている仕事のごく一部に光を当てた。ここで概要を説明したプロジェクトやイニシアチブが、刺激的で魅力あるものだと思っていただけることを期待する。このパンフレットを読んだみなさんがどこにおられようとも、私たちと共に、土地の劣化の中立性の達成に関与していただきたい。土地に根差した生活ができるかどうかは、それにかかっている。





リンクとお問合せ先

To find out more, please visit...

... www.unccd.int

... www.global-mechanism.org

... <http://global-land-outlook.squarespace.com/about/#outlook>

... http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/Capacity-building/CBW/Pages/default.aspx?utm_source=unccd.int/marketplace&utm_medium=redirect&utm_campaign=CBM#

Or contact: secretariat@unccd.int.



PHOTO CREDITS

Cover page:	We do it, A. Khandarmaa, © UNCCD
Inside front cover:	Burkina Faso48, © P. Tosco/Oxfam, Flickr CC 8328854107_af7e846241_o
Page i:	Monique Barbut, UNCCD Executive Secretary, © UNCCD
Page ii:	Plantation for new generation, Myanmar, Aung Kyaw Moe, © UNCCD
Page 1:	Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 15 icon; Un hogar soñado, © UNCCD
Page 2:	Women sowing okra in zaï holes in the Sahel, © ICRISAT, Flickr CC 7175750825_dcbf9046f8_o; Halfmoon technique, © ICRISAT, their website, 1377234405_1; Giulio Napoletano, © UNCCD
Page 3:	Sahel farmer showing the leaves that were her only food during a severe drought, Burkina Faso, © P. Tosco/Oxfam, Flickr CC 8328854107_af7e846241_o; Desertificación, E. Blanco Mendizabal, © UNCCD
Page 4:	Labourer walking in dust at construction site of National Olympic Stadium in Beijing, May 17, 2007, © REUTERS/Alfred Cheng Jin (CHINA);
Page 4/5:	Stabilizing sand dunes by planting trees in Kubuqi, China, July 2015, © AErlewein
Page 5:	Millet field after harvest, BurkinaFaso, © TreeAid 2011, Flickr CC 5900833762_3ffa25eb70_o; Burkina Faso 16, © A. Borgarelli/World Bank
Page 6:	Ignorance, © Horacio Agostini Flickr CC 326362729_f7ec7f4133_o
Page 7:	Woman in Sahelian vegetable garden, © CGIAR, Flickr CC 14324464528_cd577ef4e2_o
Page 8:	Dust storm over camps 9 Oct 2008, © N. Brooks, Flickr CC 2958921735_1b7e04ec90_o; Frenando el desierto, E. Blanco Mendizabal, © UNCCD
Page 9:	Children in happy mood, © UNCCD
Inside back cover:	Golden Harvest, A. Kumar Sanyal, © UNCCD
Back cover:	SDG 15 icon



日本語版作成 鳥取大学国際乾燥地研究教育機構
<http://www.ipdre.tottori-u.ac.jp/>

発行日:2017年2月7日



15 LIFE ON LAND



United Nations
Convention to Combat
Desertification

ISBN 978-92-95110-12-0 (e-copy) — ISBN 978-92-95110-25-0 (hard copy) Second Edition

乾燥地における住民参加による持続可能な牧草地利用等検討業務

モンゴルの遊牧

モンゴル^{注1)} は年平均気温0.5℃、年平均降水量200mm程度と寒冷で乾燥した地域です^{注2)}。それに加え、雨の降り方は時間的にも空間的にも大きく変動します。このような自然環境に適した資源利用方法が遊牧です。遊牧とは、家畜の群れを移動させながら、人々も住まいを移しながら家畜と一緒に移動する暮らしのことです。遊牧は現在でもモンゴルの牧民^{注3)} の衣食住を担う生業であり、国の基幹産業であり、文化的・精神的な支柱です。

注1) モンゴル国のことをこの資料では、モンゴルと書きます。

注2) モンゴル国内の21県とウランバートルの1968年～2016年の平均値です。

注3) モンゴル語の家畜飼育者「マルチン」の直訳として「牧民」を用いました。

遊牧に悪影響をもたらす砂漠化の要因

モンゴルにとって重要な遊牧に砂漠化は悪影響をもたらします。砂漠化を引き起こす要因として以下が挙げられます。

①移動性の低下

乾燥した草原において移動性は砂漠化を緩和し、人々の暮らしを安定させます。モンゴルにおいても遊牧の移動性低下は、放牧地の砂漠化をもたらす危険性があります。遊牧の移動性を表すのが「オトル」です。オトルとは、牧民が通常用いている放牧地から家畜群を切り離す出張放牧です。

②干ばつ時に頼りになる植物の過剰利用

乾燥に強く、干ばつ時にも残りやすい植物「デルス」(*Achnatherum splendens*) は、干ばつ時に家畜が集中し、過剰に採食されるため、劣化が進んでいます。

背景・目的

本事業はモンゴル南部に広がるゴビ地域にあるドンドゴビ県サインツァガーン郡で行いました。同郡では、放牧地を持続的に利用するために郡が放牧地利用計画を策定しています。しかし牧民が計画立案から実施、評価に参加していないため、計画の実効性が低いという課題がありました。移動性を支えるオトルについては、オトル先の牧民に追い出され、移動性が低下しかねない状況が生まれていました。さらに干ばつや冬の災害時の飼料として頼りにしたいデルスを牧民が管理できていないため、干ばつ時に使われ過ぎて劣化が進んでいました。デルスの劣化は局所的な砂漠化を示すとともに、牧畜にも悪影響をもたらします。本事業では、これらの課題を解決し、ゴビ地域における持続可能な放牧地利用を進める方法を試行し、調査しました。



干ばつ傾向時(写真1、2006年6月)と非干ばつ傾向時(写真2、2010年6月)の風景。降水量が大きく変わるため景色は一変します。移動性を支える移動式住居「ゲル」(写真3)と放牧の様子(写真4)。(撮影場所: ドンドゴビ県サインツァガーン郡)



写真5: 出張放牧「オトル」

写真6: デルス
(*Achnatherum splendens*)

(撮影場所: ドンドゴビ県サインツァガーン郡)



図1 事業対象地域

三秋 (1993) を参考に作成

＜ゴビ、ハンガイ＞

ハンガイは、モンゴル北側に広がる高山・山岳森林・森林ステップ・ステップで構成される地域です。降水量が比較的多く、牧民の移動回数は少なく、移動距離も短い傾向があります。

ゴビは、モンゴル南部に広がり、砂漠ステップと砂漠により構成されます。降水量が少なく、変動性が高い地域です。ゴビでは植物が平均的な場合でも年15～20回、植物が少ない場合には年25～30回移動します。干ばつ時の移動距離は150～200kmに及びます。




写真7

事業対象地域の風景 (写真7)

主要参考文献

- Kakinuma, K., Okayasu, T., Jamsran, U., and Okuro, T. (2014). Herding strategies during a drought vary at multiple scales in Mongolian rangeland. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 109, 88–91.
- 風戸真理 (2009). 「現代モンゴル遊牧民の民族史－ポスト社会主義を生きる」, 世界思想社.
- 小長谷有紀 (2013). モンゴルにおける遊牧 その特徴が示す現代の変容. 佐藤洋一郎・谷口真人編「イエローベルトの環境史－サヘルからシルクロードへ」, 弘文堂, 88–97.
- 三秋尚 (1993). 牧畜と食生活. 日本・モンゴル友好協会編「モンゴル入門」, 三省堂, 53–108.
- Sneath, D. (1999). Spatial mobility and inner Asian pastoralism. In C. Humphrey and D. Sneath eds. "The End of Nomadism?" Duke University Press; Durham, 218–277.
- 利光有紀 (1983). "オトル"ノートーモンゴルの移動牧畜をめぐって. 人文地理, 53(6), 68–79.
- 吉田順一 (1982). モンゴルの遊牧における移動の理由と種類について. 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科紀要, 28, 327–342.

事業概要

事業はドンドゴビ県サインツアガン郡において、2012～2015年度（平成24～27年度）に、モンゴル国自然環境・観光省、モンゴル生命科学大学、同大学牧畜研究所、モンゴル科学院地理・地生態学研究所、ドンドゴビ県、サインツアガン郡と共同して行われました。

事業の構成要素は三つあります。一つ目は、牧民が放牧地利用計画の実施に参加するようになることで、同計画の実効性が高まるのではないかと仮定して行った、牧民の参加を得た放牧地利用計画の策定です。二つ目は、既存の方法では牧民がデルスを管理できていないため、柵を用いて牧民が管理する方法の試行です。三つ目は、牧民間の互惠性の低下を補うために、郡間でのオトル受け入れに関する協定締結です。以下にそれぞれの取組の内容と成果・課題を整理します。

調査内容と成果・課題

①牧民の参加を得た放牧地利用計画の策定

2014年8月に牧民30人の参加を得て放牧地利用計画について話し合いを行いました。牧民の意見を踏まえて郡が作成した同計画を、郡の牧民が集う場で情報提供しました。その際には専門家から牧民が同計画に参加することの必要性・重要性に関する講演が行われました。2015年8月に牧民が同計画の進捗を評価し、改善点を話し合いました。ゴビ地域における工夫として試行したのは、移動して郡外に出る傾向のある世帯と、郡内に残る世帯という移動性の異なるグループ分けを導入し、村単位で話し合いを行ったことです。

成果としては、牧民の計画への認識が向上しただけでなく、放牧地を持続的に使おうとする意識の高まりが見られました。牧民の認識や意識の変化に加えて、牧民のニーズを取り込むことで計画の具体性が増したこともあり、計画の実効性向上が期待できる状況になりました。移動性や村単位での話し合いの方法については、郡や牧民から適切であったとの評価を得ました。

ただし課題も残りました。非災害時に策定された計画であったため、災害時への対応は十分とは言えませんでした。また自然環境の変動が激しい地域であるため、この方法の効果を確かめるためには、継続的なモニタリングが必要と考えられます。

②牧民によるデルスの管理

2014年9月に柵を設置し、牧民がデルスを管理しました。

成果としては、2015年1月に行った刈り取り調査から、柵内のデルスの乾燥重量は増加しており、デルスの過剰利用が防がれていました。冬営地近隣のデルスを管理したことで、弱った家畜に採食させやすくなり、家畜の状態も牧民の労働負担も改善されました。特定の牧民がデルスを管理しても、周辺牧民との紛争は起こりませんでした。

課題としては、柵を用いることでデルスを管理できるようになりましたが、柵を設置するためには資金や労力が必要です。今後は柵無しでデルスを管理する方法が必要です。

③郡間協定の締結

サインツアガン郡の牧民の主要なオトル先であるトゥブ県バヤンツアガン郡とドンドゴビ県ウルジート郡（図2）の郡職員、牧民に協定へのニーズを調査しました。そして2015年1月から7月にサインツアガン郡、バヤンツアガン郡、ウルジート郡の行政間において協定の内容を検討しました。2015年8月に3郡の牧民を交えた最終検討の後、郡間協定を締結しました。

これまではオトル先で紛争が起これと、郡間で事後的に話し合い、紛争を解決してきました。成果としては、この協定を結ぶことで、事前に紛争を起こさないような調整が郡間でなされるようになりました。牧民への調査から、郡間協定により、牧民間の紛争が減少するとともに、オトルだけでなく、職業の斡旋や学校の入学など、社会的側面でも郡間で協力が行われるようになりました。

しかし協定が郡内で広く認識されていない、オトルの移動ルートが守られていない、といった課題が残りました。

サインツアガン郡とウルジート郡長による郡間協定締結の様子（写真11）と両郡牧民による話し合いの様子（写真12）。（撮影場所：ドンドゴビ県サインツアガン郡）



放牧地利用計画の話し合い（写真8、写真9）。（撮影場所：ドンドゴビ県サインツアガン郡）



管理によるデルスの状態の違い（写真10）。（撮影場所：ドンドゴビ県サインツアガン郡）




写真11

写真12