



**HAL**  
open science

## **Biodiversity and Food Security: From Trade-offs to Synergies**

Wolfgang Cramer, Emilie Egea, Joern Fischer, Alexandra Lux, Jean-Michel Salles, Josef Settele, Muriel Tichit

► **To cite this version:**

Wolfgang Cramer, Emilie Egea, Joern Fischer, Alexandra Lux, Jean-Michel Salles, et al.. Biodiversity and Food Security: From Trade-offs to Synergies. *Regional Environmental Change*, 2017, 17 (5), pp.1257-1259. 10.1007/s10113-017-1147-z . hal-01527070

**HAL Id: hal-01527070**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01527070>**

Submitted on 12 Apr 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# 1 Biodiversity and Food Security: From Trade-offs to Synergies (Editorial)

2

3 **Authors:** Wolfgang Cramer<sup>1,\*</sup>, Emilie Egea<sup>1,2</sup>, Joern Fischer<sup>3</sup>, Alexandra Lux<sup>4,5</sup>, Jean-Michel Salles<sup>6</sup>,  
4 Josef Settele<sup>7,8,9</sup>, Muriel Tichit<sup>10</sup>

## 5 Affiliations:

6<sup>1</sup>Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie marine et continentale (IMBE), Aix Marseille  
7 Université, CNRS, IRD, Avignon Université, France

8<sup>2</sup>new address: Fondation Rovaltain, Alixan, France

9<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Sustainability, Leuphana University Lüneburg, Scharnhorststrasse 1, 21335 Lüneburg,  
10 Germany

11<sup>4</sup>ISOE – Institute for Social-Ecological Research, Hamburger Allee 45, 60486 Frankfurt, Germany

12<sup>5</sup>Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre, Senckenberganlage 25, 60325 Frankfurt,  
13 Germany

14<sup>6</sup>CNRS, Laboratoire Montpelliérain d'Economie Théorique et Appliquée (LAMETA), Montpellier,  
15 France

16<sup>7</sup>UFZ - Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Dept. of Community Ecology, Theodor-Lieser-  
17 Str. 4, 06120 Halle, Germany

18<sup>8</sup>German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e,  
19 04103 Leipzig, Germany

20<sup>9</sup>Institute of Biological Sciences, University of the Philippines Los Baños, College, Laguna 4031,  
21 Philippines

22<sup>10</sup>UMR SADAPT, INRA, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, 75005, Paris, France

23\* corresponding author, Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie marine et continentale  
24 (IMBE), Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, IRD, Avignon Université, Technopôle Arbois-Méditerranée,  
25 Bât. Villemin – BP 80, F-13545 Aix-en-Provence cedex 04, France, e-mail: wolfgang.cramer@imbe.fr

## 26 Text:

27 Biodiversity and food security are connected in many ways. Across scales from genes to species,  
28 landscapes and biomes, biodiversity is an important resource for humanity. It is the key for a broad  
29 range of services provided by ecosystems. Biodiversity helps regulate the nutrient cycle, water (e.g.  
30 floods) and mitigates impacts of climate change. Biodiversity is also of direct importance for human  
31 well-being and for cultural and other values including recreation. The provisioning of clean water  
32 and diverse food supply makes it vital for all people. Biodiversity at all levels, including the diversity  
33 of genes, species and ecosystems, is lost at alarming rates. Critical factors for these trends are  
34 habitat destruction, global warming and the uncontrolled spread of alien species. Pollution, nitrogen  
35 deposition and shifts in precipitation further affect biodiversity.

36 Food security faces significant challenges due to population growth, poverty, globalization, climate  
37 change and other factors. Supplying healthy food to all citizens is crucial for global development - to  
38 reach it, not only food production but also equitable access to food for all people must be improved  
39 substantially. Biodiversity loss and global food security are hence two major challenges of our time.

40 Linking these two areas from a research perspective, and seeking synergies between them is likely to  
41 generate multiple benefits for social, ecological and economic development.

42 In October 2014, 108 scientists met in Aix-en-Provence, France, to explore these issues. Drawing on  
43 a French-German Network of collaboration, established by the Centre National de Recherche  
44 Scientifique (CNRS) and the Leibniz-Gemeinschaft (WGL), an international conference was organized  
45 at the Mediterranean Institute of Biodiversity and Ecology (IMBE), aiming to “identify science-based  
46 solutions for global sustainability focusing on the issues of biodiversity and food security”. During  
47 sessions on “Environmental Changes and Food Security”, “Green economy, food security and  
48 biodiversity”, and “Sustainable use of biodiversity”, “Conceptual pitfalls in the food-biodiversity  
49 nexus”, “Science-based opportunities to reconcile food security, biodiversity conservation and  
50 sustainable development”, overall 81 plenary and poster presentations were given. A selection of  
51 papers is provided in this Special Issue.

52 Several conceptual studies illustrate new approaches to address conflicts and synergies between the  
53 enhancement of food security and the conservation of biodiversity. Bernard and Lux (2017) use  
54 socio-ecological discourse analysis to discuss whether—and if so how much—more food needs to be  
55 actually produced to meet the future demand, how productivity could be increased sustainably and  
56 how agroecology can be scaled up to these demands. Wittman et al. (2017) argue that rural  
57 landscapes should be re-conceptualized as social-ecological systems and illustrate their approach for  
58 the Brazilian Cerrado region. Through a structured literature review, Glamann et al. (2017) identify  
59 the contrast between biophysical-technical and social-political approaches to understanding food  
60 security and biodiversity conservation, showing that increased exchange between these  
61 communities is needed. Salles et al. (2017) argue that an economic perspective could contribute to  
62 the discussion on land sparing versus land sharing, for example by pointing out that the assumption  
63 of a fixed agricultural production target is not realistic. They also show that the consideration of  
64 productivity differences in such policies may strengthen the potential contribution of land sharing  
65 policies to the conservation of biodiversity.

66 A series of regional studies offers examples for progress that can be made. For olive-oleaster  
67 ecosystems in Morocco, Aumeeruddy et al. (2017) demonstrate the similarity between ancient and  
68 modern practices in olive cultivation, and how these contribute not only to food security but also to  
69 cultural identity. Bortolotto et al. (2017) show how, in the Brazilian Cerrado and Pantanal, how  
70 knowledge networks can be designed to improve the economic condition of rural communities while  
71 also strengthening food security and valorizing biodiversity and local culture. For Mexican wetlands,  
72 González-Marín et al. (2017) study the use of wildlife for food security and the risks for this use from  
73 water pollution, hunting practices and deforestation. In Philippine rice fields, Horgan et al. (2017)  
74 found that ecological engineering can have multiple benefits for farmers and the environment,  
75 including improved nutrition for farming communities, the creation of habitat for wildlife, and the  
76 enhancement of regulatory ecosystem services provided by insectivorous and snail-eating birds.

77 In Burkina Faso, Koffi et al. (2017) show how, in woodlands and open landscapes, households shape  
78 their adaptive strategies differently depending on the resources available and the structure of the  
79 landscape, ensuring a significant contribution of forest resources to their food security. For semi-arid  
80 silvopastoral systems in Chile, Root-Bernstein et al. (2017) show that transhumant rewilding of  
81 guanacos has the potential to contribute to food security and sustainable agricultural production. In  
82 a simulation study for France, Teillard et al. (2017) compared intensification, extensification and  
83 reallocation of agricultural areas at fine scale, identifying potential “win – no loss” cases with near  
84 zero additional costs for agricultural production. The study also shows that current mechanisms for  
85 agricultural policy are insufficient to implement such optimizations in French landscapes. For  
86 Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi, Van Soesbergen et al. (2017) show that different socio-economic  
87 projections of areas of high agricultural development all lead to similar spatial patterns of habitat

88and biodiversity loss. To expand protected areas is crucial to avoid biodiversity losses in all three  
89countries.

90For Europe, Mouysset (2017) argues that it is possible to reconcile agriculture and biodiversity with  
91public policies, since it is possible to increase simultaneously the economic and ecological  
92performances of agricultural landscapes compared to the current trends. However, it is not possible  
93to optimize this reconciliation easily in an economic context, since the different criteria cannot be  
94maximized simultaneously, and some trade-offs emerge between economic and ecological criteria.

95Finally, three studies consider biodiversity and food security at the global scale. According to Delzeit  
96et al. (2017), allowing the expansion of cropland generally results in improved food security not only  
97in regions where crop production rises, but also in net importing countries such as India and China.  
98But the estimated cropland expansion risks to affect highly biodiverse regions, pointing to the need  
99for spatially detailed and context-specific assessments to understand the possible outcomes of  
100different food security strategies. Reducing meat consumption has been shown to have strong  
101potential for the mitigation of both climate change and biodiversity loss. Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt  
102(2017) study various factors that might influence associated policies, finding that a 'health argument'  
103or arguing for flexitarianism could be particularly promising to encourage reduced meat  
104consumption. They recommend that emotional messages or new social norms could overcome  
105current barriers such as cognitive dissonance. Rumpold et al. (2017) present an overview of  
106possibilities to enhance the use of insect biodiversity not only as a human food resource but also as  
107livestock feed resource as well as for therapeutical and biotechnological applications.

108In combination, these contributions paint a rich picture of the multi-faceted challenges associated  
109with securing sufficient, healthy food for all of humanity while drawing on and conserving  
110biodiversity. Solutions for reconciling biodiversity and food security require more than just  
111controlling the environmental footprint of food production. The papers convey the picture that food  
112security is under threat by interacting changes in biodiversity and its inherent biophysical structures  
113and processes with changes in social, cultural and socioeconomic structures and processes. This  
114Special Issue highlights the analytical basis and reasonable starting points for the pathways towards  
115achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

## 116Acknowledgements

117The conference benefitted from generous support provided by CNRS and WGL and local support  
118from IMBE and Aix Marseille University. Additional financial support came from Région Provence  
119Alpes Côte d'Azur, ECCOREV, LabEx OT-Med, and the French Embassy in Germany. We thank the  
120members of the organizing committee and the scientific committee, as well as IMBE staff members  
121for all their support and good spirits. The conference was a contribution to the Future Earth  
122ecoSERVICES project, as well as to BioDivMex-MISTRALS. This Special Issue would not have been  
123possible without the help of the following scientific reviewers: David Abson, Jules Bayala, Neil Collier,  
124Hans Dagevos, Anne de la Vega-Leinert, Martin Drechsler, Chris Elphick, Elin Enfors, Karlheinz Erb,  
125Polly Ericksen, Charles A. Francis, Stephen T. Garnett, Augusto Hauber Gameiro, Klaus Henle, Valérie  
126Heuzé, Daniel Kaniewski, Naoki Katayama, Marcel Kok, Christian Körner, G. Page Kyle, Louis Lebel,  
127Heera Lee, Pia Lentini, Pablo Manzano, James Moore, Felicia Olmeta-Schult, Unai Pascual, Martin  
128Quaas, Cibele Queiroz, Peter Roebeling, Regine Schönenberg, Gorm Shackelford, Richard C.  
129Smardon, Félix Teillard, Arnold van Huis, Peter Verburg, Keith Wiebe, and Eglee Zent.

## 130References

131Aumeeruddy-Thomas Y, Moukhli A, Haouane H, Khadari B 2017 On-going domestication and  
132 diversification in grafted olive-oleaster agroecosystems in Northern Morocco. *Regional*

133 *Environmental Change* (in press for this issue – please update doi and page numbers during final  
134 copy editing)

135 Bernard B, Lux A 2017 How to feed the world sustainably: an overview of the discourse on  
136 agroecology and sustainable intensification. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi:  
137 10.1007/s10113-016-1027-y (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

138 Bortolotto IM, Hiane PA, Ishii IH, de Souza PR, Pires Campos R, Bastos Gomes RJ, da Silva Farias C,  
139 Leme FM, do Carmo de Oliveira Arruda R, de Lima Corrêa da Costa LB, Damasceno-Junior GA  
140 2017 A knowledge network to promote the use and valorization of wild food plants in the  
141 Pantanal and Cerrado, Brazil. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-1088-y  
142 (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

143 Delzeit R, Zabel F, Meyer C, Václavík T 2017 Addressing future trade-offs between biodiversity and  
144 cropland expansion to improve food security. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi:  
145 10.1007/s10113-016-0927-1 (incl erratum, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0944-0) (this issue – please  
146 update page numbers during final copy editing)

147 Glamann J, Hanspach J, Abson DJ, Collier N, Fischer J 2017 The intersection of food security and  
148 biodiversity conservation: a review. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-015-  
149 0873-3 (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

150 González-Marín RM, Moreno-Casasola P, Castro-Luna AA, Castillo A 2017 Regaining the traditional  
151 use of wildlife in wetlands on the coastal plain of Veracruz, Mexico: ensuring food security in the  
152 face of global climate change. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0955-x  
153 (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

154 Horgan F, Ramal AF, Villegas JM, Almazan MLP, Bernal CC, Jamoralin A, Pasang JM, Orboc G, Agreda  
155 V, Arroyo C 2017 Ecological engineering with high diversity vegetation patches enhances bird  
156 activity and ecosystem services in Philippine rice fields. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi:  
157 10.1007/s10113-016-0984-5 (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

158 Koffi CK, Djoudi H, Gautier D 2017 Landscape diversity and associated coping strategies during food  
159 shortage periods: evidence from the Sudano-Sahelian region of Burkina Faso. *Regional  
160 Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0945-z (this issue – please update page  
161 numbers during final copy editing)

162 Mouysset L 2017 Reconciling agriculture and biodiversity in European public policies: a bio-economic  
163 perspective. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-1023-2 (this issue –  
164 please update page numbers during final copy editing)

165 Root-Bernstein M, Guerrero-Gatica M, Piña L, Bonacic C, Svenning J-C, Jaksic FM 2017 Rewilding-  
166 inspired transhumance for the restoration of semiarid silvopastoral systems in Chile. *Regional  
167 Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0981-8 (this issue – please update page  
168 numbers during final copy editing)

169 Rumpold BA, Klocke M, Schlüter O 2017 Insect biodiversity: underutilized bioresource for sustainable  
170 applications in life science. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0967-6  
171 (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

172 Salles J-M, Teillard F, Tichit M, Zanella M 2017 Land sparing versus land sharing: An economist's  
173 perspective. *Regional Environmental Change* (in press for this issue – please add the doi and  
174 update page numbers during final copy editing)

175 Stoll-Kleemann S, Schmidt UJ 2017 Reducing meat consumption in developed and transition  
176 countries to counter climate change and biodiversity loss: a review of influence factors. *Regional  
177 Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-1057-5 (this issue – please update page  
178 numbers during final copy editing)

179 Teillard F, Doyen L, Dross C, Jiguet F, Tichit M 2017 Optimal allocations of agricultural intensity reveal  
180 win-no loss solutions for food production and biodiversity. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi:  
181 10.1007/s10113-016-0947-x (this issue – please update page numbers during final copy editing)

182 Van Soesbergen A, Arnell AP, Sassen M, Stuch B, Schaldach R, Göpel J, Vervoort J, Mason-D' Croz D,  
183 Islam S, Palazzo A 2017 Exploring future agricultural development and biodiversity in Uganda,

184 Rwanda and Burundi: a spatially explicit scenario-based assessment. *Regional Environmental*  
185 *Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-0983-6 (this issue – please update page numbers during final  
186 copy editing)  
187 Wittman H, Chappell MJ, Abson DJ, Kerr RB, Blesh J, Hanspach J, Perfecto I, Fischer J 2017 A social–  
188 ecological perspective on harmonizing food security and biodiversity conservation. *Regional*  
189 *Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-1045-9 (this issue – please update page  
190 numbers during final copy editing)  
191