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Eleven CORE Organic projects are selected

Welcome to the first 2011 issue
Due to a paternity leave in ICROFS' information staff, the first issue of ICROFS news has been issued as late as in May 2011. We apologise for any inconveniences this has entailed. For the latest news on organic food and farming research, ICROFS' website is always a good place to start.

Eleven CORE Organic II projects have been selected
The full proposals of the first call have been evaluated by scientific experts. Hereafter, the CORE Organic II consortium has selected eleven projects for funding at a meeting 11-12 May 2011.

Project coordinators have now received the notification letters from the call secretariat.

Get the list of the eleven projects at www.coreorganic2.org.

Danish research to pave the way for organic policy
A report named The Lazy Man of Europe has recently been published by the British organic organization, Soil Association.

Among many research results, the report draws on research made by the COP project under the Danish DARCOF III research programme (COP is short for Public Policies and Demand for Organic Food).

The report aims at advising the English government how to contribute promoting organics in the UK. It sums up experience with governmental actions to benefit organics in seven European countries, including Denmark.

Based on research results from the Danish COP project, the report emphasizes that in addition to providing financial resources, expertise and political will, it is important that the government actively engages in cooperation with the organic organizations to form the basis of successful organic policies.

Project manager for COP, professor Carsten Daugbjerg, calls it “gratifying that research published in international scientific journals also attracts attention among those working to promote ecology and that they can use it.”

Daugbjerg adds that it was the idea from the outset to conduct research in order to identify those political efforts that promote ecology most effectively. He expresses the hope that the Soil Association report can contribute to spread the awareness of the COP project research.

Get The Lazy Man of Europe at www.soilassociation.org.

Read about the COP project.

Organic Eprints is expanding
Organic Eprints - the Open Access archive for publications in organic research - is expanding. The number of National Editors of Organic Eprints has increased from 11 to 22.

This expansion is partly a result of appointment of National Editors in the CORE Organic II-program, by appointment from other interested countries, Brazil and Canada among others.

In a ranking of 100 repositories in Europe, Organic Eprints comes out as number 22, and of the world’s almost 1,200 repositories, Organic Eprints makes it as number 57.

Read more at www.icrofs.org.

Honourable mention of Organic Eprints
The American Association of College & Research Libraries has provided the open access online research archive, Organic Eprints, with an “Honourable mention” in connection with the 2011 STS Oberly award for Bibliography in the Agricultural or Natural Sciences.

Read more at www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/awards/oberlyaward.cfm.

ProGrOV project set in motion in Uganda
The research project on productivity and growth in organic value-chains, ProGrOV in short, was launched in on 16-23 May in a seven-day workshop at Makerere University, Uganda, University of Nairobi in Kenya, and Sokoine University of Tanzania and their supervisors from the three universities as well as Aarhus University and University of Copenhagen participated in the workshop together with representatives from the organic organisations NOGAMU, TOAM and KOAN and the coordinators from ICROFS. The workshop was the first occasion for all the participants to meet.

One of the aims of the workshop was to further develop the PhD and MSc studies and to ensure the relevance and integration of the studies according to the value chains and participatory approaches of the project.

At the workshop a broad spectrum of issues and research tools were presented and discussed to help familiarize the participants with organic value chains and appropriate research methodologies and interdisciplinary value chain approaches relevant for the project.

Read more about ProGrOV at www.icrofs.org.

VOA’R project meeting in Bologna
At a project meeting in Bologna, Italy, in late May, the first prototype of a so-called VOA’R portal was presented to the project partners.

VOA’R, an FP7 EU project, works on creating a social platform for researchers in agriculture & aquaculture to integrate open access research repositories. The VOA’R portal will allow users to:

» Locate and connect with peers
» Describe the research they are doing and get recommendations based on it.
» Find open access journals related to their profile
» Find relevant papers or other scholarly content (e.g. datasets).
» Join groups related to their topics
» and use other features

Organic Eprints is contributing to the project by making the eprints in the subject repository available for the portal.

Read more about VOA’R – Virtual Open Access Agriculture & Aquaculture Repository at http://voa3r.eu.

News from ICROFS
ICROFS’ first topic theme: Organic research, Ohio, USA

ICROFS news presents an overview article on the interdisciplinary Organic Food and Farming Education and Research Program (OFFER) at Ohio State University, including their history and some news on current projects.

The Organic Food and Farming Education and Research Program (OFFER)

Current organic research programmes and projects in different countries

In this issue - and in forthcoming issues - ICROFS news will bring a number of topic themes presenting current research programmes in different countries on the globe.
The Organic Food and Farming Education and Research Program (OFFER) in Ohio, USA

By Deborah Stinner, Ohio Agriculture Research and Development Center, Ohio State University, USA

The Ohio State University’s Ohio Agriculture Research and Development Center is one of the early US land grant universities to create an organic research program. The Organic Food and Farming Education and Research Program (OFFER) was established in 1998 and was built on European models of organic research. Today it continues to wish to build bridges to European organic research.

The OFFER Program was established in response to requests by organic farmers and supporters in Ohio who felt that organic agriculture was not getting its fair share of their land grant university’s tax dollars. Through a participatory process among Ohio State University (OSU) researchers and organic farmers and leaders, an interdisciplinary program, the Organic Food and Farming Education and Research Program (OFFER) was created in 1998 and was dedicated to building scientific support for the organic community in Ohio and beyond. Sixteen hectares of research land at the OSU Ohio Agriculture Research and Development Center (OARDC) in Wooster, Ohio was given to the new program and put into transition for organic certification. In addition, $50,000 per year for five years was allocated to catalyze university-based organic research. Researchers were charged with getting grants to further support interdisciplinary organic research projects. Although far from the level of institutional financial support that many of the great European programs have, this was a bold and radical step for a major US land grant university at the time.

European Roots
Systems ecologist, Deborah Stinner, was asked to lead the program. She and her late husband and the first Kellogg Endowed Chair of Agroecosystem Management at OSU, Benjamin Stinner, had a long history of working with organic farmers in Ohio in on-farm research. In addition, Deborah Stinner had the opportunity in 1990 to visit several European institutes doing organic research, including University of Kassel, Witzenhausen, Wageningen University and the Institute for Biodynamic Research in Darmstadt, Germany. The European organic research pioneers, particularly Hardy Vogtmann, who hosted Deborah Stinner on these visits, were extremely generous with their time and thoughtful sharing of ideas and greatly inspiring. A dream and a mental model of an interdisciplinary organic research program for Ohio was developed that later became the framework for the OFFER program.

Rapid Growth
In partnership with OSU’s Agroecosystem Management Program under the leadership of the late Benjamin Stinner, the OFFER Program was given a large boost in 2000 with the award of a $1.8 million United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) grant “Revitalizing Small and Mid-sized Farms: Organic Research, Extension and Education”.

This was one of the very first large federal grants awarded in the U. S. for organic specific research. OSU was the lead institution of a national Organic Agriculture Consortium that included Iowa State University (Kathleen Delete lead Principle Investigator, PI), North Carolina State University (Nancy Creamer, PI), and the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) as a participating member. The California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) was the lead evaluator of the program and the University of Wisconsin (UW)-Madison was the lead data repository for the long-term tests.

Through the cooperative effort of the partners, 155 projects were funded totaling $13 million to date. This was the first large scale interdisciplinary organic agriculture research program in the U.S. Because of the collaborative approach of researchers, there was a rapid growth in the quality and quantity of research. With the USDA grant, the OFFER Program was able to catalyze a large increase in university-based organic research. The OFFER Program was able to support 54 researchers in 32 states and Canada who were working together on 155 projects at 32 institutions that collectively are leading the research in organic agriculture.

The projects were competitive, evaluated on a yearly basis, and the OFFER Program has prioritized research projects that address the critical uncertainties in organic agriculture. Through the integrated approach of the OFFER Program, the research supported by the program has a much higher likelihood of impacting the growth of the organic sector in the U.S.

The OFFER Program continues to be a leading program in the U.S. for university-based organic agriculture research. As the demand for organic foods continues to grow, the OFFER Program is well positioned to meet the challenge. In 2011, the USDA has awarded the OFFER Program a new grant of $2.1 million to build upon its success and continue to build bridges to European organic research.

Deborah Stinner and Michel Cavigelli from USDA ARS Beltsville, Maryland visiting the DOK trial in Switzerland, July 2005
lead PI), the Organic Farming Research Foundation (Mark Lipson, lead PI) and Tufts University (William Lockeretz).

Today, the OFFER Program has 40 hectares of certified organic research land, includes 17 PIs and 30 co-PIs from 15 OSU departments and programs and two USDA Agriculture Research Service (ARS) units and has been instrumental to $10 million in grant awards from various government granting agencies and non-profit funding organizations.

**Continued European Connections**

After the sudden accidental death of her husband in 2004, Deborah Stinner was greatly helped personally and professionally by renewing her European organic research connections. On a trip to Switzerland in 2005 she visited FiBL and was graciously hosted by Urs Niggli and Helga Willer. She and Urs Niggli were both working on chapters for William Lockertz’s edited book, Organic Farming an International History.

More recently, in November 2010, with funding from a USDA planning grant “Environmental Sustainability of Organic Farming Systems: On-Farm, Experimental, and Watershed Assessments” (Martin Shipita-lo, ARS North Appalachian Experimental Watershed, lead PI), Deborah Stinner facilitated taking a group of project participants who had never seen European organic research on a stimulating and inspiring trip to Europe. The group was hosted by FiBL director, Urs Niggli in Frick, Switzerland; Gerald Rahmann, Director of the Institute of Organic Farming, in Trenthorst, Germany and Visa Nuutinen at Agrifood Research Finland (MTT) in Jokioinen. In addition, the group spent a half day with ICROF5’s Thomas Harttung who invited the group to the ICROF5 seminar on “Biodiversity and Organic Farming” hosted by the Danish Embassy in Washington, DC, December 2010. OFFER is organizing an international symposium on the “Role of Organic Farming in Restoring the Planets Ecosystem Services” as part of the 4th International EcoSummit to be held in Columbus, Ohio 30 September – 5 October, 2012.

A large USDA funded project, “Mental Models and Participatory Research to Redesign Extension Programming for Organic Weed Management”, (Doug Doohan., lead PI from OSU, with nine co-PI’s, three from different OSU departments, and four from three other U. S. universities) includes an European organic researcher, Marlene Reimens from Wageningen University and Research Center. A future article will highlight this international project.

Much further development is needed to fully realize the original dream and to serve the growing needs of the emerging organic sector in Ohio, the US and globally.

Our goal is to join with European leaders in nurturing the growth of organic agriculture into a vital and sustainable industry and rich and mature science, one that integrates the historical holistic and systems values of the organic movement with the very best of modern science.
Yield effects of grazing and red clover in white clover/ryegrass mixtures

By: Jørgen Eriksen and Karen Søegaard, Aarhus University, Department of Agroecology and Environment, Tjele, Denmark and Margrethe Askegaard, Knowledge Centre for Agriculture, Skejby, Denmark

In white clover/ryegrass mixtures grazing in one year significantly increases the yield in the next, compared to cutting. Red clover is a good supplement to the mixture as it performs well under cutting regime, while white clover takes over during grazing.

Overall, inclusion of red clover in the mixture contributes to a more robust sward and increased flexibility in utilization.

The production of grass-clover is affected by grazing. Dung and urine excreted during grazing increases the growth of both grass and clover. At the same time the nitrogen fixation by clover decreases. This is something always occurring with the addition of nitrogen. In addition, growth is affected by the animals with their frequent defoliation. The grass becomes denser, i.e. there are more shoots per unit area.

White clover has a good ability to adapt, its leaves become much smaller by grazing and it has the ability to cover bare spots by stolon development. This happens, for instance where animals thread, below manure or urine affected spots. Red clover does not possess this ability to spread. The number of plants is limited to those established, but grazing means that its growth becomes low and flat to the ground, and the leaves become small. We have studied the impact of grazing on grass-clover production, composition and fertilizer response in mixtures of ryegrass and white clover with and without red clover.

Positive effect of grazing in white clover/ryegrass mixtures
Yield under cutting regime was affected by whether the field was previously cut or grazed. Yield was higher when the grass-clover was grazed up until the cutting period (grazing for at least a year before the time of cutting), compared to cutting (Table 1).

This was especially so where slurry was injected, which may be due to denser grass population and thus greater growth potential. Also, the clover content was strongly reduced by previous grazing when cutting in spring, while there was no effect on the summer cut. This may be due to the fact that white clover growth is faster in summer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring growth</th>
<th></th>
<th>Summer growth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield t DM/ha</td>
<td>Clover %</td>
<td>Yield t DM/ha</td>
<td>Clover %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ryegrass/white clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- slurry</td>
<td>Cutting</td>
<td>3,8 c</td>
<td>21 a</td>
<td>2,4 ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>3,9 c</td>
<td>11 b</td>
<td>2,4 ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ slurry</td>
<td>Cutting</td>
<td>4,8 b</td>
<td>13 b</td>
<td>2,2 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>5,4 a</td>
<td>4 c</td>
<td>2,7 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ryegrass/white and red clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- slurry</td>
<td>Cutting</td>
<td>5,0 b</td>
<td>52 a</td>
<td>2,3 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>4,9 b</td>
<td>23 c</td>
<td>2,9 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ slurry</td>
<td>Cutting</td>
<td>5,6 a</td>
<td>31 b</td>
<td>2,5 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>5,9 a</td>
<td>16 d</td>
<td>3,0 a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Dry matter (DM) yield and clover proportion in spring and summer growth following different management in the previous and the year of harvest. Different letters indicate significant differences.
than in spring.
Similarly, the yield response of fertilizer was significantly increased by grazing. The reason may be the recycling of urine and manure by grazing, contributing to a higher level of fertilization as well as a higher plant density, which both affect the potential for production.

**Red clover in the mixture**
The corresponding residual effect was studied where the seed mixture contained 1 kg red clover per hectares (4%). This caused the significant yield effect of grazing found in the white clover mixture to disappear (Table 1). The explanation lies in the dynamics of white and red clover in the sward.

Red clover is influenced significantly by grazing and contributes mainly in cut grassland, and vice versa for white clover, whose share increased dramatically during grazing (Figure 1). The amount of red clover seeds was approx. half the volume in the recommended seed mixtures. Without slurry application and cutting only, the proportion of red clover was less than 50% of total dry matter, which is a satisfactory level without the grass being outcompeted. In this way red and white clover complements each other more than they compete and an overall higher clover proportion is achieved.

Overall, inclusion of red clover in the mixture contributes to a more robust sward and increased flexibility in utilization.

---

**Figure 1. Proportion of red and white clover in a mixture of perennial ryegrass, white and red clover subject to previous grazing and cutting, with and without slurry. Different letters indicate significant differences.**

---

Harvest in parcels

---

**More information**
Read more about the DARCOF III project Orggrass on the webpage: [http://www.icrofs.org/Pages/Research/darcofIII_orggrass.html](http://www.icrofs.org/Pages/Research/darcofIII_orggrass.html)

The project is funded by the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries.
In public debates about future energy supply, biogas is among the most widely considered technologies. The Danish government’s “Grøn vækst” programme (Green Growth) aims at substantially increasing biogas capacities in Denmark, mainly in the agricultural sector. Organic agriculture is highly dependent on external energy supply, at present mainly derived from fossil fuels. Biogas may be a chance to extend the sustainable approach being part of the organic principles to the energy use in organic farming.

However, sustainable biogas production requires careful integration into local agricultural frameworks. Therefore, application raises many questions about e.g. economical possibilities and risks, fertilizer supply and application, compliance with organic principles, process reliability etc.

A questionnaire developed by Risø DTU gives an idea about some Danish stakeholders’ perceptions of benefits and drawbacks.

The questionnaire

A questionnaire about biogas in organic farming carried out by Risø DTU in connection with the research project BioConcens and INBIOM (see “Read more” Box) gives insight into how stakeholders perceive biogas technologies in organic farming. Understanding the stakeholders’ point of view can point out critical issues related to biogas applications and thereby give impulses for targeted political actions.

The biogas seminar

In December 2010, a seminar about biogas-based energy self sufficiency in organic farming was arranged by BioConcens and INBIOM. The participants from agriculture, advisory services, research and authorities identified factors, which are considered to be relevant in the discussion on the application of biogas. The factors were grouped into four categories, namely Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats, following a so-called SWOT analysis. For the questionnaire, four factors from each SWOT-category were selected (see Figure 1), and respondents were asked to compare those pair wise.

Results from the questionnaire

The questionnaire was sent out to more than 200 people from the biogas and agricultural sector in Denmark as well as linked to the INBIOM distribution list. The results show that the majority of respondents are positive towards biogas technologies in organic farming. They particularly emphasize the benefits of improved fertilizer supply and fossil fuel savings. However, they also express concerns about economical risks and incompliance with organic principles.

Table 1: Selected SWOT-factors with short description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate benefits - Reduction of GHG emissions</td>
<td>Compromising organic principles - Harms image of organic farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New source of income - Heat and power as new products to trade with</td>
<td>Difficulties in plant operation - Uncertainty about stable and efficient operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy self-supply - Secured supply for own demand</td>
<td>Shortage of biomass resources - Uncertainty about availability, suitability and price of biomass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer supply - Contribution to phase out conventional manure</td>
<td>Financial risk - High investment costs, unknown repayment time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies - ...lor installation costs, energy trade, for certain biomasses</td>
<td>Unstable markeds - Uncertainty about prices of energy and biomass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available biomass resources - Use of municipal organic waste contributes to nutrient recirculation</td>
<td>Limiting rules and laws - e.g. heat supply law, restrictive planning regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure - Integration to the energy supply system, reliable heat and power sales</td>
<td>Sceptical position to biogas - Plant location, transport, odors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of biogas technology - Research and development increases efficiency, stability and income</td>
<td>Political unsteadiness - Uncertain conditions for support and requirements in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Selected SWOT-factors with short description
BIOM homepage. The answers were quantitatively evaluated using SWOT-AHP (Analytical Hierarchy Process). The results are expressed in scores which identify the average weight of a factor to all other factors of a category. For detailed information about the method see the reference box.

**A great majority supports biogas in organic agriculture**

75 stakeholders responded to the questionnaire, of which 55% dealt with organic farming. Of the respondents, 88% stated that they would support politics promoting the application of biogas technology in organic farming (5% no, 7% don’t know). The respondents were divided in stakeholder groups, namely research (51%), advisory services (24%), industry (16%) and others (9%). The average weightings of all respondents are shown as calculated scores in Figure 2.

**Focus on fertilizer benefits**

The highest rated strength of having biogas in organic farming was identified as fertilizer supply by all stakeholder groups, while least weight was given to the strength-factor new source of income. The undesirable necessity of many organic farms to import conventional manure as fertilizer is presumably a reason for this priority, as degassed biomass can contribute to a self-supply of fertilizer.

**Emphasis on the importance of subsidies**

Among opportunities, all stakeholder groups gave highest importance to subsidies. All other opportunity-factors were rated comparatively low. For weaknesses, the picture was less clear: Researchers and advisory services identified financial risk as the most relevant weakness of the technology. In contrary, industry and “other” stakeholders found the greatest weakness to be shortage of biomass resources and difficulties in plant operation, respectively. In the threats-category, political unsteadiness and limiting rules and laws had the highest priority. The high weighting of subsidies, financial risks and political unsteadiness underlines the importance of reliable framework conditions for the implementation of biogas technologies. This, along with the stakeholders’ generally supportive view on biogas technologies, suggests that with economic incentives and clear political targets biogas may be widely applied in organic agriculture.

**Incompliance with organic principles?**

Concerns that biogas could compromise organic principles have not been emphasized by many respondents, while this factor was considered important by some participants in the December seminar. The priorities set by the respondents may indicate that for these people sufficient regulations have been established to maintain the organic principles and the difference between biogas applications in organic and conventional agriculture.

**More than energy production**

Unlike a wind turbine, a biogas fermenter is more than an energy production plant: Besides producing energy, the fermentation of biomass has many impacts on the farming system with respect to e.g. crop management and use of the involved biomasses. The respondents’ low rating of energy self-supply together with the emphasis on fertilizer supply benefits reflects this fact. Therefore, political initiatives need to consider both energy related aspects such as regulation for end use of heat and power, as well as land use aspects like legislation on the application of degassed biomass and the introduction of external organic wastes.

---

**Figure 2: Weighting of the selected SWOT-factors (all respondents)**

**Read more**
Find more information about BIOCONCENS project and INBIOM on the webpages: www.icrofs.org/Pages/Research/darcoIII_biocconcens.html and www.inbiom.dk/en/knowledge/knowledge.htm

**Reference**
One important tool to improve climate change initiatives is emission trading. Thus, the EU launched the world’s first Emission Trading System (ETS) for GHG on January 1, 2005 as part of the efforts to comply with the target levels in the Kyoto Protocol.

The ETS is a unique innovation in modern environmental regulation, which has been transferred to the EU based on successful American experiences. In the EU ETS, the ownership of one permit or ‘allowance’ gives the right to emit 1 ton of CO₂.

Numerous ways to reduce greenhouse gases

The EU ETS implies that trade of GHG allowances (as translated into CO₂ equivalents) can take place between firms in different countries. Almost half of total CO₂ emission in the EU is covered by the market, including more than 10,000 installations. There are numerous ways to reduce GHG, e.g. via wind turbines, solar and wave power, bio fuels, energy efficiency measures and – a more recent method – a change in farming techniques.

Farmers, however, do not trade GHG under the Kyoto agreement. Why not? I suggest that they should. The idea of including farmers in a national emission trading system has been launched in Australia but it has not yet been applied to the EU.
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Farmers, however, do not trade GHG under the Kyoto agreement. Why not? I suggest that they should. The idea of including farmers in a national emission trading system has been launched in Australia but it has not yet been applied to the EU.
not covered by the EU ETS, namely 2. Transport, 4. Agriculture and 6. Residential. Thus, while the debate on GHG has mainly focused on the energy, industrial, and residential sectors and households, only very limited attention has been paid to the significant potential to limit GHG emissions in the agricultural sector in spite of the fact that it emits about one tenth of total GHG emissions in the EU-27.

**How to facilitate the inclusion of farmers**

Much uncertainty is involved in the measurement of emission of methane (CH$_4$) and nitrous oxide (N$_2$O) from farming. This has so far been seen as an obstacle to the inclusion of the farming sector in the EU ETS. Is it possible to develop a system that may facilitate the inclusion of farmers in the EU ETS? One possibility could be to reward practices that reduce GHG by granting permits.

As a starting point, farming contains a number of processes, like keeping animals, or producing crops. Each of these processes can be subdivided into activities like keeping different animals. Finally, for each such activities, different practices exists, like which fodder to give cows. The basic idea of this system is that instead of measuring the emission directly, one may calculate the (average) change in emission from the baseline practice to the new practice. The whole idea of the system is that the authorities can in advance specify what practices should be accepted as valid reduction measures. This could be motivated, e.g., by not including practices that are judged to generate uncertain results.

**Use of farming practices with minor uncertainty**

Such a practice-based approach implies that the regulator in advance makes a list over farming practices that can be used as valid reduction measures in the EU ETS system. This brings about the question of which practices to include? One reasonable criterion would be to only include practices in which the uncertainty is minor. The uncertainty here could relate to measurement uncertainty or simply lack of understanding of the underlying biological/chemical processes. As new research reduces such types of uncertainty or new methods that contain less uncertainty are developed, the list of acceptable practices can be expanded.

Overall, this system encourages GHG reduction either by introducing a new and less polluting practice or by reducing the polluting activity. When doing so, farmers will receive GHG permits corresponding to the amount of reduction following the change in practice. Farmers are then free to sell or store these permits in the EU ETS.

---
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Brief news

Publications

The Lazy Man of Europe
A report named The Lazy Man of Europe has recently been published by the British organic organization, Soil Association.

The aim of the report is to demonstrate how and why governments across Europe support organic food and farming, but not least to launch a discussion of how to consider what the UK government and the organic movement could do to support organic growth.

Get The Lazy Man of Europe at www.soilassociation.org.

Organic farming - An International History
Agricultural researchers and policy-makers as well as leaders of organic farming organisations should know this 2007 monograph from CABI.

Complementing general discussions with case histories of important organic institutions in various countries, this comprehensive discussion is the first to explore the development of organic agriculture. The title is now available in paperback.

Go to CABI.org.

African Seed Enterprises: Sowing the Seeds of Food Security
Researchers and policy makers in international development are among the primary target groups of this new title (2011).

In most developing countries, good quality seed is hard to obtain and farmers struggle to save seed from one year to the next. Instead, they increasingly turn to public or private enterprises that multiply, store and distribute seed. African Seed Enterprises takes a people-centred look at the companies, public agencies and family farms that are taking on this role and making a difference to food security across Africa.

Go to CABI.org.

Publications

Sustainability Bookshelf
In 2009, the Cambridge Programme for Sustainability Leadership, CPSL, surveyed its alumni to generate a list of the most noteworthy and influential sustainability books of the last fifty years, a list later published as “The Top 50 Sustainability Books.”

For The State of Sustainability Leadership 2011, CPSL invited their staff and senior associates to identify the Top 40 most significant books of the past 12 months. Go to Ecology and Farming website.

Subscribe to Ecology & Farming
After a gap of one year, IFOAM has re-launched “Ecology & Farming” magazine, now on a bimonthly basis.

Please see the magazine website for information on how to subscribe. IFOAM Affiliates are entitled to a 50% discount.

Go to Ecology and Farming website.

New CERTCOST report: Consumer Preferences and Willingness-to-Pay for Organic Certification Logos: Recommendations for Actors in the Organic Sector
A market inventory shows that the 3 most frequent kinds of organic certification logos occurring on products across the study countries are 1. national governmental logos, 2. logos of farmers’ associations and 3. their umbrella organisations, and logos of certification bodies.

This is evident in a new public report from the CERTCOST project, which in effect gives a number of recommendations for different actors in the organic sector on the use and promotion of organic certification logos. To increase consumer trust in the new mandatory EU logo, it is recommended that promotion campaigns should be carried out explaining what the logo indicates.

Read more at www.certcost.org.

Meetings

CERTCOST final meeting
The final CERTCOST project meeting will be held in Freising, 7-8 July 2011.

At this meeting, organised locally by The University of Hohenheim, all the projected scientific results will be discussed. Furthermore, the dissemination plan will be discussed in order to ensure the best possible impact of the results of this three year FP7 European research project.

Read more at www.certcost.org.