Chapter 4: Land Degradation

Coordinating Lead Authors: Lennart Olsson (Sweden), Humberto Barbosa (Brazil)

Lead Authors: Suruchi Bhadwal (India), Annette Cowie (Australia), Kenel Delusca (Haiti), Dulce Flores-Renteria (Mexico), Kathleen Hermans (Germany), Esteban Jobbagy (Argentina), Werner Kurz (Canada), Diqiang Li (China), Denis Jean Sonwa, (Cameroon), Lindsay Stringer (United Kingdom)

Contributing Authors: Timothy Crews (United States of America), Martin Dallimer (United Kingdom), Joris Eekhout (The Netherlands), Karlheinz Erb (Italy), Eamon Haughey (Ireland), Richard Houghton (United States of America), Mohammad Mohsin Iqbal (Pakistan), Francis X. Johnson (United States of America), Woo-Kyun Lee (Korea), John Morton (United Kingdom), Felipe Garcia Oliva (Mexico), Jan Petzold (Germany), Muhammad Rahimi (Iran), Florence Renou-Wilson (Ireland), Anna Tengberg (Sweden), Louis Verchot (Colombia/United States of America), Katharine Vincent (South Africa)

Review Editors: José Manuel Moreno Rodriguez (Spain), Carolina Vera (Argentina)

Chapter Scientist: Aliyu Salisu Barau (Nigeria)

Date of Draft: 28/04/2019

Table of Contents

4.1 Executive Summary

Land degradation affects people and ecosystems throughout the planet and is both affected by climate change and contributes to it. In this report, land degradation is defined as a *negative trend in land condition, caused by direct or indirect human-induced processes including anthropogenic climate change, expressed as long-term reduction or loss of at least one of the following: biological productivity, ecological integrity, or value to humans*. Forest degradation is land degradation which occurs in forest land. Deforestation is the conversion of forest to non-forest land and can result in land degradation. {4.2.3}

Land degradation adversely affects people's livelihoods *(very high confidence)* and occurs over a quarter of the Earth's ice-free land area *(medium confidence)*. The majority of the 1.3 to 3.2 billion affected people *(low confidence)* are living in poverty in developing countries *(medium confidence)*. Land use changes and unsustainable land management are direct human causes of land degradation (*very high confidence*), with agriculture being a dominant sector driving degradation (*very high confidence*). Soil loss from conventionally tilled land exceeds the rate of soil formation by >2 orders of magnitude (*medium confidence*). Land degradation affects humans in multiple ways, interacting with social, political, cultural and economic aspects, including markets, technology, inequality and demographic change (*very high confidence*). Land degradation impacts extend beyond the land surface itself, affecting marine and freshwater systems, as well as people and ecosystems far away from the local sites of degradation (*very high confidence*). {4.2.6, 4.3.1, 4.3.3, 4.4, 4.7.1, 4.8, Table 4.1}

Climate change exacerbates the rate and magnitude of several ongoing land degradation processes and introduces new degradation patterns (*high confidence*). Human-induced global warming has already caused observed changes in two drivers of land degradation: increased frequency, intensity and/or amount of heavy precipitation (*medium confidence*), and increased heat stress (*high confidence*). Global warming beyond that of present-day will further exacerbate ongoing land degradation processes through increasing floods (*medium confidence*), drought frequency and severity (*medium confidence*), intensified cyclones (*medium confidence*), and sea-level rise (*very high confidence*), with outcomes being modulated by land management (*very high confidence*). Permafrost thawing due to warming (*high confidence*), and coastal erosion due to sea level rise and impacts of changing storm paths (*low confidence*), are examples of land degradation affecting places in which it has not typically been a problem. Erosion of coastal areas because of sea level rise will increase worldwide (*high confidence*). In cyclone prone areas the combination of sea level rise and more intense cyclones will cause land degradation with serious consequences for people and livelihoods (*very high confidence*). {4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.10.6, Table 4.1}

Land degradation and climate change, both individually and in combination, have profound implications for natural resource-based livelihood systems and societal groups (*high confidence*). The number of people whose livelihood depends on degraded lands has been estimated to ~1.5 billion worldwide (*very low confidence*). People in degraded areas who directly depend on natural resources for subsistence, food security and income, including women and youth with limited adaptation options, are especially vulnerable to land degradation and climate change (*high confidence*). Land degradation reduces land productivity and increases the workload of managing the land, affecting women disproportionally in some regions. Land degradation and climate change act as threat multipliers for already precarious livelihoods (*very high confidence*), leaving them highly sensitive to extreme climatic events, with consequences such as poverty and food insecurity (*high confidence*), and in some cases migration, conflict and loss of cultural heritage (*low confidence*). Changes in vegetation cover and distribution due to climate change increase risks of land degradation in some areas (*medium confidence*). Climate change will have detrimental effects on livelihoods, habitats, and infrastructure through increased rates of land degradation (*high confidence*) and from new degradation patterns (*low evidence, high agreement*). {4.2.6, 4.3.1, 4.8}

Land degradation is a driver of climate change through emission of greenhouse gases and reduced rates of carbon uptake *(very high confidence*). Since 1990, globally the forest area has decreased by 3% (*low confidence*) with net decreases in the tropics and net increases outside the tropics (*high confidence*). Lower carbon density in re-growing forests compared to carbon stocks before deforestation results in net emissions from land use change (*very high confidence*). Forest management that reduces carbon stocks of forest land also leads to emissions, but global estimates of these emissions are uncertain. Cropland soils have lost 20-60% of their organic carbon content prior to cultivation, and soils under conventional agriculture continue to be a source of greenhouse gases (*medium confidence*). Of the land degradation processes, deforestation, increasing wildfires, degradation of peat soils, and permafrost thawing contribute most to climate change through the release of greenhouse gases and the reduction in land carbon sinks following deforestation (*high confidence*). Agricultural practices also emit non-CO_2 greenhouse gases from soils and these emissions are exacerbated by climate change (*medium confidence*). Conversion of primary to managed forests, illegal logging and unsustainable forest management result in greenhouse gas emissions (*very high confidence*) and can have additional physical effects on the regional climate including those arising from albedo shifts (*medium confidence*). These interactions call for more integrative climate impact assessments. {4.3.2, 4.4, 4.6.4, 4.7}

Large-scale implementation of dedicated biomass production for bioenergy increases competition for land with potentially serious consequences for food security and land degradation *(high confidence)*. Increasing the extent and intensity of biomass production through e.g. fertiliser additions, irrigation or monoculture energy plantations can result in local land degradation. Poorly implemented intensification of land management contributes to land degradation (e.g., salinisation from irrigation) and disrupted livelihoods (*high confidence*). In areas where afforestation and reforestation occur on previously degraded lands, opportunities exist to restore and rehabilitate lands with potentially significant co-benefits (*high confidence*) that depend on whether restoration involves natural or plantation forests. The total area of degraded lands has been estimated at 1-6 Mkm^2 (*very low confidence*). The extent of degraded and marginal lands suitable for dedicated biomass production is highly uncertain and cannot be established without due consideration of current land use and land tenure. Increasing the area of dedicated energy crops can lead to land degradation elsewhere through indirect land use change (*medium confidence*). Impacts of energy crops can be reduced through strategic integration with agricultural and forestry systems (*high confidence*) but the total quantity of biomass that can be produced through synergistic production systems is unknown. {4.2.6, 4.5.2, 4.6, 4.8.1, 4.9.1, 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.10.3}

Reducing unsustainable use of traditional biomass reduces land degradation and emissions of CO_2, while providing social and economic co-benefits (*very high confidence*). Traditional biomass in the form of fuelwood, charcoal and agricultural residues remains a primary source of energy for more than one-third of the global population leading to unsustainable use of biomass resources and forest degradation and contributing around 2% of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (*low confidence*). Enhanced forest protection, improved forest and agricultural management, fuel-switching and adoption of efficient cooking and heating appliances can promote more sustainable biomass use and reduce land degradation, with co-benefits of reduced GHG emissions, improved human health, and reduced workload especially for women and youth (*very high confidence*). {4.2.6, 4.6.4}

Land degradation can be avoided, reduced or reversed by implementing sustainable land management, restoration and rehabilitation practices that simultaneously provide many co-benefits, including adaptation to and mitigation of climate change *(high confidence)*. Sustainable land management is a comprehensive array of technologies and enabling conditions, which have proven to address land degradation at multiple landscape scales, from local farms *(very high confidence)* to entire watersheds *(medium confidence)*. Sustainable forest management can prevent deforestation, maintain and enhance carbon sinks and can contribute towards greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals. Sustainable forest management generates socio-economic benefits, provides fiber, timber and biomass to meet society's growing needs. While sustainable forest management sustains high carbon sinks, the conversion from primary forests to sustainably managed forests can result in carbon emission during the transition and can result in loss of biodiversity *(high confidence)*. Conversely, in areas of degraded forests, sustainable forest management can increase carbon stocks and biodiversity *(medium confidence)*. Carbon storage in long-lived wood products and reductions of emissions from use of wood products to substitute for emissions-intensive materials also contribute to mitigation objectives. {4.9, 4.10, Table 4.2}

Lack of action to address land degradation will increase emissions and reduce carbon sinks and is inconsistent with the emission reductions required to limit global warming to 1.5°C or 2°C. (*high confidence*). Better management of soils can offset 5–20% of current global anthropogenic GHG emissions (*medium confidence*). Measures to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation are available but economic, political, institutional, legal and socio-cultural barriers, including lack of access to resources and knowledge, restrict their uptake (*very high confidence*). Proven measures that facilitate implementation of practices that avoid, reduce, or reverse land degradation include tenure reform, tax incentives, payments for ecosystem services, participatory integrated land use planning, farmer networks and rural advisory services. Delayed action increases the costs of addressing land degradation, and can lead to irreversible biophysical and human outcomes (*high confidence*). Early actions can generate both site specific and immediate benefits to communities affected by land degradation, and contribute to long-term global benefits through climate change mitigation (*high confidence*). {4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.8.1, 4.9, Table 4.2}

Even with adequate implementation of measures to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation there will be residual degradation in some situations *(high confidence)*. Limits to adaptation are dynamic, site specific and are determined through the interaction of biophysical changes with social and institutional conditions. Exceeding the limits of adaptation will trigger escalating losses or result in undesirable changes, such as forced migration, conflicts, or poverty. Examples of potential limits to adaptation due to climate change induced land degradation are coastal erosion where land disappears, collapsing infrastructure and livelihoods due to thawing of permafrost, and extreme forms of soil erosion. {4.8, 4.9.5, 4.9.6, 4.10.6, 4.10.7, 4.10.8}

Land degradation is a serious and widespread problem, yet key uncertainties remain concerning its extent, severity, and linkages to climate change *(very high confidence)*. Despite the difficulties of objectively measuring the extent and severity of land degradation given its complex and value-based characteristics, land degradation represents, like climate change, one of the biggest and most urgent challenges for humanity (*very high confidence*). The current global extent, severity and rates of land degradation are not well quantified. There is no single method by which land degradation can be measured objectively and consistently over large areas because it is such a complex and value laden concept (*very high confidence*). However, many scientific and locally-based approaches, including the use of indigenous and local knowledge, exist that can assess different aspects of land degradation or provide proxies. Remote sensing, corroborated by other data, can generate geographically explicit and globally consistent data that can be used as proxies over relevant time scales (several decades). Few studies have specifically addressed the impacts of proposed land-based negative emission technologies on land degradation. Much research has tried to understand how livelihoods and ecosystems are affected by a particular stressor, for example drought, heat stress, or water logging. Important knowledge gaps remain in understanding how plants, habitats and ecosystems are affected by the cumulative and interacting impacts of several stressors, including potential new stressors resulting from large-scale implementation of negative emission technologies. {4.11}

4.2 Introduction

4.2.1 Scope of the chapter

This chapter examines the scientific understanding of how climate change impacts land degradation, and vice versa, with a focus on non-drylands. Land degradation of drylands is covered in Chapter 3. After providing definitions and the context (Section 4.2) we proceed with a theoretical explanation of the different processes of land degradation and how they are related to climate and to climate change, where possible (Section 4.3). Two sections are devoted to a systematic assessment of the scientific literature on status and trend of land degradation (Section 4.4) and projections of land degradation (Section 4.5). Then follows a section where we assess the impacts of climate change mitigation options, bioenergy and land-based technologies for carbon dioxide removal (CDR), on land degradation (Section 4.6). The ways in which land degradation can impact climate and climate change are assessed in Section 4.7. The impacts of climate related land degradation on human and natural systems are assessed in Section 4.8. The remainder of the chapter assesses land degradation mitigation options based on the concept of sustainable land management: avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation (Section 4.9), followed by a presentation of eight illustrative case studies of land degradation and remedies (Section 4.10). The chapter ends with a discussion of the most critical knowledge gaps and areas for further research (Section 4.11).

4.2.2 Perspectives of land degradation

Land degradation has accompanied humanity at least since the widespread adoption of agriculture during Neolithic time, some 10,000 to 7,500 years ago (Dotterweich 2013; Butzer 2005; Dotterweich 2008) and the associated population increase (Bocquet-Appel 2011). There are indications that the levels of greenhouse gases (particularly carbon dioxide and methane) of the atmosphere started to increase already more than 3,000 years ago as a result of expanding agriculture, clearing of forests, and domestication of wild animals (Fuller et al. 2011; Kaplan et al. 2011; Vavrus et al. 2018; Ellis et al. 2013). While the development of agriculture (cropping and animal husbandry) underpinned the development of civilisations, political institutions, and prosperity, farming practices led to conversion of forests and grasslands to farmland, and the heavy reliance on domesticated annual grasses for our food production meant that soils started to deteriorate through seasonal mechanical disturbances (Turner et al. 1990; Steffen et al. 2005; Ojima et al. 1994; Ellis et al. 2013). More recently, urbanisation has significantly altered ecosystems, see further Cross-chapter Box 4 on Climate Change and Urbanisation, Chapter 2. Since about 1850, about 35% of the human caused emissions of CO_2 to the atmosphere comes from land as a combined effect of land degradation and land-use change (Foley et al. 2005) and about 38% of Earth's land area has been converted to agriculture (Foley et al. 2011), see Chapter 2 for more details.

Not all human impacts on land result in degradation according to the definition of land degradation used in this report (see 4.3.1). There are many examples of long-term sustainably managed land around the world (such as terraced agricultural systems and sustainably managed forests) although degradation and its management are the focus of this chapter. We also acknowledge that human use of land and ecosystems provides essential goods and services for society (Foley et al. 2005; MA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) 2005).

Land degradation was long subject to a polarised scientific debate between disciplines and perspectives in which social scientists often proposed that natural scientists exaggerated land degradation as a global problem (Blaikie and Brookfield 1987; Forsyth 1996; Lukas 2014; Zimmerer 1993). The elusiveness of the concept in combination with the difficulties of measuring and monitoring land degradation at global and regional scales by extrapolation and aggregation of empirical studies at local scales, such as the Global Assessment of Soil Degradation database (GLASOD) (Sonneveld and Dent 2009) contributed to conflicting views. The conflicting views were not confined to science only, but also caused tension between the scientific understanding of land degradation and policy (Andersson et al. 2011; Behnke and Mortimore 2016; Grainger 2009; Toulmin and Brock 2016). Another weakness of many land degradation studies is the exclusion of the views and experiences of the land users, whether farmers or forest dependent communities (Blaikie and Brookfield 1987; Fairhead and Scoones 2005; Warren 2002; Andersson et al. 2011). More recently, the polarised views described above have been reconciled under the umbrella of Land Change Science, which has emerged as an interdisciplinary field aimed at examining the dynamics of land cover and land-use as a coupled human–environment system (Turner et al. 2007). A comprehensive discussion about concepts and different perspectives of land degradation was presented in Chapter 2 of the recent report from the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) on land degradation (Montanarella et al. 2018).

In summary, agriculture and clearing of land for food and wood products have been the main drivers of land degradation for millennia (*high confidence*). This does not mean, however, that agriculture and forestry always cause land degradation (*high confidence*); sustainable management is possible but not always practiced (*high confidence*). Reasons for this are primarily economic, political and social.

4.2.3 Definition of land degradation

To clarify the scope of this chapter it is important to start by defining land itself. The Special Report on Climate Change and Land (SRCCL) defines land as "the terrestrial portion of the biosphere that comprises the natural resources (soil, near surface air, vegetation and other biota, and water), the ecological processes, topography, and human settlements and infrastructure that operate within that system" (Henry et al. 2018), adapted from (FAO 2007; UNCCD 1994).

Land degradation is defined in many different ways within the literature, with differing emphases on biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services (e.g., Montanarella et al. 2018). In this report, land degradation is defined as a *negative trend in land condition, caused by direct or indirect human-induced processes including anthropogenic climate change, expressed as long-term reduction or loss of at least one of the following: biological productivity, ecological integrity or value to humans*. This definition applies to forest and non-forest land: forest degradation is land degradation that occurs in forest land. Soil degradation refers to a subset of land degradation processes that directly affect soil.

The SRCCL definition is derived from the IPCC AR5 definition of desertification, which is in turn taken from the UNCCD: "Land degradation in arid, semi-arid, and dry sub-humid areas resulting from various factors, including climatic variations and human activities. Land degradation in arid, semi-arid, and dry sub-humid areas is a reduction or loss of the biological or economic productivity and integrity of rainfed cropland, irrigated cropland, or range, pasture, forest, and woodlands resulting from land uses or from a process or combination of processes, including processes arising from human activities and habitation patterns, such as (1) soil erosion caused by wind and/or water; (2) deterioration of the physical, chemical, biological, or economic properties of soil; and (3) long-term loss of natural vegetation" (UNCCD 1994, Article 1).

The SRCCL definition is intended to complement the more detailed UNCCD definition, expanding the scope to all regions, not just drylands, providing an operational definition that emphasises the relationship between land degradation and climate for use in this report. Through its attention to the three aspects biological productivity, ecological integrity and value to humans, the SRCCL definition is consistent with the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) concept, which aims to maintain or enhance the land-based natural capital, and the ecosystem services that flow from it (Cowie et al. 2018).

In the SRCCL definition of land degradation, changes in land condition resulting solely from natural processes (such as volcanic eruptions and tsunamis) are not considered land degradation, as these are not direct or indirect human-induced processes. Climate variability exacerbated by human-induced climate change can contribute to land degradation. Value to humans can be expressed in terms of ecosystem services or Nature's Contribution to People.

The definition recognises the reality presented in the literature that land-use and land management decisions often result in trade-offs between time, space, ecosystem services, and stakeholder groups (e.g. Dallimer and Stringer 2018). The interpretation of a negative trend in land condition is somewhat subjective, especially where there is a trade-off between ecological integrity and value to humans. The definition also does not consider the magnitude of the negative trend or the possibility that a negative trend in one criterion may be an acceptable trade-off for a positive trend in another criterion. For example, reducing timber yields to safeguard biodiversity by leaving on site more wood that can provide habitat, or vice versa, is a trade-off that needs to be evaluated based on context (i.e. the broader landscape) and society's priorities. Reduction of biological productivity *or* ecological integrity *or* value to humans *can* constitute degradation, but any one of these changes need not necessarily be considered degradation. Thus, a land-use change that reduces ecological integrity and enhances **sustainable** food production at a specific location is not necessarily degradation. Different stakeholder groups with different world views value ecosystem services differently. As Warren (2002) explained: land degradation is contextual. Further, a decline in biomass carbon stock does not always signify degradation, such as when caused by periodic forest harvest. Even a decline in productivity may not equate to land degradation, such as when a high intensity agricultural system is converted to a lower input more sustainable production system.

In the SRCCL definition, degradation is indicated by a negative trend in land condition during the period of interest, thus the baseline is the land condition at the start of this period. The concept of baseline is theoretically important but often practically difficult to implement for conceptual and methodological reasons (Herrick et al. 2019; Prince et al. 2018; see also Sections 4.4.1 and 4.5.1). Especially in biomes characterised by seasonal and interannual variability, the baseline values of the indicators to be assessed should be determined by averaging data over a number of years prior to the commencement of the assessment period (Orr et al. 2017; see also 4.3.4).

Forest degradation is land degradation in forest remaining forest. In contrast, deforestation refers to the conversion of forest to non-forest that involves a loss of tree cover and a change in land-use. Internationally accepted definitions of forest (FAO 2015; UNFCCC 2013) include lands where tree cover has been lost temporarily, due to disturbance or harvest, with an expectation of forest regrowth. Such temporary loss of forest cover therefore is not deforestation.

4.2.4 Land degradation in previous IPCC reports

Several previous IPCC assessment reports include brief discussions of land degradation. In AR5 WGIII land degradation is one factor contributing to uncertainties of the mitigation potential of land-based ecosystems, particularly in terms of fluxes of soil carbon (Smith et al., 2014, p. 817). In AR5 WGI, soil carbon was discussed comprehensively but not in the context of land degradation, except forest degradation (Ciais et al. 2013) and permafrost degradation (Vaughan et al. 2013). Climate change impacts were discussed comprehensively in AR5 WGII, but land degradation was not prominent. Land use and land cover changes were treated comprehensively in terms of effects on the terrestrial carbon stocks and flows (Settele et al. 2015) but links to land degradation were to a large extent missing. Land degradation was discussed in relation to human security as one factor which in combination with extreme weather events has been proposed to contribute to human migration (Adger et al. 2014), an issue discussed more comprehensively in this chapter (see section 4.8.3). Drivers and processes of degradation by which land-based carbon is released to the atmosphere and/or the long-term reduction in the capacity of the land to remove atmospheric carbon and to store this in biomass and soil carbon, have been discussed in the methodological reports of IPCC (IPCC 2006, 2014a) but less so in the assessment reports.

The Special Report on Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (SR-LULUCF) (Watson et al. 2000) focused on the role of the biosphere in the global cycles of greenhouse gases (GHG). Land degradation was not addressed in a comprehensive way. Soil erosion was discussed as a process by which soil carbon is lost and the productivity of the land is reduced. Deposition of eroded soil carbon in marine sediments was also mentioned as a possible mechanism for permanent sequestration of terrestrial carbon (Watson et al. 2000) (p. 194). The possible impacts of climate change on land productivity and degradation were not discussed comprehensively. Much of the report was about how to account for sources and sinks of terrestrial carbon under the Kyoto Protocol.

The IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX) (IPCC 2012) did not provide a definition of land degradation. Nevertheless, it addressed different aspects related to some types of land degradation in the context of weather and climate extreme events. From this perspective, it provided key information on both observed and projected changes in weather and climate (extremes) events that are relevant to extreme impacts on socio-economic systems and on the physical components of the environment, notably on permafrost in mountainous areas and coastal zones for different geographic regions, but little explicit links to land degradation. The report also presented the concept of sustainable land management as an effective risk reduction tool.

Land degradation has been treated in several previous IPCC reports but mainly as an aggregated concept associated with emissions of GHG or as an issue that can be addressed through adaptation and mitigation.

4.2.5 Sustainable land management and sustainable forest management

Sustainable land management (SLM) is defined as "the stewardship and use of land resources, including soils, water, animals and plants, to meet changing human needs, while simultaneously ensuring the long-term productive potential of these resources and the maintenance of their environmental functions" (Adapted from World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies, WOCAT). Achieving the objective of ensuring that productive potential is maintained in the long term will require implementation of adaptive management and "triple loop learning", that seeks to monitor outcomes, learn from experience and emerging new knowledge, modifying management accordingly (Rist et al. 2013).

Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is defined as "the stewardship and use of forests and forest lands in a way, and at a rate, that maintains their biodiversity, productivity, regeneration capacity, vitality and their potential to fulfill, now and in the future, relevant ecological, economic and social functions, at local, national, and global levels, and that does not cause damage to other ecosystems" (Forest Europe 2016; Mackey et al. 2015). This SFM definition was developed by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe and has since been adopted by the Food and Agriculture Organization. Forest management that fails to meet these sustainability criteria can contribute to land degradation. Land degradation can be reversed through restoration and rehabilitation, which are defined in the Glossary, where other terms that are used but not explicitly defined in this section can also be found. While the definitions of SLM and SFM are very similar and could be merged, both are included to maintain the subtle differences in the existing definitions.

Climate change impacts interact with land management to determine sustainable or degraded outcome (Figure 4.1). Climate change can exacerbate many degradation processes (Table 4.1) and introduce novel ones (e.g., permafrost thawing or biome shifts). To avoid, reduce or reverse degradation, land management activities can be selected to mitigate the impact of, and adapt to, climate change. In some cases, climate change impacts may result in increased productivity and carbon stocks, at least in the short term. For example, longer growing seasons due to climate warming can lead to higher forest productivity (Henttonen et al. 2017; Kauppi et al. 2014; Dragoni et al. 2011), but warming alone many not increase productivity where other factors such a water supply are limiting (Hember et al. 2017).

The types and intensity of human land-use and climate change impacts on lands affect their carbon stocks and their ability to operate as carbon sinks. In managed agricultural lands, degradation can result in reductions of soil organic carbon stocks, which also adversely affects land productivity and carbon sinks (See Figure 4.1).

The transition from natural to managed forest landscapes usually results in an initial reduction of landscape-level carbon stocks. The magnitude of this reduction is a function of the differential in frequency of stand replacing natural disturbances (e.g. wildfires) and harvest disturbances, as well as the age-dependence of these disturbances (Harmon et al. 1990; Kurz et al. 1998a; Trofymow et al. 2008).

Sustainable forest management applied at the landscape scale to existing unmanaged forests can first reduce average forest carbon stocks and subsequently increase the rate at which carbon dioxide is removed from the atmosphere, because net ecosystem production of forest stands is highest in intermediate stand ages (Kurz et al. 2013; Volkova et al. 2018; Tang et al. 2014). The net impact on the atmosphere depends on the magnitude of the reduction in carbon stocks, the fate of the harvested biomass (i.e. use in short or long-lived products and for bioenergy, and therefore displacement of emissions associated with GHG-intensive building materials and fossil fuels), and the rate of regrowth. Thus, the impacts of sustainable forest management on one indicator (e.g., past reduction in C stocks in the forested landscape) can be negative, while those on another indicator (e.g., current forest productivity and rate of CO_2 removal from the atmosphere, avoided fossil fuel emissions) can be positive. Sustainably managed forest landscapes can have a lower biomass carbon density than unmanaged forest, but the younger forests can have a higher growth rate, and therefore contribute stronger carbon sinks, than older forests (Trofymow et al. 2008; Volkova et al. 2018; Poorter et al. 2016).



Figure 4.1 Conceptual figure illustrating that climate change impacts interact with land management to determine sustainable or degraded outcome. Climate change can exacerbate many degradation processes (Table 4.1) and introduce novel ones (e.g., permafrost thawing or biome shifts), hence management needs to respond to climate impacts in order to avoid, reduce or reverse degradation. The types and intensity of human land-use and climate change impacts on lands affect their carbon stocks and their ability to operate as carbon sinks. In managed agricultural lands, degradation typically results in reductions of soil organic carbon stocks, which also adversely affects land productivity and carbon sinks. In forest land, reduction in biomass carbon stocks alone is not necessarily an indication of a reduction in carbon sinks. Sustainably managed forest landscapes can have a lower biomass carbon density but the younger forests can have a higher growth rate, and therefore contribute stronger carbon sinks, than older forests. Ranges of carbon sinks in forest and agricultural lands are overlapping. In some cases, climate change impacts may result in increased productivity and carbon stocks, at least in the short term.

Selective logging and thinning can maintain and enhance forest productivity and achieve co-benefits when conducted with due care for the residual stand and at intensity and frequency that does not exceed the rate of regrowth (Romero and Putz 2018). In contrast, unsustainable logging practices can lead to stand-level degradation. For example, degradation occurs when selective logging (high-grading) removes valuable large-diameter trees, leaving behind damaged, diseased, non-commercial or otherwise less productive trees, reducing carbon stocks and also adversely affecting subsequent forest recovery (Belair and Ducey 2018; Nyland 1992).

Sustainable forest management is defined using several criteria (see above) and its implementation will typically involve trade-offs among these criteria. The conversion of primary forests to sustainably managed forest ecosystems increases relevant economic, social and other functions but often with adverse impacts on biodiversity (Barlow et al. 2007). In regions with infrequent or no stand replacing natural disturbances, the timber yield per hectare harvested in managed secondary forests is typically lower than the yield per hectare from the first harvest in the primary forest (Romero and Putz 2018).

The sustainability of timber yield has been achieved in temperate and boreal forests where intensification of management has resulted in increased growing stocks and increased harvest rates in countries where forests had previously been overexploited (Henttonen et al. 2017; Kauppi et al. 2018). However, intensification of management to increase forest productivity can be associated with reductions in biodiversity. For example, when increased productivity is achieved by periodic thinning and removal of trees that would otherwise die due to competition, thinning reduces the amount of dead organic matter of snags and coarse woody debris that can provide habitat and this loss reduces biodiversity (Spence 2001; Ehnström 2001) and forest carbon stocks (Russell et al. 2015; Kurz et al. 2013). Recognition of adverse biodiversity impacts of high yield forestry is leading to modified management aimed at increasing habitat availability through, for example, variable retention logging and continuous cover management (Roberts et al. 2016) and through the re-introduction of fire disturbances in landscapes where fires have been suppressed (Allen et al. 2002). Biodiversity losses are also observed during the transition from primary to managed forests in tropical regions (Barlow et al. 2007) where tree species diversity can be very high, e.g. in the Amazon region about 16,000 tree species are estimated to exist (ter Steege et al. 2013).

Forest certification schemes have been used to document SFM outcomes (Rametsteiner and Simula 2003) by assessing a set of criteria and indicators (e.g., Lindenmayer et al. 2000). While many of the certified forests are found in temperate and boreal countries (Rametsteiner and Simula 2003; MacDicken et al. 2015), examples from the tropics also show that SFM can improve outcomes. For example, selective logging emits 6% of the tropical GHG annually and improved logging practices can reduce emissions by 44 % while maintaining timber production (Ellis et al. 2019). In the Congo Basin, implementing reduced impact logging (RIL-C) practices can cut emissions in half without reducing the timber yield (Umunay et al. 2019). SFM adoption depends on the socio-economic and political context and its improvement depends mainly on better reporting and verification (Siry et al. 2005).

The successful implementation of SFM requires well established and functional governance, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms to eliminate deforestation, illegal logging, arson, and other activities that are inconsistent with SFM principles (Nasi et al. 2011). Moreover, following human and natural disturbances forest regrowth must be ensured through reforestation, site rehabilitation activities or natural regeneration. Failure of forests to regrow following disturbances will lead to unsustainable outcomes and long-term reductions in forest area, forest cover, carbon density, forest productivity and land-based carbon sinks (Nasi et al. 2011).

Achieving all of the criteria of the definitions of SLM and SFM is an aspirational goal that will be made more challenging where climate change impacts, such as biome shifts and increased disturbances, are predicted to adversely affect future biodiversity and contribute to forest degradation (Warren et al. 2018). Land management to enhance land sinks will involve trade-offs that need to be assessed within their spatial, temporal and societal context.

4.2.6 The human dimension of land degradation and forest degradation

Studies of land and forest degradation are often biased towards biophysical aspects both in terms of its processes, such as erosion or nutrient depletion, and its observed physical manifestations, such as gullying or low primary productivity. Land users' own perceptions and knowledge about land conditions and degradation have often been neglected or ignored by both policy makers and scientists (Reed et al. 2007; Forsyth 1996; Andersson et al. 2011). A growing body of work is nevertheless beginning to focus on land degradation through the lens of local land users (Kessler and Stroosnijder 2006; Fairhead and Scoones 2005; Zimmerer 1993; Stocking et al. 2001) and the importance of local and indigenous knowledge within land management is starting to be appreciated (Montanarella et al.

2018). Climate change impacts directly and indirectly the social reality, the land users, and the ecosystem and vice versa. Land degradation can also have an impact on climate change (see Section 4.7).

The use and management of land is highly gendered and is expected to remain so for the foreseeable future (Kristjanson et al. 2017). Women have often less formal access to land than men and less influence over decisions about land, even if they carry out many of the land management tasks (Jerneck 2018a; Elmhirst 2011; Toulmin 2009; Peters 2004; Agarwal 1997; Jerneck 2018b). Many oft-cited sweeping statements about women's subordination in agriculture are difficult to substantiate, yet it is clear that gender inequality persists (Doss et al. 2015). Even if women's access to land is changing formally (Kumar and Quisumbing 2015), the practical outcome is often limited due to several other factors related to both formal and informal institutional arrangements and values (Lavers 2017; Kristjanson et al. 2017; Djurfeldt et al. 2018). Women are also affected differently than men when it comes to climate change, having lower adaptive capacities due to factors such as prevailing land tenure frameworks, lower access to other capital assets and dominant cultural practices (Vincent et al. 2014; Antwi-Agyei et al. 2015; Gabrielsson et al. 2013). This affects the options available to women to respond to both land degradation and climate change. Indeed, access to land and other assets (e.g., education and training) is key in shaping land-use and land management strategies (Liu et al. 2018b; Lambin et al. 2001). Young people is another category that is often disadvantaged in terms of access to resources and decision making power, even though they carry out much of the day-to-day work (Wilson et al. 2017; Kosec et al. 2018; Naamwintome and Bagson 2013).

Land rights differ between places and are dependent on the political-economic and legal context (Montanarella et al. 2018). This means there is no universally applicable best arrangement. Agriculture in highly erosion prone regions requires site specific and long lasting soil and water conservation measures, such as terraces (see 4.9.1), which may benefit from secure private land rights (Tarfasa et al. 2018; Soule et al. 2000). Pastoral modes of production and community based forest management systems are often dominated by communal land tenure arrangements, which may conflict with agricultural/forestry modernization policies implying private property rights (Antwi-Agyei et al. 2015; Benjaminsen and Lund 2003; Itkonen 2016; Owour et al. 2011; Gebara 2018)

Cultural ecosystem services, defined as the non-material benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection, recreation and aesthetic experiences (Millennium Assessment 2005) are closely linked to land and ecosystems, although often underrepresented in the literature on ecosystem services (Tengberg et al. 2012; Hernández-Morcillo et al. 2013). Climate change interacting with land conditions can impact cultural aspects, such as sense of place and sense of belonging (Olsson et al. 2014).

4.3 Land degradation in the context of climate change

Land degradation results from a complex chain of causes making the clear distinction between direct and indirect drivers difficult. In the context of climate change, an additional complex aspect is brought by the reciprocal effects that both processes have on each other (i.e. climate change influencing land degradation and vice versa). In this chapter, we use the terms processes and drivers with the following meanings:

Processes of land degradation are those direct mechanisms by which land is degraded and are similar to the notion of "direct drivers" in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005) framework. In this report, a comprehensive list of land degradation processes is presented in Table 4.1.

Drivers of land degradation are those indirect conditions which may drive processes of land degradation and are similar to the notion of "indirect drivers" in the MA framework. Examples of indirect drivers of land degradation are changes in land tenure or cash crop prices, which can trigger land-use or management shifts that affect land degradation.

An exact demarcation between processes and drivers is not possible. Drought and fires are described as drivers of land degradation in the next section but they can also be a process: for example, if repeated fires deplete seed sources they can affect regeneration and succession of forest ecosystems. The responses to land degradation follow the logic of the Land Degradation Neutrality concept: avoiding, reducing and reversing land degradation (Orr et al. 2017b; Cowie et al. 2018).

In research on land degradation, climate and climate variability are often intrinsic factors. The role of climate change, however, is less articulated. Depending on what conceptual framework is used, climate change is understood either as a process or a driver of land degradation, and sometimes both.

4.3.1 Processes of land degradation

A large array of interactive physical, chemical, biological and human processes led to what we define in this report as land degradation (Johnson and Lewis 2007). The biological productivity, ecological integrity (which encompasses both functional and structural attributes of ecosystems) or the human value (which includes any benefit that people get from the land) of a given territory can deteriorate as the result of processes triggered at scales that range from a single furrow (e.g., water erosion under cultivation) to the landscape level (e.g., salinisation through raising groundwater levels under irrigation). While pressures leading to land degradation are often exerted on specific components of the land systems (i.e., soils, water, biota), once degradation processes start, other components become affected through cascading and interactive effects. For example, different pressures and degradation processes can have convergent effects, as can be the case of overgrazing leading to wind erosion, landscape drainage resulting in wetland drying, and warming causing more frequent burning; all of which can independently lead to reductions of the soil organic matter pools as second order process. Still, the reduction of organic matter pools is also a first order process triggered directly by the effects of rising temperatures (Crowther et al., 2016) as well as other climate changes such as precipitation shifts (Viscarra Rossel et al. 2014). Beyond this complexity, a practical assessment of the major land degradation processes helps to reveal and categorise the multiple pathways in which climate change exerts a degradation pressure (Table 4.1).

Conversion of freshwater wetlands to agricultural land has historically been a common way of increasing the area of arable land. Despite the small areal extent (~1% of the earth’s surface (Hu et al. 2017; Dixon et al. 2016)), freshwater wetlands provide a very large number of ecosystem services, such as groundwater replenishment, flood protection, and nutrient retention, and are biodiversity hotspots (Reis et al. 2017; Darrah et al. 2019; Montanarella et al. 2018). The loss of wetlands since 1900 has been estimated at ~55% globally (Davidson 2014) (*low confidence*) and 35% since 1970 (Darrah et al. 2019) (*medium confidence*) which in many situations pose a problem for adaptation to climate change. Drainage causes loss of wetlands, which can be further exacerbated by climate change, and reduces the capacity to adapt to climate change (Barnett et al. 2015; Colloff et al. 2016; Finlayson et al. 2017) (*high confidence*).

4.3.1.1 Types of land degradation processes

Land degradation processes can affect the soil, water or biotic components of the land or in their respective interfaces (Table 4.1). Across land degradation processes, those affecting the soil have received more attention. The most widespread and studied land degradation processes affecting soils are water and wind erosion, which have accompanied agriculture since its onset and are still dominant (Table 4.1). Degradation through erosion processes is not restricted to soil loss in detachment areas but includes impacts on transport and deposition areas as well (less commonly, deposition areas can have their soils improved by these inputs). Larger scale degradation processes related to the whole continuum of soil erosion, transport and deposition include dune field expansion/displacement, development of gully networks and the accumulation of sediments (siltation) of natural and artificial water bodies (Poesen and Hooke 1997; Ravi et al. 2010). Long-distance sediment transport during erosion events can have remote effects on land systems as documented for the fertilisation effect of African dust on the Amazon (Yu et al. 2015).

Coastal erosion represents a special case among erosional, with reports linking it to climate change. While human interventions in coastal areas (e.g., expansion of shrimp farms) and rivers (e.g., upstream dams cutting coastal sediment supply), and economic activities causing land subsidence (Keogh and Törnqvist 2019; Allison et al. 2016) are dominant human drivers, storms and sea level rise have already left a significant global imprint on coastal erosion (Mentaschi et al. 2018). Recent projections that take into account geomorphological and socioecological feedbacks suggest that coastal wetlands may not get reduced by sea level rise if their inland growth is accommodated with proper management actions (Schuerch et al. 2018a).

Other physical degradation process in which no material detachment and transport are involved include soil compaction, hardening, sealing and any other mechanism leading to the loss of porous space crucial for holding and exchanging air and water (Hamza and Anderson 2005). A very extreme case of degradation through pore volume loss, manifested at landscape or larger scales, is ground subsidence. Typically caused by the lowering of groundwater or oil levels, subsidence involves a sustained collapse of the ground surface, which can lead to other degradation processes such as salinisation and permanent flooding. Chemical soil degradation processes include relatively simple changes, like nutrient depletion resulting from the imbalance of nutrient extraction on harvested products and fertilisation, and more complex ones, such as acidification and increasing metal toxicity. Acidification in croplands is increasingly driven by excessive nitrogen fertilisation and to a lower extent by the depletion of cation like calcium, potassium or magnesium through exports in harvested biomass (Guo et al. 2010). One of the most relevant chemical degradation processes of soils in the context of climate change is the depletion of its organic matter pool. Reduced in agricultural soils through the increase of respiration rates by tillage and the decline of belowground plant biomass inputs, soil organic matter pools have been diminished also by the direct effects of warming, not only in cultivated land but also under natural vegetation (Bond-Lamberty et al. 2018). Debate persists, however, on whether in more humid and carbon rich ecosystems the simultaneous stimulation of decomposition and productivity may result in the lack of effects on soil carbon (Crowther et al. 2016; van Gestel et al. 2018). In the case of forests, harvesting, particularly if it is exhaustive as in the case of the use of residues for energy generation, can also lead to organic matter declines (Achat et al. 2015). Affected by many other degradation processes (e.g. wildfire increase, salinisation) and having negative effects on other pathways of soil degradation (e.g. reduced nutrient availability, metal toxicity). Soil organic matter can be considered a “hub” of degradation processes and a critical link with the climate system (Minasny et al. 2017).

Land degradation processes can also start from alterations in the hydrological system that are particularly important in the context of climate change. Salinisation, although perceived and reported in soils, is typically triggered by water table-level rises driving salts to the surface under dry to sub-humid climates (Schofield and Kirkby 2003). While salty soils occur naturally under these climates (primary salinity), human interventions have expanded their distribution (secondary salinity with irrigation without proper drainage being the predominant cause of salinisation (Rengasamy 2006). Yet, it has also taken place under non-irrigated conditions where vegetation changes (particularly dry forest clearing and cultivation) had reduced the magnitude and depth of soil water uptake, triggering water table rises towards the surface. Changes in evapotranspiration and rainfall regimes can exacerbate this process (Schofield and Kirkby 2003). Salinisation can also result from the intrusion of sea water into coastal areas both as a result of sea level rise and ground subsidence (Colombani et al. 2016).

Recurring flood and waterlogging episodes (Bradshaw et al. 2007; Poff 2002), and the more chronic expansion of wetlands over dryland ecosystems are mediated by the hydrological system, on occasions aided by geomorphological shifts as well (Kirwan et al. 2011). This is also the case for the drying of continental water bodies and wetlands, including the salinisation and drying of lakes and inland seas (Anderson et al. 2003; Micklin 2010; Herbert et al. 2015). In the context of climate change, the degradation of peatland ecosystems is particularly relevant given their very high carbon storage and their sensitivity to changes in soils, hydrology and/or vegetation (Leifeld and Menichetti 2018). Drainage for land-use conversion together with peat mining are major drivers of peatland degradation, yet other factors such as the extractive use of their natural vegetation and the interactive effects of water table levels and fires (both sensitive to climate change) are important (Hergoualc'h et al. 2017a; Lilleskov et al. 2019).

The biotic components of the land can also be the focus of degradation processes. Vegetation clearing processes associated with land-use changes are not limited to deforestation but include other natural and seminatural ecosystems such as grasslands (the most cultivated biome on Earth), as well as dry steppes and shrublands, which give place to croplands, pastures, urbanisation or just barren land. This clearing process is associated with net C losses from the vegetation and soil pool. Not all biotic degradation processes involve biomass losses. Woody encroachment of open savannahs involve the expansion of woody plant cover and/or density over herbaceous areas and often limits the secondary productivity of rangelands (Asner et al. 2004, Anadon et al. 2014). These processes have been accelerated since the mid-1800s over most continents (Van Auken 2009). Change in plant composition of natural or semi-natural ecosystems without any significant vegetation structural changes is another pathway of degradation affecting rangelands and forests. In rangelands, selective grazing and its interaction with climate variability and/or fire can push ecosystems to new compositions with lower forage value and higher proportion of invasive species (Illius and O´Connor 1999, Sasaki et al. 2007), in some cases with higher carbon sequestration potential, yet with very complex interactions between vegetation and soil carbon shifts (Piñeiro et al. 2010). In forests, extractive logging can be a pervasive cause of degradation leading to long-term impoverishment and in extreme cases, a full loss of the forest cover through its interaction with other agents such as fires (Foley et al. 2007) or progressive intensification of land use. Invasive alien species are another source of biological degradation. Their arrival into cultivated systems is constantly reshaping crop production strategies making agriculture unviable on occasions. In natural and seminatural systems such as rangelands, invasive plant species not only threaten livestock production through diminished forage quality, poisoning and other deleterious effects, but have cascading effects on other processes such as altered fire regimes and water cycling (Brooks et al. 2004). In forests, invasions affect primary productivity and nutrient availability, change fire regimes, and alter species composition, resulting in long term impacts on carbon pools and fluxes (Peltzer et al. 2010).

Other biotic components of ecosystems have been shown as a focus of degradation processes. Invertebrate invasions in continental waters can exacerbate other degradation processes such as eutrophication, which is the over enrichment of nutrients leading to excessive algal growth (Walsh et al. 2016a). Shifts in soil microbial and mesofaunal composition, which can be caused by pollution with pesticides or nitrogen deposition but also by vegetation or disturbance regime shifts, alter many soil functions including respiration rates and C release to the atmosphere (Hussain et al. 2009; Crowther et al. 2015). The role of the soil biota modulating the effects of climate change on soil carbon have been recently demonstrated (Ratcliffe et al. 2017), highlighting the importance of this less known component of the biota as a focal point of land degradation. Of special relevance as both indicators and agents of land degradation recovery are mycorrhiza, which are root associated fungal organisms (Asmelash et al. 2016; Vasconcellos et al. 2016). In natural dry ecosystems, biological soil crusts composed by a broad range of organisms including mosses are a particularly sensitive focus for degradation (Field et al. 2010) with evidenced sensitivity to climate change (Reed et al. 2012).

4.3.1.2 Land degradation processes and climate change

While the subdivision of individual processes is challenged by their strong interconnectedness, it provides a useful setting to identify the most important "focal points" of climate change pressures on land degradation. Among land degradation processes those responding more directly to climate change pressures include all types of erosion and soil organic matter declines (soil focus), salinisation, sodification and permafrost thawing (soil/water focus), waterlogging of dry ecosystems and drying of wet ecosystems (water focus), and a broad group of biological mediated processes like woody encroachment, biological invasions, pest outbreaks (biotic focus), together with biological soil crust destruction and increased burning (soil/biota focus) (Table 4.1). Processes like ground subsidence can be affected by climate change indirectly through sea level rise (Keogh and Törnqvist 2019).

Even when climate change exerts a direct pressure on degradation processes, it can be a secondary driver subordinated to other overwhelming human pressures. Important exceptions are three processes in which climate change is a dominant global or regional pressure and the main driver of their current acceleration. These are coastal erosion as affected by sea level rise and increased storm frequency/intensity (*high agreement, medium evidence*) (Johnson et al. 2015; Alongi 2015; Harley et al. 2017a; Nicholls et al. 2016), permafrost thawing responding to warming (*high agreement, robust evidence*) (Liljedahl et al. 2016; Peng et al. 2016; Batir et al. 2017) and increased burning responding to warming and altered precipitation regimes (*high agreement, robust evidence*) (Jolly et al. 2015; Abatzoglou and Williams 2016; Taufik et al. 2017; Knorr et al. 2016). The previous assessment highlights the fact that climate change not only exacerbates many of the well acknowledged ongoing land degradation processes of managed ecosystems (i.e., croplands and pastures), but becomes a dominant pressure that introduces novel degradation pathways in natural and seminatural ecosystems. Climate change has influenced species invasions and the degradation that they cause by enhancing the transport, colonisation, establishment, and ecological impact of the invasive species, but also by impairing their control practices (*medium agreement, medium evidence*) (Hellmann et al. 2008).

Table 4.1 Major land degradation processes and their connections with climate change. For each process a "focal point" (soil, water, biota) on which degradation occurs first place is indicated, acknowledging that most processes propagate to other land components and cascade into or interact with some of the other processes listed below. The impact of climate change on each process is categorised based on the proximity (very direct = high, very indirect=low) and dominance (dominant=high, subordinate to other pressures = low) of effects. The major effects of climate change on each process are highlighted together with the predominant pressures from other drivers. Feedbacks of land degradation processes on climate change are categorized according to the intensity (very intense=high, subtle=low) of the chemical (greenhouse gases emissions or capture) or physical (energy and momentum exchange, aerosol emissions) effects. Warming effects are indicated in red and cooling effects in blue. Specific feedbacks on climate change are highlighted.

Processes	Focal point	Impacts of Climate Change				Feedbacks on Climate Change			
		proximity	dominance	Climate Change pressures	Other pressures	intensity of chemical effects	intensity of physical effects	global extent	Specific Impacts
Wind erosion	Soil	high	medium	Altered wind/drought patterns (*high confidence* on effect, *medium-low confidence* on trend) (*1*). Indirect effect through vegetation type and biomass production shifts	Tillage, leaving low cover, overgrazing, deforestation/vegetation clearing, large plot sizes, vegetation and fire regime shifts	low	medium	high	Radiative cooling by dust release (*medium confidence*). Ocean and land fertilisation and C burial (*medium confidence*). Albedo increase. Dust effect as condensation nuclei (19).
Water erosion	Soil	high	medium	Increasing rainfall intensity (*high confidence* on effect and trend) (2). Indirect effects on fire frequency/intensity, permafrost thawing, biomass production.	Tillage, cultivation leaving low cover, overgrazing, deforestation/vegetation clearing, vegetation burning, poorly designed roads and paths.	medium	medium	high	Net C release. Net release is probably less than site-specific loss due to deposition and burial (*high confidence*). Albedo increase (20).
Coastal erosion	Soil/Water	high	high	Sea level rise, increasing intensity/frequency of storm surges (*high confidence* on effects and trends)(3)	Retention of sediments by upstream dams, Coastal aquiculture, Elimination of mangrove forests, Subsidence	high	low	low	Release of old buried C pools (*medium confidence*)(21).

Subsidence	Soil/Water	low	low	Indirect through increasing drought leading to higher ground water use. Indirect through enhanced decomposition (e.g. through drainage) in organic soils.	Groundwater depletion / overpumping. Peatland drainage.	**low/high**	low	low	Unimportant in the case of groundwater depletion. Very high net C release in the case of drained peatlands
Compaction/Hardening	Soil	low	low	Indirect through reduced organic matter content.	Land use conversion, machinery overuse, intensive grazing, poor tillage/grazing management (e.g. under wet or waterlogged conditions)	low	low	**medium**	Contradictory effects of reduced aeration on N_2O emissions
Nutrient depletion	Soil	low	low	Indirect (e.g. shifts in cropland distribution, BECCS)	Insufficient replenishment of harvested nutrients	low	low	**medium**	Net C release due shrinking SOC pools. Larger reliance on soil liming with associated CO_2 releases.
Acidification/Overfertilisation	Soil	low	low	Indirect (e.g. shifts in cropland distribution, BECCS). Sulfidic wetland drying due to increased drought as special direct effect.	High N fertilisation. High cation depletion. Acid rain/deposition	**medium**	low	**medium**	N_2O release from overfertilised soils, increased by acidification. Inorganic C release from acidifying soils (*medium to high confidence*) (22).
Pollution	Soil/Biota	low	low	Indirect (e.g. increased pest and weed incidence)	Intensifying chemical control of weed and pests	low	low	**medium**	Unknown, probably unimportant.
Organic matter decline	Soil	**high**	**medium**	Warming accelerates soil respiration rates (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (4). Indirect effects through changing quality of plant litter or fire/waterlogging regimes.	Tillage. reduced plant input to soil. Drainage of waterlogged soils. Influenced by most of the other soil degradation processes.	**high**	low	**high**	Net C release (*high confidence*)(23).
Metal toxicity	Soil	low	low	Indirect	High cation depletion, fertilisation, mining activities	low	low	low	unknown, probably unimportant.

Salinisation	Soil / Water	High	low	Sea level rise (*high confidence* on effects and trends) (5). Water balance shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (6). Indirect effects through irrigation expansion.	Irrigation without good drainage infrastructure. Deforestation and water table level raises under dryland agriculture	low	medium	medium	Reduced methane emissions with high sulfate load. Albedo increase.
Sodification (increased sodium and associated physical degradation in soils)	Soil / Water	High	low	Water balance shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (7). Indirect effects through irrigation expansion.	Poor water management	low	medium	low	Net C release due to soil structure and organic matter dispersion. Albedo increase.
Permafrost thawing	Soil / Water	High	high	Warming (*very high confidence* on effects and trends) (8), seasonality shifts and accelerated snow melt leading to higher erosivity.		high	low	high	Net C release. CH_4 release (*high confidence*)(24).
Waterlogging of dry systems	Water	High	medium	Water balance shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (9). Indirect effects through vegetation shifts.	Deforestation. Irrigation without good drainage infrastructure	medium	medium	low	CH_4 release. Albedo decrease
Drying of continental waters/wetland/lowlands	Water	High	medium	Increasing extent and duration of drought (*high confidence* on effects, *medium confidence* on trends) (10). Indirect effects through vegetation shifts.	Upstream surface and groundwater water consumption. Intentional drainage. Trampling/overgrazing.	medium	medium	medium	Net C release. N_2O release. Albedo increase
Flooding	Water	High	medium	Sea level raise, increasing intensity/frequency of storm surges, increasing rainfall intensity causing flash floods (*high confidence* on effects and trends)(11).	Land clearing. Increasing impervious surface. Transport infrastructure.	medium	medium	low	CH_4 and N_2O release. Albedo decrease
Eutrophication of continental waters	Water/Biota	Low	low	Indirect through warming effects on N losses from the land or climate change effects on erosion rates. Interactive effects of warming and nutrient loads on algal blooms.	Excess fertilisation. Erosion. Poor management of livestock/human sewage.	medium	low	low	CH_4 and N_20 release.

Woody encroachment	Biota	**High**	**medium**	Rainfall shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends), CO_2 rise (*medium confidence* on effects, *very high confidence* on trends)(12).	Overgrazing. Altered fire regimes, fire suppression. Invasive alien species.	**high**	**high**	**high**	Net C storage. Albedo decrease
Species loss, compositional shifts	Biota	**High**	**medium**	Habitat loss as a result of climate shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (13).	Selective grazing and logging causing plant species loss, Pesticides causing soil microbial and soil faunal losses, Large animal extinctions, Interruption of disturbance regimes	low	low	medium	Unknown.
Soil microbial and mesofaunal shifts	Biota	**High**	low	Habitat loss as a result of climate shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (14).	Altered fire regimes, nitrogen deposition, pesticide pollution, vegetation shifts, disturbance regime shifts	low	low	medium	Unknown.
Biological soil crust destruction	Biota/Soil	**High**	**medium**	Warming. Changing rainfall regimes. (*medium confidence* on effects, high confidence and trends). Indirect through fire regime shifts and/or invasions (15).	Overgrazing and trampling. Land use conversion.	low	**high**	**high**	Radiative cooling through albedo rise and dust release (*high confidence*)(25).
Invasions	Biota	**High**	**medium**	Habitat gain as a result of climate shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (16).	Intentional and unintentional species introductions.	low	low	medium	Unknown.
Pest outbreaks	Biota	**High**	**medium**	Habitat gain and accelerated reproduction as a result of climate shifts (*medium confidence* on effects and trends) (17).	Large scale monocultures. Poor pest management practices.	**medium**	low	medium	Net C release.

Increased burning	Soil/Biota	High	high	Warming, drought, shifting precipitation regimes, also wet spells rising fuel load. (*high confidence* on effects and trends) (18).	Fire suppression policies increasing wildfire intensity. Increasing use of fire for rangeland management. Agriculture introducing fires in humid climates without previous fire history. Invasions.	high	medium	medium	Net C release. CO, CH_4, N_2O release. Albedo increase. (*high confidence*). Long term decline of NPP in non-adapted ecosystems (26).

References in table 4.1:

(1) (Bärring et al. 2003; Munson et al. 2011; Sheffield et al. 2012), (2) (Nearing et al. 2004b; Shakesby 2011; Panthou et al. 2014), (3) (Johnson et al. 2015; Alongi 2015; Harley et al. 2017b), (4) (Bond-Lamberty et al. 2018; Crowther et al. 2016; van Gestel et al. 2018), (5) (Colombani et al. 2016), (6) (Schofield and Kirkby 2003; Aragüés et al. 2015; Benini et al. 2016), (7) (Jobbágy et al. 2017), (8) (Liljedahl et al. 2016; Peng et al. 2016; Batir et al. 2017), (9) (Piovano et al. 2004; Osland et al. 2016), (10) (Burkett and Kusler 2000; Nielsen and Brock 2009; Johnson et al. 2015; Green et al. 2017), (11) (Panthou et al. 2014; Arnell and Gosling 2016; Vitousek et al. 2017), (12) (Van Auken 2009; Wigley et al. 2010), (13) (Vincent et al. 2014; Gonzalez et al. 2010; Scheffers et al. 2016), (14) (Pritchard 2011; Ratcliffe et al. 2017), (15) (Reed et al. 2012; Maestre et al. 2013), (16) (Hellmann et al. 2008; Hulme 2017), (17) (Pureswaran et al. 2015; Cilas et al. 2016; Macfadyen et al. 2018), (18) (Jolly et al. 2015; Abatzoglou and Williams 2016; Taufik et al. 2017; Knorr et al. 2016), (19) (Davin et al. 2010; Pinty et al. 2011), (20) (Wang et al. 2017b; Chappell et al. 2016), (21) (Pendleton et al. 2012), (22) (Oertel et al. 2016), (23) (Houghton et al. 2012; Eglin et al. 2010), (24) (Schuur et al. 2015; Christensen et al. 2004; Walter Anthony et al. 2016; Abbott et al. 2016), (25) (Belnap, Walker, Munson, & Gill, 2014; Rutherford et al., 2017), (26) (Page et al. 2002; Pellegrini et al. 2018)

4.3.2 Drivers of land degradation

Drivers of land degradation and land improvement are many and they interact in multiple ways. Figure 4.2, illustrates how some of the most important drivers interact with the land users. It is important to keep in mind that both natural and human factors can drive both degradation and improvement (Kiage 2013; Bisaro et al. 2014).



Figure 4.2 Schematic representation of the interactions between the human and environmental components of the land system showing decision making and ecosystem services as the key linkages between the components (moderated by an effective system of local and scientific knowledge), and indicating how the rates of change and the way these linkages operate must be kept broadly in balance for functional coevolution of the components. Modified with permission from (Stafford Smith et al. 2007)**.**

Land degradation is driven by the entire spectrum of factors, from very short and intensive events such as individual rain storms of 10 minutes removing topsoil or initiating a gully or a landslide (Coppus and Imeson 2002; Morgan 2005b) to century scale slow depletion of nutrients or loss of soil particles (Johnson and Lewis 2007, p. 5-6). But instead of focusing on absolute temporal variations, the drivers of land degradation can be assessed in relation to the rates of possible recovery. Unfortunately, this is impractical to do in a spatially explicit way because rates of soil formation is difficult to measure due the slow rate, usually < 5mm/century (Delgado and Gómez 2016). Studies suggest that erosion rates of conventionally tilled agricultural fields exceed the rate at which soil is generated by one to two orders of magnitude (Montgomery 2007a).

The landscape effects of gully erosion from one short intensive rainstorm can persist for decades and centuries (Showers 2005). Intensive agriculture under the Roman Empire in occupied territories in France is still leaving its marks and can be considered an example of irreversible land degradation (Dupouey et al. 2002).

The climate change related drivers of land degradation are both gradual changes of temperature, precipitation, and wind as well as changes of the distribution and intensity of extreme events (Lin et al. 2017). Importantly, these drivers can act in two directions: land improvement and land degradation.

Increasing CO_2 levels in the atmosphere is a driver of land improvement even if the net effect is modulated by other factors, such as the availability of nitrogen (Terrer et al. 2016) and water (Gerten et al. 2014; Settele et al. 2015; Girardin et al. 2016).

The gradual and planetary changes that can cause land degradation/improvement have been studied by global integrated models and Earth observation technologies. Studies of global land suitability for agriculture suggest that climate change will increase the area suitable for agriculture by 2100 in the Northern high latitudes by 16% (Ramankutty et al. 2002) or 5.6 million km^2 (Zabel et al. 2014), while tropical regions will experience a loss (Ramankutty et al. 2002; Zabel et al. 2014).

Temporal and spatial patterns of tree mortality can be used as an indicator of climate change impacts on terrestrial ecosystems. Episodic mortality of trees occur naturally even without climate change, but more widespread spatio-temporal anomalies can be a sign of climate induced degradation (Allen et al. 2010). In the absence of systematic data on tree mortality, a comprehensive meta-analysis of 150 published articles suggests that increasing tree mortality around the world can be attributed to increasing drought and heat stress in forests worldwide (Allen et al. 2010).

Other and more indirect drivers can be a wide range of factors such as demographic changes, technological change, changes of consumption patterns and dietary preferences, political and economic changes, and social changes (Mirzabaev et al. 2016). It is important to stress that there are no simple or direct relationships between underlying drivers and land degradation, such as poverty or high population density, that are necessarily causing land degradation (Lambin et al. 2001). However, drivers of land degradation need to be studied in the context of spatial, temporal, economic, environmental and cultural aspects (Warren 2002). Some analyzes suggest an overall negative correlation between population density and land degradation (Bai et al. 2008) but we find many local examples of both positive and negative relationships (Brandt et al. 2018a, 2017). Even if there are correlations in one or the other direction, causality is not always the same.

Land degradation is inextricably linked to several climate variables, such as temperature, precipitation, wind, and seasonality. This means that there are many ways in which climate change and land degradation are linked. The linkages are better described as a web of causality than a set of cause – effect relationships.

4.3.3 Attribution in the case of land degradation

The question here is whether or not climate change can be attributed to land degradation and vice versa. Land degradation is a complex phenomenon often affected by multiple factors such as climatic (rainfall, temperature, and wind), abiotic ecological factors (e.g. soil characteristics and topography), type of land use (e.g. farming of various kinds, forestry, or protected area), and land management practices (e.g. tilling, crop rotation, and logging/thinning). Therefore, attribution of land degradation to climate change is extremely challenging. Because land degradation is highly dependent on land management, it is even possible that climate impacts would trigger land management changes reducing or reversing land degradation, sometimes called transformational adaptation (Kates et al. 2012). There is not much research on attributing land degradation explicitly to climate change, but there is more on climate change as a threat multiplier for land degradation. However, it is in some cases possible to infer climate change impacts on land degradation both theoretically and empirically. Section 4.3.3.1 will outline the potential direct linkages of climate change on land degradation based on current theoretical understanding of land degradation processes and drivers. Section 4.3.3.2 will investigate possible indirect impacts on land degradation.

4.3.3.1 Direct linkages with climate change

The most important direct impacts of climate change on land degradation are the results of increasing temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, and intensification of rainfall. These changes will in various combinations cause changes in erosion rates and the processes driving both increases and decreases of soil erosion. From an attribution point of view, it is important to note that projections of precipitation are in general more uncertain than projections of temperature changes (Murphy et al. 2004; Fischer and Knutti 2015; IPCC 2013a). Precipitation involves local processes of larger complexity than temperature and projections are usually less robust than those for temperature (Giorgi and Lionello 2008; Pendergrass 2018).

Theoretically the intensification of the hydrological cycle as a result of human induced climate change is well established (Guerreiro et al. 2018; Trenberth 1999; Pendergrass et al. 2017; Pendergrass and Knutti 2018) and also empirically observed (Blenkinsop et al. 2018; Burt et al. 2016a; Liu et al. 2009; Bindoff et al. 2013). AR5 WGI concluded that heavy precipitation events have increased in frequency, intensity, and/or amount since 1950 (*likely*) and that further changes in this direction are *likely* to *very likely* during the 21st century (IPCC 2013). The IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C concluded that human-induced global warming has already caused an increase in the frequency, intensity and/or amount of heavy precipitation events at the global scale (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2018). As an example, in central India, there has been a threefold increase in widespread extreme rain events during 1950–2015 which has influenced several land degradation processes, not least soil erosion (Burt et al. 2016b). In Europe and North America, where observation networks are dense and having long time series, it is *likely* that the frequency or intensity of heavy rainfall have increased (IPCC 2013b). It is also expected that seasonal shifts and cycles such as monsoons and ENSO (see Glossary) will further increase the intensity of rainfall events (IPCC 2013).

When rainfall regimes change, it is expected to drive changes in vegetation cover and composition, which may be a cause of land degradation in and of itself, as well as impacting other aspects of land degradation. Vegetation cover, for example is a key factor in determining soil loss through both water (Nearing et al. 2005) and wind erosion (Shao 2008). Changing rainfall regimes also affect below-ground biological processes, such as fungi and bacteria (Meisner et al. 2018; Shuab et al. 2017; Asmelash et al. 2016).

Changing snow accumulation and snow melt alter both volume and timing of hydrological flows in and from mountain areas (Brahney et al. 2017; Lutz et al. 2014), with potentially large impacts on downstream areas. Soil processes are also affected by changing snow conditions by affecting the partitioning between evaporation and streamflow and between subsurface flow and surface runoff (Barnhart et al. 2016). Rainfall intensity is a key climatic driver of soil erosion. Early modelling studies and theory suggest that light rainfall events will decrease while heavy rainfall events increase at about 7% per degree of warming (Liu et al. 2009; Trenberth 2011). Such changes result in increases in the intensity of rainfall which increase the erosive power of rainfall (erosivity) and hence increase the likelihood of water erosion. Increases in rainfall intensity can even exceed the rate of increase of atmospheric moisture content (Liu et al. 2009; Trenberth 2011). Erosivity is highly correlated to the product of total rainstorm energy and the maximum 30 minute rainfall intensity of the storm (Nearing et al. 2004a) and increases of erosivity will exacerbate water erosion substantially (Nearing et al. 2004a). However, the effects will not be uniform but highly variable across regions (Almagro et al. 2017; Mondal et al. 2016). Several empirical studies around the world have shown the increasing intensity of rainfall (IPCC 2013b; Ma et al. 2015, 2017) and also suggest that this will be accentuated with future increasing warming (Cheng and AghaKouchak 2015; Burt et al. 2016b; O'Gorman 2015).

The very comprehensive database of direct measurements of water erosion presented by García-Ruiz et al. (2015) contains 4377 entries (North America: 2776, Europe: 847, Asia: 259, Latin America: 237, Africa: 189, Australia & Pacific: 67), even though not all entries are complete (Figure 4.3).



Figure 4.3. Map of observed soil erosion rates in database of 4377 entries by García-Ruiz et al., 2015). The map was published by (Li and Fang 2016).

An important finding from that database is that almost any erosion rate is possible under almost any climatic condition (García-Ruiz et al. 2015). Even if the results show few clear relationships between erosion and land conditions, the authors highlighted four observations: 1) the highest erosion rates were found in relation to agricultural activities – even though moderate erosion rates were also found in agricultural settings, 2) high erosion rates after forest fires were not observed (although the cases were few), 3) land covered by shrubs showed generally low erosion rates, 4) pasture land showed generally medium rates of erosion. Some important findings for the link between soil erosion and climate change can be noted from erosion measurements: erosion rates tend to increase with increasing mean annual rainfall, with a peak in the interval of 1000 to 1400 mm annual rainfall (García-Ruiz et al. 2015) (*low confidence*). However, such relationships are overshadowed by the fact that most rainfall events do not cause any erosion, instead erosion is caused by a few high intensity rainfall events (Fischer et al. 2016; Zhu et al. 2019). Hence mean annual rainfall is not a good predictor of erosion (Gonzalez-Hidalgo et al. 2012, 2009). In the context of climate change, it means the tendency of rainfall patterns to change towards more intensive precipitation events is serious. Such patterns have already been observed widely, even in cases where the total rainfall is decreasing (Trenberth 2011). The findings generally confirm the strong consensus about the importance of vegetation cover as a protection against soil erosion, emphasising how extremely important land management is for controlling erosion.

In the Mediterranean region, the observed and expected decrease in annual rainfall due to climate change is accompanied by an increase of rainfall intensity and hence erosivity (Capolongo et al. 2008). In tropical and sub-tropical regions, the on-site impacts of soil erosion dominate, and are manifested in very high rates of soil loss, in some cases exceeding 100 t ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Tadesse 2001; García-Ruiz et al. 2015). In temperate regions, the off-site costs of soil erosion are often a greater concern, for example siltation of dams and ponds, downslope damage to property, roads and other infrastructure (Boardman 2010). In cases where water erosion occurs the down-stream effects, such as siltation of dams, are often significant and severe in terms of environmental and economic damages (Kidane and Alemu 2015; Reinwarth et al. 2019; Quiñonero-Rubio et al. 2016; Adeogun et al. 2018; Ben Slimane et al. 2016).

The distribution of wet and dry spells also affects land degradation although uncertainties remain depending on resolution of climate models used for prediction (Kendon et al. 2014). Changes in timing of rainfall events may have significant impacts on processes of soil erosion through changes in wetting and drying of soils (Lado et al. 2004).

Soil moisture content is affected by changes in evapotranspiration and evaporation which may influence the partitioning of water into surface and subsurface runoff (Li and Fang 2016; Nearing et al. 2004b). This portioning of rainfall can have a decisive effect on erosion (Stocking et al. 2001).

Wind erosion is a serious problem in agricultural regions, not only in drylands (Wagner 2013). Near-surface wind speeds over land areas have decreased in recent decades (McVicar and Roderick 2010), partly as a result of changing surface roughness (Vautard et al. 2010), Theoretically (Bakun 1990; Bakun et al. 2015) and empirically (Sydeman et al. 2014; England et al. 2014) mean winds along coastal regions worldwide have increased with climate change (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Other studies of wind and wind erosion have not detected any long-term trend suggesting that climate change has altered wind patterns outside drylands in a way that can significantly affect the risk of wind erosion (Pryor and Barthelmie 2010; Bärring et al. 2003). Therefore, the findings regarding wind erosion and climate change are inconclusive, partly due to inadequate measurements.

Global mean temperatures are rising worldwide, but particularly in the Arctic region (*high confidence*) (IPCC 2018a). Heat stress from extreme temperatures and heatwaves (multiple days of hot weather in a row) have increased markedly in some locations in the last three decades (*high confidence*), and are *virtually certain* to continue during the 21st century (Olsson et al. 2014a). The IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C concluded that human-induced global warming has already caused more frequent heatwaves in most of land regions, and that climate models project robust differences between present-day and global warming up to 1.5°C and between 1.5°C and 2°C (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2018). Direct temperature effects on soils are of two kinds. Firstly, permafrost thawing leads to soil degradation in boreal and high altitude regions (Yang et al. 2010; Jorgenson and Osterkamp 2005). Secondly, warming alters the cycling of nitrogen (N) and carbon (C) in soils, partly due to impacts on soil microbiota (Solly et al. 2017). There are many studies with particularly strong experimental evidence, but a full understanding of cause and effect is contextual and elusive (Conant et al. 2011a,b; Wu et al. 2011). This is discussed comprehensively in Chapter 2.

Climate change, including increasing atmospheric CO_2 levels, affects vegetation structure and function and hence conditions for land degradation. Exactly how vegetation responds to changes remains a research task. In a comparison of seven global vegetation models under four representative concentration pathways Friend et al., (2014) found that all models predicted increasing vegetation carbon storage, however with substantial variation between models. An important insight compared with previous understanding is that structural dynamics of vegetation seems to play a more important role for carbon storage than vegetation production (Friend et al. 2014). The magnitude of CO_2 fertilisation of vegetation growth, and hence conditions for land degradation is still uncertain (Holtum and Winter 2010), particularly in tropical rainforests (Yang et al. 2016). For more discussion on this topic, see Chapter 2 in this report.

In summary, rainfall changes attributed to human-induced climate change have already intensified drivers of land degradation (*robust evidence, high agreement*) but attributing land degradation to climate change is challenging because of the importance of land management (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Changes in climate variability modes, such as in monsoons and ENSO events, can also affect land degradation (*low evidence, low agreement*).

4.3.3.2 Indirect and complex linkages with climate change

Many important indirect linkages between land degradation and climate change occur via agriculture, particularly through changing outbreaks of pests (Rosenzweig et al. 2001; Porter et al. 1991; Thomson et al. 2010; Dhanush et al. 2015; Lamichhane et al. 2015), which is covered comprehensively in Chapter 5. More negative impacts have been observed than positive ones (IPCC 2014b). After 2050 the risk of yield losses increase as a result of climate change in combination with other drivers (*medium confidence*) and such risks will increase dramatically if global mean temperatures increase by ~4°C (*high confidence*) (Porter et al. 2014). The reduction (or plateauing) in yields in major production areas (Brisson et al. 2010; Lin and Huybers 2012; Grassini et al. 2013) may trigger cropland expansion elsewhere, either into natural ecosystems, marginal arable lands or intensification on already cultivated lands, with possible consequences for increasing land degradation.

Precipitation and temperature changes will trigger changes in land- and crop management, such as changes in planting and harvest dates, type of crops, and type of cultivars, which may alter the conditions for soil erosion (Li and Fang 2016).

Much research has tried to understand how plants are affected by a particular stressor, for example drought, heat, or waterlogging, including effects on belowground processes. But less research has tried to understand how plants are affected by several simultaneous stressors – which of course is more realistic in the context of climate change (Mittler 2006; Kerns et al. 2016) and from a hazards point of view (see 7.3.1). From an attribution point of view, such a complex web of causality is problematic if attribution is only done through statistical significant correlation. It requires a combination of statistical links and theoretically informed causation, preferably integrated into a model. Some modelling studies have combined several stressors with geomorphologically explicit mechanisms (using the WEPP model) and realistic land use scenarios, and found severe risks of increasing erosion from climate change (Mullan et al. 2012; Mullan 2013). Other studies have included various management options, such as changing planting and harvest dates (Zhang and Nearing 2005; Parajuli et al. 2016; Routschek et al. 2014; Nunes and Nearing 2011), type of cultivars (Garbrecht and Zhang 2015), and price of crops (Garbrecht et al. 2007; O'Neal et al. 2005) to investigate the complexity of how new climate regimes may alter soil erosion rates.

In summary, climate change increases the risk of land degradation both in terms of likelihood and consequence but the exact attribution to climate change is challenging due to several confounding factors. But since climate change exacerbates most degradation processes it is clear that unless land management is improved, climate change will result in increasing land degradation (*very high confidence*).

4.3.4 Approaches to assessing land degradation

In a review of different approaches and attempts to map global land degradation, Gibbs and Salmon (2015) identified four main approaches to map the global extent of degraded lands: expert opinions (Oldeman and van Lynden 1998; Dregne 1998; Reed 2005; Bot et al. 2000), satellite observation of vegetation greenness (e.g., remote sensing of NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index), EVI (Enhanced Vegetation Index), PPI (Plant Phenology Index) (Yengoh et al. 2015; Bai et al. 2008c; Shi et al. 2017a; Abdi et al. 2019; JRC 2018), biophysical models (biogeographical/ topological) (Cai et al. 2011b; Hickler et al. 2005; Steinkamp and Hickler 2015; Stoorvogel et al. 2017) and inventories of land use/condition. Together they provide a relatively complete evaluation, but none on its own assesses the complexity of the process (Vogt et al. 2011; Gibbs and Salmon 2015). There is, however, a robust consensus that remote sensing and field-based methods are critical to assess and monitor land degradation, particularly over large areas (such as global, continental and sub-continental) although there are still knowledge gaps to be filled (Wessels et al. 2007, 2004; Prince 2016; Ghazoul and Chazdon 2017) as well as the problem of baseline (see 4.2.3).

Remote sensing can provide meaningful proxies of land degradation in terms of severity, temporal development, and areal extent. These proxies of land degradation include several indexes that have been used to assess land conditions and monitoring the changes of land condition, for example extent of gullies, severe forms of rill and sheet erosion, and deflation. The presence of open-access, quality controlled and continuously updated global databases of remote sensing data is invaluable, and is the only method for consistent monitoring of large areas over several decades (Sedano et al. 2016; Brandt et al. 2018b; Turner 2014).The NDVI, as a proxy for Net Primary Production (NPP, see glossary), is one of the most commonly used methods to assess land degradation, since it indicates land cover, an important factor for soil protection. Although NDVI is not a direct measure of vegetation biomass, there is a close coupling between NDVI integrated over a season and in situ NPP (*high agreement*, *robust evidence*) (see Higginbottom et al. 2014; Andela et al. 2013; Wessels et al. 2012).

Distinction between land degradation/improvement and the effects of climate variation is an important and contentious issue (Murthy and Bagchi 2018; Ferner et al. 2018). There is no simple and straightforward way to disentangle these two effects. The interaction of different determinants of primary production is not well understood. A key barrier to this is a lack of understanding of the inherent inter-annual variability of vegetation (Huxman et al. 2004; Knapp and Smith 2001; Ruppert et al. 2012; Bai et al. 2008a; Jobbágy and Sala 2000). One possibility is to compare potential land productivity modelled by vegetation models and actual productivity measured by remote sensing (Seaquist et al. 2009; Hickler et al. 2005; van der Esch et al. 2017), but the difference in spatial resolution, typically 0.5 degrees for vegetation models compared to 0.25–0.5 km for remote sensing data, is hampering the approach. Moderate-resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer, or MODIS, provides higher spatial resolution (up to 0.25 km), delivers data for the Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) which is calculated similarly to NDVI and have showed robust approach to estimate spatial patterns of global annual primary productivity (Shi et al. 2017b; Testa et al. 2018).

Another approach to disentangle the effects of climate and land use/management is to use the Rain Use Efficiency (RUE), defined as the biomass production per unit of rainfall, as an indicator (Le Houerou 1984; Prince et al. 1998; Fensholt et al. 2015). A variant of the RUE approach is the residual trend (RESTREND) of a NDVI time-series, defined as the fraction of the difference between the observed NDVI and the NDVI predicted from climate data (Yengoh et al. 2015; John et al. 2016). These two metrics aim to estimate the NPP, rainfall and the time dimensions. They are simple transforms of the same three variables: RUE shows the NPP relationship with rainfall for individual years, while RESTREND is the interannual change of RUE; also, both consider that rainfall is the only variable that affects biomass production. They are legitimate metrics when used appropriately, but in many cases they involve oversimplifications and yield misleading results (Fensholt et al. 2015; Prince et al. 1998).

Furthermore, increases in NPP do not always indicate improvement in land condition/reversal of land degradation, since this does not account for changes in vegetation composition. It could, for example, result from conversion of native forest to plantation, or due to bush encroachment, which many consider to be a form of land degradation (Ward 2005). Also, NPP may be increased by irrigation, which can enhance productivity in the short-medium term while increasing risk of soil salinisation in the long term (Niedertscheider et al. 2016).

Recent progress and expanding time series of canopy characterisations based on passive microwave satellite sensors have offered rapid progress in regional and global descriptions of forest degradation and recovery trends (Tian et al. 2017). The most common proxy is VOD (vertical optical depth) and has already been used to describe global forest/savannah carbon stock shifts over two decades, highlighting strong continental contrasts (Liu et al. 2015a) demonstrating the value of this approach to monitor forest degradation at large scales. Contrasting NDVI which is only sensitive to vegetation "greenness", from which primary production can be modelled, VOD is also sensitive to water in woody parts of the vegetation and hence provides a view of vegetation dynamics that can be complementary to NDVI. As well as the NDVI, VOD also needs to be corrected to take into account the rainfall variation (Andela et al. 2013).

Even though remote sensing offers much potential, its application to land degradation and recovery remains challenging as structural changes often occur at scales below the detection capabilities of most remote sensing technologies. Additionally, if the remote sensing is based on vegetation indexes data, other forms of land degradation, such as nutrient depletion, changes of soil physical or biological properties, loss of values for humans, among others, cannot be inferred indirectly by remote sensing. The combination of remotely sensed images and field based approach can give improved estimates of carbon stocks and tree biodiversity (Imai et al. 2012; Fujiki et al. 2016).

Additionally, the majority of trend techniques employed would be capable of detecting only the most severe of degradation processes, and would therefore not be useful as a degradation early-warning system (Higginbottom et al. 2014; Wessels et al. 2012). However, additional analyses using higher resolution imagery, such as the Landsat and SPOT satellites, would be well suited to provide further localized information on trends observed (Higginbottom et al. 2014). New approaches to assess land degradation using high spatial resolution are developing but the need for time series makes progress slow. The use of synthetic aperture radar (SAR) data has been shown to be advantageous for the estimation of soil surface characteristics, in particular surface roughness and soil moisture (Gao et al. 2017; Bousbih et al. 2017), and detecting and quantifying selective logging (Lei et al. 2018). It is still necessary to maintain the efforts to fully assess land degradation using remote sensing.

Computer simulation models can be used alone or combined with the remote sensing observations to assess land degradation. The RUSLE (Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation) can be used, to some extent, to predict the long-term average annual soil loss by water erosion. RUSLE has been constantly revisited to estimate soil loss based on the product of rainfall–runoff erosivity, soil erodibility, slope length and steepness factor, conservation factor, and support practice parameter (Nampak et al. 2018). Inherent limitations of RUSLE include data-sparse regions, inability to account for soil loss from gully erosion or mass wasting events, and that it does not predict sediment pathways from hillslopes to water bodies (Benavidez et al. 2018). Since RUSLE models only provide gross erosion, the integration of a further module in the RUSLE scheme to estimate the sediment yield from the modelled hillslopes is needed. The spatially distributed sediment delivery model WaTEM/SEDEM has been widely tested in Europe (Borrelli et al. 2018). Wind erosion is another factor that needs to be taken into account in the modelling of soil erosion (Webb et al. 2017a, 2016). Additional models need to be developed to include the limitations of the RUSLE models.

Regarding the field based approach to assess land degradation, there are multiple indicators that reflect functional ecosystem processes linked to ecosystem services and, thus, to the value for humans. These indicators are a composite set of measurable attributes from different factors, such as climate, soil, vegetation, biomass, management, among others, that can be used together or to develop indexes to better assess land degradation (Allen et al. 2011; Kosmas et al. 2014).

Declines in vegetation cover, changes in vegetation structure, decline in mean species abundances, decline in habitat diversity, changes in abundance of specific indicator species, reduced vegetation health and productivity, and vegetation management intensity and use, are the most common indicators in the vegetation condition of forest and woodlands (Stocking et al. 2001; Wiesmair et al. 2017; Ghazoul and Chazdon 2017; Alkemade et al. 2009).

Several indicators of the soil quality (soil organic matter, depth, structure, compaction, texture, pH, C:N ratio, aggregate size distribution and stability, microbial respiration, soil organic carbon, salinisation, among others) have been proposed (see also 2.3) (Schoenholtz et al. 2000). Among these, soil organic matter (SOM) directly and indirectly drives the majority of soil functions. Decreases in SOM can lead to a decrease in fertility and biodiversity, as well as a loss of soil structure, causing reductions in water holding capacity, increased risk of erosion (both wind and water) and increased bulk density and hence soil compaction (Allen et al. 2011; Certini 2005; Conant et al. 2011a). Thus, indicators related with the quantity and quality of the SOM are necessary to identify land degradation (Pulido et al. 2017;

Dumanski and Pieri 2000). The composition of the microbial community is *very likely* to be positive impacted by both climate change and land degradation processes (Evans and Wallenstein 2014; Wu et al. 2015; Classen et al. 2015), thus changes in microbial community composition can be very usefull to rapidly reflect land degradation (e.g. forest degradation increased the bacterial alpha-diversity indexes) (Flores-Rentería et al. 2016; Zhou et al. 2018). These indicators might be used as a set of indicators site-dependent, and in a plant-soil system (Ehrenfeld et al. 2005).

Useful indicators of degradation and improvement include changes in ecological processes and disturbance regimes that regulate the flow of energy and materials and that control ecosystem dynamics under a climate change scenario. Proxies of dynamics include spatial and temporal turnover of species and habitats within ecosystems (Ghazoul et al. 2015; Bahamondez and Thompson 2016). Indicators in agricultural lands include crop yield decreases and difficulty in maintaining yields (Stocking et al. 2001). Indicators of landscape degradation/improvement in fragmented forest landscapes include the extent, size, and distribution of remaining forest fragments, an increase in edge habitat, and loss of connectivity and ecological memory (Zahawi et al. 2015; Pardini et al. 2010).

In summary, as land degradation is such a complex and global process there is no single method by which land degradation can be estimated objectively and consistently over large areas (*very high confidence*). However, many approaches exist that can be used to assess different aspects of land degradation or provide proxies of land degradation. Remote sensing, complemented by other kinds of data (i.e., field observations, inventories, expert opinions), is the only method that can generate geographically explicit and globally consistent data over time scales relevant for land degradation (several decades).

4.4 Status and current trends of land degradation

The scientific literature on land degradation often excludes forest degradation, yet here we attempt to assess both issues. Because of the different bodies of scientific literature, we assess land degradation and forest degradation under different sub-headings, and where possible draw integrated conclusions.

4.4.1 Land degradation

There are no reliable global maps of the extent and severity of land degradation (Gibbs and Salmon 2015; Prince et al. 2018; van der Esch et al. 2017), despite the fact that land degradation is a severe problem (Turner et al. 2016). The reasons are both conceptual, i.e., how is land degradation defined, using what baseline (Herrick et al. 2019) or over what time period, and methodological, i.e. how can it be measured (Prince et al. 2018). Although there is a strong consensus that land degradation is a reduction in productivity of the land or soil, there are diverging views regarding the spatial and temporal scales at which land degradation occurs (Warren 2002), and how this can be quantified and mapped. Proceeding from the definition in this report, there are also diverging views concerning ecological integrity and the value to humans. A comprehensive treatment of the conceptual discussion about land degradation is provided by the recent report on land degradation from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, IPBES (Montanarella et al. 2018).

A review of different attempts to map global land degradation, based on expert opinion, satellite observations, biophysical models and a data base of abandoned agricultural lands, suggested that between <10 M km^2 to 60 M km^2 (corresponding to 8–45% of the ice-free land area) have been degraded globally (Gibbs and Salmon, 2015) (*very low confidence*).

One often used global assessment of land degradation used trends in NDVI as a proxy for land degradation and improvement during the period 1983 to 2006 (Bai et al. 2008b,c) with an update to 2011 (Bai et al. 2015). These studies, based on very coarse resolution satellite data (8 km NOAA AVHRR), indicated that between 22% and 24% of the global ice-free land area was subject to a downward trend, while about 16% showed an increasing trend. The study also suggested, contrary to earlier assessments (Middleton and Thomas 1997), that drylands were not among the most affected regions. Another study using a similar approach for the period 1981-2006 suggested that about 29% of the global land area is subject to 'land degradation hotspots', i.e. areas with acute land degradation in need of particular attention. These hotspot areas were distributed over all agro-ecological regions and land cover types. Two different studies have tried to link land degradation, identified by NDVI as a proxy, and number of people affected: Le et al. (2016) estimated that at least 3.2 billion people were affected, while Barbier and Hochard (2016, 2018) estimated that 1.33 billion people were affected, of which 95% were living in developing countries.

Yet another study, using a similar approach and type of remote sensing data, compared NDVI trends with biomass trends calculated by a global vegetation model over the period 1982-2010 and found that 17-36% of the land areas showed a negative NDVI trend while a positive or neutral trend was predicted in modelled vegetation (Schut et al. 2015). The World Atlas of Desertification (3rd edition) includes a global map of land productivity change over the period 1999 to 2013, which is one useful proxy for land degradation (Cherlet et al. 2018). Over that period about 20% of the global ice-free land area shows signs of declining or unstable productivity, whereas about 20% shows increasing productivity. The same report also summarized the productivity trends by land categories and found that most forest land showed increasing trends in productivity while rangelands had more declining trends than increasing trends (Fig 4.4). These productivity assessments, however, do not distinguish between trends due to climate change and trends due to other factors. A recent analysis of "greening" of the world using MODIS time series of NDVI 2000 – 2017, shows a striking increase in the greening over China and India. In China the greening is seen over both forested areas, 42%, and cropland areas, in which 32% is increasing (see Section 4.10.3). In India, the greening is almost entirely associated with cropland (82%) (Chen et al. 2019).

All the studies of vegetation trends referred to above show that there are regionally-differentiated trends of either decreasing or increasing vegetation. When comparing vegetation trends with trends in climatic variables, Schut et al. (2015) found very few areas (1-2%) where an increase in vegetation trend was independent of the climate drivers, and that study suggested that positive vegetation trends are primarily caused by climatic factors.



Figure 4.4. Proportional global land productivity trends by land cover/land use class. (Cropland includes arable land, permanent crops and mixed classes with over 50% crops; Grassland includes natural grassland and managed pasture land; Rangelands include shrubland, herbaceous and sparsely vegetated areas; Forest land includes all forest categories and mixed classes with tree cover greater than 40%). Data source: Copernicus Global Land SPOT VGT, 1999-2013.

In an attempt to go beyond the mapping of global vegetation trends for assessing land degradation, Borelli et al. (2017) used a soil erosion model (RUSLE) and suggested that soil erosion is mainly caused in areas of crop land expansion, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, South America and Southeast Asia. The method is controversial for both conceptual reasons (i.e., the ability of the model to capture the most important erosion processes) and data limitations (i.e., the availability of relevant data at regional to global scales), and its validity for assessing erosion over large areas has been questioned by several studies (Baveye 2017; Evans and Boardman 2016a,b; Labrière et al. 2015).

An alternative to using remote sensing for assessing the state of land degradation is to compile field based data from around the globe (Turner et al. 2016). In addition to the problems of definitions and baselines, this approach is also hampered by the lack of standardized methods used in the field. An assessment of the global severity of soil erosion in agriculture, based on 1,673 measurements around the world (compiled from 201 peer reviewed articles), indicated that the global net median rate of soil formation (i.e., formation minus erosion) is about 0.004 mm yr^{-1} (~ 0.05 t $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$) compared with the median net rate of soil loss in agricultural fields, 1.52 mm yr^{-1} (~ 18 t $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$) in tilled fields and 0.065 mm yr^{-1} (~ 0.8 t $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$) in no-till fields (Montgomery 2007a). This means that the rate of soil erosion from agricultural fields is in between 380 (conventional tilling) and 16 times (no-till) the natural rate of soil formation (*medium agreement, limited evidence*). These approximate figures are supported by another large meta-study including over 4000 sites around the world (see Figure 4.4) where the average soil loss from agricultural plots was ~ 21 t $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$ (García-Ruiz et al. 2015). Climate change, mainly through the intensification of rainfall, will further increase these rates unless land management is improved (*high agreement, medium evidence*).

Soils contain about 1500 Gt of organic carbon (median across 28 different estimates presented by (Scharlemann et al. 2014)), which is about 1.8 times more carbon than in the atmosphere (Ciais et al. 2013) and 2.3 – 3.3 times more than what is held in the terrestrial vegetation of the world (Ciais et al. 2013). Hence, land degradation including land conversion leading to soil carbon losses has the potential to impact the atmospheric concentration of CO_2 substantially. When natural ecosystems are cultivated they lose soil carbon that accumulated over long time periods. The loss rate depends on the type of natural vegetation and how the soil is managed. Estimates of the magnitude of loss vary but figures between 20% and 59% have been reported in several meta studies (Poeplau and Don 2015; Wei et al. 2015; Li et al. 2012; Murty et al. 2002; Guo and Gifford 2002). The amount of soil carbon lost explicitly due to land degradation after conversion is hard to assess due to large variation in local conditions and management, see also Chapter 2.

From a climate change perspective, land degradation plays an important role in the dynamics of nitrous oxide (N_2O) and methane (CH_4). N_2O is produced by microbial activity in the soil and the dynamics are related to both management practices and weather conditions while CH_4 dynamics are primarily determined by the amount of soil carbon and to what extent the soil is subject to water logging (Palm et al. 2014), see also Chapter 2.

Several attempts have been made to map the human footprint on the planet (Čuček et al. 2012; Venter et al. 2016) but they in some cases confuse human impact on the planet with degradation. From our definition it is clear that human impact (or pressure) is not synonymous with degradation but information on the human footprint provides a useful mapping of potential non-climatic drivers of degradation.

In summary, there are no uncontested maps of the location, extent and severity of land degradation. Proxy estimates based on remote sensing of vegetation dynamics provide one important information source, but attribution of the observed changes in productivity to climate change, human activities, or other drivers is hard. Nevertheless, the different attempts to map the extent of global land degradation using remotely sensed proxies show some convergence and suggest that about a quarter of the ice free land area is subject to some form of land degradation (*limited evidence, medium agreement*) affecting about 3.2 billion people (*low confidence*). Attempts to estimate the severity of land degradation through soil erosion estimates suggest that soil erosion is a serious form of land degradation in croplands closely associated with unsustainable land management in combination with climatic parameters, some of which are subject to climate change (*limited evidence, high agreement*). Climate change is one among several causal factors in the status and current trends of land degradation (*limited evidence, high agreement*).

4.4.2 Forest degradation

Quantifying degradation in forests has also proven difficult. Indicators that remote sensing or inventory methods can measure more easily than reductions in biological productivity, losses of ecological integrity or value to humans include reductions in canopy cover or carbon stocks. However, the causes of reductions in canopy cover or carbon stocks can be many (Curtis et al. 2018), including natural disturbances (e.g., fires, insects and other forest pests), direct human activities (e.g., harvest, forest management) and indirect human impacts (such as climate change) and these may not reduce long-term biological productivity. In many boreal, some temperate and other forest types natural disturbances are common, and consequently these disturbance-adapted forest types are comprised of a mosaic of stands of different ages and stages of stand recovery following natural disturbances. In those managed forests where natural disturbances are uncommon or suppressed, harvesting is the primary determinant of forest age-class distributions.

Quantifying forest degradation as a reduction in productivity, carbon stocks or canopy cover also requires that an initial condition (or baseline) is established against which this reduction is assessed (see

Section 4.2.4). In forest types with rare stand-replacing disturbances, the concept of "intact" or "primary" forest has been used to define the initial condition (Potapov et al. 2008) but applying a single metric can be problematic (Bernier et al. 2017). Moreover, forest types with frequent stand-replacing disturbances, such as wildfires, or with natural disturbances that reduce carbon stocks, such as some insect outbreaks, experience over time a natural variability of carbon stocks or canopy density making it more difficult to define the appropriate baseline carbon density or canopy cover against which to assess degradation. In these systems, forest degradation cannot be assessed at the stand level, but requires a landscape-level assessment that takes into consideration the stand age-class distribution of the landscape, which reflects natural and human disturbance regimes over past decades to centuries and also considers post-disturbance regrowth (van Wagner 1978; Volkova et al. 2018; Lorimer and White 2003).

The lack of a consistent definition of forest degradation also affects the ability to establish estimates of the rates or impacts of forest degradation because the drivers of degradation are not clearly defined (Sasaki and Putz 2009). Moreover, the literature at times confounds estimates of forest degradation and deforestation (i.e. the conversion of forest to non-forest land uses). Deforestation is a change in land use, while forest degradation is not, although severe forest degradation can ultimately lead to deforestation.

Based on empirical data provided by 46 countries, the drivers for deforestation (due to commercial agriculture) and forest degradation (due to timber extraction and logging) are similar in Africa, Asia and Latin America (Hosonuma et al. 2012). More recently, global forest disturbance over the period 2001 – 2015 was attributed to commodity driven deforestation (27 ± 5%), forestry (26 ± 4%), shifting agriculture (24 ± 3%) and wildfire (23 ± 4%). The remaining 0.6 ± 0.3% was attributed to the expansion of urban centers (Curtis et al. 2018).

The trends of productivity shown by several remote sensing studies (see previous section) are largely consistent with mapping of forest cover and change using a 34 year time series of coarse resolution satellite data (NOAA AVHRR) (Song et al. 2018). This study, based on a thematic classification of satellite data, suggests that (i) global tree canopy cover increased by 2.24 million km² between 1982 and 2016 (corresponding to +7.1%) but with regional differences that contribute a net loss in the tropics and a net gain at higher latitudes, and (ii) the fraction of bare ground decreased by 1.16 million km² (corresponding to -3.1%), mainly in agricultural regions of Asia (Song et al. 2018), see Figure 4.5. Other tree or land cover datasets show opposite global net trends (Li et al. 2018b), but high agreement in terms of net losses in the tropics and large net gains in the temperate and boreal zones (Li et al. 2018b; Song et al. 2018; Hansen et al. 2013). Differences across global estimates are further discussed in Chapter 1 (1.2.2.3) and Chapter 2.

The changes detected from 1982 to 2016 were primarily linked to direct human action, such as land-use changes (about 60% of the observed changes), but also to indirect effects, such as human induced climate change (about 40% of the observed changes) (Song et al. 2018), a finding also supported by a more recent study (Chen et al. 2019). The climate induced effects were clearly discernible in some regions, such as forest decline in the US Northwest due to increasing pest infestation and increasing fire frequency (Lesk et al. 2017; Abatzoglou and Williams 2016; Seidl et al. 2017), warming induced vegetation increase in the Arctic region, general greening in the Sahel probably as a result of increasing rainfall and atmospheric CO_2, and advancing treelines in mountain regions (Song et al. 2018).

Keenan et al.(Keenan et al. 2015) and Sloan and Sayer (2015) studied the 2015 Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) of the FAO (FAO 2016) and found that the total forest area from 1990 to 2015 declined by 3%, an estimate that is supported by a global remote sensing assessment of forest area change that found a 2.8% decline between 1990-2010 (D'Annunzio et al. 2017; Lindquist and D'Annunzio 2016). The trend in deforestation is, however, contradicting between these two global assessments with FAO (2016) suggesting deforestation is slowing down while the remote sensing assessments finds it to be accelerating (D'Annunzio et al. 2017). Recent estimates (Song et al. 2018) owing to semantic and methodological differences (see Chapter 1, section 1.2.2.3) suggest global tree cover to have increased over the period 1982-2016, which contradicts the forest area dynamics assessed by FAO (2016, Lindquist and D'Annunzio 2016). The loss rate in tropical forest areas from 2010 to 2015 is 55 000 km^2 yr^{-1}. According to the FRA the global natural forest area also declined from 39.61 M km^2 to 37.21 M km^2 during the period 1990 to 2015 (Keenan et al. 2015).



Figure 4.5. Diagrams showing latitudinal profiles of land cover change over the period 1982 to 2016 based on analysis of time-series of NOAA AVHRR imagery: a, Tree canopy cover change (ΔTC). b, Short vegetation cover change (ΔSV). c, Bare ground cover change (ΔBG). Area statistics were calculated for every 1° of latitude (Song et al. 2018). Source of data: NOAA AVHRR.

Since 1850, deforestation globally contributed 77% of the emissions from land-use and land-cover change (LULCC) while degradation contributed 10% (with the remainder originating from non-forest land uses) (Houghton and Nassikas 2018). That study also showed large temporal and regional differences with northern mid-latitude forests currently contributing carbon sinks due to increasing forest area and forest management. However, the contribution to carbon emissions of degradation as percentage of total forest emissions (degradation and deforestation) are uncertain, with estimates varying from 25% (Pearson et al. 2017) to nearly 70% of carbon losses (Baccini et al. 2017). The 25% estimate refers to an analysis of 74 developing countries within tropical and subtropical regions covering 22 million km^2 for the period 2005-2010 while the 70% estimate refers to an analysis of the tropics for the period 2003-2014, but by and large the scope of these studies is the same. Pearson et al. (2017) estimated annual gross emissions of 2.1 Gt CO_2, of which 53% were derived from timber harvest, 30% from wood fuel harvest and 17% from forest fire. Estimating gross emissions only, creates a distorted representation of human impacts on the land sector carbon cycle. While forest harvest for timber and fuel wood and land–use change (deforestation) contribute to gross emissions, to quantify impacts on the atmosphere it is necessary to estimate net emissions, i.e. the balance of gross emissions and gross removals of carbon from the atmosphere through forest regrowth (Chazdon et al. 2016a; Poorter et al. 2016; Sanquetta et al. 2018).

Current efforts to reduce atmospheric CO_2 concentrations can be supported by reductions in forest-related carbon emissions and increases in sinks, which requires that the net impact of forest management on the atmosphere be evaluated (Griscom et al. 2017). Forest management and the use of wood products in GHG mitigation strategies result in changes in forest ecosystem C stocks, changes in harvested wood product C stocks, and potential changes in emissions resulting from the use of wood products and forest biomass that substitute for other emissions-intensive materials such as concrete, steel and fossil fuels (Kurz et al. 2016; Lemprière et al. 2013; Nabuurs et al. 2007). The net impact of these changes on GHG emissions and removals, relative to a scenario without forest mitigation actions needs to be quantified, (e.g. Werner et al. 2010; Smyth et al. 2014; Xu et al. 2018). Therefore, reductions in forest ecosystem C stocks alone are an incomplete estimator of the impacts of forest management on the atmosphere (Nabuurs et al. 2007; Lemprière et al. 2013; Kurz et al. 2016; Chen et al. 2018b). The impacts of forest management and the carbon storage in long-lived products and landfills vary greatly by region, however, because of the typically much shorter life-span of wood products produced from tropical regions compared to temperate and boreal regions (Earles et al. 2012; Lewis et al. 2019; Iordan et al. 2018) (see also section 4.9.4).

Assessments of forest degradation based on remote sensing of changes in canopy density or land cover, (e.g., (Hansen et al. 2013; Pearson et al. 2017) quantify changes in aboveground biomass C stocks and require additional assumptions or model-based analyses to also quantify the impacts on other ecosystem carbon pools including belowground biomass, litter, woody debris and soil carbon. Depending on the type of disturbance, changes in aboveground biomass may lead to decreases or increases in other carbon pools, for example, windthrow and insect induced tree mortality may result in losses in aboveground biomass that are (initially) off-set by corresponding increases in dead organic matter carbon pools (Yamanoi et al. 2015; Kurz et al. 2008), while deforestation will reduce the total ecosystem carbon pool (Houghton et al. 2012).

A global study of current vegetation carbon stocks (450 Gt C), relative to a hypothetical condition without land-use (916 Gt C), attributed 42-47% of carbon stock reductions to land management effects without land-use change, while the remaining 53-58% of carbon stock reductions were attributed to deforestation and other land-use changes (Erb et al. 2018). While carbon stocks in European forests are lower than hypothetical values in the complete absence of human land use, forest area and carbon stocks have been increasing over recent decades (McGrath et al. 2015; Kauppi et al. 2018). Studies of Gingrich et al. (2015) on the long-term trends in land-use over nine European countries (Albania, Austria, Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom) also show an increase in forest land and reduction in cropland and grazing land from the 19th century to the early 20th century. However, the extent to which human activities have affected the productive capacity of forest lands is poorly understood. Biomass Production Efficiency (BPE), i.e. the fraction of photosynthetic production used for biomass production, was significantly higher in managed forests (0.53) compared to natural forests (0.41) (and it was also higher in managed (0.44) compared to natural (0.63) grasslands) (Campioli et al. 2015). Managing lands for production may involve trade-offs. For example, a larger proportion of Net Primary Production in managed forests is allocated to biomass carbon storage, but lower allocation to fine roots is hypothesised to reduce soil C stocks in the long-term (Noormets et al. 2015). Annual volume increment in Finnish forests has more than doubled over the last century, due to increased growing stock, improved forest management and environmental changes (Henttonen et al. 2017).

As economies evolve, the patterns of land-use and C stock changes associated with human expansion into forested areas often include a period of rapid decline of forest area and carbon stocks, recognition of the need for forest conservation and rehabilitation, and a transition to more sustainable land management that is often associated with increasing carbon stocks, (e.g. Birdsey et al. 2006). Developed and developing countries around the world are in various stages of forest transition (Kauppi et al. 2018;

Meyfroidt and Lambin 2011). Thus, opportunities exist for sustainable forest management to contribute to atmospheric carbon targets through reduction of deforestation and degradation, forest conservation, forest restoration, intensification of management, and enhancements of carbon stocks in forests and harvested wood products (Griscom et al. 2017) (*medium evidence, medium agreement*).

4.5 Projections of land degradation in a changing climate

Land degradation will be affected by climate change in both direct and indirect ways, and land degradation will to some extent also feed-back into the climate system. The direct impacts are those in which climate and land interact directly in time and space. Examples of direct impacts are when increasing rainfall intensity exacerbates soil erosion, or when prolonged droughts reduce the vegetation cover of the soil making it more prone to erosion and nutrient depletion. The indirect impacts are those where climate change impacts and land degradation are separated in time and/or space. Examples of such impacts are when declining agricultural productivity due to climate change drives an intensification of agriculture elsewhere, which may cause land degradation. Land degradation, if sufficiently widespread, may also feed back into the climate system by reinforcing ongoing climate change.

Although climate change is exacerbating many land degradation processes (*high to very high confidence*), prediction of future land degradation is challenging because land management practices determine to a very large extent the state of the land. Scenarios of climate change in combination with land degradation models can provide useful knowledge on what kind and extent of land management will be necessary to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation.

4.5.1 Direct impacts on land degradation

There are two main levels of uncertainty in assessing the risks of future climate change induced land degradation. The first level, where uncertainties are comparatively low, is the changes of the degrading agent, such as erosive power of precipitation, heat stress from increasing temperature extremes (HÜVE et al. 2011), water stress from droughts, and high surface wind speed. The second level of uncertainties, and where the uncertainties are much larger, relates to the above and below ground ecological changes as a result of changes in climate, such as rainfall, temperature, and increasing level of CO_2. Vegetation cover is crucial to protect against erosion (Mullan et al. 2012; García-Ruiz et al. 2015).

Changes in rainfall patterns, such as distribution in time and space, and intensification of rainfall events will increase the risk of land degradation, both in terms of likelihood and consequences (*high agreement, medium evidence*). Climate induced vegetation changes will increase the risk of land degradation in some areas (where vegetation cover will decline) (*medium confidence*). Landslides are a form of land degradation that is induced by extreme rainfall events. There is a strong theoretical reason for increasing landslide activity due to intensification of rainfall, but the empirical evidence is so far lacking that climate change has contributed to landslides (Crozier 2010; Huggel et al. 2012; Gariano and Guzzetti 2016), human disturbance may be a more important future trigger than climate change (Froude and Petley 2018).

Erosion of coastal areas as a result of sea level rise will increase worldwide (*very high confidence*). In cyclone prone areas (such as the Caribbean, Southeast Asia, and the Bay of Bengal) the combination of sea level rise and more intense cyclones (Walsh et al. 2016b), and in some areas also land subsidence (Yang et al. 2019; Shirzaei and Bürgmann 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Fuangswasdi et al. 2019; Keogh and Törnqvist 2019), will pose a serious risk to people and livelihoods (*very high confidence*), in some cases even exceeding limits to adaption, see further section 4.9.4.1, 4.10.6, 4.10.8.

4.5.1.1 Changes in water erosion risk due to precipitation changes

The hydrological cycle is intensifying with increasing warming of the atmosphere. The intensification means that the number of heavy rainfall events is increasing while the total number of rainfall events tends to decrease (Trenberth 2011; Li and Fang 2016; Kendon et al. 2014; Guerreiro et al. 2018; Burt et al. 2016a; Westra et al. 2014; Pendergrass and Knutti 2018) *(robust evidence, high agreement*). Modelling of changes in land degradation as a result of climate change alone is hard because of the importance of local contextual factors. As shown above, actual erosion rate is extremely dependent on local conditions, primarily vegetation cover and topography (García-Ruiz et al. 2015). Nevertheless, modelling of soil erosion risks has advanced substantially in recent decades and such studies are indicative of future changes in the risk of soil erosion while actual erosion rates will still primarily be determined by land management. In a review article, Li & Fang (Li and Fang 2016) summarised 205 representative modelling studies around the world where erosion models had been used in combination with down-scaled climate models to assess future (between 2030 to 2100) erosion rates. The meta-study by Li & Fang considered, where possible, climate change in terms of temperature increase and changing rainfall regimes and their impacts on vegetation and soils. Almost all of the sites had current soil loss rates above 1t ha^{-1} (assumed to be the upper limit for acceptable soil erosion in Europe) and 136 out of 205 studies predicted increased soil erosion rates. The percentage increase in erosion rates varied between 1.2% to as much as over 1600%, whereas 49 out of 205 studies projected more than 50% increase. Projected soil erosion rates varied substantially between studies because the important of local factors, hence climate change impacts on soil erosion should preferably be assessed at the local to regional scale, rather than the global (Li and Fang 2016).

Mesoscale convective systems (MCS), typically thunder storms, have increased markedly in recent 3-4 decades in the USA and Australia and they are projected to increase substantially (Prein et al. 2017). Using a climate model with the ability to represent MCS, Prein and colleagues were able to predict future increases in frequency, intensity, and size of such weather systems. Findings include the 30% decrease in number of MCS of <40 mm h^{-1}, but a sharp increase of 380% in the number of extreme precipitation events of >90 mm h^{-1} over the North American continent. The combined effect of increasing precipitation intensity and increasing size of the weather systems implies that the total amount of precipitation from these weather systems is expected to increase by up to 80% (Prein et al. 2017), which will substantially increase the risk of land degradation in terms of landslides, extreme erosion events, flashfloods etc.

The potential impacts of climate change on soil erosion can be assessed by modelling the projected changes in particular variables of climate change known to cause erosion, such as erosivity of rainfall. A study of the conterminous United States based on three climate models and three scenarios (A2, A1B, and B1) found that rainfall erosivity will increase in all scenarios, even if there are large spatial differences – strong increase in NE and NW, and either weak or inconsistent trends in the SW and mid-West (Segura et al. 2014).

In a study of how climate change will impact future soil erosion processes in the Himalayas, Gupta and Kumar (2017) estimated that soil erosion will increase by about 27% in the near term (2020s) and 22% in the medium term (2080s), with little difference between scenarios. A study from Northern Thailand estimated that erosity will increase by 5% in the near term (2020s) and 14% in the medium term (2080s), which would result in a similar increase of soil erosion, all other factors being constant (Plangoen and Babel 2014). Observed rainfall erosivity has increased significantly in the lower Niger Basin (Nigeria) and are predicted to increase further based on statistical downscaling of four General Circulation Models (GCM) scenarios, with an estimated increase of 14%, 19% and 24% for the 2030s, 2050s, and 2070s respectively (Amanambu et al. 2019).

Many studies from around the world where statistical downscaling of GCM results have been used in combination with process based erosion models show a consistent trend of increasing soil erosion

Using a comparative approach Serpa et al. (2015) studied two Mediterranean catchments (one dry and one humid) using a spatially explicit hydrological model (SWAT) in combination with land use and climate scenarios for 2071-2100. Climate change projections showed, on the one hand, decreased rainfall and streamflow for both catchments whereas sediment export decreased only for the humid catchment; projected land use change, from traditional to more profitable, on the other hand resulted in increase in streamflow. The combined effect of climate and land use change resulted in reduced sediment export for the humid catchment (-29% for A1B; -22% for B1) and increased sediment export for the dry catchment (+222% for A1B; +5% for B1). Similar methods have been used elsewhere, also showing the dominant effect of land use/land cover for runoff and soil erosion (Neupane and Kumar 2015).

A study of future erosion rates in Northern Ireland, using a spatially explicit erosion model in combination with downscaled climate projections (with and without sub-daily rainfall intensity changes), showed that erosion rates without land management changes would decrease by 2020s, 2050s and 2100s irrespective of changes in intensity, mainly as a result of a general decline in rainfall (Mullan et al. 2012). When land management scenarios were added to the modelling, the erosion rates started to vary dramatically for all three time periods, ranging from a decrease of 100% for no-till land use, to an increase of 3621% for row crops under annual tillage and sub-days intensity changes (Mullan et al. 2012). Again, it shows how crucial land management is for addressing soil erosion, and the important role of rainfall intensity changes.

There is a large body of literature based on modelling future land degradation due to soil erosion concluding that in spite of the increasing trend of erosive power of rainfall (*medium evidence*, *high agreement*) land degradation is primarily determined by land management (*very high confidence*).

4.5.1.2 Climate induced vegetation changes, implications for land degradation

The spatial mosaic of vegetation is determined by three factors: the ability of species to reach a particular location, how species tolerate the environmental conditions at that location (e.g. temperature, precipitation, wind, the topographic and soil conditions), and the interaction between species (including above/below ground species (Settele et al. 2015). Climate change is projected to alter the conditions and hence impact the spatial mosaic of vegetation, which can be considered a form of land degradation. Warren et al. (2018) estimated that only about 33% of globally important biodiversity conservation areas will remain intact if global mean temperature increases to 4.5°C, while twice that area (67%) will remain intact if warming is restricted to 2°C. According to AR5, the clearest link between climate change and ecosystem change is when temperature is the primary driver, with changes of Arctic tundra as a response to significant warming as the best example (Settele et al. 2015). Even though distinguishing climate induced changes from land use changes is challenging, Boit et al. (2016) suggest that 5-6% of biomes in South America will undergo biome shifts until 2100, regardless of scenario, attributed to climate change. The projected biome shifts are primarily forests shifting to shrubland and dry forests becoming fragmented and isolated from more humid forests (Boit et al. 2016). Boreal forests are subject to unprecedented warming in terms of speed and amplitude (IPCC 2013b), with significant impacts on their regional distribution (Juday et al. 2015). Globally, tree lines are generally expanding northward and to higher elevations, or remaining stable, while a reduction in tree line was rarely observed and only where disturbances occurred (Harsch et al. 2009) There is *limited evidence* of a slow northward migration of the boreal forest in eastern North America (Gamache and Payette 2005). The thawing of permafrost may increase drought induced tree mortality throughout the circumboreal zone (Gauthier et al. 2015).

Forests are a prime regulator of hydrological cycling, both fluxes of atmospheric moisture and precipitation, hence climate and forests are inextricably linked (Ellison et al. 2017; Keys et al. 2017). Forest management influences the storage and flow of water in forested watersheds, particularly harvesting, thinning and construction of roads increase the likelihood of floods as an outcome of extreme climate events (Eisenbies et al. 2007). Water balance of at least partly forested landscapes is to a large extent controlled by forest ecosystems (Sheil and Murdiyarso 2009; Pokam et al. 2014). This includes surface runoff, as determined by evaporation and transpiration and soil conditions, and water flow routing (Eisenbies et al. 2007). Water use efficiency (i.e., the ratio of water loss to biomass gain) is increasing with increased CO_2 levels (Keenan et al. 2013), hence transpiration is predicted to decrease which in turn will increase surface runoff (Schlesinger and Jasechko 2014). However, the interaction of several processes makes predictions challenging (Frank et al. 2015; Trahan and Schubert 2016). Surface runoff is an important agent in soil erosion.

Generally, removal of trees through harvesting or forest death (Anderegg et al. 2012) will reduce transpiration and hence increase the runoff during the growing season. Management induced soil disturbance (such as skid trails and roads) will affect water flow routing to rivers and streams (Zhang et al. 2017; Luo et al. 2018; Eisenbies et al. 2007).

Climate change affects forests in both positive and negative ways (Trumbore et al. 2015; Price et al. 2013) and there will be regional and temporal differences in vegetation responses (Hember et al. 2017; Midgley and Bond 2015). Several climate change related drivers interact in complex ways, such as warming, changes in precipitation and water balance, CO_2 fertilisation, and nutrient cycling, which makes projections of future net impacts challenging (see 2.4.1.2) (Kurz et al. 2013; Price et al. 2013). In high latitudes, a warmer climate will extend the growing seasons which however, could be constrained by summer drought (Holmberg et al. 2019) while increasing levels of atmospheric CO_2 will increase water use efficiency but not necessarily tree growth (Giguère-Croteau et al. 2019). Improving one growth limiting factor will only enhance tree growth if other factors are not limiting (Norby et al. 2010; Trahan and Schubert 2016; Xie et al. 2016; Frank et al. 2015). Increasing forest productivity has been observed in most of Fennoscandia (Kauppi et al. 2014; Henttonen et al. 2017), Siberia and the northern reaches of North America as a response to a warming trend (Gauthier et al. 2015) but increased warming may also decrease forest productivity and increase risk of tree mortality and natural disturbances (Price et al. 2013; Girardin et al. 2016; Beck et al. 2011; Hember et al. 2016; Allen et al. 2011). The climatic conditions in high latitudes are changing at a magnitude faster than the ability of forests to adapt with detrimental, yet unpredictable, consequences (Gauthier et al. 2015).

Negative impacts dominate, however, and have already been documented (Lewis et al. 2004; Bonan et al. 2008; Beck et al. 2011) and are predicted to increase (Miles et al. 2004 ; Allen et al. 2010; Gauthier et al. 2015; Girardin et al. 2016; Trumbore et al. 2015). Several authors have emphasized a concern that tree mortality (forest dieback) will increase due to climate induced physiological stress as well as interactions between physiological stress and other stressors, such as insect pests, diseases, and wildfires (Anderegg et al. 2012; Sturrock et al. 2011; Bentz et al. 2010; McDowell et al. 2011). Extreme events such as extreme heat and drought, storms, and floods also pose increased threats to forests in both high and low latitude forests (Lindner et al. 2010; Mokria et al. 2015). However, comparing observed forest dieback with modelled climate induced damages did not show a general link between climate change and forest dieback (Steinkamp and Hickler 2015). Forests are subject to increasing frequency and intensity of wildfires which is projected to increase substantially with continued climate change (see also Cross-Chapter Box 3: Fire and climate change, Chapter 2) (Price et al. 2013). In the tropics, interaction between climate change, CO_2 and fire could lead to abrupt shifts between woodland and grassland dominated states in the future (Shanahan et al. 2016).

Within the tropics, much research has been devoted to understanding how climate change may alter regional suitability of various crops. For example coffee is expected to be highly sensitive to both temperature and precipitation changes, both in terms of growth and yield and in terms of increasing problems of pests (Ovalle-Rivera et al. 2015). Some studies conclude that the global area of coffee production will decrease by 50% (Bunn et al. 2015). Due to increased heat stress, the suitability of Arabica coffee is expected to deteriorate in Mesoamerica, while it can improve in high altitude areas in

South America. The general pattern is that the climatic suitability for Arabica coffee will deteriorate at low altitudes of the tropics as well as at the higher latitudes (Ovalle-Rivera et al. 2015). This means that climate change in and of itself can render unsustainable previously sustainable land use and land management practices and vice versa (Laderach et al. 2011).

Rangelands are projected to change in complex ways due to climate change. Increasing levels of atmospheric CO_2 stimulate directly plant growth and can potentially compensate negative effects from drying by increasing rain use efficiency. But the positive effect of increasing CO_2 will be mediated by other environmental conditions, primarily water availability but also nutrient cycling, fire regimes and invasive species. Studies over the North American rangelands suggest, for example, that warmer and dryer climatic conditions will reduce NPP in the southern Great Plains, the Southwest, and northern Mexico, but warmer and wetter conditions will increase NPP in the northern Plains and southern Canada (Polley et al. 2013).

4.5.1.3 Coastal erosion

Coastal erosion is expected to increase dramatically by sea level rise and in some areas in combination with increasing intensity of cyclones (highlighted in Section 4.10.6). Cyclone induced coastal erosion). Coastal regions are also characterised by high population density, particularly in Asia (Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Vietnam), whereas the highest population increase in coastal regions is projected in Africa (East Africa, Egypt, and West Africa) (Neumann et al. 2015). For coastal regions worldwide, and particularly in developing countries with high population density in low-lying coastal areas, limiting the warming to 1.5˚C to 2.0 ˚C will have major socio-economic benefits compared with higher temperature scenarios (IPCC 2018a; Nicholls et al. 2018). For more in-depth discussions on coastal process, please refer to Chapter 4 of the upcoming IPCC Special Report on The Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (IPCC SROCC).

Despite the uncertainty related to the responses of the large ice sheets of Greenland and west Antarctica, climate change-induced sea level rise is largely accepted and represents one of the biggest threats faced by coastal communities and ecosystems (Nicholls et al. 2011; Cazenave and Cozannet 2014; DeConto and Pollard 2016; Mengel et al. 2016). With significant socio-economic effects, the physical impacts of projected sea level rise, notably coastal erosion, have received considerable scientific attention (Nicholls et al. 2011; Rahmstorf 2010; Hauer et al. 2016).

Rates of coastal erosion or recession will increase due to rising sea levels and in some regions also in combination with increasing oceans waves (Day and Hodges 2018; Thomson and Rogers 2014; McInnes et al. 2011; Mori et al. 2010), lack or absence of sea-ice (Savard et al. 2009; Thomson and Rogers 2014) and thawing of permafrost (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2018), and changing cyclone paths (Tamarin-Brodsky and Kaspi 2017; Lin and Emanuel 2016a). The respective role of the different climate factors in the coastal erosion process will vary spatially. Some studies have shown that the role of sea level rise on the coastal erosion process can be less important than other climate factors, like wave heights, changes in the frequency of the storms, and the cryogenic processes (Ruggiero 2013; Savard et al. 2009). Therefore, in order to have a complete picture of the potential effects of sea level rise on rates of coastal erosion, it is crucial to consider the combined effects of the aforementioned climate controls and the geomorphology of the coast under study.

Coastal wetlands around the world are sensitive to sea-level rise. Projections of the impacts on global coastlines are inconclusive, with some projections suggesting that 20% to 90% (depending on sea-level rise scenario) of present day wetlands will disappear during the 21st century (Spencer et al. 2016). Another study, which included natural feed-back processes and management responses suggested that coastal wetlands may actually increase (Schuerch et al. 2018b).

Low-lying coastal areas in the tropics are particularly subject to the combined effect of sea-level rise and increasing intensity of tropical cyclones, conditions which in many cases pose limits to adaptation, see section 4.9.5.1.

Many large coastal deltas are subject to the additional stress of shrinking deltas as a consequence of the combined effect of reduced sediment loads from rivers due to damming and water use, and land subsidence resulting from extraction of ground water or natural gas, and aquaculture (Higgins et al. 2013; Tessler et al. 2016; Minderhoud et al. 2017; Tessler et al. 2015; Brown and Nicholls 2015; Szabo et al. 2016; Yang et al. 2019; Shirzaei and Bürgmann 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Fuangswasdi et al. 2019). In some cases the rate of subsidence can outpace the rate of sea level rise by one order of magnitude (Minderhoud et al. 2017) or even two (Higgins et al. 2013). Recent findings from the Mississippi Delta raises the risk of a systematic underestimation of the rate of land subsidence in coastal deltas (Keogh and Törnqvist 2019)

In sum, from a land degradation point of view, low lying coastal areas are particularly exposed to the nexus of climate change and increasing concentration of people (Elliott et al. 2014) (*robust evidence, high agreement*) and the situation will become particularly acute in delta areas shrinking from both reduced sediment loads and land subsidence (*robust evidence, high agreement*).

4.5.2 Indirect impacts on land degradation

Indirect impacts of climate change on land degradation are difficult to quantify because of the many conflating factors. The causes of land-use change are complex, combining physical, biological and socioeconomic drivers (Lambin et al. 2001; Lambin and Meyfroidt 2011). One such driver of land-use change is the degradation of agricultural land, which can result in a negative cycle of natural land being converted to agricultural land to sustain production levels. The intensive management of agricultural land can lead to a loss of soil function, negatively impacting the many ecosystem services provided by soils including maintenance of water quality and soil carbon sequestration (Smith et al. 2016a). The degradation of soil quality due to cropping is of particular concern in tropical regions, where it results in a loss of productive potential of the land, affecting regional food security and driving conversion of non-agricultural land, such as forestry, to agriculture (Lambin et al. 2003; Drescher et al. 2016; Van der Laan et al. 2017). Climate change will exacerbate these negative cycles unless sustainable land managed practices are implemented.

Climate change impacts on agricultural productivity (see Chapter 5) will have implications for the intensity of land use and hence exacerbate the risk of increasing land degradation. There will be both localised effects (i.e., climate change impacts on productivity affecting land use in the same region) and teleconnections (i.e., climate change impacts and land-use change are spatially and temporally separate) (Wicke et al. 2012; Pielke et al. 2007). If global temperature increases beyond 3°C it will have negative yield impacts on all crops (Porter et al. 2014) which, in combination with a doubling of demands by 2050 (Tilman et al. 2011), and increasing competition for land from the expansion of negative emissions technologies (IPCC 2018a; Schleussner et al. 2016), will exert strong pressure on agricultural lands and food security.

In sum, reduced productivity of most agricultural crops will drive land-use changes worldwide (*robust evidence, medium agreement*), but predictions of how this will impact land degradation is challenging because of several conflating factors. Social change, such as widespread changes in dietary preferences will have a huge impact on agriculture and hence land degradation (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

4.6 Impacts of bioenergy and technologies for CO_2 removal (CDR) on land degradation

4.6.1 Potential scale of bioenergy and land-based CDR

In addition to the traditional land use drivers (e.g. population growth, agricultural expansion, forest management), a new driver will interact to increase competition for land throughout this century: the potential large-scale implementation of land-based technologies for CO_2 removal (CDR). Land-based CDR include afforestation and reforestation, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), soil carbon management, biochar and enhanced weathering (Smith et al., 2015; Smith 2016)

Most scenarios, including two of the four pathways in the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C (IPCC 2018a), compatible with stabilisation at 2°C involve substantial areas devoted to land-based CDR, specifically afforestation/ reforestation and BECCS (Schleussner et al. 2016; Smith et al. 2016b; Mander et al. 2017). Even larger land areas are required in most scenarios aimed at keeping average global temperature increases to below 1.5 °C , and scenarios that avoid BECCS also require large areas of energy crops in many cases (IPCC 2018b), although some options with strict demand-side management avoid this need (Grubler et al. 2018). Consequently, the addition of carbon capture and storage (CCS) systems to bioenergy facilities enhances mitigation benefits because it increases the carbon retention time and reduces emissions relative to bioenergy facilities without CCS. The IPCC SR 1.5 states that "When considering pathways limiting warming to 1.5°C with no or limited overshoot, the full set of scenarios shows a conversion of 0.5 – 11 M km^2 of pasture into 0 – 6 M km^2 for energy crops, a 2 M km^2 reduction to 9.5 M km^2 increase forest, and a 4 M km^2 decrease to a 2.5 M km^2 increase in non-pasture agricultural land for food and feed crops by 2050 relative to 2010." (Rogelj et al., 2018, p. 145) . For comparison, the global cropland area in 2010 was 15.9 M km^2 (Table 1.1), and (Woods et al. 2015) estimate the area of abandoned and degraded land potentially available for energy crops (or afforestation/reforestation) exceeds 5 M km^2. However, the area of available land has long been debated, as much marginal land is subject customary land tenure and used informally often by impoverished communities (Baka 2013, 2014; Haberl et al. 2013; Young 1999). Thus, as noted in the SR1.5, "The implementation of land-based mitigation options would require overcoming socio-economic, institutional, technological, financing and environmental barriers that differ across regions" (IPCC, 2018a, p. 18).

The wide range of estimates reflects the large differences among the pathways, availability of land in various productivity classes, types of NET implemented, uncertainties in computer models, and social and economic barriers to implementation (Fuss et al. 2018; Nemet et al. 2018; Minx et al. 2018).

4.6.2 Risks of land degradation from expansion of bioenergy and land-based CDR

The large-scale implementation of high intensity dedicated energy crops, and harvest of crop and forest residues for bioenergy, could contribute to increases in the area of degraded lands: intensive land management can result in nutrient depletion, over fertilisation and soil acidification, salinisation (from irrigation without adequate drainage), wet ecosystems drying (from increased evapotranspiration), as well as novel erosion and compaction processes (from high impact biomass harvesting disturbances) and other land degradation processes described in Section 4.3.1.

Global integrated assessment models used in the analyses of mitigation pathways vary in their approaches to modelling CDR (Bauer et al. 2018) and the outputs have large uncertainties due to their limited capability to consider site-specific details (Krause et al. 2018). Spatial resolutions vary from 11 world regions to 0.25 degrees gridcells (Bauer et al. 2018). While model projections identify potential areas for CDR implementation (Heck et al. 2018), the interaction with climate change induced biome shifts, available land and its vulnerability to degradation are unknown. The crop/forest types and management practices that will be implemented are also unknown, and will be influenced by local incentives and regulations. While it is therefore currently not possible to project the area at risk of degradation from the implementation of land-based CDR, there is a clear risk that expansion of energy crops at the scale anticipated could put significant strain on land systems, biosphere integrity, freshwater supply and biogeochemical flows (Heck et al. 2018). Similarly, extraction of biomass for energy from existing forests, particularly where stumps are utilized, can impact soil health (de Jong et al. 2017). Reforestation and afforestation present a lower risk of land degradation and may in fact reverse degradation (see Section 4.6.3) although potential adverse hydrological and biodiversity impacts will need to be managed (Caldwell et al. 2018; Brinkman et al. 2017). Soil carbon management can deliver negative emissions while reducing or reversing land degradation. Chapter 6 discusses the significance of context and management in determining environmental impacts of implementation of land-based options.

4.6.3 Potential contributions of land-based CDR to reducing and reversing land degradation

Although large-scale implementation of land-based CDR has significant potential risks, the need for negative emissions and the anticipated investments to implement such technologies can also create significant opportunities. Investments into land-based CDR can contribute to halting and reversing land degradation, to the restoration or rehabilitation of degraded and marginal lands (Chazdon and Uriarte 2016; Fritsche et al. 2017) and can contribute to the goals of land degradation neutrality (Orr et al. 2017a).

Estimates of the global area of degraded land range from less than 10 to 60 M km^2 (Gibbs and Salmon 2015), see also section 4.4.1. Additionally, large areas are classified as marginal lands and may be suitable for the implementation of bioenergy and land-based CDR (Woods et al. 2015). The yield per hectare of marginal and degraded lands is lower than on fertile lands, and if CDR will be implemented on marginal and degraded lands this will increase the area demand and costs per unit area of achieving negative emissions (Fritsche et al. 2017). Selection of lands suitable for CDR must be considered carefully to reduce conflicts with existing users, to assess the possible trade-offs in biodiversity contributions of the original and the CDR land uses, to quantify the impacts on water budgets, and to ensure sustainability of the CDR land use.

Land use and land condition prior to the implementation of CDR affect the climate change benefits (Harper et al. 2018). Afforestation/ reforestation on degraded lands can increase C stocks in vegetation and soil, increase carbon sinks (Amichev et al. 2012), and deliver co-benefits for biodiversity and ecosystem services particularly if a diversity of local species are used. Afforestation and reforestation on native grasslands can reduce soil carbon stocks, although the loss is typically more than compensated by increases in biomass and dead organic matter C stocks (Bárcena et al. 2014; Li et al. 2012; Ovalle-Rivera et al. 2015; Shi et al. 2013), and may impact biodiversity (Li et al. 2012) (see also 4.5.1: Large scale forest cover expansion, what can be learned in context of the SRCCL).

Strategic incorporation of energy crops into agricultural production systems, applying an integrated landscape management approach, can provide co-benefits for management of land degradation and other environmental objectives. For example, buffers of Miscanthus and other grasses can enhance soil carbon and reduce water pollution (Cacho et al. 2018; Odgaard et al. 2019), and strip-planting of short rotation tree crops can reduce the water table where crops are affected by dryland salinity (Robinson et al. 2006). Shifting to perennial grain crops has the potential to combine food production with carbon sequestration at a higher rate than with annual grain crops and avoid the trade-off between food production and climate change mitigation (Crews, Carton, & Olsson, 2018; de Oliveira, Brunsell, Sutherlin, Crews, & DeHaan, 2018; Ryan et al., 2018, see also 4.10.2).

Changes in land cover can affect surface reflectance, water balances and emissions of volatile organic compounds and thus the non-GHG impacts on the climate system from afforestation/reforestation or planting energy crops (Anderson et al. 2011; Bala et al. 2007; Betts 2000; Betts et al. 2007), (see Section 4.7 for further details). Some of these impacts reinforce the GHG mitigation benefits, while others off-set the benefits, with strong local (slope, aspect) and regional (boreal vs. tropical biomes) differences in the outcomes (Li et al. 2015). Adverse effects on albedo from afforestation with evergreen conifers in boreal zones can be reduced through planting of broadleaf deciduous species (Astrup et al. 2018; Cai et al. 2011a; Anderson et al. 2011).

Combining CDR technologies may prove synergistic. Two soil management techniques with an explicit focus on increasing the soil carbon content rather than promoting soil conservation more broadly have been suggested: Addition of biochar to agricultural soils (see 4.10.5) and addition of ground silicate minerals to soils in order to take up atmospheric CO_2 through chemical weathering (Taylor et al. 2017; Haque et al. 2019; Beerling 2017; Strefler et al. 2018). The addition of biochar is comparatively well understood and also field tested at large scale, see section 4.10.5 for a comprehensive discussion. The addition of silicate minerals to soils is still highly uncertain in terms of its potential (from 95 $GtCO_2$ yr^{-1} (Strefler et al. 2018) to only 2-4 $GtCO_2$ yr^{-1} (Fuss et al. 2018)) and costs (Schlesinger and Amundson 2018).

Effectively addressing land degradation through implementation of bioenergy and land-based CDR will require site-specific local knowledge, matching of species with the local land, water balance, nutrient and climatic conditions, and ongoing monitoring and, where necessary, adaptation of land management to ensure sustainability under global change (Fritsche et al. 2017). Effective land governance mechanisms including integrated land-use planning, along with strong sustainability standards could support deployment of energy crops and afforestation/reforestation at appropriate scales and geographical contexts (Fritsche et al. 2017). Capacity-building and technology transfer through the international cooperation mechanisms of the Paris Agreement could support such efforts. Modelling to inform policy development is most useful when undertaken with close interaction between model developers and other stakeholders including policymakers to ensure that models account for real world constraints (Dooley and Kartha 2018).

International initiatives to restore lands, such as the Bonn Challenge (Verdone and Seidl 2017) and the New York Declaration on Forests (Chazdon et al. 2017), and interventions undertaken for Land Degradation Neutrality and implementation of NDCs (see Glossary) can contribute to NET objectives. Such synergies may increase the financial resources available to meet multiple objectives (see section 4.9.4).

4.6.4 Traditional biomass provision and land degradation

Traditional biomass (fuelwood, charcoal, agricultural residues, animal dung) used for cooking and heating by some 2.8 billion people (38% of global population) in non-OECD countries accounts for more than half of all bioenergy used worldwide (IEA 2017; REN21 2018; see Cross-Chapter Box 7 on Bioenergy, Chapter 6). Cooking with traditional biomass has multiple negative impacts on human health, particularly for women, children and youth (Machisa et al. 2013; Sinha and Ray 2015; Price 2017; Mendum and Njenga 2018; Adefuye et al. 2007) and on household productivity including high workloads for women and youth (Mendum and Njenga 2018; Brunner et al. 2018; Hou et al. 2018; Njenga et al. 2019). Traditional biomass is land-intensive due to reliance on open fires, inefficient stoves and overharvesting of woodfuel, contributing to land degradation, losses in biodiversity and reduced ecosystem services (IEA 2017; Bailis et al. 2015; Masera et al. 2015; Specht et al. 2015; Fritsche et al. 2017; Fuso Nerini et al. 2017). Traditional woodfuels account for 1.9-2.3% of global GHG emissions, particularly in "hotspots" of land degradation and fuelwood depletion in eastern Africa and South Asia, such that one-third of traditional woodfuels globally are harvested unsustainably (Bailis et al. 2015).

Scenarios to significantly reduce reliance on traditional biomass in developing countries present multiple co-benefits (*high evidence, high agreement*), including reduced emissions of black carbon, a short-lived climate forcer that also causes respiratory disease (Shindell et al. 2012).

A shift from traditional to modern bioenergy, especially in the African context, contributes to improved livelihoods and can reduce land degradation and impacts on ecosystem services (Smeets et al. 2012; Gasparatos et al. 2018; Mudombi et al. 2018). In Sub-Saharan Africa, most countries mention woodfuel in their Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) but fail to identify transformational processes to make fuelwood a sustainable energy source compatible with improved forest management (Amugune et al. 2017). In some regions, especially in South and Southeast Asia, a scarcity of woody biomass may lead to excessive removal and use of agricultural wastes and residues, which contributes to poor soil quality and land degradation (Blanco-Canqui and Lal 2009; Mateos et al. 2017).

In sub-Saharan Africa, forest degradation is widely associated with charcoal production although in some tropical areas rapid re-growth can offset forest losses (Hoffmann et al. 2017; McNicol et al. 2018). Overharvesting of wood for charcoal contributes to the high rate of deforestation in sub-Saharan Africa, which is five times the world average, due in part to corruption and weak governance systems (Sulaiman et al. 2017). Charcoal may also be a by-product of forest clearing for agriculture, with charcoal sale providing immediate income when the land is cleared for food crops (Kiruki et al. 2017; Ndegwa et al. 2016). Besides loss of forest carbon stock, a further concern for climate change is methane and black carbon emissions from fuelwood burning and traditional charcoal-making processes (Bond et al. 2013; Patange et al. 2015; Sparrevik et al. 2015).

A fundamental difficulty in reducing environmental impacts associated with charcoal lies in the small-scale nature of much charcoal production in sub-Saharan Africa leading to challenges in regulating its production and trade, which is often informal, and in some cases illegal, but nevertheless widespread since charcoal is the most important urban cooking fuel (Zulu 2010; Zulu and Richardson 2013; Smith et al. 2015; World Bank 2009) (World Bank, 2009). Urbanisation combined with population growth has led to continuously increasing charcoal production. Low efficiency of traditional charcoal production results in a four-fold increase in raw woody biomass required and thus much greater biomass harvest (Hojas-Gascon et al. 2016; Smeets et al. 2012). With continuing urbanisation anticipated, increased charcoal production and use will probably contribute to increasing land pressures and increased land degradation, especially in sub-Saharan Africa *(medium evidence, high agreement)*.

Although it could be possible to source this biomass more sustainably, the ecosystem and health impacts of this increased demand for cooking fuel would be reduced through use of other renewable fuels or in some cases, non-renewable fuels (LPG), as well as through improved efficiency in end-use and through better resource and supply chain management (Santos et al. 2017; Smeets et al. 2012; Hoffmann et al. 2017). Integrated response options such as agro-forestry (see Chapter 6) and good governance mechanisms for forest and agricultural management (see Chapter 7) can support the transition to sustainable energy for households and reduce the environmental impacts of traditional biomass.

4.7 Impacts of land degradation on climate

While Chapter 2 has its focus on land cover changes and their impacts on the climate system, this chapter focuses on the influences of individual land degradation processes on climate (see cross chapter Table 4.1) which may or may not take place in association to land cover changes. The effects of land degradation on CO_2 and other greenhouse gases as well as those on surface albedo and other physical controls of the global radiative balance are discussed.

4.7.1 Impacts on greenhouse gases

Land degradation processes with direct impact on soil and terrestrial biota have great relevance in terms of CO_2 exchange with the atmosphere given the magnitude and activity of these reservoirs in the global C cycle. As the most widespread form of soil degradation, erosion detaches the surface soil material which typically hosts the highest organic C stocks, favoring the mineralisation and release as CO_2, yet complementary processes such as C burial may compensate this effect, making soil erosion a long-term C sink (*low agreement, limited evidence)*, (Wang et al. 2017b), but see also (Chappell et al. 2016). Precise estimation of the CO_2 released from eroded lands is challenged by the fact that only a fraction of the detached C is eventually lost to the atmosphere. It is important to acknowledge that a substantial fraction of the eroded material may preserve its organic C load in field conditions. Moreover, C sequestration may be favored through the burial of both the deposited material and the surface of its hosting soil at the deposition location (Quinton et al. 2010). The cascading effects of erosion on other environmental processes at the affected sites can often cause net CO_2 emissions through their indirect influence on soil fertility and the balance of organic C inputs and outputs, interacting with other non-erosive soil degradation processes such as nutrient depletion, compaction and salinisation, which can lead to the same net C effects (see Table 4.1) (van de Koppel et al. 1997).

As natural and human-induced erosion can result in net C storage in very stable buried pools at the deposition locations, degradation in those locations has a high C-release potential. Coastal ecosystems such as mangrove forests, marshes and seagrasses are a typical deposition locations and their degradation or replacement with other vegetation is resulting in a substantial C release (0.15 to 1.02 Gt C yr^{-1}) (Pendleton et al. 2012), which highlights the need for a spatially-integrated assessment of land degradation impacts on climate that considers in-situ but also ex-situ emissions.

Cultivation and agricultural management of cultivated land are relevant in terms of global CO_2 land-atmosphere exchange (see also 4.9.1). Besides the initial pulse of CO_2 emissions associated with the onset of cultivation and associated vegetation clearing (see Chapter 2), agricultural management practices can increase or reduce C losses to the atmosphere. Although global croplands are considered to be at relatively neutral stage in the current decade (Houghton et al. 2012), this results from a highly uncertain balance between coexisting net losses and gains. Degradation losses of soil and biomass carbon appear to be compensated by gains from soil protection and restoration practices such as cover crops, conservation tillage and nutrient replenishment favoring organic matter build-up. Cover crops, increasingly used to improve soils, have the potential to sequester 0.12 Gt C yr^{-1} on global croplands with a saturation time of more than 150 years (Poeplau and Don 2015). No-till practices (i.e. tillage elimination favoring crop residue retention in the soil surface) which were implemented to protect soils from erosion and reduce land preparation times, were also seen with optimism as a C sequestration option, which today is considered more modest globally and, in some systems, even less certain (VandenBygaart 2016; Cheesman et al. 2016; Powlson et al. 2014). Among soil fertility restoration practices, lime application for acidity correction, increasingly important in tropical regions, can generate a significant net CO_2 source in some soils (Bernoux et al. 2003, Alemu et al 2017).

Land degradation processes in seminatural ecosystems driven by unsustainable uses of their vegetation through logging or grazing lead to reduced plant cover and biomass stocks, causing net C releases from soils and plant stocks. Degradation by logging activities is particularly important in developing tropical and subtropical regions, involving C releases that exceed by far the biomass of harvested products, including additional vegetation and soil sources that are estimated to reach 0.6 Gt C yr^{-1} (Pearson et al. 2014, 2017). Excessive grazing pressures pose a more complex picture with variable magnitudes and even signs of C exchanges. A general trend of higher C losses in humid overgrazed rangelands suggests a high potential for C sequestration following the rehabilitation of those systems (Conant and Paustian 2002) with a global potential sequestration of 0.045 Gt C yr^{-1}. A special case of degradation in rangelands are those processes leading to the woody encroachment of grass-dominated systems, which can be responsible of declining animal production but high C sequestration rates (Asner et al. 2003, Maestre et al. 2009).

Fire regime shifts in wild and seminatural ecosystems can become a degradation process in itself, with high impact on net C emission and with underlying interactive human and natural drivers such as burning policies (Van Wilgen et al. 2004), biological invasions (Brooks et al. 2009), and plant pest/disease spread (Kulakowski et al. 2003). Some of these interactive processes affecting unmanaged forests have resulted in massive C release, highlighting how degradation feedbacks on climate are not restricted to intensively used land but can affect wild ecosystems as well (Kurz et al. 2008).

Agricultural land and wetlands represent the dominant source of non-CO_2 greenhouse gases (Chen et al. 2018d). In agricultural land, the expansion of rice cultivation (increasing CH_4 sources), ruminant stocks and manure disposal (increasing CH_4, N_2O and NH_3 fluxes) and nitrogen over-fertilisation combined with soil acidification (increasing N_2O fluxes) are introducing the major impacts (*medium agreement*, *medium evidence*) and their associated emissions appear to be exacerbated by global warming (*medium agreement and medium evidence)* (Oertel et al. 2016).

As the major sources of global N_2O emissions, over-fertilisation and manure disposal are not only increasing in-situ sources but also stimulating those along the pathway of dissolved inorganic nitrogen transport all the way from draining waters to the ocean (*high agreement*, *medium evidence*). Current budgets of anthropogenically fixed nitrogen on the Earth System (Tian et al. 2015; Schaefer et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2017a) suggest that N_2O release from terrestrial soils and wetlands accounts for 10-15% of the inputs, yet many further release fluxes along the hydrological pathway remain uncertain, with emissions from oceanic “dead-zones” being a major aspect of concern (Schlesinger 2009; Rabalais et al. 2014).

Environmental degradation processes focused on the hydrological system, which are typically manifested at the landscape scale, include both drying (as in drained wetlands or lowlands) and wetting trends (as in waterlogged and flooded plains). Drying of wetlands reduces CH_4 emissions (Turetsky et al. 2014) but favors pulses of organic matter mineralization linked to high N_2O release (Morse and Bernhardt 2013; Norton et al. 2011). The net warming balance of these two effects is not resolved and may be strongly variable across different types of wetlands. In the case of flooding of non-wetland soils, a suppression of CO_2 release is typically over compensated in terms of net greenhouse impact by enhanced CH_4 fluxes, that stem from the lack of aeration but are aided by the direct effect of extreme wetting on the solubilisation and transport of organic substrates (McNicol and Silver 2014). Both wetlands rewetting/restoration and artificial creation can increase CH_4 release (Altor and Mitsch 2006; Fenner et al. 2011). Permafrost thawing is another major source of CH_4 release with substantial long-term contributions to the atmosphere that are starting to get globally quantified (Christensen et al. 2004; Schuur et al. 2015; Walter Anthony et al. 2016).

4.7.2 Physical impacts

Among the physical effects of land degradation, surface albedo changes are those with the most evident impact on the net global radiative balance and net climate warming/cooling. Degradation processes affecting wild and semi-natural ecosystems such as fire regime changes, woody encroachment, logging and overgrazing can trigger strong albedo changes before significant biogeochemical shifts take place, in most cases these two types of effects have opposite signs in terms of net radiative forcing, making their joint assessment critical for understanding climate feedbacks (Bright et al. 2015).

In the case of forest degradation or deforestation, the albedo impacts are highly dependent on the latitudinal/climatic belt to which they belong. In boreal forests the removal or degradation of the tree cover increases albedo (net cooling effect)(*medium evidence*, *high agreement*) as the reflective snow cover becomes exposed, which can exceed the net radiative effect of the associated C release to the atmosphere (Davin et al. 2010; Pinty et al. 2011). On the other hand, progressive greening of boreal and temperate forests has contributed to net albedo declines (*medium agreement*, *medium evidence*) (Planque et al. 2017; Li et al. 2018a). In the northern treeless vegetation belt (tundra), shrub encroachment leads to the opposite effect as the emergence of plant structures above the snow cover level reduce winter-time albedo (Sturm 2005).

The extent to which albedo shifts can compensate carbon storage shifts at the global level has not been estimated. A significant but partial compensation takes place in temperate and subtropical dry ecosystems in which radiation levels are higher and C stocks smaller compared to their more humid counterparts (*medium agreement, medium evidence*). In cleared dry woodlands half of the net global warming effect of net C release has been compensated by albedo increase (Houspanossian et al. 2013), whereas in afforested dry rangelands albedo declines cancelled one fifth of the net C sequestration (Rotenberg and Yakir 2010). Other important cases in which albedo effects impose a partial compensation of C exchanges are the vegetation shifts associated to wild fires, as shown for the savannahs, shrublands and grasslands of sub-Saharan Africa (Dintwe et al. 2017). Besides the net global effects discussed above, albedo shifts can play a significant role on local climate (*high agreement, medium evidence*), as exemplified by the effect of no-till agriculture reducing local heat extremes in European landscapes (Davin et al. 2014) and the effects of woody encroachment causing precipitation rises in the North American Great Plains (Ge and Zou 2013). Modeling efforts that integrate ground data from deforested areas worldwide accounting for both physical and biogeochemical effects, indicate that massive global deforestation would have a net warming impact (Lawrence and Vandecar 2015) at both local and global levels with highlight non-linear effects of forest loss on climate variables.

Beyond the albedo effects presented above, other physical impacts of land degradation on the atmosphere can contribute to global and regional climate change. Of particular continental to global relevance are the net cooling effects of dust emissions (*low agreement, medium evidence*) (Lau and Kim 2007), but see also (Huang et al. 2014). Anthropogenic emission of mineral particles from degrading land appear to have a similar radiative impact than all other anthropogenic aerosols (Sokolik and Toon 1996). Dust emissions may explain regional climate anomalies through reinforcing feedbacks, as suggested for the amplification of the intensity, extent and duration of the low precipitation anomaly of the North American "Dust Bowl" in the 1930s (Cook et al. 2009). Another source of physical effects on climate are surface roughness changes which, by affecting atmospheric drag, can alter cloud formation and precipitation (*low agreement, low evidence*), as suggested by modeling studies showing how the massive deployment of solar panels in the Sahara could increase rainfall in the Sahel (Li et al. 2018c) or how woody encroachment in the Arctic tundra could reduce cloudiness and raise temperature (Cho et al. 2018). The complex physical effects of deforestation, as explored through modeling, converge into general net regional precipitation declines, tropical temperature increases and boreal temperature declines, while net global effects are less certain (Perugini et al. 2017). Integrating all the physical effects of land degradation and its recovery or reversal is still challenge, yet modeling attempts suggest that over the last three decades the slow but persistent net global greening caused by the average increase of leaf area in the land has caused a net cooling of the Earth, mainly through the raise of evapotranspiration (Zeng et al. 2017) (*low confidence*).

4.8 Impacts of climate-related land degradation on poverty and livelihoods

Unravelling the impacts of climate-related land degradation on poverty and livelihoods is highly challenging. This complexity is due to the interplay of multiple social, political, cultural, and economic factors, such as markets, technology, inequality, population growth, (Barbier and Hochard 2018) each of which interact and shape the ways in which social-ecological systems respond (Morton 2007). We find *limited evidence* attributing the impacts of climate-related land degradation to poverty and livelihoods, with climate often not distinguished from any other driver of land degradation. Climate is nevertheless frequently noted as a risk multiplier for both land degradation and poverty (*high agreement, robust evidence*) and is one of many stressors people live with, respond to and adapt to in their daily lives (Reid and Vogel 2006). Climate change is considered to exacerbate land degradation and potentially accelerate it due to heat stress, drought, changes to evapotranspiration rates and biodiversity, as well as a result of changes to environmental conditions that allow new pests and diseases to thrive (Reed and Stringer 2016b). In general terms, the climate (and climate change) can increase human and ecological communities' sensitivity to land degradation. Land degradation then leaves livelihoods more sensitive to the impacts of climate change and extreme climatic events (*high agreement, robust evidence*). If human and ecological communities exposed to climate change and land degradation are sensitive and cannot adapt, they can be considered vulnerable to it; if they are sensitive and can adapt, they can be considered resilient (Reed and Stringer 2016b). The impacts of land degradation will vary under a changing climate both spatially and temporally, leading some communities and ecosystems to be more vulnerable or more resilient than others under different scenarios. Even within communities, groups such as women and the youth are often more vulnerable than others.

4.8.1 Relationships between land degradation, climate change and poverty

This section sets out the relationships between land degradation and poverty, and climate change and poverty, leading to inferences about the 3-way links between them. Poverty is multidimensional and includes a lack of access to the whole range of capital assets that can be used to pursue a livelihood. Livelihoods constitute the capabilities, assets, and activities that are necessary to make a living (Chambers and Conway 1992; Olsson et al. 2014b).

The literature shows *high agreement* in terms of speculation that there are potential links between land degradation and poverty. However, studies have not provided robust quantitative assessments of the extent and incidence of poverty within land degradation affected populations (Barbier and Hochard 2016). Some researchers, e.g. Nachtergaele et al. (2011) estimate that 1.5 billion people were dependent upon degraded land to support their livelihoods in 2007, while >42 % of the world's poor population inhabit degraded areas. However, there is overall *low confidence* in the evidence base, a lack of studies that look beyond the past and present, and the literature calls for more in-depth research to be undertaken on these issues (Gerber et al. 2014). Recent work by Barbier and Hochard (Barbier and Hochard 2018) points to biophysical constraints such as poor soils and limited rainfall which interact to limit land productivity, suggesting that those farming in climatically less favourable agricultural areas are challenged by poverty. Studies such as those by (Coomes et al. 2011), focusing on an area in the Amazon, highlight the importance of the initial conditions of land holding in the dominant (shifting) cultivation system in terms of long-term effects on household poverty and future forest cover, showing initial land tenure and socio-economic aspects can make some areas less favourable too.

Much of the qualitative literature is focused on understanding the livelihood and poverty impacts of degradation through a focus on subsistence agriculture, where farms are small, under traditional or informal tenure and where exposure to environmental (including climate) risks is high (Morton 2007). In these situations, the poor lack access to assets (financial, social, human, natural and physical) and in the absence of appropriate institutional supports and social protection, this leaves them sensitive and unable to adapt, so a vicious cycle of poverty and degradation can ensue. To further illustrate the complexity, livelihood assessments often focus on a single snapshot in time, livelihoods are dynamic and people alter their livelihood activities and strategies depending the on internal and external stressors to which they are responding (O'Brien et al. 2004). When certain livelihood activities and strategies become no longer tenable as a result of land degradation (and may push people into poverty), it can have further effects on issues such as migration (Lee 2009), as people adapt by moving (see Section 4.8.3); and may result in conflict (see Section 4.8.3), as different groups within society compete for scarce resources, sometimes through non-peaceful actions. Both migration and conflict can lead to land use changes elsewhere that further fuel climate change through increased emissions.

Similar challenges as for understanding land degradation-poverty linkages are experienced in unravelling the relationship between climate change and poverty. A particular issue in examining climate change-poverty links relates to the common use of aggregate economic statistics like GDP, as the assets and income of the poor constitute such as minor proportion of national wealth (Hallegatte et al. 2018). Aggregate quantitative measures also fail to capture the distributions of costs and benefits from climate change. Furthermore, people fall into and out of poverty, with climate change being one of many factors affecting these dynamics, through its impacts on livelihoods. Much of the literature on climate change and poverty tends to look backward rather than forward (Skoufias et al. 2011), providing a snap-shot of current or past relationships, (for example, (Dell et al. 2009) who examine the relationship between temperature and income (GDP) using cross-sectional data from countries in the Americas). Yet, simulations of future climate change impacts on income or poverty are largely lacking.

Noting the *limited evidence* that exists that explicitly focuses on the relationship between land degradation, climate change and poverty, Barbier and Hochard (2018b) suggest that those people living in less favoured agricultural areas face a poverty-environment trap that can result in increased land degradation under climate change conditions. The emergent relationships between land degradation, climate change and poverty are shown in Figure 4.6 (see also Figure 6.1).



Figure 4.6 Schematic representation of links between climate change, land management and socio-economic conditions.

The poor have access to few productive assets, so land, and the natural resource base more widely, plays a key role in supporting the livelihoods of the poor. It is however, hard to make generalisations about how important income derived from the natural resource base is for rural livelihoods in the developing world (Angelsen et al. 2014) with studies focusing on forest resources having shown that approximately one quarter of the total rural household income in developing countries stems from forests, with forest-based income shares being tentatively higher for low-income households (Vedeld et al. 2007; Angelsen et al. 2014). Different groups use land in different ways within their overall livelihood portfolios and are therefore at different levels of exposure and sensitivity to climate shocks and stresses. The literature nevertheless displays *high evidence* and *high agreement* that those populations whose livelihoods are more sensitive to climate change and land degradation are often more dependent on environmental assets, and these people are often the poorest members of society. There is further *high evidence and high agreement* that both climate change and land degradation can affect livelihoods and poverty through their threat multiplier effect. Research in Bellona, in the Solomon Islands in the south Pacific (Reenberg et al. 2008) examined event-driven impacts on livelihoods, taking into account weather events as one of many drivers of land degradation and links to broader land-use and land cover changes that have taken place. Geographical locations experiencing land degradation are often the same locations that are directly affected by poverty, and are also affected by extreme events linked to climate change and variability.

Much of the assessment presented above has considered placed-based analyses examining the relationships between poverty, land degradation and climate change in the locations in which these outcomes have occurred. Altieri and Nicholls (2017) note that due to the globalised nature of markets and consumption systems, the impacts of changes in crop yields linked to climate-related land degradation (manifest as lower yields) will be far reaching, beyond the sites and livelihoods experiencing degradation. Despite these teleconnections, farmers living in poverty in developing countries will be especially vulnerable due to their exposure, dependence on the environment for income and limited options to engage in other ways to make a living (Rosenzweig and Hillel 1998). In identifying ways in which these interlinkages can be addressed, (Scherr 2000) observes that key actions that can jointly address poverty and environmental improvement often seek to increase access to natural resources, enhance the productivity of the natural resource assets of the poor, and to engage stakeholders in addressing public natural resource management issues. In this regard, it is increasingly recognised that those suffering from and being vulnerable to land degradation and poverty need to have a voice and play a role in the development of solutions, especially where the natural resources and livelihood activities they depend on are further threatened by climate change.

4.8.2 Impacts of climate related land degradation on food security

How and where we grow food compared to where and when we need to consume it is at the crux of issues surrounding land degradation, climate change and food security, especially because more than 75% of the global land surface (excluding Antarctica) faces rain-fed crop production constraints (Fischer et al. 2009), see also Chapter 5. Taken separately, knowledge on land degradation processes and human-induced climate change has attained a great level of maturity. However, their combined effects on food security, notably food supply, remain underappreciated (Webb et al. 2017b), and quantitative information is lacking. Just a few studies have shown how the interactive effects of the aforementioned challenging, interrelated phenomena can impact crop productivity and hence food security and quality (Karami et al. 2009; Allen et al. 2001; Högy and Fangmeier 2008) (*low evidence*). Along with socio-economic drivers climate change accelerates land degradation due to its influence on land-use systems (Millennium Assessment 2005; UNCCD 2017), potentially leading to a decline in agri-food system productivity, particularly on the supply side. Increases in temperature and changes in precipitation patterns are expected to have impacts on soil quality, including nutrient availability and assimilation (St.Clair and Lynch 2010). Those climate-related changes are expected to have net negative impacts on agricultural productivity, particularly in tropical regions, though the magnitude of impacts depends on the models used. Anticipated supply side issues linked to land and climate relate to biocapacity factors (including e.g. whether there is enough water to support agriculture); production factors (e.g. chemical pollution of soil and water resources or lack of soil nutrients) and distribution issues (e.g. decreased availability of and/or accessibility to the necessary diversity of quality food where and when it is needed) (Stringer et al. 2011). Climate sensitive transport infrastructure is also problematic for food security (Islam et al. 2017), and can lead to increased food waste, while poor siting of roads and transport links can lead to soil erosion and forest loss (Xiao et al. 2017), further feeding back into climate change.

Over the past decades, crop models have been useful tools for assessing and understanding climate change impacts on crop productivity and food security (White et al. 2011; Rosenzweig et al. 2014). Yet, the interactive effects of soil parameters and climate change on crop yields and food security remain limited, with *low evidence* of how they play out in different economic and climate settings (e.g. Sundström et al. 2014). Similarly, there have been few meta-analyses focusing on the adaptive capacity of land-use practices such as conservation agriculture in light of climate stress (see e.g. Steward et al. 2018), as well as *low evidence* quantifying the role of wild foods and forests (and by extension forest degradation) in both the global food basket and in supporting household scale food security (Bharucha and Pretty 2010; Hickey et al. 2016)

To be sustainable, any initiative aiming at addressing food security – encompassing supply, diversity and quality - must take into consideration the interactive effects between climate and land degradation in a context of other socio-economic stressors. Such socio-economic factors are especially important if we look at demand side issues too, which include lack of purchasing power, large scale speculation on global food markets leading to exponential price rises (Tadesse et al. 2014), competition in appropriation of supplies and changes to per capita food consumption (Stringer et al. 2011; see also Chapter 5). Lack of food security, combined with lack of livelihood options, is often an important manifestation of vulnerability, and can act as a key trigger for people to migrate. In this way, migration becomes an adaptation strategy.

4.8.3 Impacts of climate-related land degradation on migration and conflict

Land degradation may trigger competition for scarce natural resources potentially leading to migration and/or conflict, though even with *medium evidence* there is *low agreement* in the literature. Linkages between land degradation and migration occur within a larger context of multi-scale interaction of environmental and non-environmental drivers and processes, including resettlement projects, searches for education and/or income, land shortages, political turmoil, and family-related reasons (McLeman 2017; Hermans and Ide 2019). The complex contribution of climate to migration and conflict hampers retrieving any level of confidence on climate-migration and climate-conflict linkages, therefore constituting a major knowledge gap (Cramer et al. 2014; Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2018).

There is *low evidence* on the causal linkages between climate change, land degradation processes (other than desertification) and migration. Existing studies on land degradation and migration – particularly in drylands – largely focus on the effect of rainfall variability and drought and shows how migration serves as adaptation strategy (Piguet et al. 2018; McLeman 2017; chapter 3). For example, in the Ethiopian highlands severe topsoil erosion and forest degradation is a major environmental stressor which is amplified by re-occurring droughts, with migration being an important household adaptation strategy (Morrissey 2013). In the humid tropics, land degradation, mainly as a consequence of deforestation, has been a reported reason for people leaving their homes during the Amazonian colonisation (Hecht 1983) but was also observed more recently, for example in Guatemala, where soil degradation was one of the most frequently cited migration pushes (López-Carr 2012) and Kenya, where households respond to low soil quality by sending temporary migrants for additional income generation (Gray 2011). In contrast, in the Andean highlands and the Pacific coastal plain, migration increased with land quality, probably because revenues from additional agricultural production was invested in costly forms of migration (Gray and Bilsborrow 2013). These mixed results illustrate the complex, non-linear relationship of land degradation-migration linkages and suggest explaining land degradation-migration linkages requires considering a broad socio-ecological embedding (McLeman 2017).

In addition to people moving away from an area due to “lost” livelihood activities, climate related land degradation can also reduce the availability of livelihood safety nets – environmental assets that people use during times of shocks or stress. For example, Barbier (2000) notes that wetlands in north-east Nigeria around Hadejia–Jama'are floodplain provide dry season pastures for seminomadic herders, agricultural surpluses for Kano and Borno states, groundwater recharge of the Chad formation aquifer and 'insurance' resources in times of drought. The floodplain also supports many migratory bird species. As climate change and land degradation combine, delivery of these multiple services can be undermined, particularly as droughts become more widespread, reducing the utility of this wetland environment as a safety net for people and wildlife alike.

Early studies conducted in Africa hint at a significant causal link between land degradation and violent conflict (Homer-Dixon et al. 1993). For example, Percival and Homer-Dixon (1995) identified land degradation as one of the drivers of the crisis in Rwanda in the early 1990s which allowed radical forces to stoke ethnic rivalries. With respect to the Darfur conflict, some scholars and UNEP concluded that land degradation, together with other environmental stressors, constitute a major security threat for the Sudanese people (Byers and Dragojlovic 2004; Sachs 2007; UNEP 2007). Recent studies show *low agreement*, suggesting that climate change can increase the likelihood of civil violence if certain economic, political and social factors, including low development and weak governance mechanisms, are present (Scheffran et al. 2012; Benjaminsen et al. 2012). In contrast, Raleigh (Raleigh and Urdal 2007) found in a global study that land degradation is a weak predictor for armed conflict. As such, studies addressing possible linkages between climate change – a key driver of land degradation – and the risks of conflict have yielded contradictory results and it remains largely unclear whether land degradation resulting from climate change leads to conflict or cooperation (Salehyan 2008; Solomon et al. 2018).

Land degradation-conflict linkages can be bi-directional. Research suggests that households experiencing natural resource degradation often engage in migration for securing livelihoods (Kreamer 2012), which potentially triggers land degradation at the destination leading to conflict there (Kassa et al. 2017). While this indeed holds true for some cases it may not for others given the complexity of processes, contexts and drivers. Where conflict and violence do ensue, it is often as a result of a lack of appreciation for the cultural practices of others.

4.9 Addressing land degradation in the context of climate change

Land degradation in the form of soil carbon loss is estimated to have been ongoing for at least 12,000 years, but increased exponentially in the last 200 years (Sanderman et al. 2017). Before the advent of modern sources of nutrients, it was imperative for farmers to maintain and improve soil fertility through the prevention of runoff and erosion, and management of nutrients through vegetation residues and manure. Many ancient farming systems were sustainable for hundreds and even thousands of years, such as raised field agriculture in Mexico (Crews and Gliessman 1991), tropical forest gardens in SE Asia and Central America (Ross 2011; Torquebiau 1992; Turner and Sabloff 2012), terraced agriculture in East Africa, Central America, Southeast Asia and the Mediterranean basin (Turner and Sabloff 2012; Preti and Romano 2014; Widgren and Sutton 2004; Håkansson and Widgren 2007; Davies and Moore 2016; Davies 2015), and integrated rice-fish cultivation in East Asia (Frei and Becker 2005).

Such long-term sustainable farming systems evolved in very different times and geographical contexts, but they share many common features, such as: the combination of species and structural diversity in time, and space (horizontally and vertically) in order to optimise the use of available land; recycling of nutrients through biodiversity of plants, animals, and microbes; harnessing the full range of site-specific micro-environments (e.g. wet and dry soils); biological interdependencies which helps suppression of pests; reliance on mainly local resources; reliance on local varieties of crops and sometimes incorporation of wild plants and animals; the systems are often labour and knowledge intensive (Rudel et al. 2016; Beets 1990; Netting 1993; Altieri and Koohafkan 2008). Such farming systems have stood the test of time and can provide important knowledge for adapting farming systems to climate change (Koohafkann and Altieri 2011).

In modern agriculture the importance of maintaining the biological productivity and ecological integrity of farm land has not been a necessity in the same way as in pre-modern agriculture because nutrients and water have been supplied externally. The extreme land degradation in the US Midwest during the Dust Bowl period in the 1930s became an important wake-up call for agriculture and agricultural research and development, from which we can still learn much in order to adapt to ongoing and future climate change (McLeman et al. 2014; Baveye et al. 2011; McLeman and Smit 2006).

Sustainable Land Management (SLM) is a unifying framework for addressing land degradation and can be defined as the stewardship and use of land resources, including soils, water, animals and plants, to meet changing human needs, while simultaneously ensuring the long-term productive potential of these resources and the maintenance of their environmental functions. 'It is a comprehensive approach comprising technologies combined with social, economic and political enabling conditions (Nkonya et al. 2011). It is important to stress that farming systems are informed by both scientific and local/traditional knowledge. The power of SLM in small-scale diverse farming was demonstrated effectively in Nicaragua after the severe cyclone Mitch in 1998 (Holt-Giménez 2002). Pairwise analysis of 880 fields with and without implementation of SLM practices showed that the SLM fields systematically fared better than the fields without SLM in terms of more topsoil remaining, higher field moisture, more vegetation, less erosion and lower economic losses after the cyclone. Furthermore the difference between fields with and without SLM increased with increasing levels of storm intensity, increasing slope gradient, and increasing age of SLM (Holt-Giménez 2002).

When addressing land degradation through SLM and other approaches it is important to consider feedbacks that impact climate change. Table 4.2 shows some of the most important land degradation issues, their potential solutions, and their impacts on climate change. This table provides a link between the comprehensive lists of land degradation processes (Table 4.1) and land management solutions (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 (Cross-chapter Ch 3 and Ch 4) Interaction of human and climate drivers can exacerbate desertification and land degradation

Climate change exacerbates the rate and magnitude of several ongoing land degradation and desertification processes. Human drivers of land degradation and desertification include expanding agriculture, agricultural practices and forest management. In turn land degradation and desertification are also drivers of climate change through the emission of greenhouse gases, reduced rates of carbon uptake and reduced capacity of ecosystems to act as carbon sinks into the future.

Human driver	Climate driver
Grazing pressure	Warming trend
Agriculture practices	Extreme temperatures
Expansion of agriculture	Drying trend
Forest clearing	Extreme rainfall
Wood fuel	Shifting rains
	Intensifying cyclones
	Sea level rise

Issue/syndrome	Impact on climate change	Human driver	Climate driver	Land management options	References
Erosion of agricultural soils	Emission: CO_2, N_2O			Increase soil organic matter, no till, perennial crops, erosion control, agroforestry, dietary change	{3.2.4, 3.5.1, 3.6.2, 3.8.1, 4.9.1, 4.9.5, 4.10.2, 4.10.5}
Deforestation	Emission of CO_2			Forest protection, sustainable forest management and dietary change	{4.2.5, 4.6, 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.10.3}
Forest degradation	Emission of CO_2 Reduced carbon sink			Forest protection, sustainable forest management	{4.2.5, 4.6, 4.9.3, 4.9.4, 4.10.3}
Overgrazing	Emission: CO_2, CH_4 Increasing albedo			Controlled grazing, rangeland management	{3.2.4.2, 3.5.1, 3.7.1, 3.8.1, 4.9.1.4}
Firewood and charcoal production	Emission: CO_2, CH_4 Increasing albedo			Clean cooking (health co-benefits, particularly for women and children)	{3.7.3, 4.6.4, 4.9.3, 4.9.4}
Increasing fire frequency and intensity	Emission: CO_2, CH_4, N_2O Emission: aerosols, increasing albedo			Fuel management, fire management	{3.2.4, 3.7.1, 4.2.5, 4.9.3, Cross chapter box 3}
Degradation of tropical peat soils	Emission: CO_2, CH_4			Peatland restoration, erosion control, regulating the use of peat soils	{4.10.4}
Thawing of perma-frost	Emission: CO_2, CH_4			relocation of settlement and infrastructure	{4.9.5.1}
Coastal erosion	Emission: CO_2, CH_4			Wetland and coastal restoration, mangrove conservation, long term land use planning	{4.10.6, 4.10.7, 4.10.8}
Sand and dust storms, wind erosion	Emission: aerosols			Vegetation management, afforestation, windbreaks	{3.4.1, 3.5.1, 3.7.1, 3.8.1, 3.8.2}
Bush encroachment	Capturing: CO_2, Decreasing albedo			Grazing land management, fire management	{3.7.1.3, 3.8.3.2}

4.9.1 Actions on the ground to address land degradation

Concrete actions on the ground to address land degradation are primarily focused on soil and water conservation. In the context of adaptation to climate change, actions relevant for addressing land degradation are sometimes framed as ecosystem based adaptation (EBA) (Scarano 2017) or Nature Based Solutions (NBS) (Nesshöver et al. 2017), and in an agricultural context, agroecology (see glossary) provides an important frame. The site-specific biophysical and social conditions, including local and indigenous knowledge, are important for successful implementation of concrete actions.

Responses to land degradation generally take the form of agronomic measures (methods related to managing the vegetation cover), soil management (methods related to tillage, nutrient supply), and mechanical methods (methods resulting in durable changes to the landscape) (Morgan 2005a). Measures may be combined to reinforce benefits to land quality, as well as improving carbon sequestration that supports climate change mitigation. Some measures offer adaptation options and other co-benefits, such as agroforestry involving planting fruit trees that can support food security in the face of climate change impacts (Reed and Stringer 2016a) or application of compost or biochar that enhances soil water holding capacity, so increases resilience to drought.

There are important differences in terms of labour and capital requirements for different technologies, and also implications for land tenure arrangements. Agronomic measures and soil management require generally little extra capital input and comprise activities repeated annually, so have no particular implication for land tenure arrangements. Mechanical methods require substantial upfront investments in terms of capital and labour, resulting in long lasting structural change requiring more secure land tenure arrangements (Mekuriaw et al. 2018). Agroforestry is a particularly important strategy for SLM in the context of climate change because the large potential to sequester carbon in plants and soil and enhance resilience of agricultural systems (Zomer et al. 2016).

Implementation of sustainable land management practices has been shown to increase the productivity of land (Branca et al. 2013) and to provide good economic returns on investment in many different settings around the world (Mirzabaev et al. 2015). Giger et al (2018) showed in a meta study of 363 projects over the period 1990 to 2012 that 73% of the projects were perceived to have a positive or at least neutral cost/benefit ratio in the short term, and 97% were perceived to have a positive or very positive cost/benefit ratio in the long term (*robust evidence, high agreement*). Despite the positive effects, uptake is far from universal. Local factors, both biophysical conditions (e.g. soils, drainage, and topography) and socio-economic conditions (e.g. land tenure, economic status, and land fragmentation) play decisive roles in the interest in, capacity to undertake, and successful implementation of sustainable land management practices (Teshome et al. 2016; Vogl et al. 2017; Tesfaye et al. 2016; Cerdà et al. 2018; Adimassu et al. 2016). From a landscape perspective, sustainable land management can generate benefits, including adaptation to and mitigation of climate change, for entire watersheds, but challenges remain regarding coordinated and consistent implementation (Kerr et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2016a). (*medium evidence, medium agreement*)

4.9.1.1 Agronomic and soil management measures

Rebuilding soil carbon is an important goal of SLM, particularly in the context of climate change (Rumpel et al. 2018). The two most important reasons why agricultural soils have lost 20-60% of the soil carbon they contained under natural ecosystem conditions are the frequent disturbance through tillage and harvesting and the change from deep rooted perennial plants to shallow rooted annual plants (Crews and Rumsey 2017). Practices that build soil carbon are those that increase organic matter input to soil, or reduce decomposition of soil organic matter.

Agronomic practices can alter the carbon balance significantly, by increasing organic inputs from litter and roots into the soil. Practices include retention of residues, use of locally-adapted varieties, inter-cropping, crop rotations, and green manure crops that replace the bare field fallow during winter and are eventually ploughed before sowing next main crop (Henry et al., 2018). Cover crops (green manure crops and catch crops that are grown between the main cropping seasons) can increase soil carbon stock by between 0.22 and 0.4 t C $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$ (Poeplau and Don 2015; Kaye and Quemada 2017).

Reduced tillage (or no-tillage) is an important strategy for reducing soil erosion and nutrient loss by wind and water (Van Pelt et al. 2017; Panagos et al. 2015; Borrelli et al. 2016). But the evidence that no-till agriculture also sequesters carbon is not compelling (VandenBygaart 2016). Soil sampling of only the upper 30 cm can give biased results suggesting that soils under no-till practices have higher carbon content than soils under conventional tillage (Baker et al. 2007; Ogle et al. 2012; Fargione et al. 2018; VandenBygaart 2016).

Changing from annual to perennial crops can increase soil carbon content (Culman et al. 2013; Sainju et al. 2017). A perennial grain crop (intermediate wheatgrass) was on average over four years a net carbon sink of about 13.5 t CO_2 $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$ (de Oliveira et al. 2018). Sprunger et al. (2018) compared an annual winter wheat crop with a perennial grain crop (intermediate wheatgrass) and found that the perennial grain root biomass was 15 times larger than winter wheat, however, there was no significant difference in soil carbon pools after the four-year experiment. Exactly how much, and over what time period, carbon can be sequestered through changing from annual to perennial crops depends on the degree of soil carbon depletion and other local biophysical factors (see also section 4.10.2).

Integrated soil fertility management is a sustainable approach to nutrient management that uses a combination of chemical and organic amendments (manure, compost, biosolids, biochar), rhizobial nitrogen fixation, and liming materials to address soil chemical constraints (Henry et al., 2018). In pasture systems, management of grazing pressure, fertilisation, diverse species including legumes and perennial grasses can reduce erosion and enhance soil carbon (Conant et al. 2017).

4.9.1.2 Mechanical soil and water conservation

In hilly and mountainous terrain terracing is an ancient but still practiced soil conservation method worldwide (Preti and Romano 2014) in climatic zones from arid to humid tropics (Balbo 2017). By reducing the slope gradient of hillsides, terraces provide flat surfaces and deep, loose soils that increase infiltration, reduce erosion and thus sediment transport. They also decrease the hydrological connectivity and thus reduce hillside runoff (Preti et al. 2018; Wei et al. 2016; Arnáez et al. 2015; Chen et al. 2017). In terms of climate change, terraces are a form of adaptation which helps both in cases where rainfall is increasing or intensifying (by reducing slope gradient and the hydrological connectivity), and where rainfall is decreasing (by increasing infiltration and reducing runoff) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). There are several challenges, however, to continued maintenance and construction of new terraces, such as the high costs in terms of labour and/or capital (Arnáez et al. 2015) and disappearing local knowledge for maintaining and constructing new terraces (Chen et al. 2017). The propensity of farmers to invest in mechanical soil conservation methods varies with land tenure, farmers with secure tenure arrangements are more willing to invest in durable practices such as terraces (Lovo 2016; Sklenicka et al. 2015; Haregeweyn et al. 2015). Where the slope is less severe, erosion can be controlled by contour banks, and the keyline approach (Duncan 2016; Stevens et al. 2015) to soil and water conservation.

4.9.1.3 Agroforestry

Agroforestry is defined as a collective name for land-use systems in which woody perennials (trees, shrubs, etc.) are grown in association with herbaceous plants (crops, pastures) and/or livestock in a spatial arrangement, a rotation, or both, and in which there are both ecological and economic interactions between the tree and non-tree components of the system (Young, 1995, p. 11). At least since the 1980s agroforestry has been widely touted as an ideal land management practice in areas vulnerable to climate variations and subject to soil erosion. Agroforestry holds the promise of improving of soil and climatic conditions while generating income from wood energy, timber, and non-timber products – sometimes presented as a synergy of adaptation and mitigation of climate change (Mbow et al. 2014).

There is strong scientific consensus that a combination of forestry with agricultural crops and/or livestock, agroforestry systems can provide additional ecosystem services when compared with monoculture crop systems (Waldron et al. 2017; Sonwa et al. 2011a, 2014, 2017; Charles et al. 2013). Agroforestry can enable sustainable intensification by allowing continuous production on the same unit of land with higher productivity without the need to use shifting agriculture systems to maintain crop yields (Nath et al. 2016). This is especially relevant where there is a regional requirement to find a balance between the demand for increased agricultural production and the protection of adjacent natural ecosystems such as primary and secondary forests (Mbow et al. 2014). For example, the use of agroforestry for perennial crops such as coffee and cocoa are increasingly promoted as offering a route to sustainable farming with important climate change adaptation and mitigation co-benefits (Sonwa et al. 2001; Kroeger et al. 2017). Reported co-benefits of agroforestry in cocoa production include increased carbon sequestration in soils and biomass, improved water and nutrient use efficiency and the creation of a favourable micro-climate for crop production (Sonwa et al. 2017; Chia et al. 2016). Importantly, the maintenance of soil fertility using agroforestry has the potential to reduce the practice of shifting-agriculture (of cocoa) which results in deforestation (Gockowski and Sonwa 2011).

However, positive interactions within these systems can be ecosystem and/or species specific, but co-benefits such as increased resilience to extreme climate events, or improved soil fertility are not always observed (Blaser et al. 2017; Abdulai et al. 2018). These contrasting outcomes indicate the importance of field scale research programs to inform agroforestry system design, species selection and management practices (Sonwa et al. 2014) .

Despite the many proven benefits, adoption of agroforestry has been low and slow (Toth et al. 2017; National Research Centre for Agroforestry et al. 1999; Pattanayak et al. 2003; Jerneck and Olsson 2014). There are several reasons for the slow uptake, but the perception of risks and the time lag between adoption and realisation of benefits are often important (Pattanayak et al. 2003; Mercer 2004; Jerneck and Olsson 2013).

An important question for agroforestry is whether it supports poverty alleviation, or if it favours comparatively affluent households. Experiences from India suggest that the overall adoption is (s)low and differential between rich and poor households. Brockington el al. (2016), studied agroforestry adoption over many years in South India, they found that overall only 18% of the households adopted agroforestry but among the relatively rich households who adopted agroforestry, 97% of them were still practicing it after 6-8 years and some had expanded their operations. Similar results were obtained in Western Kenya, that food secure households were much more willing to adopt agroforestry than food insecure households (Jerneck and Olsson 2013, 2014). Other experiences from sub-Saharan Africa illustrate the difficulties (such as local institutional support) of having a continued engagement of communities in agroforestry (Noordin et al. 2001; Matata et al. 2013; Meijer et al. 2015).

4.9.1.4 Crop-livestock interaction as an approach to manage land degradation

The integration of crop and livestock production into “mixed farming” for smallholders in developing countries became an influential model, particularly for Africa, in the early 1990s (Pritchard et al. 1992; McIntire et al. 1992). Crop-livestock integration under this model was seen as founded on three pillars; improved use of manure for crop fertility management; expanded use of animal traction (draught animals); and promotion of cultivated fodder crops. For Asia, emphasis was placed on draught power for land preparation, manure for soil fertility enhancement, and fodder production as an entry point for cultivation of legumes (Devendra and Thomas 2002). Mixed farming was seen as an evolutionary process to expand food production in the face of population increase, promote improvements in income and welfare, and protect the environment. The process could be further facilitated and steered by research, extension and policy (Pritchard et al. 1992; McIntire et al. 1992; Devendra 2002) (Pritchard et al., 1992; McIntire et al. 1992; Devendra 1992).

Scoones and Wolmer (2002) place this model in historical context, including concern about population pressure on resources and the view that mobile pastoralism was environmentally damaging. The latter view had already been critiqued by developing understandings of pastoralism, mobility and communal tenure of grazing lands (for example (Behnke 1994; Ellis 1994)). They set out a much more differentiated picture of crop livestock interactions, which can take place either within a single farm household, or between crop and livestock producers, in which case they will be mediated by formal and informal institutions governing the allocation of land, labour and capital, with the interactions evolving through multiple place-specific pathways (Ramisch et al. 2002; Scoones and Wolmer 2002). Promoting a diversity of approaches to crop-livestock interactions does not imply that the integrated model necessarily leads to land degradation, but increases the space for institutional support to local innovation (Scoones and Wolmer 2002).

However, specific managerial and technological practices that link crop and livestock production will remain an important part of the repertoire of on-farm adaptation and mitigation. Howden and coauthors (Howden et al. 2007) note the importance of innovation within existing integrated systems including use of adapted forage crops. Rivera-Ferre et al. (2016) list as adaptation strategies with high potential for grazing systems, mixed crop-livestock systems or both: crop-livestock integration in general; soil management including composting; enclosure and corralling of animal; improved storage of feed. Most of these are seen as having significant co-benefits for mitigation, and improved management of manure is seen as a mitigation measure with adaptation co-benefits.

4.9.2 Local and indigenous knowledge for addressing land degradation

In practice, responses are anchored both in scientific research, as well as local, indigenous and traditional knowledge and know-how. For example, studies in the Philippines Camacho et al. (2016) examine how traditional integrated watershed management by indigenous people sustain regulating services vital to agricultural productivity, while delivering co-benefits in the form of biodiversity and ecosystem resilience at a landscape scale. Although responses can be site specific and sustainable at a local scale, the multi-scale interplay of drivers and pressures can nevertheless cause practices that have been sustainable for centuries to become less so. Siahaya et al (2016) explore the traditional knowledge that has informed rice cultivation in the uplands of East Borneo, grounded in sophisticated shifting cultivation methods (gilir balik) which have been passed on for generations (more than 200 years) in order to maintain local food production. Gilir balik involves temporary cultivation of plots, after which, abandonment takes place as the land user moves to another plot, leaving the natural (forest) vegetation to return. This approach is considered sustainable if it has the support of other subsistence strategies, adapts to and integrates with the local context, and if the carrying capacity of the system is not surpassed (Siahaya et al. 2016). Often gilir balik cultivation involves intercropping of rice with bananas, cassava and other food crops. Once the abandoned plot has been left to recover such that soil fertility is restored, clearance takes place again and the plot is reused for cultivation. Rice cultivation in this way plays an important role in forest management, with several different types of succession forest being found in the study are of Siahaya et al (2016). Nevertheless, interplay of these practices with other pressures (large-scale land acquisitions for oil palm plantation, logging and mining), risk their future sustainability. Use of fire is critical in processes of land clearance, so there are also trade-offs for climate change mitigation which have been sparsely assessed.

Interest appears to be growing in understanding how indigenous and local knowledge inform land users' responses to degradation, as scientists engage farmers as experts in processes of knowledge co-production and co-innovation (Oliver et al. 2012; Bitzer and Bijman 2015). This can help to introduce, implement, adapt and promote the use of locally appropriate responses (Schwilch et al. 2011). Indeed, studies strongly agree on the importance of engaging local populations in both sustainable land and forest management. Meta-analyses in tropical regions that examined both forests in protected areas and community managed forests suggest that deforestation rates are lower, with less variation in deforestation rates presenting in community managed forests compared to protected forests (Porter-Bolland et al. 2012). This suggests that consideration of the social and economic needs of local human populations is vital in preventing forest degradation (Ward et al. 2018). However, while disciplines such as ethnopedology seek to record and understand how local people perceive, classify and use soil, and draw on that information to inform its management (Barrera-Bassols and Zinck 2003), links with climate change and its impacts (perceived and actual) are not generally considered.

4.9.3 Reducing deforestation and forest degradation and increasing afforestation

Improved stewardship of forests through reduction or avoidance of deforestation and forest degradation, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks can all contribute to land-based natural climate solutions (Angelsen et al. 2018; Sonwa et al. 2011b; Griscom et al. 2017). While estimates of annual emissions from tropical deforestation and forest degradation range widely from 0.5 to 3.5 Gt C yr^{-1} (Baccini et al. 2017; Houghton et al. 2012; Mitchard 2018, see also Chapter 2), they all indicate the large potential to reduce annual emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Recent estimates of forest extent for Africa in 1900 may result in downward adjustments of historic deforestation and degradation emission estimates (Aleman et al. 2018). Emissions from forest degradation in non-Annex I countries have declined marginally from 1.1 $GtCO_2$ yr^{-1} in 2001-2010 to 1 $GtCO_2$ yr^{-1} in 2011-2015, but the relative emissions from degradation compared to deforestation have increased from a quarter to a third (Federici et al. 2015). Forest sector activities in developing countries were estimated to represent a technical mitigation potential in 2030 of 9 Gt CO_2 (Miles et al. 2015). This was partitioned into reduction of deforestation (3.5 Gt CO_2), reduction in degradation and forest management (1.7 Gt CO_2) and afforestation and reforestation (3.8 $GtCO_2$). The economic mitigation potential will be lower than the technical potential (Miles et al. 2015).

Natural regeneration of second-growth forests enhances carbon sinks in the global carbon budget (Chazdon and Uriarte 2016). In Latin America, Chazdon et al. (2016) estimated that in 2008, second-growth forests (1 to 60 years old) covered 2.4 M km^2 of land (28.1% of the total study area). Over 40 years, these lands can potentially accumulate 8.5 Gt C in aboveground biomass via low-cost natural regeneration or assisted regeneration, corresponding to a total CO_2 sequestration of 31.1 Gt CO_2 (Chazdon et al. 2016b). While aboveground biomass carbon stocks are estimated to be declining in the tropics, they are increasing globally due to increasing stocks in temperate and boreal forests (Liu et al. 2015b), consistent with the observations of a global land sector carbon sink (Le Quéré et al. 2013; Keenan et al. 2017; Pan et al. 2011).

Moving from technical mitigation potentials (Miles et al. 2015) to real reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation required transformational changes (Korhonen-Kurki et al. 2018). This transformation can be facilitated by two enabling conditions: the presence of already initiated policy change; or the scarcity of forest resources combined with an absence of any effective forestry framework and policies. These authors and others (Angelsen et al. 2018) found that the presence of powerful transformational coalitions of domestic pro-REDD+ political actors combined with strong ownership and leadership, regulations and law enforcement, and performance-based funding, can provide a strong incentive for achieving REDD+ goals.

Implementing schemes such as REDD+ and various projects related to the voluntary carbon market is often regarded as a no-regrets investment (Seymour and Angelsen 2012) but the social and ecological implications (including those identified in the Cancun Safeguards) must be carefully considered for REDD+ projects to be socially and ecologically sustainable (Jagger et al. 2015). In 2018, 34 countries have submitted a REDD+ forest reference level and/or forest reference emission level to the UNFCCC. Of these REDD+ reference levels, 95% included the activity "reducing deforestation" while 34% included the activity "reducing forest degradation" (FAO 2018). Five countries submitted REDD+ results in the technical annex to their Biannual Update Report (BUR) totalling an emission reduction of 6.3 Gt CO_2 between 2006 and 2015 (FAO 2018).

Afforestation is another mitigation activity that increases carbon sequestration (see also Cross-Chapter Box 2: Implications of large-scale reforestation and afforestation, Chapter 1). Yet, it requires careful consideration about where to plant trees to achieve potential climatic benefits given an altering of local albedo and turbulent energy fluxes and increasing night-time land surface temperatures (Peng et al., 2014). A recent hydro-climatic modelling effort has shown that forest cover can account for about 40% of the observed decrease in annual runoff (Buendia et al. 2016). A meta-analysis of afforestation in Northern Europe (Bárcena and co-authors 2014) concluded that significant soil organic carbon sequestration in Northern Europe occurs after afforestation of croplands but not grasslands. Additional sequestration occurs in forest floors and biomass carbon stocks. Successful programmes of large scale afforestation activities in South Korea and China are discussed in-depth a special case study (Section 4.10.3).

The potential outcome of efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation in Indonesia through a 2011 moratorium on concessions to convert primary forests to either timber or palm oil uses was evaluated against rates of emissions over the period 2000 to 2010. The study concluded that less than 7% of emissions would have been avoided had the moratorium been implemented in 2000 because it only curtailed emissions due to a subset of drivers of deforestation and degradation (Busch et al. 2015).

In terms of ecological integrity of tropical forests, the policy focus on carbon storage and tree cover can be problematic if it leaves out other aspects of forests ecosystems, such as biodiversity – and particularly fauna (Panfil and Harvey 2016; Peres et al. 2016; Hinsley et al. 2015). Other concerns of forest based projects under the voluntary carbon market are potential negative socio-economic side effects (Edstedt and Carton 2018a; Carton and Andersson 2017; Osborne 2011; Scheidel and Work 2018; Richards and Lyons 2016; Borras and Franco 2018; Paladino and Fiske 2017) and leakage (particularly at the subnational scale), i.e. when interventions to reduce deforestation or degradation at one site displace pressures and increase emissions elsewhere (Atmadja and Verchot 2012; Phelps et al. 2010; Lund et al. 2017; Balooni and Lund 2014).

Maintaining and increasing forest area, in particular of native forests rather than monoculture and short-rotation plantations, contributes to the maintenance of global forest carbon stocks (Lewis et al. 2019) (*robust evidence, high agreement*).

4.9.4 Sustainable forest management and CO_2 removal technologies

While reducing deforestation and forest degradation may help directly meet mitigation goals, sustainable forest management aimed at providing timber, fiber, biomass and non-timber resources can provide long-term livelihood for communities, can reduce the risk of forest conversion to non-forest uses (settlement, crops, etc.), and can maintain land productivity, thus reducing the risks of land degradation (Putz et al. 2012; Gideon Neba et al. 2014; Sufo Kankeu et al. 2016; Nitcheu Tchiadje et al. 2016; Rossi et al. 2017).

Developing sustainable forest management strategies aimed at contributing towards negative emissions throughout this century requires an understanding of forest management impacts on ecosystem carbon stocks (including soils), carbon sinks, carbon fluxes in harvested wood, carbon storage in harvested wood products including landfills and the emission reductions achieved through the use of wood products and bioenergy (Nabuurs et al. 2007; Lemprière et al. 2013; Kurz et al. 2016; Law et al. 2018; Nabuurs et al. 2017). Transitions from natural to managed forest landscapes can involve a reduction in forest carbon stocks, the magnitude of which depends on the initial landscape conditions, the harvest rotation length relative to the frequency and intensity of natural disturbances and on the age-dependence of managed and natural disturbances (Harmon et al. 1990; Kurz et al. 1998a). Initial landscape conditions, in particular the age-class distribution and therefore C stocks of the landscape strongly affect the mitigation potential of forest management options (Ter-Mikaelian et al. 2013; Kilpeläinen et al. 2017). Landscapes with predominantly mature forests may experience larger reductions in carbon stocks during the transition to managed landscapes (Harmon et al. 1990; Kurz et al. 1998b; Lewis et al. 2019) while in landscapes with predominantly young or recently disturbed forests sustainable forest management can enhance carbon stocks (Henttonen et al. 2017).

Forest growth rates, net primary productivity, and net ecosystem productivity are age-dependent with maximum rates of carbon removal from the atmosphere occurring in young to medium aged forests and declining thereafter (Tang et al. 2014). In boreal forest ecosystem, estimation of carbon stocks and carbon fluxes indicate that old growth stands are typically small carbon sinks or carbon sources (Gao et al. 2018; Taylor et al. 2014; Hadden and Grelle 2016). In tropical forests, carbon uptake rates in the first 20 years of forest recovery were 11 times higher than uptake rates in old-growth forests (Poorter et al. 2016). Age-dependent increases in forest carbon stocks and declines in forest carbon sinks mean that landscapes with older forests have accumulated more carbon but their sink strength is diminishing, while landscapes with younger forests contain less carbon but they are removing CO_2 from the atmosphere at a much higher rate (Volkova et al. 2017; Poorter et al. 2016). The rates of carbon removal are not just age-related but also controlled by many biophysical factors and human activities (Bernal et al. 2018) and in ecosystems with uneven-aged, multispecies forests the relationships between carbon stocks and sinks are more difficult and expensive to quantify.

Whether or not forest harvest and use of biomass is contributing to net reductions of atmospheric carbon depends on carbon losses during and following harvest, rates of forest regrowth, and the use of the harvested wood and the carbon retention in long-lived or short-lived products as well as the emission reductions achieved through the substitution of emissions-intensive products with wood products (Lemprière et al. 2013; Lundmark et al. 2014; Xu et al. 2018b; Olguin et al. 2018; Dugan et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2018b; Pingoud et al. 2018; Seidl et al. 2007). Studies that ignore changes in forest carbon stocks (such as some life cycle analyses that assume no impacts of harvest on forest carbon stocks), ignore changes in wood product pools (Mackey et al. 2013) or assume long-term steady state (Pingoud et al. 2018), or ignore changes in emissions from substitution benefits (Mackey et al. 2013; Lewis et al. 2019) will arrive at diverging conclusions about the benefits of sustainable forest management. Moreover, assessments of climate benefits of any mitigation action must also consider the time dynamics of atmospheric impacts as some actions will have immediate benefits (e.g. avoided deforestation) while others may not achieve net atmospheric benefits for decades or centuries. For example, the climate benefits of woody biomass use for bioenergy depend on several factors such as the source and alternate fate of the biomass, the energy type it substitutes and the rates of regrowth of the harvested forest (Laganière et al. 2017; Ter-Mikaelian et al. 2014; Smyth et al. 2017). Conversion of primary forests in regions of very low stand replacing disturbances to short-rotation plantations where the harvested wood is used for short-lived products with low displacement factors will increase emissions. In general, greater mitigation benefits are achieved if harvested wood products are used for products with long carbon retention time and high displacement factors.

With increasing forest age, carbon sinks in forests will diminish until harvest or natural disturbances such as wildfire remove biomass carbon or release it to the atmosphere (Seidl et al. 2017). While individual trees can accumulate carbon for centuries (Köhl et al. 2017), stand level carbon accumulation rates depend on both tree growth and tree mortality rates (Hember et al. 2016; Lewis et al. 2004). Sustainable forest management, including harvest and forest regeneration, can help maintain active carbon sinks by maintaining a forest age-class distribution that includes a share of young, actively growing stands (Volkova et al. 2018; Nabuurs et al. 2017). The use of the harvested carbon in either long-lived wood products (e.g. for construction), short-lived wood products (e.g., pulp and paper), or biofuels affects the net carbon balance of the forest sector (Lemprière et al. 2013; Matthews et al. 2018). The use of these wood products can further contribute to GHG emission reduction goals by avoiding the emissions from the products with higher embodied emissions that have been displaced (Nabuurs et al. 2007; Lemprière et al. 2013). In 2007 the IPCC concluded that "[i]n the long term, a sustainable forest management strategy aimed at maintaining or increasing forest carbon stocks, while producing an annual sustained yield of timber, fibre or energy from the forest, will generate the largest sustained mitigation benefit" (Nabuurs et al. 2007).-The apparent trade-offs between maximising forest C stocks and maximising ecosystem C sinks are at the origin of ongoing debates about optimum management strategies to achieve negative emissions (Keith et al. 2014; Kurz et al. 2016; Lundmark et al. 2014). Sustainable forest management, including the intensification of carbon-focussed management strategies, can make long-term contributions towards negative emissions if the sustainability of management is assured through appropriate governance, monitoring and enforcement. As specified in the definition of sustainable forest management, other criteria such as biodiversity must also be considered when assessing mitigation outcomes (Lecina-Diaz et al. 2018). Moreover, the impacts of changes in management on albedo and other non-GHG factors also need to be considered (Luyssaert et al. 2018) (See also Chapter 2). The contribution of sustainable forest management for negative emissions is strongly affected by the use of the wood products derived from forest harvest and the time horizon over which the carbon balance is assessed. Sustainable forest management needs to anticipate the impacts of climate change on future tree growth, mortality and disturbances when designing climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies (Valade et al. 2017; Seidl et al. 2017).

4.9.5 Policy responses to land degradation

The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit, recognised land degradation as a major challenge to sustainable development, and led to the establishment of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which addressed specifically land degradation in the drylands. The UNCCD emphasizes sustainable land use to link poverty reduction on one hand and environmental protection on the other. The two other "Rio Conventions" emerging from the UNCED, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), focus on climate change and biodiversity, respectively. The land has been recognized as an aspect of common interest to the three conventions, and sustainable land management (SLM) is proposed as a unifying theme for current global efforts on combating land degradation, climate change and loss of biodiversity, as well as facilitating land-based adaptation to climate change and sustainable development.

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) funds developing countries to undertake activities that meet the goals of the conventions and deliver global environmental benefits. Since 2002, the GEF has invested in projects that support sustainable land management through its Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy, to address land degradation within and beyond the drylands.

Under the UNFCCC, parties have devised National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) that identify medium- and long-term adaptation needs. Parties have also developed their climate change mitigation plans, presented as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). These programs have the potential of assisting the promotion of SLM. It is realised that the root causes of land degradation and successful adaptation will not be realised until holistic solutions to land management are explored. SLM can help address root causes of low productivity, land degradation, loss of income generating capacity as well as contribute to the amelioration of the adverse effects of climate change.

The "4 per 1000" (4p1000) initiative (Soussana et al. 2019) launched by France during the UNFCCC COP21 in 2015 aims at capturing CO_2 from the atmosphere through changes to agricultural and forestry practices at a rate that would increase the carbon content of soils by 0.4% per year (Rumpel et al. 2018). If global soil carbon content increases at this rate in the top 30-40 cm, the annual increase in atmospheric CO_2 would be stopped (Dignac et al. 2017). This is an illustration of how extremely important soils are for addressing climate change. The initiative is based on eight steps: stop carbon loss (priority #1 is peat soils); promote carbon uptake; monitor, report, and verify impacts; deploy technology for tracking soil carbon; test strategies for implementation and upscaling; involve communities; coordinate policies; provide support (Rumpel et al. 2018). Questions remain however, to what extent the 4p1000 is achievable as a universal goal (van Groenigen et al. 2017; Poulton et al. 2018; Schlesinger and Amundson 2018).

Land degradation neutrality (LDN) was introduced by the UNCCD at Rio +20, and adopted at UNCCD COP12 (UNCCD 2016a). LDN is defined as "a state whereby the amount and quality of land resources necessary to support ecosystem functions and services and enhance food security remain stable or increase within specified temporal and spatial scales and ecosystems". Pursuit of LDN requires effort to avoid further net loss of the land-based natural capital relative to a reference state, or baseline. LDN encourages a dual-pronged effort involving sustainable land management to reduce the risk of land degradation, combined with efforts in land restoration and rehabilitation, to maintain or enhance land-based natural capital, and its associated ecosystem services (Orr et al., 2017; Cowie et al. 2018;). Planning for LDN involves projecting the expected cumulative impacts of land use and land management decisions, then counterbalancing anticipated losses with measures to achieve equivalent gains, within individual land types (where land type is defined by land potential). Under LDN framework developed by UNCCD, three primary indicators are used to assess whether LDN is achieved by 2030: land cover change, net primary productivity and soil organic carbon (Cowie et al. 2018; Sims et al., 2019. Achieving LDN therefore requires integrated landscape management that seeks to optimize land use to meet multiple objectives (ecosystem health, food security, human well-being) (Cohen-Shacham, E., Walters, G., Janzen, C. and Maginnis 2016). The response hierarchy of Avoid > Reduce > Reverse land degradation articulates the priorities in planning LDN interventions. LDN provides the impetus for widespread adoption of SLM and efforts to restore or rehabilitate land. Through its focus LDN ultimately provides tremendous potential for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change by halting and reversing land degradation and transforming land from a carbon source to a sink. There are strong synergies between the concept of LDN and the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of many countries with linkages to national climate plans. LDN is also closely related to many Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in the areas of poverty, food security, environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources (UNCCD 2016b). The GEF is supporting countries to set LDN targets and implement their LDN plans through its land degradation focal area, which encourages application of integrated landscape approach to managing land degradation (GEF 2018).

The 2030 agenda for sustainable development, adopted by the United Nations in 2015, comprises 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Goal 15 is of direct relevance to land degradation with the objective to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss. Target 15.3 specifically addresses land degradation neutrality. Other goals that are relevant for land degradation include goal 2 (Zero hunger), goal 3 (Good health and well-being), goal 7 (Affordable and clean energy), goal 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), and goal 12 (Responsible production and consumption). Sustainable management of land resources underpins the SDGs related to hunger, climate change and environment. Further goals of a cross-cutting nature include 1 (No poverty), 6 (Clean water and sanitation) and 13 (Climate action). It remains to be seen how these interconnections are dealt with in practice.

With a focus on biodiversity, IPBES published a comprehensive assessment of land degradation in 2018 (Montanarella et al. 2018). The IPBES report, together with this report focusing on climate change, may contribute to create synergy between the two main global challenges for addressing land degradation in order to help achieving the goals of SDG 15 (Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss).

Market based mechanisms like the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the UNFCCC and the voluntary carbon market provide incentives to enhance carbon sinks on the land through afforestation and reforestation. Implications for local land use and food security have been raised as a concern and need to be assessed (Edstedt and Carton 2018b; Olsson et al. 2014b). Many projects aimed at reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradations (not to be confused with the national REDD+ programs in accordance with the UNFCCC Warsaw Framework) are being planned and implemented primarily targeting countries with high forest cover and high deforestation rates. Some parameters of incentivising emissions reduction, quality of forest governance, conservation priorities, local rights and tenure frameworks, and sub-national project potential are being looked into with often very mixed results (Newton et al. 2016; Gebara and Agrawal 2017).

Besides international public initiatives, some actors in the private sector are increasingly aware of the negative environmental impacts of some global value chains producing food, fibre, and energy products (Lambin et al. 2018; van der Ven and Cashore 2018; van der Ven et al. 2018; Lyons-White and Knight 2018). While improvement is under way in many supply chains, measures implemented so far are often insufficient to be effective in reducing or stopping deforestation and forest degradation (Lambin et al.

2018). The GEF is investing in actions to reduce deforestation in commodity supply chains through its Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (GEF 2018).

4.9.5.1 Limits to adaptation

SLM can be deployed as a powerful adaptation strategy in most instances of climate change impacts on natural and social systems, yet there are limits to adaptation (Klein, R.J.T., G.F. Midgley, B.L. Preston, M. Alam, F.G.H. Berkhout, K. Dow 2014; Dow et al. 2013a). Such limits are dynamic and interact with social and institutional conditions (Barnett et al. 2015; Filho and Nalau 2018). Exceeding adaptation limits will trigger escalating losses or require undesirable transformational change, such as forced migration. The rate of change in relation to the rate of possible adaptation is crucial (Dow et al. 2013b). How limits to adaptation are defined and how they can be measured is contextual and contested. Limits must be assessed in relation to the ultimate goals of adaptation, which is subject to diverse and differential values (Dow et al. 2013b; Adger et al. 2009). A particularly sensitive issue is whether migration is accepted as adaptation or not (Black et al. 2011; Tacoli 2009; Bardsley and Hugo 2010). If migration were understood and accepted as a form of successful adaptation, it would change the limits to adaptation by reducing or even avoiding future humanitarian crises caused by climate extremes (Adger et al. 2009; Upadhyay et al. 2017; Nalau et al. 2018).

In the context of land degradation potential limits to adaptation exist if land degradation becomes so severe and irreversible that livelihoods cannot be maintained, and if migration is either not acceptable or possible. Examples are coastal erosion where land disappears (Gharbaoui and Blocher 2016; Luetz 2018), collapsing livelihoods due to thawing of permafrost (Landauer and Juhola 2019), and extreme forms of soil erosion (e.g., landslides (Van der Geest and Schindler 2016) and gully erosion leading to badlands (Poesen et al. 2003)).

4.9.6 Resilience and thresholds

Resilience refers to the capacity of interconnected social, economic and ecological systems, such as farming systems, to absorb disturbance (e.g., drought, conflict, market collapse), and respond or reorganise, to maintain their essential function, identity and structure. Resilience can be described as "coping capacity". The disturbance may be a shock - sudden events such as a flood or disease epidemic – or it may be a trend that develops slowly, like a drought or market shift. The shocks and trends anticipated to occur due to climate change are expected to exacerbate risk of land degradation. Therefore, assessing and enhancing resilience to climate change is a critical component of designing sustainable land management strategies.

Resilience as an analytical lens is particularly strong in ecology and related research on natural resource management (Folke et al. 2010; Quinlan et al. 2016) while in the social sciences the relevance of resilience for studying social and ecological interactions is contested (Cote and Nightingale 2012; Olsson et al. 2015; Cretney 2014; Béné et al. 2012; Joseph 2013). In the case of adaptation to climate change (and particularly regarding limits to adaptation), a crucial ambiguity of resilience is the question whether resilience is a normative concept (i.e. resilience is good or bad) or is a descriptive characteristic of a system (i.e. neither good nor bad). Previous IPCC reports have defined resilience as a normative (positive) attribute (see AR5 Glossary), while the wider scientific literature is divided on this (Weichselgartner and Kelman 2015; Strunz 2012; Brown 2014; Grimm and Calabrese 2011; Thorén and Olsson 2018). For example, is outmigration from a disaster prone area considered a successful adaptation (high resilience) or a collapse of the livelihood system (lack of resilience) (Thorén and Olsson 2018)? In this report resilience is considered a positive attribute when it maintains capacity for adaptation, learning and/or transformation.

Furthermore, resilience and the related terms adaptation and transformation are defined and used differently by different communities (Quinlan et al. 2016). The relationship and hierarchy of resilience with respect to vulnerability and adaptive capacity are also debated, with different perspectives between the disaster management, and global change communities, (e.g., Cutter et al. 2008). Nevertheless, these differences in usage need not inhibit the application of "resilience thinking" in managing land degradation; researchers using these terms, despite variation in definitions, apply the same fundamental concepts to inform management of human-environment systems, to maintain or improve the resource base, and sustain livelihoods.

Applying resilience concepts involves viewing the land as a component of an interlinked social-ecological system; identifying key relationships that determine system function and vulnerabilities of the system; identifying thresholds or tipping points beyond which the system transitions to an undesirable state; and devising management strategies to steer away from thresholds of potential concern, thus facilitating healthy systems and sustainable production (Walker et al., 2009).

A threshold is a non-linearity between a controlling variable and system function, such that a small change in the variable causes the system to shift to an alternative state. Bestelmeyer et al. (2015) and Prince et al. (2018) illustrate this concept in the context of land degradation. Studies have identified various biophysical and socio-economic thresholds in different land-use systems. For example, 50% ground cover (living and dead plant material and biological crusts) is a recognised threshold for dryland grazing systems (e.g., (Tighe et al. 2012); below this threshold infiltration rate declines, risk of erosion causing loss of topsoil increases, a switch from perennial to annual grass species occurs and there is a consequential sharp decline in productivity. This shift to a lower-productivity state cannot be reversed without significant human intervention. Similarly, the combined pressure of water limitations and frequent fire can lead to transition from closed forest to savannah or grassland: if fire is too frequent trees do not reach reproductive maturity and post-fire regeneration will fail; likewise, reduced rainfall / increased drought prevents successful forest regeneration (Reyer et al. 2015; Thompson et al. 2009) see also Cross-chapter box 3 on Fire and climate change, Chapter 2.

In managing land degradation, it is important to assess the resilience of the existing system, and the proposed management interventions. If the existing system is in an undesirable state or considered unviable under expected climate trends, it may be desirable to promote adaptation or even transformation to a different system that is more resilient to future changes. For example, in an irrigation district where water shortages are predicted, measures could be implemented to improve water use efficiency, for example by establishing drip irrigation systems for water delivery, although transformation to pastoralism or mixed dryland cropping/livestock production may be more sustainable in the longer term, at least for part of the area. Application of sustainable land management practices, especially those focussed on ecological functions (e.g., agroecology, ecosystem-based approaches, regenerative agriculture, organic farming), can be effective in building resilience of agro-ecosystems (Henry et al. 2018). Similarly, the resilience of managed forests can be enhanced by sustainable forest management that protects or enhances biodiversity, including assisted migration of tree species within their current range limit (Winder et al. 2011; Pedlar et al. 2012) or increasing species diversity in plantation forests (Felton et al. 2010; Liu et al. 2018a). The essential features of a resilience approach to management of land degradation under climate change are described by (O'Connell et al. 2016; Simonsen et al. 2014).

Consideration of resilience can enhance effectiveness of interventions to reduce or reverse land degradation (*medium agreement, limited evidence*). This approach will increase the likelihood that SLM/SFM and land restoration/rehabilitation interventions achieve long-term environmental and social benefits. Thus, consideration of resilience concepts can enhance the capacity of land systems to cope with climate change and resist land degradation, and assist land use systems to adapt to climate change.

4.9.7 Barriers to implementation of sustainable land management

There is a growing recognition that addressing barriers and designing solutions to complex environmental problems, such as land degradation, requires awareness of the larger system into which the problems and solutions are embedded (Laniak et al. 2013). An ecosystem approach to SLM based on understanding of the processes of land degradation has been recommended that can separate multiple drivers, pressures and impacts (Kassam et al. 2013), but large uncertainty in model projections of future climate, and associated ecosystem processes (IPCC 2013a) pose additional challenges to the implementation of SLM. As discussed earlier in this chapter, many SLM practices, including both technologies and approaches, are available that can increase yields and contribute to closing the yield gap between actual and potential crop or pasture yield, while also enhancing resilience to climate change (Yengoh and Ardö 2014; WOCAT). However, there are often systemic barriers to adoption and scaling up of SLM practices, especially in developing countries.

Uitto (2016) identified areas that the GEF, the financial mechanism of the UNCCD, UNFCCC and other multilateral environmental agreements, can address to solve global environmental problems. This includes removal of barriers related to knowledge and information; strategies for implementation of technologies and approaches; and institutional capacity. Strengthening these areas would drive transformational change leading to behavioral change and broader adoption of sustainable environmental practices. Detailed analysis of barriers as well as strategies, methods and approaches to scale up SLM have been undertaken for GEF programs in Africa, China and globally (Tengberg and Valencia 2018; Liniger et al. 2011; Tengberg et al. 2016). A number of interconnected barriers and bottlenecks to the scaling up of SLM have been identified in this context and are related to:

- Limited access to knowledge and information, including new SLM technologies and problem-solving capacities;
- Weak enabling environment, including the policy, institutional and legal framework for SLM, and land tenure and property rights;
- Inadequate learning and adaptive knowledge management in the project cycle, including monitoring and evaluation of impacts; and
- Limited access to finance for scaling up, including public and private funding, innovative business models for SLM technologies and financial mechanisms and incentives, such as payments for ecosystem services (PES), insurance and micro-credit schemes (see also Shames et al 2014).

Adoption of innovations and new technologies are increasingly analysed using the transition theory framework (Geels 2002), the starting point being the recognition that many global environmental problems cannot be solved by technological change alone but require more far-reaching change of social-ecological systems. Using transition theory makes it possible to analyse how adoption and implementation follow the four stages of sociotechnical transitions, from predevelopment of technologies and approaches at the niche level, take-off and acceleration, to regime shift and stabilisation at the landscape level. According to a recent review of sustainability transitions in developing countries (Wieczorek 2018), three internal niche processes are important, including the formation of networks that support and nurture innovation, the learning process and the articulation of expectations to guide the learning process. While technologies are important, institutional and political aspects form the major barriers to transition and upscaling. In developing and transition economies, informal institutions play a pivotal role and transnational linkages are also important, such as global value chains. In these countries, it is therefore more difficult to establish fully coherent regimes or groups of individuals who share expectations, beliefs or behavior, as there is a high level of uncertainty about rules and social networks or dominance of informal institutions, which creates barriers to change. This uncertainty is further exacerbated by climate change. Landscape forces comprise a set of slow changing factors, such as broad cultural and normative values, long-term economic effects such as urbanisation, and shocks such as war and crises that can lead to change.

A study on SLM in the Kenyan highlands using transition theory concluded that barriers to adoption of SLM included high poverty levels, a low input-low output farming system with limited potential to generate income, diminishing land sizes and low involvement of the youth in farming activities.

Coupled with a poor coordination of government policies for agriculture and forestry, these barriers created negative feedbacks in the SLM transition process. Other factors to consider include gender issues and lack of secure land tenure. Scaling up of SLM technologies would require collaboration of diverse stakeholders across multiple scales, a more supportive policy environment and substantial resource mobilisation (Mutoko et al. 2014). Tengberg and Valencia (2018) analysed the findings from a review of the GEF integrated natural resources management portfolio of projects using the transition theory framework (Figure 4.7). They concluded that to remove barriers to SLM, an agricultural innovations systems approach that supports co-production of knowledge with multiple stakeholders, institutional innovations, a focus on value chains and strengthening of social capital to facilitate shared learning and collaboration could accelerate the scaling up of sustainable technologies and practices from the niche to the landscape level. Policy integration and establishment of financial mechanisms and incentives could contribute to overcoming barriers to a regime shift. The new SLM regime could in turn be stabilised and sustained at the landscape level by multi-stakeholder knowledge platforms and strategic partnerships. However, transitions to more sustainable regimes and practices are often challenged by lock-in mechanisms in the current system (Lawhon and Murphy 2012), such as economies of scale, investments already made in equipment, infrastructure and competencies, lobbying, shared beliefs, and practices, which could hamper wider adoption of SLM.



Figure 4.7 The transition from SLM niche adoption to regime shift and landscape development (figure draws inspiration from (Geels 2002)). Adapted from (Tengberg and Valencia 2018)

Adaptive, multi-level and participatory governance of social-ecological systems is considered important for regime shifts and transitions to take place (Wieczorek 2018) and essential to secure the capacity of environmental assets to support societal development over longer time periods (Folke et al. 2005). There is also recognition that effective environmental policies and programs need to be informed by a comprehensive understanding of the biophysical, social, and economic components and processes of a system, their complex interactions, and how they respond to different changes (Kelly (Letcher) et al. 2013). But blueprint policies will not work due to the wide diversity of rules and informal institutions used across sectors and regions of the world, especially in traditional societies (Ostrom 2009).

The most effective way of removing barriers to funding of SLM has been mainstreaming of SLM objectives and priorities into relevant policy and development frameworks and combining SLM best practices with economic incentives for land users. As the short-term costs for establishing and maintaining SLM measures are generally high and constitute a barrier to adoption, land users may need to be compensated for generation of longer-term public goods, such as ecosystem services. Cost-benefit analyses can be conducted on SLM interventions to facilitate such compensations (Liniger et al. 2011; Nkonya et al. 2016; Tengberg et al. 2016). The landscape approach is a means to reconcile competing demands on the land and remove barriers to implementation of SLM (e.g. Sayer et al. 2013; Bürgi et al. 2017). It involves an increased focus on participatory governance, development of new SLM business models, and innovative funding schemes including insurance (Shames et al. 2014). The Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Fund takes a landscape approach and raises private finance for SLM and promotes market-based instruments, such as Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES), certification and carbon trading, that can support scaling up of SLM to improve local livelihoods, sequester carbon and enhance the resilience to climate change.

4.10 Case-studies

Climate change impacts on land degradation can be avoided, reduced or even reversed, but need to be addressed in a context sensitive manner. Many of the responses described in this section can also provide synergies of adaptation and mitigation. In this section we provide more in-depth analysis of a number of salient aspects of how land degradation and climate change interact. Table 4.3 is a synthesis of how of these case studies relate to climate change and other broader issues in terms of co-benefits.

Table 4.2 Synthesis of how the case studies interact with climate change and a broader set of co-benefits

Case studies (4.10)	Mitigation benefits and potential	Adaptation benefits	Co-benefits	Legend	
Urban green infrastructure (4.10.1) An increasing majority of the world population live in cities and land degradation is an urgent matter for urban areas	↓		human health, recreation	↓	carbon sink
Perennial grains (4.10.2) After 40 years of breeding, perennial grains now seem to have the potential of reducing climate impacts of agriculture while increasing its overall sustainability	↓ ↑		reduced use of herbicides, reduced soil erosion and nutrient leakage	↑	reduced emission
Reforestation (4.10.3) Two cases of successful reforestation serve as illustrations of the potential of sustained efforts into reforestation	↓		economic return from sustainable forestry, reduced flood risk downstream		
Managment of peat soils (4.10.4) Degradation of peat soils in tropical and arctic regions is a major source of greenhouse gases, hence an urgent mitigation option	↑		improved air quality in tropical regions		reduced flood risk
Biochar (4.10.5) Biochar is a land managent technique of high potential, but controversial	↓↑		improved soil fertility		reduced heat stress
Protection against hurricane damages (4.10.6) More severe tropical cyclones increase the risk of land degradation in some areas, hence the need for increased adaptation			reduced losses (human lives, livelihoods, and assets)		drought resistance
Responses to salt water intrusion (4.10.7) The combined effect of climate induced sealevel rise and land use change in coastal regions increases the risk of saltwater intrusion in many coastal regions			improved food and water security,		storm protection
Avoiding coastal maladaptation (4.10.8) Low lying coastal areas are in urgent need of adaptation, but examples have resulted in maladaptation			reduced losses (human lives, livelihoods, and assets)		protection against sea level rise

4.10.1 Urban green infrastructure

Over half the world's population now lives in towns and cities, a proportion that is predicted to increase to ~70% by the middle of the century (United Nations 2015). Rapid urbanisation is a severe threat to land and the provision of ecosystem services (Seto et al. 2012). However, as cities expand, the avoidance of land degradation, or the maintenance/enhancement of ecosystem services is rarely considered in planning processes. Instead economic development and the need for space for construction is prioritised, which can result in substantial pollution of air and water sources, the degradation of existing agricultural areas and indigenous, natural or semi-natural ecosystems both within and outside of urban areas. For instance, urban areas are characterised by extensive impervious surfaces. Degraded, sealed soils beneath these surfaces do not provide the same quality of water retention as intact soils. Urban landscapes comprising 50-90% impervious surfaces can therefore result in 40-83% of rainfall becoming surface water runoff (Pataki et al. 2011). With rainfall intensity predicted to increase in many parts of the world under climate change (Royal Society 2016), increased water runoff is going to get worse. Urbanisation, land degradation and climate change are therefore strongly interlinked, suggesting the need for common solutions (Reed and Stringer 2016b).

There is now a large body of research and application demonstrating the importance of retaining urban green infrastructure (UGI) for the delivery of multiple ecosystem services (DG Environment News Alert Service, 2012; Wentworth, 2017) as an important tool to mitigate and adapt to climate change. UGI can be defined as all green elements within a city, including but not limited to retained indigenous ecosystems, parks, public greenspaces, green corridors, street trees, urban forests, urban agriculture, green roofs/walls and private domestic gardens (Tzoulas et al. 2007). The definition is usually extended to include 'blue' infrastructure, such as rivers, lakes, bioswales and other water drainage features. The related concept of Nature Based Solutions (defined as: living solutions inspired by, continuously supported by and using nature, which are designed to address various societal challenges in a resource-efficient and adaptable manner and to provide simultaneously economic, social, and environmental benefits) has gained considerable traction within the European Commission as one approach to mainstreaming the importance of UGI (Maes and Jacobs 2017; European Union 2015).

Through retaining existing vegetation and ecosystems, revegetating previous developed land or integrating vegetation into buildings in the form of green walls and roofs, UGI can play a direct role in mitigating climate change through carbon sequestration. However, compared to overall carbon emissions from cities, effects will be small. Given that UGI necessarily involves the retention and management of non-sealed surfaces, co-benefits for land degradation (e.g. soil compaction avoidance, reduced water run-off, carbon storage and vegetation productivity; (Davies et al. 2011; Edmondson et al. 2011, 2014; Yao et al. 2015) will also be apparent. Although not currently a priority, its role in mitigating land degradation could be substantial. For instance, appropriately managed innovative urban agricultural production systems, such as vertical farms, could have the potential to both meet some of the food needs of cities and reduce the production (and therefore degradation) pressure on agricultural land in rural areas, although thus far this is unproven (for a recent review (Wilhelm and Smith 2018)).

The importance of UGI as part of a climate change adaptation approach has received greater attention and application (Gill et al. 2007; Fryd et al. 2011; Demuzere et al. 2014; Sussams et al. 2015). The EU's Adapting to Climate Change White Paper emphasises the "crucial role in adaptation in providing essential resources for social and economic purposes under extreme climate conditions" (CEC, 2009, p. 9). Increasing vegetation cover, planting street trees and maintaining/expanding public parks reduces temperatures (Cavan et al. 2014; Di Leo et al. 2016; Feyisa et al. 2014; Tonosaki K, Kawai S 2014; Zölch et al. 2016). Further, the appropriate design and spatial distribution of greenspaces within cities can help to alter urban climates to improve human health and comfort (e.g. (Brown and Nicholls 2015; Klemm et al. 2015)). The use of green walls and roofs can also reduce energy use in buildings (e.g. (Coma et al. 2017)). Similarly, natural flood management and ecosystem based approaches of providing space for water, renaturalising rivers and reducing surface run-off through the presence of permeable surfaces and vegetated features (including walls and roofs) can manage flood risks, impacts and vulnerability (e.g. (Gill et al. 2007; Munang et al. 2013)). Access to UGI in times of environmental stresses and shock can provide safety nets for people and can, therefore, be an important adaptation mechanism, both to climate change (Potschin et al. 2016) and land degradation.

Most examples of UGI implementation as a climate change adaptation strategy have centered on its role in water management for flood risk reduction. The importance for land degradation is either not stated, or not prioritized. In Beira, Mozambique, the government is using UGI to mitigate against increased flood risks predicted to occur under climate change and urbanisation, which will be done by improving the natural water capacity of the Chiveve River. As part of the UGI approach, mangrove habitats have been restored and future phases include developing new multi-functional urban green spaces along the river (World Bank 2016). The retention of green spaces within the city will have the added benefit of halting further degradation in those areas. Elsewhere, planning mechanisms promote the retention and expansion of green areas within cities to ensure ecosystem service delivery, which directly halts land degradation, but are largely viewed and justified in the context of climate change adaptation and mitigation. For instance, the Landscape Programme in Berlin includes five plans, one of which covers adapting to climate change through the recognition of the role of UGI (Green Surge 2016). Major climate related challenges facing Durban, South Africa, include sea level rise, urban heat island, water runoff and conservation (Roberts and O'Donoghue 2013). Now considered a global leader in climate adaptation planning (Roberts 2010), Durban's Climate Change Adaptation plan includes the retention and maintenance of natural ecosystems in particular those which are important for mitigating flooding, coastal erosion, water pollution, wetland siltation and climate change (eThekwini Municipal Council 2014).

4.10.2 Perennial Grains and Soil Organic Carbon

The severe ecological perturbation that is inherent in the conversion of native perennial vegetation to annual crops, and the subsequent high frequency of perturbation required to maintain annual crops, results in at least four forms of soil degradation that will be exacerbated by the effects of climate change (Crews et al. 2016). First, soil erosion is a very serious consequence of annual cropping with median losses exceeding rates of formation by 1-2 orders of magnitude in conventionally plowed agroecosystems, and while erosion is reduced with conservation tillage, median losses still exceed formation by several fold (Montgomery 2007). More severe storm intensity associated with climate change is expected to cause even greater losses to wind and water erosion (Nearing et al. 2004b). Secondly, the periods of time in which live roots are reduced or altogether absent from soils in annual cropping systems allow for substantial losses of nitrogen from fertilised croplands, averaging 50% globally (Ladha et al. 2005). This low retention of nitrogen is also expected to worsen with more intense weather events (Bowles et al. 2018). A third impact of annual cropping is the degradation of soil structure caused by tillage, which can reduce infiltration of precipitation, and increase surface runoff. It is predicted that the percentage of precipitation that infiltrates into agricultural soils will decrease further under climate change scenarios (Basche and DeLonge 2017; Wuest et al. 2006). The fourth form of soil degradation that results from annual cropping is the reduction of soil organic matter (SOM), a topic of particular relevance to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Undegraded cropland soils can theoretically hold far more SOM (which is ~58% carbon) than they currently do (Soussana et al. 2006). We know this deficiency because, with few exceptions, comparisons between cropland soils and those of proximate mature native ecosystems commonly show a 40-75% decline in soil carbon attributable to agricultural practices. What happens when native ecosystems are converted to agriculture that induces such significant losses of SOM? Wind and water erosion commonly results in preferential removal of light organic matter fractions that can accumulate on or near the soil surface (Lal 2003). In addition to the effects of erosion, the fundamental practices of growing annual food and fiber crops alters both inputs and outputs of organic matter from most agroecosystems resulting in net reductions in soil carbon equilibria (Soussana et al. 2006; McLauchlan 2006; Crews et al. 2016). Native vegetation of almost all terrestrial ecosystems is dominated by perennial plants, and the belowground carbon allocation of these perennials is a key variable in determining formation rates of stable soil organic carbon (SOC) (Jastrow et al. 2007; Schmidt et al. 2011). When perennial vegetation is replaced by annual crops, inputs of root-associated carbon (roots, exudates, mycorrhizae) decline substantially. For example, perennial grassland species allocate around 67% of productivity to roots, whereas annual crops allocate between 13-30% (Saugier 2001; Johnson et al. 2006).

At the same time inputs of SOC are reduced in annual cropping systems, losses are increased because of tillage, compared to native perennial vegetation. Tillage breaks apart soil aggregates, which, among other functions, are thought to inhibit soil bacteria, fungi and other microbes from consuming and decomposing soil organic matter (Grandy and Neff 2008). Aggregates reduce microbial access to organic matter by restricting physical access to mineral-stabilized organic compounds as well as reducing oxygen availability (Cotrufo et al. 2015; Lehmann and Kleber 2015). When soil aggregates are broken open with tillage in the conversion of native ecosystems to agriculture, microbial consumption of SOC and subsequent respiration of CO_2 increase dramatically, reducing soil carbon stocks (Grandy and Robertson 2006; Grandy and Neff 2008).

Many management approaches are being evaluated to reduce soil degradation in general, especially by increasing mineral-protected forms of SOC in the world's croplands (Paustian et al. 2016). The menu of approaches being investigated focus either on increasing belowground carbon inputs, usually through increases in total crop productivity, or by decreasing microbial activity, usually through reduced soil disturbance (Crews and Rumsey 2017). However, the basic biogeochemistry of terrestrial ecosystems managed for production of annual crops presents serious challenges to achieving the standing stocks of SOC accumulated by native ecosystems that preceded agriculture. A novel new approach that is just starting to receive significant attention is the development of perennial cereal, legume and oilseed crops (Glover et al. 2010; Baker 2017).

There are two basic strategies that plant breeders and geneticists are using to develop new perennial grain crop species. The first involves making wide hybrid crosses between existing elite lines of annual crops, such as wheat, sorghum and rice, with related wild perennial species in order to introgress perennialism into the genome of the annual (Cox et al. 2018; Huang et al. 2018; Hayes et al. 2018). The other approach is *de novo* domestication of wild perennial species that have crop-like traits of interest (DeHaan et al. 2016; DeHaan and Van Tassel 2014). New perennial crop species undergoing *de novo* domestication include intermediate wheatgrass, a relative of wheat that produces grain also known as Kernza (DeHaan et al. 2018; Cattani and Asselin 2018) and *Silphium integrifolium*, an oilseed crop in the sunflower family (Van Tassel et al. 2017). Other perennial grain crops receiving attention include pigeon pea, barley, buckwheat and maize (Batello et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2018c) and a number of legume species (Schlautman et al. 2018). In most cases, the seed yields of perennial grain crops under development are well below those of elite modern grain varieties. In the time that it takes intensive breeding efforts to close the yield and other trait gaps between annual and perennial grains, perennial proto-crops may be used for purposes other than grain, including forage production (Ryan et al. 2018). Perennial rice stands out as a high-yielding exception, as its yields matched those of elite local varieties in the Yunnan Province for six growing seasons over three years (Huang et al. 2018).

In a perennial agroecosystem, the biogeochemical controls on SOC accumulation shift dramatically, and begin to resemble the controls that govern native ecosystems (Crews et al. 2016). When erosion is reduced or halted, and crop allocation to roots increases by 100-200%, and when soil aggregates are not disturbed thus reducing microbial respiration, SOC levels are expected to increase (Crews and Rumsey 2017). Deep roots growing year-round are also effective at increasing nitrogen retention (Culman et al.

2013; Jungers et al. 2019). Substantial increases in SOC have been measured where croplands that had historically been planted to annual grains were converted to perennial grasses, such as in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) of the US, or in plantings of second generation perennial biofuel crops. Two studies have assessed carbon accumulation in soils when croplands were converted to the perennial grain Kernza. In one, researchers found no differences in soil labile (permanganate-oxidizable) C after 4 years of cropping to perennial Kernza versus annual wheat in a sandy textured soil. Given that coarse textured soils do not offer the same physicochemical protection against microbial attack as many finer textured soils, these results are not surprising, but these results do underscore how variable rates of carbon accumulation can be (Jastrow et al. 2007). In the second study, researchers assessed the carbon balance of a Kernza field in Kansas USA over 4.5 years using eddy covariance observations (de Oliveira et al. 2018). They found the net C accumulation rate of about 1500 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} in the first year of the study corresponding to the biomass of Kernza increasing, to about 300 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1}in the final year where CO_2 respiration losses from the decomposition of roots and soil organic matter approached new carbon inputs from photosynthesis. Based on measurements of soil carbon accumulation in restored grasslands in this part of US, the net carbon accumulation in stable organic matter under a perennial grain crop might be expected to sequester 30-50 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1}(Post and Kwon 2000) until a new equilibrium is reached. Sugar cane, a highly productive perennial, has been shown to accumulate a mean of 187 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1}in Brazil (La Scala Júnior et al. 2012).

Reduced soil erosion, increased nitrogen retention, greater water uptake efficiency and enhanced carbon sequestration represent improved ecosystem functions made possible in part by deep and extensive root systems of perennial crops (Figure 4.8).

Figure 4.8 Comparison of root systems between the newly domesticated intermediate wheatgrass (left) and annual wheat (right). Photo and copyright: Jim Richardson

When compared to annual grains like wheat, single species stands of deep rooted perennial grains such as Kernza are expected to reduce soil erosion, increase nitrogen retention, achieve greater water uptake efficiency and enhance carbon sequestration (Crews et al. 2018) (Figure 4.8). An even higher degree of ecosystem services can at least theoretically be achieved by strategically combining different functional groups of crops such as a cereal and a nitrogen-fixing legume (Soussana and Lemaire 2014). Not only is there evidence from plant diversity experiments that communities with higher species richness sustain higher concentrations of soil organic carbon (Hungate et al. 2017; Sprunger and Robertson 2018; Chen et al. 2018b; Yang et al. 2019), but other valuable ecosystem services such as pest suppression, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and greater nutrient retention may be enhanced (Schnitzer et al. 2011; Culman et al. 2013).

Similar to perennial forage crops such as alfalfa, perennial grain crops are expected to have a definite productive life span, probably in the range of 3-10 years. A key area of research on perennial grains cropping systems is to minimise losses of soil organic carbon during conversion of one stand of perennial grains to another. Recent work demonstrates that no-till conversion of a mature perennial grassland to another perennial crop will experience several years of high net CO_2 emissions as decomposition of copious crop residues exceeds ecosystem uptake of carbon by the new crop (Abraha et al. 2018). Most if not all of this lost carbon will be recaptured in the replacement crop. It is not known whether mineral-stabilised carbon that is protected in soil aggregates is vulnerable to loss in perennial crop succession.

Perennial grains hold promises of agricultural practices which can significantly reduce soil erosion and nutrient leakage while sequestering carbon. When cultivated in mixes with N-fixing species (legumes) such polycultures also reduce the need for external inputs of nitrogen - a large source of GHG from conventional agriculture.

4.10.3 Reversing land degradation through reforestation

4.10.3.1 South Korea Case Study on Reforestation Success

In the first half of the 20th century, forests in the Republic of South Korea were severely degraded and deforested during foreign occupations and the Korean War. Unsustainable harvest for timber and fuel wood resulted in severely degraded landscapes, heavy soil erosion and large areas denuded of vegetation cover. Recognising that South Korea's economic health would depend on a healthy environment, South Korea established a national forest service (1967) and embarked on the first phase of a 10-year reforestation program in 1973 (Forest Development Program), which was followed by subsequent reforestation programs that ended in 1987, after 2.4 Mha of forests were restored, see Figure 4.9.

As a consequence of reforestation, forest volume increased from 11.3 m^3 ha^{-1} in 1973 to 125.6 m^3 ha^{-1} in 2010 and 150.2 m^3 ha^{-1} in 2016 (Korea Forest Service 2017). Increases in forest volume had significant co-benefits such as increasing water yield by 43% and reducing soil losses by 87% from 1971 to 2010 (Kim et al. 2017).

The forest carbon density in South Korea has increased from 5–7 Mg C ha^{-1} in the period 1955–1973 to more than 30 Mg C ha^{-1} in the late 1990s (Choi et al. 2002). Estimates of C uptake rates in the late 1990s were 12 Tg C yr^{-1} (Choi et al. 2002). For the period 1954 to 2012 C uptake was 8.3 Tg C yr^{-1} (Lee et al. 2014), lower than other estimates because reforestation programs did not start until 1973. NEP in South Korea was 10.55 ± 1.09 Tg C yr^{-1} in the 1980s, 10.47 ± 7.28 Tg C yr^{-1} in the 1990s, and 6.32 ± 5.02 Tg C yr^{-1} in the 2000s, showing a gradual decline as average forest age increased (Cui et al. 2014). The estimated past and projected future increase in the carbon content of South Korea's forest area during 1992-2034 was 11.8 Tg C yr^{-1} (Kim et al. 2016).

Figure 4.9 Example of severely degraded hills in South Korea and stages of forest restoration. The top two photos are taken in the early 1970s, before and after restoration, the third photo about 5 years after restoration and the bottom photo was taken about 20 years after restoration. Many examples of such restoration success exist throughout South Korea (Source: Korea Forest Service).

During the period of forest restoration, South Korea also promoted inter-agency cooperation and coordination, especially between the energy and forest sectors, to replace firewood with fossil fuels, and by reducing demand for firewood helped forest recovery (Bae et al. 2012). As experience with forest restoration programs has increased, emphasis has shifted from fuelwood plantations, often with exotic species and hybrid varieties to planting more native species and encouraging natural regeneration (Kim and Zsuffa 1994; Lee et al. 2015). Avoiding monocultures in reforestation programs can reduce susceptibility to pests (Kim and Zsuffa 1994). Other important factors in the success of the reforestation program were that private landowners were heavily involved in initial efforts (both corporate entities and smallholders) and that the reforestation program was made part of the national economic development program (Lamb 2014).

The net present value and the benefit-cost ratio of the reforestation program were USD 54.3 billion and 5.84 billion in 2010, respectively. The breakeven point of the reforestation investment appeared within two decades. Substantial benefits of the reforestation program included disaster risk reduction and carbon sequestration (Lee et al. 2018a).

In summary, the reforestation program was a comprehensive technical and social initiative that restored forest ecosystems, enhanced the economic performance of rural regions, contributed to disaster risk reduction, and enhanced carbon sequestration (Kim et al. 2017; Lee et al. 2018a; UNDP 2017).

The success of the reforestation program in South Korea and the associated significant carbon sink indicate a high mitigation potential that might be contributed by a potential future reforestation program in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) (Lee et al. 2018b).

4.10.3.2 China Case Study on Reforestation Success

The dramatic decline in the quantity and quality of natural forests in China resulted in land degradation, such as soil erosion, floods, droughts, carbon emission, and damage to wildlife habitat (Liu and Diamond 2008). In response to failures of previous forestry and land policies, the severe droughts in 1997, and the massive floods in 1998, the central government decided to implement a series of land degradation control policies, including the National Forest Protection Program (NFPP), Grain for Green or the Conversion of Cropland to Forests and Grasslands Program (GFGP) (Liu et al. 2008; Yin 2009; Tengberg et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2000). The NFPP aimed to completely ban logging of natural forests in the upper reaches of the Yangtze and Yellow rivers as well as in Hainan Province by 2000 and to substantially reduce logging in other places (Xu et al. 2006). In 2011, NFPP was renewed for the 10-year second phase, which also added another 11 counties around Danjiangkou Reservoir in Hubei and Henan Provinces, the water source for the middle route of the South-to-North Water Diversion Project (Liu et al. 2013). Furthermore, the NFPP afforested 31 Mha by 2010 through aerial seeding, artificial planting, and mountain closure (i.e., prohibition of human activities such as fuelwood collection and lifestock grazing) (Xu et al. 2006). China banned commercial logging in all natural forests by the end of 2016, which imposed logging bans and harvesting reductions in 68.2 Mha of forest land – including 56.4 Mha of natural forest (approximately 53% of China's total natural forests).

GFGP became the most ambitious of China's ecological restoration efforts with over USD 45 billion devoted to its implementation since 1990 (Kolinjivadi and Sunderland 2012) The program involves the conversion of farmland on slopes of 15-25° or greater to forest or grassland (Bennett 2008). The pilot program started in three provinces –Sichuan, Shaanxi, and Gansu – in 1999 (Liu and Diamond 2008). After initial success, it was extended to 17 provinces by 2000 and finally to all provinces by 2002, including the headwaters of the Yangtze and Yellow rivers (Liu et al. 2008).

NFPP and GFGP have dramatically improved China's land conditions and ecosystem services, and thus have mitigated the unprecedented land degradation in China (Liu et al. 2013; Liu et al 2002; Long et al. 2006; Xu et al. 2006). NFPP protected 107 Mha forest area and increased forest area by 10 Mha between 2000 and 2010. For the second phase (2011–2020), the NFPP plans to increase forest cover by a further 5.2 Mha, capture 416 million tons of carbon, provide 648,500 forestry jobs, further reduce land degradation, and enhance biodiversity (Liu et al. 2013). During 2000–2007, sediment concentration in the Yellow River had declined by 38%. In the Yellow River basin, it was estimated that surface runoff would be reduced by 450 million m^3 from 2000 to 2020, which is equivalent to 0.76% of the total surface water resources (Jia et al. 2006). GFGP had cumulatively increased vegetative cover by 25 Mha, with 8.8 Mha of cropland being converted to forest and grassland, 14.3 Mha barren land being afforested, and 2.0 million ha of forest regeneration from mountain closure. Forest cover within the GFGP region has increased 2% during the first 8 years (Liu et al. 2008). In Guizhou Province, GFGP plots had 35–53% less loss of phosphorus than non-GFGP plots (Liu et al. 2002). In Wuqi County of Shaanxi Province, the Chaigou Watershed had 48% and 55% higher soil moisture and moisture-holding capacity in GFGP plots than in non-GFGP plots, respectively (Liu et al. 2002). According to reports on China's first national ecosystem assessment (2000–2010), for carbon sequestration and soil retention, coefficients for the GTGP targeting forest restoration and NFPP are positive and statistically significant. For sand fixation, GTGP targeting grassland restoration is positive and statistically significant. Remote sensing observations confirm vegetation cover increases and bare soil decline in China over the period 2001 to 2015 (Qiu et al. 2017) (Qiu et al. 2017). But where afforestation is sustained by drip irrigation from groundwater, questions about plantation sustainability arise (Chen et al. 2018a). Moreover, greater gains in biodiversity could be achieved by promoting mixed forests over monocultures (Hua et al. 2016).

NFPP-related activities received a total commitment of 93.7 billion yuan (about USD 14 billion with today's exchange rate) between 1998 and 2009. Most of the money was used to offset economic losses of forest enterprises caused by the transformation from logging to tree plantations and forest management (Liu et al. 2008). By 2009, the cumulative total investment through the NFPP and GFGP exceeded USD 50 billion and directly involved more than 120 million farmers in 32 million households in the GFGP alone (Liu et al. 2013). All programs reduce or reverse land degradation and improve human well-being. Thus, a coupled human and natural systems perspective (Liu et al. 2008) would be helpful to understand the complexity of policies and their impacts, and to establish long-term management mechanisms to improve the livelihood of participants in these programs and other land management policies in both China and many other parts of the world.

4.10.4 Degradation and management of peat soils

Globally, peatlands cover 3-4 % of the Earth's land area (~430 Mha) (Xu et al. 2018a; Wu et al. 2017b) and store 26-44% of estimated global soil organic carbon (Moore 2002). They are most abundant in high northern latitudes, covering large areas in North America, Russia and Europe. At lower latitudes, the largest areas of tropical peatlands are located in Indonesia, the Congo Basin and the Amazon Basin in the form of peat swamp forests (Gumbricht et al. 2017; Xu et al. 2018a). It is estimated that while 80-85% of the global peatland areas is still largely in a natural state, they are such carbon-dense ecosystems that degraded peatlands (0.3% of the terrestrial land) are responsible for a disproportional 5% of global anthropogenic carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, that is an annual addition of 0.9-3 Gt of CO_2 to the atmosphere (Dommain et al. 2012; IPCC 2014c).

Peatland degradation is not well quantified globally, but regionally peatland degradation can involve a large percentage of the areas. Land-use change and degradation in tropical peatlands have primarily been quantified in Southeast Asia, where drainage and conversion to plantation crops is the dominant transition (Miettinen et al. 2016). Degradation of peat swamps in Peru is also a growing concern and one pilot survey showed that over 70% of the peat swamps were degraded in one region that was surveyed (Hergoualc'h et al. 2017a). Around 65,000km^2 or 10% of the European peatland area has been lost and 44% of the remaining European peatlands are degraded (Joosten, H., Tanneberger 2017). Large areas of fens have been entirely 'lost' or greatly reduced in thickness due to peat wastage (Lamers et al. 2015).

The main drivers of the acceleration of peatland degradation in the twentieth century were associated with drainage for agriculture, peat extraction and afforestation related activities (burning, over-grazing, fertilisation) with a variable scale and severity of impact depending on existing resources in the various countries (O'Driscoll et al. 2018; Abu et al. 2017; Dommain et al. 2018; Lamers et al. 2015). New drivers include urban development, wind farm construction (Smith et al. 2012), hydro-electric development, tar sands mining and recreational (Joosten, H., Tanneberger 2017). Anthropogenic pressures are now affecting peatlands in previously geographically isolated areas with consequences for global environmental concerns and impacts on local livelihoods (Dargie et al. 2017; Lawson et al. 2015; Butler et al. 2009).

Drained and managed peatlands are GHG emissions hotspots (Swails et al. 2018; Hergoualc'h et al. 2017b; Roman-Cuesta et al. 2016; Hergoualc'h et al. 2017a). In most cases, lowering of the water table leads to direct and indirect CO_2 and N_2O emissions to the atmosphere with rates dependent on a range of factors, including the groundwater level and the water content of surface peat layers, nutrient content, temperature, and vegetation communities. The exception is nutrient limited boreal peatlands (Minkkinen et al. 2018; Ojanen et al. 2014). Drainage also increases erosion and dissolved organic C loss, removing stored carbon into streams as dissolved and particulate organic carbon, which ultimately returns to the atmosphere (Moore et al. 2013; Evans et al. 2016).

In tropical peatlands, oil palm is the most widespread plantation crop and on average it emits around 40 t CO_2 ha^{-1} yr^{-1}; Acacia plantations for pulpwood are the second most widespread plantation crop and emit around 73 t CO_2 ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Drösler et al. 2013). Other land uses typically emit less than 37 t CO_2 ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. Total emissions from peatland drainage in the region are estimated to be between 0.07 and 1.1 Gt CO_2 yr^{-1} (Houghton and Nassikas 2017; Frolking et al. 2011). Land-use change also affects the fluxes of N_2O and CH_4. Undisturbed tropical peatlands emit about 0.8 Mt CH_4 yr^{-1} and 0.002 Mt N_2O yr^{-1}, while disturbed peatlands emit 0.1 Mt CH_4 $yr^{-1}$and 0.2 Mt N_2O–N yr^{-1} (Frolking et al. 2011). These N_2O emissions are probably low as new findings show that emissions from fertilised oil palm can exceed 20 kg N_2O–N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Oktarita et al. 2017).

In the temperate and boreal zones, peatland drainage often leads to emissions on the order of 0.9 to 9.5 t CO_2 ha^{-1} y^{-1} in forestry plantations and 21 to 29 t CO_2 ha^{-1} y^{-1} in grasslands and croplands. Nutrient poor sites often continue to be CO_2 sinks for long periods (e.g. 50 y) following drainage and in some cases sinks for atmospheric CH_4, even when drainage ditch emissions are considered (Minkkinen et al. 2018; Ojanen et al. 2014). Undisturbed boreal and temperate peatlands emit about 030 Mt CH_4 yr^{-1} and 0.02 Mt N_2O-N yr^{-1}, while disturbed peatlands emit 0.1 Mt CH_4 $yr^{-1}$and 0.2 Mt $yr^{-1}N_2O$ (Frolking et al. 2011).

Fire emissions from tropical peatlands are only a serious issue in Southeast Asia, where they are responsible for 634 (66–4070) Mt CO_2 yr^{-1} (van der Werf et al. 2017). Much of the variability is linked with the El Niño Southern Oscillation, which produces drought conditions in this region. Anomalously active fire seasons have also been observed in non-drought years and this has been attributed to the increasing effect of high temperatures that dry vegetation out during short dry spells in otherwise normal rainfall years (Fernandes et al. 2017; Gaveau et al. 2014). Fires have significant societal impacts; for example, the 2015 fires caused over 100,000 additional deaths across Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore and this event was more than twice as deadly as the 2006 El Niño event (Koplitz et al. 2016).

Peatland degradation in other parts of the world differs from Asia. In Africa large peat deposits like those found in the Cuvette Centrale in the Congo Basin or in the Okavango inland delta, the principle threat is changing rainfall regimes due to climate variability and change (Weinzierl et al. 2016; Dargie et al. 2017). Expansion of agriculture is not yet a major factor in these regions. In the Western Amazon, extraction of non-timber forest products like the fruits of *Mauritia flexuosa* (moriche palm) and Suri worms are major sources of degradation that lead to losses of carbon stocks (Hergoualc'h et al. 2017a).

The effects of peatland degradation on livelihoods have not been systematically characterised. In places where plantation crops are driving the conversion of peat swamps, the financial benefits can be considerable. One study in Indonesia found that the net present value of an oil palm plantation is between USD 3,835 and 9,630 per ha to land owners (Butler et al. 2009). High financial returns are creating the incentives for the expansion of smallholder production in peatlands. Smallholder plantations extend over 22% of the peatlands in insular Southeast Asia compared to 27% for industrial plantations (Miettinen et al. 2016). In places where income is generated from extraction of marketable products, ecosystem degradation probably has a negative effect on livelihoods. For example, the sale of fruits of *M. flexuosa* in some parts of the western Amazon constitutes as much as 80% of the winter income of many rural households, but information on trade values and value chains of *M. flexuosa* is still sparse (Sousa et al. 2018; Virapongse et al. 2017).

There is little experience with peatland restoration in the tropics. Experience from northern latitudes suggests that extensive damage and changes in hydrological conditions mean that restoration in many cases is unachievable (Andersen et al. 2017). In the case of Southeast Asia, where peatlands form as raised bogs, drainage leads to collapse of the dome and this collapse cannot be reversed by rewetting. Nevertheless, efforts are underway to develop solutions or at least partial solutions in Southeast Asia, for example, by the Indonesian Peatland Restoration Agency. The first step is to restore the hydrological regime in drained peatlands and experiences with canal blocking and re-flooding of the peat. These efforts have been only partially successful (Ritzema et al. 2014). Market incentives with certification through the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil have also not been particularly successful as many concessions seek certification only after significant environmental degradation has been accomplished (Carlson et al. 2017). Certification had no discernible effect on forest loss or fire detection in peatlands in Indonesia. To date there is no documentation of restoration methods or successes in many other parts of the tropics, but in situations where degradation does not involve drainage, ecological restoration may be possible. In South America, for example, there is growing interest in restoration of palm swamps, and as experiences are gained it will be important to document success factors to inform successive efforts (Virapongse et al. 2017).

In higher latitudes where degraded peatlands have been drained, the most effective option to reduce losses from these large organic carbon stocks is change hydrological conditions and increase soil moisture and surface wetness (Regina et al. 2015). Long-term GHG monitoring in boreal sites has demonstrated that rewetting and restoration noticeably reduce emissions compared to degraded drained sites and can restored the carbon sink function when vegetation is re-established (Wilson et al. 2016; IPCC 2014a; Nugent et al. 2018) although restored ecosystems may not yet be as resilient as their undisturbed counterparts (Wilson et al. 2016). Several studies have demonstrated the co-benefits of rewetting specific degraded peatlands for biodiversity, carbon sequestration, (Parry et al. 2014; Ramchunder et al. 2012; Renou-Wilson et al. 2018) and other ecosystem services such as improvement of water storage and quality (Martin-Ortega et al. 2014) with beneficial consequences for human well-being (Bonn et al. 2016; Parry et al. 2014).

4.10.5 Biochar

Biochar is organic matter that is carbonised by heating in an oxygen-limited environment, and used as a soil amendment. The properties of biochar vary widely, dependent on the feedstock and the conditions of production. Biochar could make a significant contribution to mitigating both land degradation and climate change, simultaneously.

4.10.5.1 Role of biochar in climate change mitigation

Biochar is relatively resistant to decomposition compared with fresh organic matter or compost, so represents a long-term C store (*very high confidence*). Biochars produced at higher temperature (> 450°C) and from woody material have greater stability than those produced at lower temperature (300-450°C), and from manures (*very high confidence*) (Singh et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2016b). Biochar stability is influenced by soil properties: biochar carbon can be further stabilised by interaction with clay minerals and native soil organic matter (*medium evidence*) (Fang et al. 2015). Biochar stability is estimated to range from decades to thousands of years, for different biochars in different applications (Singh et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016). Biochar stability decreases as ambient temperature increases (*limited evidence*) (Fang et al. 2017).

Biochar can enhance soil carbon stocks through "negative priming", in which rhizodeposits are stabilised through sorption of labile C on biochar, and formation of biochar-organo-mineral complexes (Weng et al. 2015, 2017, 2018; Wang et al. 2016b). Conversely, some studies show increased turnover of native soil carbon ("positive priming") due to enhanced soil microbial activity induced by biochar. In clayey soils, positive priming is minor and short-lived compared to negative priming effects, which dominate in the medium to long-term (Singh and Cowie 2014; Wang et al. 2016b). Negative priming has been observed particularly in loamy grassland soil (Ventura et al. 2015) and clay-dominated soils, whereas positive priming is reported in sandy soils (Wang et al. 2016b) and those with low C content (Ding et al. 2018).

Biochar can provide additional climate change mitigation by decreasing nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions from soil, due in part to decreased substrate availability for denitrifying organisms, related to the molar H/C ratio of the biochar (Cayuela et al. 2015). However, this impact varies widely: meta-analyses found an average decrease in N_2O emissions from soil of 30-54%, (Cayuela et al. 2015) (Moore 2002; Borchard et al. 2019), although another study found no significant reduction in field conditions when weighted by the inverse of the number of observations per site (Verhoeven et al. 2017). Biochar has been observed to reduce methane emissions from flooded soils, such as rice paddies, though, as for N_2O, results vary between studies and increases have also been observed (He et al. 2017; KAMMANN et al. 2017). Biochar has also been found to reduces methane uptake by dryland soils, though the effect is small in absolute terms (Jeffery et al. 2016).

Additional climate benefits of biochar can arise through reduced N fertiliser requirements, due to reduced losses of N through leaching and/or volatilization (Singh, Hatton, Balwant, & Cowie, 2010) and enhanced biological nitrogen fixation (Van Zwieten et al. 2015); increased yields of crop, forage, vegetable and tree species (Biederman and Stanley Harpole 2013), particularly in sandy soils and acidic tropical soils (Simon et al. 2017) ; avoided GHG emissions from manure that would otherwise be stockpiled, crop residues that would be burned or processing residues that would be landfilled; and reduced GHG emissions from compost when biochar is added (Agyarko-Mintah et al. 2017; Wu et al. 2017a).

Climate benefits of biochar could be substantially reduced through reduction in albedo if biochar is surface-applied at high rates to light-colored soils (Genesio et al. 2012; Bozzi et al. 2015; Woolf et al. 2010), or if black carbon dust is released (Genesio et al. 2016). Pelletizing or granulating biochar, and applying below the soil surface or incorporating into the soil, minimises the release of black carbon dust and reduces the effect on albedo (Woolf et al. 2010).

Biochar is a potential “negative emissions” technology: the thermochemical conversion of biomass to biochar slows mineralisation of the biomass, delivering long term C storage; gases released during pyrolysis can be combusted for heat or power, displacing fossil energy sources, and could be captured and sequestered if linked with infrastructure for carbon capture and storage (Smith 2016). Studies of the life cycle climate change impacts of biochar systems generally show emissions reduction in the range 0.4 -1.2 t CO_2e t^{-1} (dry) feedstock (Cowie et al. 2015). Use of biomass for biochar can deliver greater benefits than use for bioenergy, if applied in a context where it delivers agronomic benefits and/or reduces non-CO_2 GHG emissions (Ji et al. 2018; Woolf et al. 2010, 2018; Xu et al. 2019). A global analysis of technical potential, in which biomass supply constraints were applied to protect against food insecurity, loss of habitat and land degradation, estimated technical potential abatement of 3.7 - 6.6 Gt CO_2e yr^{-1} (including 2.6-4.6 GtCO_2e yr^{-1} carbon stabilization), with theoretical potential to reduce total emissions over the course of a century by 240 – 475 Gt CO_2e (Woolf et al. 2010). Fuss et al. 2018 propose a range of 0.5-2 GtCO_2e as the sustainable potential for negative emissions through biochar. Mitigation potential of biochar is reviewed in Chapter 2.

4.10.5.2 Role of biochar in management of land degradation

Biochars generally have high porosity, high surface area and surface-active properties that lead to high absorptive and adsorptive capacity, especially after interaction in soil (Joseph et al. 2010). As a result of these properties, biochar could contribute to avoiding, reducing and reversing land degradation through the following documented benefits:

- Improved nutrient use efficiency due to reduced leaching of nitrate and ammonium (e.g. (Haider et al. 2017) and increased availability of phosphorus (P) in soils with high P fixation capacity (Liu et al. 2018c), potentially reducing N and P fertiliser requirements.
- Management of heavy metals and organic pollutants: through reduced bioavailability of toxic elements (O’Connor et al., 2018; Peng ; Deng, ; Peng, & Yue, 2018), by reducing availability, through immobilization due to increased pH and redox effects (Rizwan et al. 2016) and adsorption on biochar surfaces (Zhang et al. 2013) thus providing a means of remediating contaminated soils, and enabling their utilisation for food production.

- Stimulation of beneficial soil organisms, including earthworms and mycorrhizal fungi (Thies et al. 2015).
- Improved porosity and water holding capacity (Quin et al. 2014), particularly in sandy soils (Omondi et al. 2016), enhancing microbial function during drought (Paetsch et al. 2018).
- Amelioration of soil acidification, through application of biochars with high pH and acid neutralising capacity (Chan et al. 2008)(Van Zwieten et al. 2010).

Biochar systems can deliver a range of other co-benefits including destruction of pathogens and weed propagules, avoidance of landfill, improved handling and transport of wastes such as sewage sludge, management of biomass residues such as environmental weeds and urban greenwaste, reduction of odors and management of nutrients from intensive livestock facilities, reduction in environmental N pollution and protection of waterways. As a compost additive, biochar has been found to reduce leaching and volatilisation of nutrients, increasing nutrient retention, through absorption and adsorption processes (Joseph et al. 2018).

While many studies report positive responses, some studies have found negative or zero impacts on soil properties or plant response (e.g. Kuppusamy, Thavamani, Megharaj, Venkateswarlu, & Naidu, 2016). The risk that biochar may enhance PAH in soil or sediments has been raised (Quilliam et al. 2013; Ojeda et al. 2016), but bioavailability of PAH in biochar has been shown to be very low (Hilber et al. 2017) Pyrolysis of biomass leads to losses of volatile nutrients, especially N. While availability of N and P in biochar is lower in biochar than in fresh biomass (Xu et al. 2016) the impact of biochar on plant uptake is determined by the interactions between biochar, soil minerals and activity of microorganisms (e.g. (Vanek and Lehmann 2015); (Nguyen et al. 2017). To avoid negative responses, it is important to select biochar formulations to address known soil constraints, and to apply biochar prior to planting (Nguyen et al., 2017). Nutrient enrichment improves the performance of biochar from low nutrient feedstocks (Joseph et al. 2013). While there are many reports of biochar reducing disease or pest incidence, there are also reports of nil or negative effects (Bonanomi et al. 2015). Biochar may induce systemic disease resistance (e.g., Elad et al. 2011)), though (Viger et al. 2015) reported down-regulation of plant defence genes, suggesting increased susceptibility to insect and pathogen attack. Disease suppression where biochar is applied is associated with increased microbial diversity and metabolic potential of the rhizosphere microbiome (Kolton et al. 2017). Differences in properties related to feedstock (Bonanomi et al. 2018) and differential response to biochar dose, with lower rates more effective (Frenkel et al. 2017) in contributing to variable disease responses.

Constraints to biochar adoption are high cost and limited availability due to limited large-scale production; limited amount of unutilised biomass; and competition for land for growing biomass. While early biochar research tended to use high rates of application (10 t ha^{-1} or more) subsequent studies have shown that biochar can be effective at lower rates especially when combined with chemical or organic fertilisers (Joseph et al. 2013). Biochar can be produced at many scales and levels of engineering sophistication, from simple cone kilns and cookstoves to large industrial scale units processing several tonnes of biomass per hour (Lehmann and Stephen 2015). Substantial technological development has occurred recently, though large-scale deployment is limited to date.

Governance of biochar is required to manage climate, human health and contamination risks associated with biochar production in poorly-designed or operated facilities that release methane or particulates (Downie et al. 2012)(Buss et al. 2015), to ensure quality control of biochar products, and to ensure biomass is sourced sustainably and is uncontaminated. Measures could include labelling standards, sustainability certification schemes and regulation of biochar production and use. Governance mechanisms should be tailored to context, commensurate with risks of adverse outcomes.

In summary, application of biochar to soil can improve soil chemical, physical and biological attributes, enhancing productivity and resilience to climate change, while also delivering climate change mitigation through carbon sequestration and reduction in GHG emissions (*medium agreement, robust evidence*). However, responses to biochar depend on biochar properties, in turn dependent on feedstock and biochar production conditions, and the soil and crop to which it is applied. Negative or nil results have been recorded. Agronomic and methane reduction benefits appear greatest in tropical regions, where acidic soils predominate and suboptimal rates of lime and fertiliser are common, while carbon stabilisation is greater in temperate regions. Biochar is most effective when applied in low volumes to the most responsive soils and when properties are matched to the specific soil constraints and plant needs. Biochar is thus a practice that has potential to address land degradation and climate change simultaneously, while also supporting sustainable development. The potential of biochar is limited by the availability of biomass for its production. Biochar production and use requires regulation and standardisation to manage risks (*strong agreement*).

4.10.6 Management of land degradation induced by tropical cyclones

Tropical cyclones are normal disturbances that natural ecosystems have been affected by and recovered from for millennia. Climate models mostly predict decreasing frequency of tropical cyclones, but dramatically increasing intensity of the strongest storms as well as increasing rainfall rates (Bacmeister et al. 2018; Walsh et al. 2016b). Large amplitude fluctuations in the frequency and intensity complicate both the detection and attribution of tropical cyclones to climate change (Lin and Emanuel 2016b). Yet, the intensity of high-intensity cyclones have increased and are expected to increase further due to global climate change (Knutson et al. 2010; Bender et al. 2010; Vecchi et al. 2008; Bhatia et al. 2018; Tu et al. 2018; Sobel et al. 2016) (*medium agreement, robust evidence*). Tropical cyclone paths are also shifting towards the poles increasing the area subject to tropical cyclones (Sharmila and Walsh 2018; Lin and Emanuel 2016b). Climate change alone will affect the hydrology of individual wetland ecosystems mostly through changes in precipitation and temperature regimes with great global variability (Erwin 2009). Over the last seven decades, the speed at which tropical cyclones move has decreased significantly as expected from theory, exacerbating the damage on local communities from increasing rainfall amounts and high wind speed (Kossin 2018). Tropical cyclones will accelerate changes in coastal forest structure and composition. The heterogeneity of land degradation at coasts that are affected by tropical cyclones can be further enhanced by the interaction of its components (for example, rainfall, wind speed, and direction) with topographic and biological factors (for example, species susceptibility) (Luke et al. 2016).

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are particularly affected by land degradation induced by tropical cyclones, recent examples are Matthew (2016) in the Caribbean, and Pam (2015) and Winston (2016) in the Pacific (Klöck and Nunn 2019; Handmer and Nalau 2019). Even if the Pacific Ocean has experienced cyclones of unprecedented intensity in the recent years, their geomorphological effects may not be unprecedented (Terry and Lau 2018).

Cyclone impacts on coastal areas is not restricted to SIDS, but a problem for all low-lying coastal areas (Petzold and Magnan 2019). The Sundarban, one of the world's largest coastal wetlands, covers about one million hectares between Bangladesh and India. Large areas of the Sundarban mangroves have been converted into paddy fields over the past two centuries and more recently into shrimp farms (Ghosh et al. 2015). In 2009 the cyclone Aila caused incremental stresses on the socioeconomic conditions of the Sundarban coastal communities through rendering huge areas of land unproductive for a long time (Abdullah et al. 2016). The impact of Aila was wide spread throughout the Sundarbans mangroves showing changes between pre- and post-cyclonic period of 20-50% in the enhanced vegetation index (Dutta et al. 2015). Although the magnitude of the effects of the Sundarban mangroves derived from climate change is not yet defined (Payo et al. 2016; Loucks et al. 2010; Gopal and Chauhan 2006; Ghosh et al. 2015; Chaudhuri et al. 2015). There is *high agreement* that the joint effect of climate change and land degradation will be very negative for the area, strongly affecting the environmental services provided by these forests, including the extinction of large mammal species (Loucks et al. 2010). This changes in vegetation are mainly due to inundation and erosion (Payo et al. 2016).

The tropical cyclone Nargis hit unexpectedly the Ayeyarwady River delta (Myanmar) in 2008 with unprecedented and catastrophic damages to livelihoods, destruction of forests and erosion of fields (Fritz et al. 2009) as well as eroding the shoreline 148 m compared with the long-term average (1974-2015) of 0.62 m yr^{-1}. This is an example of the disastrous effects that changing cyclone paths can have on areas previously not affected by cyclones (Fritz et al. 2010).

4.10.6.1 Management of coastal wetlands

Tropical cyclones mainly, but not exclusively, affect coastal regions, threatening maintenance of the associated ecosystems, mangroves, wetlands, seagrasses, etc. This areas not only provide food, water and shelter for fish, birds and other wildlife, but also provide important ecosystem services such as water quality improvement, flood abatement and carbon sequestration (Meng et al. 2017).

Despite its importance coastal wetlands are listed amongst the most heavily damaged of natural ecosystems worldwide. Starting in the 1990s, wetland restoration and re-creation became a “hotspot” in the ecological research fields (Zedler 2000). The coastal wetland restoration and preservation is an extremely cost-effective strategy for society, for example the preservation of coastal wetlands in the USA provide storm protection services with the cost of 23.2 billion yr^{-1} USD (Costanza et al. 2008).

There is a *high agreement* with *medium evidence* that the success of wetland restoration depends mainly on the flow of the water through the system and the degree to which re-flooding occurs, the disturbance regimes, and the control of invasive species (Burlakova et al. 2009; López-Rosas et al. 2013). The implementation of the Ecological Mangrove Rehabilitation (EMR) protocol (López-Portillo et al. 2017) that includes monitoring and reporting tasks, has been proven to deliver successful rehabilitation of wetland ecosystem services.



Figure 4.10 Decision tree showing recommended steps and tasks to restore a mangrove wetland based on original site conditions (Modified from Bosire et al. (2008)

4.10.7 Saltwater intrusion

Current environmental changes, including climate change, have caused sea levels to rise worldwide, particularly in tropical and subtropical regions (Fasullo and Nerem 2018). Combined with scarcity of water in river channels, such rises have been instrumental in the intrusion of highly saline seawater inland, posing a threat to coastal areas and an emerging challenge to land managers and policy makers. Assessing the extent of salinisation due to sea water intrusion at a global scale nevertheless remains challenging. Wicke et al. (2011) suggest that across the world, approximately 1.1 Gha of land is affected by salt, with 14% of this categorised as forest, wetland or some other form of protected area. Seawater intrusion is generally caused by: i) increased tidal activity, storm surges, cyclones and sea storms due to changing climate, ii) heavy groundwater extraction or land use changes as a result of changes in precipitation, and droughts/floods, iii) coastal erosion as a result of destruction of mangrove forests and wetlands iv) construction of vast irrigation canals and drainage networks leading to low river discharge in the deltaic region; and v) sea level rise contaminating nearby freshwater aquifers as a result of subsurface intrusion (Uddameri et al. 2014).

The Indus delta, located in the south-eastern coast of Pakistan near Karachi in the North Arabian sea, is one of the six largest estuaries in the world spanning an area of 600,000 ha. The Indus delta is a clear example of seawater intrusion and land degradation due to local as well as up-country climatic and environmental conditions (Rasul et al. 2012). Salinisation and waterlogging in the up-country areas including provinces of Punjab and Sindh is, however, caused by the irrigation network and over-irrigation (Qureshi 2011).

Such degradation takes the form of high soil salinity, inundation and waterlogging, erosion and freshwater contamination. The inter-annual variability of precipitation with flooding conditions in some years and drought conditions in others has caused variable river flows and sediment runoff below Kotri barrage (about 200 km upstream of the Indus delta). This has affected hydrological processes in the lower reaches of the river and the delta, contributing to the degradation (Rasul et al. 2012).

Over 480,000 ha of fertile land is now affected by sea water intrusion, wherein eight coastal subdivisions of the districts of Badin and Thatta are mostly affected (Chandio et al. 2011). A very high intrusion rate of 0.179 ± 0.0315 km yr^{-1}, based on the analysis of satellite data, was observed in the Indus delta during the past 10 years (2004–2015) (Kalhoro et al. 2016). The area of agricultural crops under cultivation has been declining with economic losses of millions of USD (IUCN 2003). Crop yields have reduced due to soil salinity, in some places failing entirely. Soil salinity varies seasonally, depending largely on the river discharge: during the wet season (August 2014), salinity (0.18 mg L^{-1}) reached 24 km upstream while during the dry season (May 2013), it reached 84 km upstream (Kalhoro et al. 2016). The freshwater aquifers have also been contaminated with sea water rendering them unfit for drinking or irrigation purposes. Lack of clean drinking water and sanitation causes widespread diseases, of which diarrhoea is most common (IUCN 2003).

Lake Urmia in northwest Iran, the second largest saltwater lake in the world and the habitat for endemic Iranian brine shrimp, *Artemia urmiana*, has also been affected by salty water intrusion. During a 17-year period between 1998 and 2014, human disruption including agriculture and years of dam building affected the natural flow of freshwater as well as salty sea water in the surrounding area of Lake Urmia. Water quality has also been adversely affected, with salinity fluctuating over time, but in recent years reaching a maximum of 340 g L^{-1} (similar to levels in the Dead Sea). This has rendered the underground water unfit for drinking and agricultural purposes and risky to human health and livelihoods. Adverse impacts of global climate change as well as direct human impacts have caused changes in land use, overuse of underground water resources and construction of dams over rivers which resulted in the drying-up of the lake in large part. This condition created sand, dust and salt storms in the region which affected many sectors including agriculture, water resources, rangelands, forests and health, and generally presented desertification conditions around the lake (Karbassi et al. 2010; Marjani and Jamali 2014; Shadkam et al. 2016).

Rapid irrigation expansion in the basin has, however, indirectly contributed to inflow reduction. Annual inflow to Lake Urmia has dropped by 48% in recent years. About three fifths of this change was caused by climate change and two fifths by water resource development and agriculture (Karbassi et al. 2010; Marjani and Jamali 2014; Shadkam et al. 2016).

In the drylands of Mexico, intensive production of irrigated wheat and cotton using groundwater (Halvorson et al. 2003) resulted in sea water intrusion into the aquifers of La Costa de Hermosillo, a coastal agricultural valley at the center of Sonora Desert in Northwestern Mexico. Production of these crops in 1954 was on 64,000 ha of cultivated area, increasing to 132,516 ha in 1970, but decreasing to 66,044 ha in 2009 as a result of saline intrusion from the Gulf of California (Romo-Leon et al. 2014). In 2003, only 15% of the cultivated area was under production, with around 80,000 ha abandoned due to soil salinisation whereas in 2009, around 40,000 ha was abandoned (Halvorson et al. 2003; Romo-Leon et al. 2014). Salinisation of agricultural soils could be exacerbated by climate change, as Northwestern Mexico is projected to be warmer and drier under climate change scenarios (IPCC 2013a).

In other countries, intrusion of seawater is exacerbated by destruction of mangrove forests. Mangroves are important coastal ecosystems that provide spawning bed for fish, timber for building, livelihoods to dependent communities, act as barriers against coastal erosion, storm surges, tropical cyclones and tsunamis (Kalhoro et al. 2017) and are among the most carbon-rich stocks on Earth (Atwood et al. 2017). They nevertheless face a variety of threats: climatic (storm surges, tidal activities, high temperatures) and human (coastal developments, pollution, deforestation, conversion to aquaculture, rice culture, oil palm plantation), leading to declines in their areas. In Pakistan, using remote sensing (RS), the mangrove forest cover in the Indus delta decreased from 260,000 ha in 1980s to 160,000 ha in 1990 (Chandio et al. 2011). Based on remotely sensed data, a sharp decline in the mangrove area was also found in the arid coastal region of Hormozgan province in southern Iran during 1972, 1987 and 1997 (Etemadi et al. 2016). Myanmar has the highest rate (about 1% yr^{-1}) of mangrove deforestation in the world (Atwood et al. 2017). Regarding global loss of carbon stored in the mangrove due to deforestation, four countries exhibited high levels of loss: Indonesia (3,410 Gg CO_2 yr^{-1}), Malaysia (1,288 GgCO_2 yr^{-1}), US (206 Gg CO_2 yr^{-1}) and Brazil (186 GgCO_2 yr^{-1}). Only in Bangladesh and Guinea Bissau there was no decline in the mangrove area from 2000 to 2012 (Atwood et al. 2017).

Frequency and intensity of average tropical cyclones will continue to increase (Knutson et al. 2015) and global sea level will continue to rise. The IPCC (2013) projected with *medium confidence* that sea level in the Asia Pacific region will rise from 0.4 to 0.6 m, depending on the emission pathway, by the end of this century. Adaptation measures are urgently required to protect the world's coastal areas from further degradation due to saline intrusion. A viable policy framework is needed to ensure the environmental flows to deltas in order to repulse the intruding seawater.

4.10.8 Avoiding coastal maladaptation

Coastal degradation—for example, beach erosion, coastal squeeze, and coastal biodiversity loss—as a result of rising sea levels is a major concern for low lying coasts and small islands (*high confidence*). The contribution of climate change to increased coastal degradation has been well documented in AR5 (Nurse et al. 2014; Wong et al. 2014) and is further discussed in Section 4.5.1.31. as well as in the IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (SROCC). However, coastal degradation can also be indirectly induced by climate change as the result of adaptation measures that involve changes to the coastal environment, for example, coastal protection measures against increased flooding and erosion due to sea level rise and storm surges transforming the natural coast to a 'stabilised' coastline (Cooper and Pile 2014; French 2001). Every kind of adaptation response option is context-dependent, and, in fact, sea walls play an important role for adaptation in many places. Nonetheless, there are observed cases where the construction of sea walls can be considered 'maladaptation' (Barnett and O'Neill 2010; Magnan et al. 2016) by leading to increased coastal degradation, such as in the case of small islands, where due to limitations of space coastal retreat is less of an option than in continental coastal zones. There is emerging literature on the implementation of alternative coastal protection measures and mechanisms on small islands to avoid coastal degradation induced by sea walls (e.g., Mycoo and Chadwick 2012; Sovacool 2012).

In many cases, increased rates of coastal erosion due to the construction of sea walls are the result of the negligence of local coastal morphological dynamics and natural variability as well as the interplay of environmental and anthropogenic drivers of coastal change (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Sea walls in response to coastal erosion may be ill-suited for extreme wave heights under cyclone impacts and can lead to coastal degradation by keeping overflowing sea water from flowing back into the sea, and therefore affect the coastal vegetation through saltwater intrusion, as observed in Tuvalu (Government of Tuvalu 2006; Wairiu 2017). Similarly, in Kiribati, poor construction of sea walls has resulted in increased erosion and inundation of reclaimed land (Donner 2012; Donner and Webber 2014). In the Comoros and Tuvalu, sea walls have been constructed from climate change adaptation funds and 'often by international development organizations seeking to leave tangible evidence of their investments' (Marino and Lazrus 2015, p. 344). In these cases, they have even increased coastal erosion, due to poor planning and the negligence of other causes of coastal degradation, such as sand mining (Marino and Lazrus 2015; Betzold and Mohamed 2017; Ratter et al. 2016). On the Bahamas, the installation of sea walls as a response to coastal erosion in areas with high wave action has led to the contrary effect and even increased sand loss in those areas (Sealey 2006). The reduction of natural buffer zones—i.e., beaches and dunes—due to vertical structures, such as sea walls, increased the impacts of tropical cyclones on Reunion Island (Duvat et al. 2016). Such a process of 'coastal squeeze' (Pontee 2013) also results in the reduction of intertidal habitat zones, such as wetlands and marshes (Linham and Nicholls 2010). Coastal degradation resulting from the construction of sea walls, however, is not only observed in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), as described above, but also on islands in the Global North, for example, the North Atlantic (Muir et al. 2014; Young et al. 2014; Cooper and Pile 2014; Bush 2004).

The adverse effects of coastal protection measures may be avoided by the consideration of local social-ecological dynamics, including the critical studying of diverse drivers of ongoing shoreline changes, and the according implementation of locally adequate coastal protection options (French 2001; Duvat 2013). Critical elements for avoiding maladaptation include profound knowledge of local tidal regimes, availability of relative sea level rise scenarios and projections for extreme water levels. Moreover, the downdrift effects of sea walls need to be considered, since undefended coasts may be exposed to increased erosion (Linham and Nicholls 2010). In some cases, it may be possible to keep intact and restore natural buffer zones as an alternative to the construction of hard engineering solutions. Otherwise, changes in land-use, building codes, or even coastal realignment can be an option in order to protect and avoid the loss of the buffer function of beaches (Duvat et al. 2016; Cooper and Pile 2014). Examples of Barbados show that combinations of hard and soft coastal protection approaches can be sustainable and reduce the risk of coastal ecosystem degradation while keeping the desired level of protection for coastal users (Mycoo and Chadwick 2012). Nature-based solutions and approaches such as 'building with nature' (Slobbe et al. 2013) may allow for more sustainable coastal protection mechanisms and avoid coastal degradation. Examples from the Maldives, several Pacific islands and the North Atlantic show the importance of the involvement of local communities in coastal adaptation projects, considering local skills, capacities, as well as demographic and socio-political dynamics, in order to ensure the proper monitoring and maintenance of coastal adaptation measures (Sovacool 2012; Muir et al. 2014; Young et al. 2014; Buggy and McNamara 2016; Petzold 2016).

4.11 Knowledge gaps and key uncertainties

The co-benefits of improved land management, such as mitigation of climate change, increased climate resilience of agriculture, and impacts on rural areas/societies are well-known in theory but there is a lack of a coherent and systematic global inventory of such integrated efforts. Both successes and failures are important to document systematically.

Efforts to reduce climate change through land-demanding mitigation actions aimed at removing atmospheric carbon, such as afforestation, reforestation, bioenergy crops, intensification of land management and plantation forestry can adversely affect land conditions and lead to degradation. However, they may also lead to avoidance, reduction and reversal of degradation. Regionally differentiated, socially and ecologically appropriate sustainable land management strategies need to be identified, implemented, monitored and the results communicated widely to ensure climate effective outcomes.

Impacts of new technologies on land degradation and their social and economic ramifications need more research.

Improved quantification of the global extent, severity and rates of land degradation by combining remote sensing with a systematic use of ancillary data is a priority. The current attempts need a better scientific underpinning and appropriate funding.

Land degradation is defined using multiple criteria but the definition does not provide thresholds or the magnitude of acceptable change. In practice, human interactions with land will result in a variety of changes, some may contribute positively to one criterion while adversely affecting another. Research is required on the magnitude of impacts and the resulting trade-offs. Given the urgent need to remove carbon from the atmosphere and to reduce climate change impacts, it is important to reach agreement on what level of reduction in one criterion (biological productivity, ecological integrity) may be acceptable for a given increase in another criterion (ecological integrity, biological productivity)?

Attribution of land degradation to the underlying drivers is a challenge because a complex web of causality rather than simple cause-effect relationships. Also, diverging views on land degradation in relation to other challenges is hampering such efforts.

A more systematic treatment of the views and experiences of land users would be useful in land degradation studies.

Much research has tried to understand how social and ecological systems are affected by a particular stressor, for example drought, heat, or waterlogging. But less research has tried to understand how such systems are affected by several simultaneous stressors – which of course is more realistic in the context of climate change (Mittler 2006).

More realistic modelling of carbon dynamics, including better appreciation of belowground biota, would help us to better quantify the role of soils and soil management for soil carbon sequestration.

Frequently Asked Questions

FAQ 4.1 How do climate change and land degradation interact with land use?

Climate change, land degradation, and land use are linked in a complex web of causality. One important impact of climate change (e.g. flood and drought) on land degradation is that increasing global temperatures intensify the hydrological cycle resulting in more intense rainfall, which is an important driver of soil erosion. This means that sustainable land management (SLM) becomes even more important with climate change. Land-use change in the form of clearing of forest for rangeland and cropland (e.g., for provision of bio-fuels), and cultivation of peat soils, is a major source of greenhouse gas emission from both biomass and soils. Many SLM practices (e.g., agroforestry, shifting perennial crops, restoration, etc.) increase carbon content of soil and vegetation cover and hence provide both local and immediate adaptation benefits combined with global mitigation benefits in the long term, while providing many social and economic co-benefits. Avoiding, reducing and reversing land degradation has a large potential to mitigate climate change and help communities to adapt to climate change.

FAQ 4.2 How does climate change affect land-related ecosystem services and biodiversity?

Climate change will affect land-related ecosystem services (e.g. pollination, resilience to extreme climate events, water yield, soil conservation, carbon storage, etc.) and biodiversity, both directly and indirectly. The direct impacts range from subtle reductions or enhancements of specific services, such as biological productivity, resulting from changes in temperature, temperature variability or rainfall, to complete disruption and elimination of services. Disruptions of ecosystem services can occur where climate change causes transitions from one biome to another, e.g., forest to grassland as a result of changes in water balance or natural disturbance regimes. Climate change will result in range shifts and, in some cases, extinction of species. Climate change can also alter the mix of land-related ecosystem services, such as groundwater recharge, purification of water, and flood protection. While the net impacts are specific to ecosystem types, ecosystem services and time, there is an asymmetry of risk such that overall impacts of climate change are expected to reduce ecosystem services. Indirect impacts of climate change on land-related ecosystem services include those that result from changes in human behavior, including potential large-scale human migrations or the implementation of afforestation, reforestation or other changes in land management, which can have positive or negative outcomes on ecosystem services.

References

Abatzoglou, J. T., and A. P. Williams, 2016: Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **113**, 11770–11775, doi:10.1073/pnas.1607171113. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27791053 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Abbott, B. W., and Coauthors, 2016: Biomass offsets little or none of permafrost carbon release from soils, streams, and wildfire: an expert assessment. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 034014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034014. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=3/a=034014?key=crossref.66df61179f78005f9999c2637a68bf9e (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Abdi, A. M., N. Boke-Olén, H. Jin, L. Eklundh, T. Tagesson, V. Lehsten, and J. Ardö, 2019: First assessment of the plant phenology index (PPI) for estimating gross primary productivity in African semi-arid ecosystems. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf.*, **78**, 249–260, doi:10.1016/J.JAG.2019.01.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0303243418311085 (Accessed March 22, 2019).

Abdulai, I., P. Vaast, M. P. Hoffmann, R. Asare, L. Jassogne, P. Van Asten, R. P. Rötter, and S. Graefe, 2018: Cocoa agroforestry is less resilient to sub-optimal and extreme climate than cocoa in full sun. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 273–286, doi:10.1111/gcb.13885. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13885 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Abdullah, A. N. M., K. K. Zander, B. Myers, N. Stacey, and S. T. Garnett, 2016: A short-term decrease in household income inequality in the Sundarbans, Bangladesh, following Cyclone Aila. *Nat. Hazards*, **83**, 1103–1123, doi:10.1007/s11069-016-2358-1. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11069-016-2358-1 (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Abraha, M., S. K. Hamilton, J. Chen, and G. P. Robertson, 2018: Ecosystem carbon exchange on conversion of Conservation Reserve Program grasslands to annual and perennial cropping systems. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **253–254**, 151–160, doi:10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2018.02.016. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192318300662 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Abu, K., and Coauthors, 2017: How temporal patterns in rainfall determine the geomorphology and carbon fluxes of tropical peatlands. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 201701090, doi:10.1073/pnas.1701090114.

Achat, D. L., M. Fortin, G. Landmann, B. Ringeval, and L. Augusto, 2015: Forest soil carbon is threatened by intensive biomass harvesting. *Sci. Rep.*, **5**, 15991, doi:10.1038/srep15991. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep15991 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Adefuye, B. O., O. Odusan, T. I. Runsewe-Abiodun, T. Olowonyo, B. Bodunde, K. Alabi, and P. O. Adefuye, 2007: Practice and percepton of biomass fuel use and its health effects among residents in a sub urban area of southern Nigeria. a qualitative study. *Niger. Hosp. Pract.*, **22**, 48–54. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/nhp/article/view/180452 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Adeogun, A. G., B. A. Ibitoye, A. W. Salami, and G. T. Ihagh, 2018: Sustainable management of erosion prone areas of upper watershed of Kainji hydropower dam, Nigeria. *J. King Saud Univ. - Eng. Sci.*, doi:10.1016/J.JKSUES.2018.05.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1018363918300321 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Adger, N. W., and Coauthors, 2014: Human Security. *Climate Change 2014 Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, C.B. Field and V.R. Barros, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, 755–791 https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/36898556/WGIIAR5-Chap12_FINAL.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1514896597&Signature=IBxRb2IGBKXQluH5y%2F%2BNuOlJJwo%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B filename%3DHuman_Security_WGII_Cha (Accessed January 2, 2018).

Adger, W. N., and Coauthors, 2009: Are there social limits to adaptation to climate change? *Clim. Change*, **93**, 335–354, doi:10.1007/s10584-008-9520-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-008-9520-z (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Adimassu, Z., S. Langan, and R. Johnston, 2016: Understanding determinants of farmers' investments in sustainable land management practices in Ethiopia: review and synthesis. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **18**, 1005–1023, doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9683-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10668-015-9683-5 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Agarwal, B., 1997: Environmental Action, Gender Equity and Women's Participation. *Dev. Change*, **28**, 1–44, doi:10.1111/1467-7660.00033. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1467-7660.00033 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Agyarko-Mintah, E., A. Cowie, B. P. Singh, S. Joseph, L. Van Zwieten, A. Cowie, S. Harden, and R. Smillie, 2017: Biochar increases nitrogen retention and lowers greenhouse gas emissions when added to composting poultry litter. *Waste Manag.*, **61**, 138–149, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2016.11.027. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0956053X16306869.

Aleman, J. C., M. A. Jarzyna, and A. C. Staver, 2018: Forest extent and deforestation in tropical Africa since. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, **2**, 26–33, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0406-1.

Alkemade, R., M. van Oorschot, L. Miles, C. Nellemann, M. Bakkenes, and B. ten Brink, 2009: GLOBIO3: A Framework to Investigate Options for Reducing Global Terrestrial Biodiversity Loss. *Ecosystems*, **12**, 374–390, doi:10.1007/s10021-009-9229-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10021-009-9229-5 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Allen, C. D., and Coauthors, 2002: Ecological Restoration of Southwestern Ponderosa Pine Ecosystems: A Broad Perspective. *Ecol. Appl.*, **12**, 1418–1433, doi:10.2307/3099981.

——, and Coauthors, 2010: A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **259**, 660–684, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2009.09.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900615X (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Allen, D. E., B. P. Singh, and R. C. Dalal, 2011: Soil Health Indicators Under Climate Change: A Review of Current Knowledge. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 25–45 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-20256-8_2 (Accessed November 5, 2017).

Allen, H. M., J. K. Pumpa, and G. D. Batten, 2001: Effect of frost on the quality of samples of Janz wheat. *Aust. J. Exp. Agric.*, **41**, 641, doi:10.1071/EA00187. http://www.publish.csiro.au/journals/abstractHTML.cfm?J=EA&V=41&I=5&F=EA00187abs.XML (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Allison, M., and Coauthors, 2016: Global Risks and Research Priorities for Coastal Subsidence. *Eos (Washington. DC).*, **97**, doi:10.1029/2016EO055013. https://eos.org/features/global-risks-and-research-priorities-for-coastal-subsidence (Accessed April 7, 2019).

Almagro, A., P. T. S. Oliveira, M. A. Nearing, and S. Hagemann, 2017: Projected climate change impacts in rainfall erosivity over Brazil. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 8130, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08298-y. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-08298-y (Accessed December 5, 2017).

Alongi, D. M., 2015: The Impact of Climate Change on Mangrove Forests. *Curr. Clim. Chang. Reports*, **1**, 30–39, doi:10.1007/s40641-015-0002-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40641-015-0002-x (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Altieri, M. A., and P. Koohafkan, 2008: *Enduring Farms: Climate Change, Smallholders and Traditional Farming Communities*. Penang, Malaysia, 72 pp. http://sa.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/files/Enduring_Farms.pdf.

——, and C. I. Nicholls, 2017: The adaptation and mitigation potential of traditional agriculture in a changing climate. *Clim. Change*, **140**, 33–45, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0909-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-013-0909-y (Accessed October 20, 2017).

Altor, A. E., and W. J. Mitsch, 2006: Methane flux from created riparian marshes: Relationship to intermittent versus continuous inundation and emergent macrophytes. *Ecol. Eng.*, **28**, 224–234, doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2006.06.006.

Amanambu, A. C., L. Li, C. N. Egbinola, O. A. Obarein, C. Mupenzi, and D. Chen, 2019: Spatio-temporal variation in rainfall-runoff erosivity due to climate change in the Lower Niger Basin, West Africa. *CATENA*, **172**, 324–334, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2018.09.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816218303709 (Accessed March 13, 2019).

Amichev, B. Y., W. A. Kurz, C. Smyth, and K. C. J. Van Rees, 2012: The carbon implications of large-scale afforestation of agriculturally marginal land with short-rotation willow in Saskatchewan. *GCB Bioenergy*, **4**, doi:10.1111/j.1757-1707.2011.01110.x.

Amugune, I., P. Cerutti, H. Baral, S. Leonard, and C. Martius, 2017: *Small flame but no fire: Wood fuel in the (Intended) Nationally Determined ... - Amugune, I., Cerutti, P.O., Baral, H., Leonard, S., Martius, C. - Google Books*. Bogor, Indonesia, 35 pp. https://books.google.se/books?hl=en&lr=&id=CRZQDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Amugune+I,+Cerutti+P,+Baral+H,+Leonard+S+and+Martius+C&ots=plDorqu9zX&sig=pVljVjzzw8aj8wmOqCbzhHNpEHE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Amugune I%2C Cerutti P%2C Baral H%2C Leonard (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Andela, N., Y. Y. Liu, A. I. J. M. Van Dijk, R. A. M. De Jeu, T. R. McVicar, A. I. J. M. van Dijk, R. A. M. De Jeu, and T. R. McVicar, 2013: *Global changes in dryland vegetation dynamics (1988-2008) assessed by satellite remote sensing: Comparing a new passive microwave vegetation density record with reflective greenness data*. https://www.biogeosciences.net/10/6657/2013/

(Accessed September 26, 2018).

Anderegg, W. R. L., J. A. Berry, and C. B. Field, 2012: Linking definitions, mechanisms, and modeling of drought-induced tree death. *Trends Plant Sci.*, **17**, 693–700, doi:10.1016/J.TPLANTS.2012.09.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1360138512002130#bib0010 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Andersen, R., C. Farrell, M. Graf, F. Muller, E. Calvar, P. Frankard, S. Caporn, and P. Anderson, 2017: An overview of the progress and challenges of peatland restoration in Western Europe. *Restor. Ecol.*, **25**, 271–282, doi:10.1111/rec.12415.

Anderson, R. G., and Coauthors, 2011: Biophysical considerations in forestry for climate protection. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **9**, 174–182, doi:10.1890/090179. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/090179 (Accessed December 20, 2017).

Anderson, R. L., D. R. Foster, and G. Motzkin, 2003: Integrating lateral expansion into models of peatland development in temperate New England. *J. Ecol.*, **91**, 68–76, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2745.2003.00740.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-2745.2003.00740.x (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Andersson, E., S. Brogaard, and L. Olsson, 2011: The Political Ecology of Land Degradation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **36**, 295–319, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-033110-092827. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-environ-033110-092827 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Angelsen, A., P. Jagger, R. Babigumira, N. J. Hogarth, S. Bauch, J. Börner, and C. Smith-Hall, 2014: Environmental Income and Rural Livelihoods: A Global-Comparative Analysis. *World Dev.*, **64**, S12–S28, doi:10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2014.03.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X14000722?via%3Dihub (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Angelsen, A., C. Martius, V. de Sy, A. E. Duchelle, A. M. Larson, and T. T. Pham, 2018: Transforming REDD+: Lessons and new directions. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) https://www.cifor.org/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/7045.html (Accessed March 26, 2019).

Antwi-Agyei, P., A. J. Dougill, and L. C. Stringer, 2015: Impacts of land tenure arrangements on the adaptive capacity of marginalized groups: The case of Ghana's Ejura Sekyedumase and Bongo districts. *Land use policy*, **49**, 203–212, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2015.08.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715002422 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Aragüés, R., E. T. Medina, W. Zribi, I. Clavería, J. Álvaro-Fuentes, and J. Faci, 2015: Soil salinization as a threat to the sustainability of deficit irrigation under present and expected climate change scenarios. *Irrig. Sci.*, **33**, 67–79, doi:10.1007/s00271-014-0449-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00271-014-0449-x (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Arnáez, J., N. Lana-Renault, T. Lasanta, P. Ruiz-Flaño, and J. Castroviejo, 2015: Effects of farming terraces on hydrological and geomorphological processes. A review. *CATENA*, **128**, 122–134, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2015.01.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816215000351 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Arnell, N. W., and S. N. Gosling, 2016: The impacts of climate change on river flood risk at the global scale. *Clim. Change*, **134**, 387–401, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1084-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-014-1084-5 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Asmelash, F., T. Bekele, and E. Birhane, 2016: The Potential Role of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi in the Restoration of Degraded Lands. *Front. Microbiol.*, **7**, 1095, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01095. http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01095/abstract (Accessed March 6,

2019).

Asner, G. P., A. J. Elmore, L. P. Olander, R. E. Martin, and A. T. Harris, 2004: Grazing Systems, Ecosystem Responses, and Global Change. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **29**, 261–299, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.29.062403.102142. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.energy.29.062403.102142 (Accessed December 28, 2017).

Astrup, R., P. Y. Bernier, H. Genet, D. A. Lutz, and R. M. Bright, 2018: A sensible climate solution for the boreal forest. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0043-3.

Atmadja, S., and L. Verchot, 2012: A review of the state of research, policies and strategies in addressing leakage from reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+). *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **17**, 311–336, doi:10.1007/s11027-011-9328-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11027-011-9328-4 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Atwood, T. B., and Coauthors, 2017: Global patterns in mangrove soil carbon stocks and losses. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 523–528, doi:10.1038/nclimate3326. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nclimate3326 (Accessed July 30, 2018).

Van Auken, O. W., 2009: Causes and consequences of woody plant encroachment into western North American grasslands. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **90**, 2931–2942, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.04.023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479709001522 (Accessed December 28, 2017).

Baccini, A., W. Walker, L. Carvalho, M. Farina, D. Sulla-Menashe, and R. A. Houghton, 2017: Tropical forests are a net carbon source based on aboveground measurements of gain and loss. *Science*, **358**, 230–234, doi:10.1126/science.aam5962. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28971966 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Bacmeister, J. T., K. A. Reed, C. Hannay, P. Lawrence, S. Bates, J. E. Truesdale, N. Rosenbloom, and M. Levy, 2018: Projected changes in tropical cyclone activity under future warming scenarios using a high-resolution climate model. *Clim. Change*, **146**, 547–560, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1750-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-016-1750-x (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Bae, J. S., R. W. Joo, Y.-S. Kim, and Y. S. Kim Yeon-Su., 2012: Forest transition in South Korea: Reality, path and drivers. *Land use policy*, **29**, 198–207, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2011.06.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837711000615 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Bahamondez, C., and I. D. Thompson, 2016: Determining forest degradation, ecosystem state and resilience using a standard stand stocking measurement diagram: theory into practice. *Forestry*, **89**, 290–300, doi:10.1093/forestry/cpv052. https://academic.oup.com/forestry/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/forestry/cpv052 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Bai, Y., J. Wu, Q. Xing, Q. Pan, J. Huang, D. Yang, and X. Han, 2008a: PRIMARY PRODUCTION AND RAIN USE EFFICIENCY ACROSS A PRECIPITATION GRADIENT ON THE MONGOLIA PLATEAU. *Ecology*, **89**, 2140–2153, doi:10.1890/07-0992.1. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/07-0992.1 (Accessed January 3, 2018).

Bai, Z., D. Dent, L. Olsson, and M. E. Schaepman, 2008b: *Global Assessment of Land Degradation and Improvment. 1. Identification by Remote Sensing*. Wageningen, The Netherlands, 78 pp.

Bai, Z. G., D. L. Dent, L. Olsson, and M. E. Schaepman, 2008c: Proxy global assessment of land degradation. *Soil Use Manag.*, **24**, 223–234, doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.2008.00169.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1475-2743.2008.00169.x (Accessed October 19, 2017).

Bai, Z. G., D. L. Dent, L. Olsson, A. Tengberg, C. J. Tucker, and G. Yengoh, 2015: A longer, closer, look at land degradation. *Agric. Dev.*, **24**, 3–9. http://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/wurpubs/490477 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Bailis, R., R. Drigo, A. Ghilardi, and O. Masera, 2015: The carbon footprint of traditional woodfuels.

Nat. Clim. Chang., **5**, 266–272, doi:10.1038/nclimate2491. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2491 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Baka, J., 2013: The Political Construction of Wasteland: Governmentality, Land Acquisition and Social Inequality in South India. *Dev. Change*, **44**, 409–428, doi:10.1111/dech.12018. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/dech.12018 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

——, 2014: What wastelands? A critique of biofuel policy discourse in South India. *Geoforum*, **54**, 315–323, doi:10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2013.08.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718513001760 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Baker, B., 2017: Can modern agriculture be sustainable? *Bioscience*, **67**, 325–331, doi:10.1093/biosci/bix018.

Baker, J. M., T. E. Ochsner, R. T. Venterea, and T. J. Griffis, 2007: Tillage and soil carbon sequestration—What do we really know? *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **118**, 1–5, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2006.05.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880906001617 (Accessed March 31, 2019).

Bakun, A., 1990: Global climate change and intensification of coastal ocean upwelling. *Science*, **247**, 198–201, doi:10.1126/science.247.4939.198. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17813287 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Bakun, A., B. A. Black, S. J. Bograd, M. García-Reyes, A. J. Miller, R. R. Rykaczewski, and W. J. Sydeman, 2015: Anticipated Effects of Climate Change on Coastal Upwelling Ecosystems. *Curr. Clim. Chang. Reports*, **1**, 85–93, doi:10.1007/s40641-015-0008-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40641-015-0008-4 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Bala, G., K. Caldeira, M. Wickett, T. J. Phillips, D. B. Lobell, C. Delire, and A. Mirin, 2007: Combined climate and carbon-cycle effects of large-scale deforestation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **104**, 6550–6555, doi:10.1073/pnas.0608998104.

Balbo, A. L., 2017: Terrace landscapes. Editorial to the special issue. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **202**, 495–499, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2017.02.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479717301056#bib1 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Balooni, K., and J. F. Lund, 2014: Forest Rights: The Hard Currency of REDD+. *Conserv. Lett.*, **7**, 278–284, doi:10.1111/conl.12067. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/conl.12067 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Barbier, E. B., 2000: Valuing the environment as input: review of applications to mangrove-fishery linkages. *Ecol. Econ.*, **35**, 47–61, doi:10.1016/S0921-8009(00)00167-1. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800900001671 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Barbier, E. B., and J. P. Hochard, 2016: Does Land Degradation Increase Poverty in Developing Countries? *PLoS One*, **11**, e0152973, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0152973. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152973 (Accessed February 13, 2019).

——, and ——, 2018: Land degradation and poverty. *Nat. Sustain.*, **1**, 623–631, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0155-4. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-018-0155-4 (Accessed March 5, 2019).

Bárcena, T. G., L. P. Kiaer, L. Vesterdal, H. M. Stefánsdóttir, P. Gundersen, and B. D. Sigurdsson, 2014: Soil carbon stock change following afforestation in Northern Europe: a meta-analysis. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **20**, 2393–2405, doi:10.1111/gcb.12576. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12576 (Accessed October 21, 2018).

Bardsley, D. K., and G. J. Hugo, 2010: Migration and climate change: examining thresholds of change to guide effective adaptation decision-making. *Popul. Environ.*, **32**, 238–262, doi:10.1007/s11111-010-0126-9. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11111-010-0126-9 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Barlow, J., and Coauthors, 2007: Quantifying the biodiversity value of tropical primary, secondary, and plantation forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **104**, 18555–18560, doi:10.1073/pnas.0703333104. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18003934 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Barnett, J., and S. O'Neill, 2010: Maladaptation. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **20**, 211–213, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.11.004.

——, L. S. Evans, C. Gross, A. S. Kiem, R. T. Kingsford, J. P. Palutikof, C. M. Pickering, and S. G. Smithers, 2015: From barriers to limits to climate change adaptation: path dependency and the speed of change. *Ecol. Soc.*, **20**, art5, doi:10.5751/ES-07698-200305. http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol20/iss3/art5/ (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Barnhart, T. B., N. P. Molotch, B. Livneh, A. A. Harpold, J. F. Knowles, and D. Schneider, 2016: Snowmelt rate dictates streamflow. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **43**, 8006–8016, doi:10.1002/2016GL069690. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2016GL069690 (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Barrera-Bassols, N., and J. A. Zinck, 2003: Ethnopedology: a worldwide view on the soil knowledge of local people. *Geoderma*, **111**, 171–195, doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(02)00263-X. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S001670610200263X (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Bärring, L., P. Jönsson, J. O. Mattsson, and R. Åhman, 2003: Wind erosion on arable land in Scania, Sweden and the relation to the wind climate—a review. *CATENA*, **52**, 173–190, doi:10.1016/S0341-8162(03)00013-4. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816203000134 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Basche, A., and M. DeLonge, 2017: The Impact of Continuous Living Cover on Soil Hydrologic Properties: A Meta-Analysis. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **81**, 1179, doi:10.2136/sssaj2017.03.0077. https://dl.sciencesocieties.org/publications/sssaj/abstracts/81/5/1179 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Batello, C., L. Wade, S. Cox, N. Pogna, A. Bozzini, and J. Choptiany, 2014: *Perennial crops for food security*. http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=XF2017002349 (Accessed October 31, 2017).

Batir, J. F., M. J. Hornbach, and D. D. Blackwell, 2017: Ten years of measurements and modeling of soil temperature changes and their effects on permafrost in Northwestern Alaska. *Glob. Planet. Change*, **148**, 55–71, doi:10.1016/J.GLOPLACHA.2016.11.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818116303034 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Bauer, N., and Coauthors, 2018: Global energy sector emission reductions and bioenergy use: overview of the bioenergy demand phase of the EMF-33 model comparison. *Clim. Change*, 1–16, doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2226-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-018-2226-y (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Baveye, P. C., 2017: Quantification of ecosystem services: Beyond all the "guesstimates", how do we get real data? *Ecosyst. Serv.*, **24**, 47–49, doi:10.1016/J.ECOSER.2017.02.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212041616302856?via%3Dihub (Accessed February 20, 2019).

——, D. Rangel, A. R. Jacobson, M. Laba, C. Darnault, W. Otten, R. Radulovich, and F. A. O. Camargo, 2011: From Dust Bowl to Dust Bowl: Soils are Still Very Much a Frontier of Science. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **75**, 2037, doi:10.2136/sssaj2011.0145. https://www.soils.org/publications/sssaj/abstracts/75/6/2037 (Accessed October 30, 2018).

Beck, P. S. A., and Coauthors, 2011: Changes in forest productivity across Alaska consistent with biome shift. *Ecol. Lett.*, **14**, 373–379, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01598.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01598.x (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Beerling, D. J., 2017: Enhanced rock weathering: biological climate change mitigation with co-benefits for food security? *Biol. Lett.*, **13**, 20170149, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2017.0149. http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/lookup/doi/10.1098/rsbl.2017.0149 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Beets, W. C., 1990: *Raising and sustaining productivity of smallholder farming systems in the tropics: a handbook of sustainable agricultural development.* Agbe Publishing, Alkmaar, The Netherlands, 754 pp. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19916780980 (Accessed October 30, 2018).

Behnke, R., 1994: Natural Resource Management in Pastoral Africa. *Dev. Policy Rev.*, **12**, 5–28, doi:10.1111/j.1467-7679.1994.tb00053.x.

——, and M. Mortimore, 2016: Introduction: The End of Desertification? Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1–34 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-16014-1_1 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Belair, E. P., and M. J. Ducey, 2018: Patterns in Forest Harvesting in New England and New York: Using FIA Data to Evaluate Silvicultural Outcomes. *J. For.*, **116**, 273–282, doi:10.1093/jofore/fvx019. https://academic.oup.com/jof/article/116/3/273/4993098 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Bellamy, P. H., P. J. Loveland, R. I. Bradley, R. M. Lark, and G. J. D. Kirk, 2005: Carbon losses from all soils across England and Wales 1978–2003. *Nature*, **437**, 245–248, doi:10.1038/nature04038. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature04038 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Belnap, J., B. J. Walker, S. M. Munson, and R. A. Gill, 2014: Controls on sediment production in two U.S. deserts. *Aeolian Res.*, **14**, 15–24, doi:10.1016/J.AEOLIA.2014.03.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1875963714000263 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Benavidez, R., B. Jackson, D. Maxwell, and K. Norton, 2018: A review of the (Revised) Universal Soil Loss Equation (R/USLE): with a view to increasing its global applicability and improving soil loss estimates. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 1–34, doi:10.5194/hess-2018-68. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-68 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Bender, M. A., T. R. Knutson, R. E. Tuleya, J. J. Sirutis, G. A. Vecchi, S. T. Garner, and I. M. Held, 2010: Modeled Impact of Anthropogenic Warming on the Frequency of Intense Atlantic Hurricanes. *Science (80-.).*, **327**, 454 LP-458. http://science.sciencemag.org/content/327/5964/454.abstract.

Béné, C., R. G. Wood, A. Newsham, and M. Davies, 2012: Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability Reduction Programmes. *IDS Work. Pap.*, **2012**, 1–61, doi:10.1111/j.2040-0209.2012.00405.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2012.00405.x (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Benini, L., M. Antonellini, M. Laghi, and P. N. Mollema, 2016: Assessment of Water Resources Availability and Groundwater Salinization in Future Climate and Land use Change Scenarios: A Case Study from a Coastal Drainage Basin in Italy. *Water Resour. Manag.*, **30**, 731–745, doi:10.1007/s11269-015-1187-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11269-015-1187-4 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Benjaminsen, T. A., and C. Lund, 2003: *Securing land rights in Africa.* Frank Cass Publishers, London, UK, 175 pp. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20053122959 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Benjaminsen, T. A., K. Alinon, H. Buhaug, and J. T. Buseth, 2012: Does climate change drive land-use conflicts in the Sahel? *J. Peace Res.*, **49**, 97–111, doi:10.1177/0022343311427343.

http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022343311427343 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Bennett, M. T., 2008: China's sloping land conversion program: Institutional innovation or business as usual? *Ecol. Econ.*, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.09.017.

Bentz, B. J., and Coauthors, 2010: Climate Change and Bark Beetles of the Western United States and Canada: Direct and Indirect Effects. *Bioscience*, **60**, 602–613, doi:10.1525/bio.2010.60.8.6. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article-lookup/doi/10.1525/bio.2010.60.8.6 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Bernal, B., L. T. Murray, and T. R. H. Pearson, 2018: Global carbon dioxide removal rates from forest landscape restoration activities. *Carbon Balance Manag.*, **13**, doi:10.1186/s13021-018-0110-8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13021-018-0110-8.

Bernier, P. Y., and Coauthors, 2017: Moving beyond the concept of "primary forest" as a metric of forest environment quality. *Ecol. Appl.*, **27**, 349–354, doi:10.1002/eap.1477. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/eap.1477 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Bernoux, M., B. Volkoff, M. da C. S. Carvalho, and C. C. Cerri, 2003: CO2 emissions from liming of agricultural soils in Brazil. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **17**, n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2001GB001848. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2001GB001848 (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Betts, R. A., 2000: Offset of the potential carbon sink from boreal forestation by decreases in surface albedo. *Nature*, **408**, 187–190, doi:10.1038/35041545. http://www.nature.com/articles/35041545 (Accessed December 26, 2017).

——, and Coauthors, 2007: Projected increase in continental runoff due to plant responses to increasing carbon dioxide. *Nature*, **448**, 1037–1041, doi:10.1038/nature06045.

Betzold, C., and I. Mohamed, 2017: Seawalls as a response to coastal erosion and flooding: a case study from Grande Comore, Comoros (West Indian Ocean). *Reg. Environ. Chang.*, **17**, 1077–1087, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1044-x.

Bharucha, Z., and J. Pretty, 2010: The roles and values of wild foods in agricultural systems. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, **365**, 2913–2926, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0123. http://www.royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2010.0123 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Bhatia, K., and Coauthors, 2018: Projected Response of Tropical Cyclone Intensity and Intensification in a Global Climate Model. *J. Clim.*, **31**, 8281–8303, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0898.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0898.1 (Accessed October 14, 2018).

Biederman, L. A., and W. Stanley Harpole, 2013: Biochar and its effects on plant productivity and nutrient cycling: A meta-analysis. *GCB Bioenergy*, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12037.

Bindoff, N. L., and Coauthors, 2013: Detection and Attribution of Climate Change: from Global to Regional. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, T.F. Stocker et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 867–940.

Birdsey, R., K. Pregitzer, and A. Lucier, 2006: Forest Carbon Management in the United States. *J. Environ. Qual.*, **35**, 1461, doi:10.2134/jeq2005.0162. https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/35/4/1461 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Bisaro, A., M. Kirk, P. Zdruli, and W. Zimmermann, 2014: GLOBAL DRIVERS SETTING DESERTIFICATION RESEARCH PRIORITIES: INSIGHTS FROM A STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION FORUM. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **25**, 5–16, doi:10.1002/ldr.2220. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2220 (Accessed March 1, 2019).

Bitzer, V., and J. Bijman, 2015: From innovation to co-innovation? An exploration of African agrifood chains. *Br. Food J.*, **117**, 2182–2199, doi:10.1108/BFJ-12-2014-0403. http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/10.1108/BFJ-12-2014-0403 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

Black, R., S. R. G. Bennett, S. M. Thomas, and J. R. Beddington, 2011: Climate change: Migration as adaptation. *Nat. 2011 4787370*,.

Blaikie, P. M., and H. C. Brookfield, 1987: *Land degradation and society*. P.M. Blaikie and H.C. Brookfield, Eds. Methuen, Milton Park, Abingdon, UK,.

Blanco-Canqui, H., and R. Lal, 2009: Crop Residue Removal Impacts on Soil Productivity and Environmental Quality. *CRC. Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*, **28**, 139–163, doi:10.1080/07352680902776507. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352680902776507.

Blaser, W. J., J. Oppong, E. Yeboah, and J. Six, 2017: Shade trees have limited benefits for soil fertility in cocoa agroforests. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **243**, 83–91, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2017.04.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880917301615 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Blenkinsop, S., and Coauthors, 2018: The INTENSE project: using observations and models to understand the past, present and future of sub-daily rainfall extremes. *Adv. Sci. Res.*, **15**, 117–126, doi:10.5194/asr-15-117-2018. https://www.adv-sci-res.net/15/117/2018/ (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Boardman, J., 2010: A short history of muddy floods. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **21**, 303–309, doi:10.1002/ldr.1007. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.1007 (Accessed March 15, 2018).

Bocquet-Appel, J.-P., 2011: When the world's population took off: the springboard of the Neolithic Demographic Transition. *Science*, **333**, 560–561, doi:10.1126/science.1208880. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21798934 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Boit, A., and Coauthors, 2016: Large-scale impact of climate change vs. land-use change on future biome shifts in Latin America. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **22**, 3689–3701, doi:10.1111/gcb.13355. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13355 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Bonan, G. B., and Coauthors, 2008: Forests and climate change: forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits of forests. *Science*, **320**, 1444–1449, doi:10.1126/science.1155121. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18556546 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Bonanomi, G., F. Ippolito, G. Cesarano, F. Vinale, N. Lombardi, A. Crasto, S. L. Woo, and F. Scala, 2018: Biochar chemistry defined by13C-CPMAS NMR explains opposite effects on soilborne microbes and crop plants. *Appl. Soil Ecol.*, doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.11.027.

Bond-Lamberty, B., V. L. Bailey, M. Chen, C. M. Gough, and R. Vargas, 2018: Globally rising soil heterotrophic respiration over recent decades. *Nature*, **560**, 80–83, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0358-x. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0358-x (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Bond, T. C., and Coauthors, 2013: Bounding the role of black carbon in the climate system: A scientific assessment. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **118**, 5380–5552, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50171. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50171.

Bonn, A., Allott, T., Evans, M., Joosten, H., Stoneman, R., 2016: Peatland restoration and ecosystem services: nature-based solutions for societal goals. In: Bonn A., Allott T., Evans M., Joosten H., Stoneman R., (Eds.), Peatland restoration and ecosystem services: science, policy and practice. Cambridge University Pres. 402–417.

Borchard, N., and Coauthors, 2019: Biochar, soil and land-use interactions that reduce nitrate leaching and N2O emissions: A meta-analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **651**, 2354–2364, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.10.060. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969718339330 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Borras, S. M., and J. C. Franco, 2018: The challenge of locating land-based climate change mitigation and adaptation politics within a social justice perspective: towards an idea of agrarian climate justice. *Third World Q.*, **39**, 1308–1325, doi:10.1080/01436597.2018.1460592. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01436597.2018.1460592 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Borrelli, P., K. Paustian, P. Panagos, A. Jones, B. Schütt, and E. Lugato, 2016: Effect of Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions on erosion and soil organic carbon balance: A national case study. *Land use policy*, **50**, 408–421, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2015.09.033. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715003257 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

——, and Coauthors, 2017: An assessment of the global impact of 21st century land use change on soil erosion. *Nat. Commun.*, **8**, 2013, doi:10.1038/s41467-017-02142-7. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-017-02142-7 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Borrelli, P., K. Van Oost, K. Meusburger, C. Alewell, E. Lugato, and P. Panagos, 2018: A step towards a holistic assessment of soil degradation in Europe: Coupling on-site erosion with sediment transfer and carbon fluxes. *Environ. Res.*, **161**, 291–298, doi:10.1016/J.ENVRES.2017.11.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935117308137 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Bosire, J. O., F. Dahdouh-Guebas, M. Walton, B. I. Crona, R. R. Lewis, C. Field, J. G. Kairo, and N. Koedam, 2008: Functionality of restored mangroves: A review. *Aquat. Bot.*, **89**, 251–259, doi:10.1016/J.AQUABOT.2008.03.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304377008000521 (Accessed July 30, 2018).

Bot, A., F. Nachtergaele, and A. Young, 2000: *Land resource potential and constraints at regional and country levels*. Land and Water Development Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 114 pp.

Bousbih, S., and Coauthors, 2017: Potential of Sentinel-1 Radar Data for the Assessment of Soil and Cereal Cover Parameters. *Sensors*, **17**, 2617, doi:10.3390/s17112617. http://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/17/11/2617 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Bowles, T. M., S. S. Atallah, E. E. Campbell, A. C. M. Gaudin, W. R. Wieder, and A. S. Grandy, 2018: Addressing agricultural nitrogen losses in a changing climate. *Nat. Sustain.*, **1**, 399–408, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0106-0. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-018-0106-0 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Bozzi, E., L. Genesio, P. Toscano, M. Pieri, and F. Miglietta, 2015: Mimicking biochar-albedo feedback in complex Mediterranean agricultural landscapes. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/8/084014.

Bradshaw, C. J. A., N. S. Sodhi, K. S.-H. Peh, and B. W. Brook, 2007: Global evidence that deforestation amplifies flood risk and severity in the developing world. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **13**, 2379–2395, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01446.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01446.x (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Brahney, J., F. Weber, V. Foord, J. Janmaat, and P. J. Curtis, 2017: Evidence for a climate-driven hydrologic regime shift in the Canadian Columbia Basin. *Can. Water Resour. J. / Rev. Can. des ressources hydriques*, **42**, 179–192, doi:10.1080/07011784.2016.1268933. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07011784.2016.1268933 (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Branca, G., L. Lipper, N. McCarthy, and M. C. Jolejole, 2013: Food security, climate change, and sustainable land management. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, **33**, 635–650, doi:10.1007/s13593-013-0133-1.

Brandt, M., and Coauthors, 2017: Human population growth offsets climate-driven increase in woody vegetation in sub-Saharan Africa. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, **1**, 0081, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0081. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41559-017-0081 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2018a: Reduction of tree cover in West African woodlands and promotion in semi-arid farmlands. *Nat. Geosci.*, **11**, 328–333, doi:10.1038/s41561-018-0092-x. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41561-018-0092-x (Accessed May 23, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2018b: Satellite passive microwaves reveal recent climate-induced carbon losses in African drylands. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, **2**, 827–835, doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0530-6. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41559-018-0530-6 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Bright, R. M., K. Zhao, R. B. Jackson, and F. Cherubini, 2015: Quantifying surface albedo and other direct biogeophysical climate forcings of forestry activities. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **21**, 3246–3266, doi:10.1111/gcb.12951. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12951 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Brinkman, E. P., R. Postma, W. H. van der Putten, and A. J. Termorshuizen, 2017: Influence of growing Eucalyptus trees for biomass on soil quality. 1–39. https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai:pure.knaw.nl:publications%2F15ebd62c-9252-40d6-b54e-12f1d592ecbc (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Brisson, N., P. Gate, D. Gouache, G. Charmet, F.-X. Oury, and F. Huard, 2010: Why are wheat yields stagnating in Europe? A comprehensive data analysis for France. *F. Crop. Res.*, **119**, 201–212, doi:10.1016/J.FCR.2010.07.012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378429010001929 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Brockington, J. D., I. M. Harris, and R. M. Brook, 2016: Beyond the project cycle: a medium-term evaluation of agroforestry adoption and diffusion in a south Indian village. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **90**, 489–508, doi:10.1007/s10457-015-9872-0. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10457-015-9872-0 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Brooks, M. L., and Coauthors, 2004: Effects of Invasive Alien Plants on Fire Regimes. *Bioscience*, **54**, 677–688, doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0677:eoiapo]2.0.co;2. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/54/7/677/223532 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Brooks, M. L., and Coauthors, 2009: Effects of Invasive Alien Plants on Fire Regimes. *http://dx.doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0677:EOIAPO]2.0.CO;2*, doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0677:EOIAPO]2.0.CO;2. http://www.bioone.org/doi/abs/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0677:EOIAPO]2.0.CO;2 (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Brown, K., 2014: Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience? *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, **38**, 107–117, doi:10.1177/0309132513498837. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132513498837 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Brown, S., and R. J. Nicholls, 2015: Subsidence and human influences in mega deltas: The case of the Ganges–Brahmaputra–Meghna. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **527**–**528**, 362–374, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2015.04.124. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969715300589 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Brunner, K.-M., S. Mandl, and H. Thomson, 2018: Energy Poverty: Energy equity in a world of high demand and low supply. *The Oxford Handbook of Energy and Society*, D.J. Davidson and M. Gross, Eds., Oxford University Press, New York, United States, 297–316 https://books.google.se/books?hl=sv&lr=&id=eiRjDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA297&dq=biomass+cooking+time+poverty&ots=m5XhMqzIXq&sig=pcuysj1q-oUMYn5tH2PEAMAOn58&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=biomass cooking time poverty&f=false (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Buendia, C., R. J. Batalla, S. Sabater, A. Palau, and R. Marcé, 2016: Runoff Trends Driven by Climate and Afforestation in a Pyrenean Basin. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 823–838, doi:10.1002/ldr.2384. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2384 (Accessed October 21, 2018).

Buggy, L., and K. E. McNamara, 2016: The need to reinterpret “community” for climate change adaptation: a case study of Pele Island, Vanuatu. *Clim. Dev.*, **8**, 270–280, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1041445.

Bunn, C., P. Läderach, O. Ovalle Rivera, and D. Kirschke, 2015: A bitter cup: climate change profile of global production of Arabica and Robusta coffee. *Clim. Change*, **129**, 89–101, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1306-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-014-1306-x (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Bürgi, M., and Coauthors, 2017: Integrated Landscape Approach: Closing the Gap between Theory and Application. *Sustainability*, **9**, 1371, doi:10.3390/su9081371. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/9/8/1371 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Burkett, V., and J. Kusler, 2000: Climate change: potential impacts and interactions in wetlands in the United States. *JAWRA J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.*, **36**, 313–320, doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.2000.tb04270.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2000.tb04270.x (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Burlakova, L. E., A. Y. Karatayev, D. K. Padilla, L. D. Cartwright, and D. N. Hollas, 2009: Wetland restoration and invasive species: Apple snail (Pomacea insularum) feeding on native and invasive aquatic plants. *Restor. Ecol.*, **17**, 433–440, doi:10.1111/j.1526-100X.2008.00429.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2008.00429.x (Accessed July 18, 2018).

Burt, T., J. Boardman, I. Foster, and N. Howden, 2016a: More rain, less soil: long-term changes in rainfall intensity with climate change. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **41**, 563–566, doi:10.1002/esp.3868. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3868 (Accessed December 5, 2017).

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2016b: More rain, less soil: long-term changes in rainfall intensity with climate change. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **41**, 563–566, doi:10.1002/esp.3868.

Busch, J., and Coauthors, 2015: Reductions in emissions from deforestation from Indonesia's moratorium on new oil palm, timber, and logging concessions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **112**, 1328–1333, doi:10.7910/DVN/28615. http://www.pnas.org/content/112/5/1328.short.

Bush, D. M., 2004: *Living with Florida's Atlantic beaches : coastal hazards from Amelia Island to Key West*. Duke University Press, 338 pp.

Buss, W., O. Mašek, M. Graham, and D. Wüst, 2015: Inherent organic compounds in biochar-Their content, composition and potential toxic effects. *J. Environ. Manage.*, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.03.035.

Butler, R. A., L. P. Koh, and J. Ghazoul, 2009: REDD in the red: palm oil could undermine carbon payment schemes. *Conserv. Lett.*, **2**, 67–73, doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2009.00047.x.

Butzer, K. W., 2005: Environmental history in the Mediterranean world: cross-disciplinary investigation of cause-and-effect for degradation and soil erosion. *J. Archaeol. Sci.*, **32**, 1773–1800, doi:10.1016/J.JAS.2005.06.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305440305001275 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Byers, M., and N. Dragojlovic, 2004: Darfur: A climate change-induced humanitarian crisis? *Hum. Secur. Bull.*, 16–18.

Cacho, J. F., M. C. Negri, C. R. Zumpf, and P. Campbell, 2018: Introducing perennial biomass crops into agricultural landscapes to address water quality challenges and provide other environmental services. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Energy Environ.*, **7**, e275, doi:10.1002/wene.275. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/wene.275 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Cai, T., D. T. Price, A. L. Orchansky, and B. R. Thomas, 2011a: Carbon, Water, and Energy Exchanges of a Hybrid Poplar Plantation During the First Five Years Following Planting. *Ecosystems*, **14**, 658–671, doi:10.1007/s10021-011-9436-8.

Cai, X., X. Zhang, and D. Wang, 2011b: Land Availability for Biofuel Production. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **45**, 334–339, doi:10.1021/es103338e. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es103338e (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Caldwell, P. V., C. R. Jackson, C. F. Miniat, S. E. Younger, J. A. Vining, J. J. McDonnell, and D. P. Aubrey, 2018: Woody bioenergy crop selection can have large effects on water yield: A southeastern United States case study. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **117**, 180–189, doi:10.1016/J.BIOMBIOE.2018.07.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0961953418301910 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Camacho, L. D., D. T. Gevaña, †Antonio P. Carandang, and S. C. Camacho, 2016: Indigenous knowledge and practices for the sustainable management of Ifugao forests in Cordillera, Philippines. *Int. J. Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Manag.*, **12**, 5–13, doi:10.1080/21513732.2015.1124453. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21513732.2015.1124453 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Campioli, M., and Coauthors, 2015: Biomass production efficiency controlled by management in temperate and boreal ecosystems. *Nat. Geosci.*, **8**, 843–846, doi:10.1038/ngeo2553.

Capolongo, D., N. Diodato, C. M. Mannaerts, M. Piccarreta, and R. O. Strobl, 2008: Analyzing temporal changes in climate erosivity using a simplified rainfall erosivity model in Basilicata (southern Italy). *J. Hydrol.*, **356**, 119–130, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2008.04.002. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169408001753 (Accessed December 5, 2017).

Carlson, K. M., and Coauthors, 2017: Effect of oil palm sustainability certification on deforestation and fire in Indonesia. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **115**, 201704728, doi:10.1073/pnas.1704728114.

Carton, W., and E. Andersson, 2017: Where Forest Carbon Meets Its Maker: Forestry-Based Offsetting as the Subsumption of Nature. *Soc. Nat. Resour.*, **30**, 829–843, doi:10.1080/08941920.2017.1284291. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08941920.2017.1284291 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Cattani, D., and S. Asselin, 2018: Has Selection for Grain Yield Altered Intermediate Wheatgrass? *Sustainability*, **10**, 688, doi:10.3390/su10030688. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/3/688 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Cavan, G., and Coauthors, 2014: Urban morphological determinants of temperature regulating ecosystem services in two African cities. *Ecol. Indic.*, **42**, 43–57, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2014.01.025. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X14000338 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Cayuela, M. L., S. Jeffery, and L. Van Zwieten, 2015: The molar H: Corg ratio of biochar is a key factor in mitigating N 2 O emissions from soil. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **202**, 135–138.

Cazenave, A., and G. Le Cozannet, 2014: Sea level rise and its coastal impacts. *Earth's Futur.*, **2**, 15–34, doi:10.1002/2013EF000188. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2013EF000188 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

CEC, 2009: *Adapting to Climate Change: towards a European Framework for Action. Europena Commission, Brussels.*

Cerdà, A., J. Rodrigo-Comino, A. Giménez-Morera, and S. D. Keesstra, 2018: Hydrological and erosional impact and farmer's perception on catch crops and weeds in citrus organic farming in Canyoles river watershed, Eastern Spain. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **258**, 49–58, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2018.02.015. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880918300823 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Certini, G., 2005: Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: a review. *Oecologia*, **143**, 1–10, doi:10.1007/s00442-004-1788-8. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00442-004-1788-8 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Chambers, R., and G. Conway, 1992: *Sustainable rural livelihoods : practical concepts for the 21st century*. Institute of Development Studies, 42 pp.

https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/775 (Accessed January 9, 2018).

Chan, K. Y., L. Van Zwieten, I. Meszaros, A. Downie, and S. Joseph, 2008: Using poultry litter biochars as soil amendments. *Soil Res.*, **46**, 437, doi:10.1071/SR08036. http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=SR08036 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Chandio, N. H., M. M. Anwar, and A. A. Chandio, 2011: Degradation ofIndus Delta, Removal of Mangroves Forestland; its causes. A Case Study of Indus River Delta. *Sindh Univ. Res. Jour. (Sci. Ser.)*, **43**.

Changjin, S., and C. L., 2007: A review of watershed environmental services from forest in China. Chapter 3. *in L.Xiaoyun, J. Leshan, Z. Ting, and I. Bond, editors. Payment for watershed services in China: the role of government and market. Social Sciences Academic Press (China), Beijing,China.*

Chappell, A., J. Baldock, and J. Sanderman, 2016: The global significance of omitting soil erosion from soil organic carbon cycling schemes. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 187–191, doi:10.1038/nclimate2829. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2829 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Charles, R. L., P. K. T. Munushi, and E. F. Nzunda, 2013: Agroforestry as Adaptation Strategy under Climate Change in Mwanga District, Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. *Int. J. Environ. Prot.*, **3**, 29–38.

Chaudhuri, P., S. Ghosh, M. Bakshi, S. Bhattacharyya, and B. Nath, 2015: A Review of Threats and Vulnerabilities to Mangrove Habitats: With Special Emphasis on East Coast of India. *J. Earth Sci. Clim. Change*, **06**, 270, doi:10.4172/2157-7617.1000270. http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2157-7617.1000270 (Accessed July 30, 2018).

Chazdon, R. L., and M. Uriarte, 2016: Natural regeneration in the context of large-scale forest and landscape restoration in the tropics. *Biotropica*, **48**, 709–715, doi:10.1111/btp.12409.

Chazdon, R. L., and Coauthors, 2016a: Carbon sequestration potential of second-growth forest regeneration in the Latin American tropics. *Sci. Adv.*, **2**, e1501639–e1501639, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1501639.

——, and Coauthors, 2016b: Carbon sequestration potential of second-growth forest regeneration in the Latin American tropics. *Sci. Adv.*, **2**, e1501639–e1501639, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1501639. http://advances.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/sciadv.1501639 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Chazdon, R. L., P. H. S. Brancalion, D. Lamb, L. Laestadius, M. Calmon, and C. Kumar, 2017: A Policy-Driven Knowledge Agenda for Global Forest and Landscape Restoration. *Conserv. Lett.*, **10**, 125–132, doi:10.1111/conl.12220. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/conl.12220 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Cheesman, S., C. Thierfelder, N. S. Eash, G. T. Kassie, and E. Frossard, 2016: Soil carbon stocks in conservation agriculture systems of Southern Africa. *Soil Tillage Res.*, **156**, 99–109, doi:10.1016/J.STILL.2015.09.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167198715300350 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Chen, C., and Coauthors, 2019: China and India lead in greening of the world through land-use management. *Nat. Sustain.*, **2**, 122–129, doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0220-7. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-019-0220-7 (Accessed February 21, 2019).

Chen, D., W. Wei, and L. Chen, 2017: Effects of terracing practices on water erosion control in China: A meta-analysis. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **173**, 109–121, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2017.08.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825217300090 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Chen, J., and Coauthors, 2018a: Prospects for the sustainability of social-ecological systems (SES) on the Mongolian plateau: five critical issues. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, 123004, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaf27b.

Chen, J., M. T. Ter-Mikaelian, P. Q. Ng, and S. J. Colombo, 2018b: Ontario's managed forests and harvested wood products contribute to greenhouse gas mitigation from 2020 to 2100. *For. Chron.*, **43**, 269–282, doi:10.5558/tfc2018-040.

Chen, S., and Coauthors, 2018c: Plant diversity enhances productivity and soil carbon storage. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **115**, 4027–4032, doi:10.1073/pnas.1700298114. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29666315 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Chen, Z., and Coauthors, 2018d: Source Partitioning of Methane Emissions and its Seasonality in the U.S. Midwest. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, **123**, 646–659, doi:10.1002/2017JG004356. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2017JG004356 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Cheng, L., and A. AghaKouchak, 2015: Nonstationary Precipitation Intensity-Duration-Frequency Curves for Infrastructure Design in a Changing Climate. *Sci. Rep.*, **4**, 7093, doi:10.1038/srep07093. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep07093 (Accessed March 7, 2019).

Cherlet, M., C. Hutchinson, J. Reynolds, J. Hill, S. Sommer, and G. von Maltitz, 2018: *World Atlas of Desertification*. 3rd editio. Publication Office of the European Union, Luxemburg, 248 pp.

Chia, E., K. Fobissie, M. Kanninen, E. L. Chia, K. Fobissie, and M. Kanninen, 2016: Exploring Opportunities for Promoting Synergies between Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in Forest Carbon Initiatives. *Forests*, **7**, 24, doi:10.3390/f7010024. http://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/7/1/24 (Accessed March 22, 2019).

Cho, M.-H., A.-R. Yang, E.-H. Baek, S. M. Kang, S.-J. Jeong, J. Y. Kim, and B.-M. Kim, 2018: Vegetation-cloud feedbacks to future vegetation changes in the Arctic regions. *Clim. Dyn.*, **50**, 3745–3755, doi:10.1007/s00382-017-3840-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00382-017-3840-5 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Choi, S.-D., K. Lee, and Y.-S. Chang, 2002: Large rate of uptake of atmospheric carbon dioxide by planted forest biomass in Korea. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **16**, 1089, doi:10.1029/2002GB001914, doi:10.1029/2002GB001914. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2002GB001914 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Christensen, T. R., T. Johansson, H. J. Åkerman, M. Mastepanov, N. Malmer, T. Friborg, P. Crill, and B. H. Svensson, 2004: Thawing sub-arctic permafrost: Effects on vegetation and methane emissions. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **31**, L04501, doi:10.1029/2003GL018680. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2003GL018680 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Ciais, P., and Coauthors, 2013: Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, J. Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen and V.B. and P.M.M. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, 467–570.

Cilas, C., F.-R. Goebel, R. Babin, and J. Avelino, 2016: Tropical Crop Pests and Diseases in a Climate Change Setting—A Few Examples. *Climate Change and Agriculture Worldwide*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 73–82 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-017-7462-8_6 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Classen, A. T., M. K. Sundqvist, J. A. Henning, G. S. Newman, J. A. M. Moore, M. A. Cregger, L. C. Moorhead, and C. M. Patterson, 2015: Direct and indirect effects of climate change on soil microbial and soil microbial-plant interactions: What lies ahead? *Ecosphere*, **6**, art130, doi:10.1890/ES15-00217.1. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/ES15-00217.1 (Accessed May 2, 2018).

Cohen-Shacham, E., Walters, G., Janzen, C. and Maginnis, S., 2016: *Nature-based Solutions to address global societal challenges*. Gland, Switzerland, xiii + 97pp. pp.

Colloff, M. J., S. Lavorel, R. M. Wise, M. Dunlop, I. C. Overton, and K. J. Williams, 2016: Adaptation services of floodplains and wetlands under transformational climate change. *Ecol. Appl.*, **26**, 1003–1017, doi:10.1890/15-0848. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/15-0848 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Colombani, N., A. Osti, G. Volta, and M. Mastrocicco, 2016: Impact of Climate Change on Salinization of Coastal Water Resources. *Water Resour. Manag.*, **30**, 2483–2496, doi:10.1007/s11269-016-1292-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11269-016-1292-z (Accessed February 28, 2019).

Coma, J., G. Pï¿½rez, A. de Gracia, S. Burï¿½s, M. Urrestarazu, and L. F. Cabeza, 2017: Vertical greenery systems for energy savings in buildings: A comparative study between green walls and green facades. *Build. Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.11.014.

Conant, R. T., and K. Paustian, 2002: Potential soil carbon sequestration in overgrazed grassland ecosystems. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **16**, 90-1-90–99, doi:10.1029/2001GB001661. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2001GB001661 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2011a: Temperature and soil organic matter decomposition rates - synthesis of current knowledge and a way forward. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **17**, 3392–3404, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02496.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02496.x (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Conant, R. T., S. M. Ogle, E. A. Paul, and K. Paustian, 2011b: Measuring and monitoring soil organic carbon stocks in agricultural lands for climate mitigation. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **9**, 169–173, doi:10.1890/090153. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/090153 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Conant, R. T., C. E. P. Cerri, B. B. Osborne, and K. Paustian, 2017: Grassland management impacts on soil carbon stocks: a new synthesis. *Ecol. Appl.*, **27**, 662–668, doi:10.1002/eap.1473. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/eap.1473 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Coomes, O. T., Y. Takasaki, and J. M. Rhemtulla, 2011: Land-use poverty traps identified in shifting cultivation systems shape long-term tropical forest cover. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **108**, 13925–13930, doi:10.1073/PNAS.1012973108. https://www.pnas.org/content/108/34/13925.long (Accessed March 5, 2019).

Cooper, J. A. G., and J. Pile, 2014: The adaptation-resistance spectrum: A classification of contemporary adaptation approaches to climate-related coastal change. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **94**, 90–98, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.09.006.

Coppus, R., and A. C. Imeson, 2002: Extreme events controlling erosion and sediment transport in a semi-arid sub-andean valley. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **27**, 1365–1375, doi:10.1002/esp.435. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.435 (Accessed May 22, 2018).

Costanza, R., O. Pérez-Maqueo, M. L. Martinez, P. Sutton, S. J. Anderson, and K. Mulder, 2008: The Value of Coastal Wetlands for Hurricane Protection. *AMBIO A J. Hum. Environ.*, **37**, 241–248, doi:10.1579/0044-7447(2008)37[241:TVOCWF]2.0.CO;2. http://www.bioone.org/doi/abs/10.1579/0044-7447(2008)37[241:TVOCWF]2.0.CO;2 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Cote, M., and A. J. Nightingale, 2012: Resilience thinking meets social theory. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, **36**, 475–489, doi:10.1177/0309132511425708. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132511425708 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Cotrufo, M. F., J. L. Soong, A. J. Horton, E. E. Campbell, M. L. Haddix, D. H. Wall, and W. J. Parton, 2015: Formation of soil organic matter via biochemical and physical pathways of litter mass loss. *Nat. Geosci.*, **8**, 776–779, doi:10.1038/ngeo2520. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2520 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

Cowie, A., A. D. Woolf, J. Gaunt, M. Brandão, R. A. de la Rosa, and C. A., 2015: Biochar, carbon accounting and climate change. *Biochar for Environmental Management Science, Technology and Implementation Edited By Stephen Joseph, Johannes Lehmann. Taylor and Francis. 763-794*.

Cowie, A. L., and Coauthors, 2018: Land in balance: The scientific conceptual framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **79**, 25–35.

Cox, S., P. Nabukalu, A. Paterson, W. Kong, and S. Nakasagga, 2018: Development of Perennial Grain Sorghum. *Sustainability*, **10**, 172, doi:10.3390/su10010172. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-

1050/10/1/172 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Cramer, W., and Coauthors, 2014: Detection and attribution of observed impacts. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, D.J.D. [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, E.S.K. K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, and And L.L.W. A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 979–1037.

Cretney, R., 2014: Resilience for Whom? Emerging Critical Geographies of Socio-ecological Resilience. *Geogr. Compass*, **8**, 627–640, doi:10.1111/gec3.12154. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gec3.12154 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Crews, T., W. Carton, and L. Olsson, 2018: Is the future of agriculture perennial? Imperatives and opportunities to reinvent agriculture by shifting from annual monocultures to perennial polycultures. *Glob. Sustain.*, **forthcomin**, 35.

Crews, T. E., and S. R. Gliessman, 1991: Raised field agriculture in Tlaxcala, Mexico: An ecosystem perspective on maintenance of soil fertility. *Am. J. Altern. Agric.*, **6**, 9, doi:10.1017/S088918930000374X. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S088918930000374X (Accessed October 29, 2018).

——, and B. E. Rumsey, 2017: What agriculture can learn from native ecosystems in building soil organic matter: A review. *Sustain.*, **9**, 1–18, doi:10.3390/su9040578.

Crews, T. E., J. Blesh, S. W. Culman, R. C. Hayes, E. Steen Jensen, M. C. Mack, M. B. Peoples, and M. E. Schipanski, 2016: Going where no grains have gone before: From early to mid-succession. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **223**, 223–238, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.012 (Accessed October 31, 2017).

Crowther, T. W., S. M. Thomas, D. S. Maynard, P. Baldrian, K. Covey, S. D. Frey, L. T. A. van Diepen, and M. A. Bradford, 2015: Biotic interactions mediate soil microbial feedbacks to climate change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **112**, 7033–7038, doi:10.1073/pnas.1502956112. http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1502956112 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Crowther, T. W., and Coauthors, 2016: Quantifying global soil carbon losses in response to warming. *Nature*, **540**, 104–108, doi:10.1038/nature20150. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature20150 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Crozier, M. J., 2010: Deciphering the effect of climate change on landslide activity: A review. *Geomorphology*, **124**, 260–267, doi:10.1016/J.GEOMORPH.2010.04.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X10001881 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Čuček, L., J. J. Klemeš, and Z. Kravanja, 2012: A Review of Footprint analysis tools for monitoring impacts on sustainability. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **34**, 9–20, doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2012.02.036. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652612001126 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Cui, G., and Coauthors, 2014: Estimation of forest carbon budget from land cover change in South and North Korea between 1981 and 2010. *J. Plant Biol.*, **57**, 225–238, doi:10.1007/s12374-014-0165-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12374-014-0165-3 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Culman, S. W., S. S. Snapp, M. Ollenburger, B. Basso, and L. R. DeHaan, 2013: Soil and water quality rapidly responds to the perennial grain Kernza wheatgrass. *Agron. J.*, **105**, 735–744, doi:10.2134/agronj2012.0273.

Curtis, P. G., C. M. Slay, N. L. Harris, A. Tyukavina, and M. C. Hansen, 2018: Classifying drivers of global forest loss. *Science (80-.).*, **361**, 1108–1111, doi:10.1126/science.aau3445. http://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aau3445.

Cutter, S. L., L. Barnes, M. Berry, C. Burton, E. Evans, E. Tate, and J. Webb, 2008: A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **18**, 598–606, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2008.07.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378008000666 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

D'Annunzio, R., E. J. Lindquist, and K. G. MacDicken, 2017: *Global forest land- -use change from 1990 to 2010: an update to a global remote sensing survey of forests*. FAO, Rome, Italy, http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5098e.pdf.

Dallimer, M., and L. C. Stringer, 2018: Informing investments in land degradation neutrality efforts: A triage approach to decision making. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **89**, 198–205, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.08.004.

Dargie, G. C., S. L. Lewis, I. T. Lawson, E. T. A. Mitchard, S. E. Page, Y. E. Bocko, and S. A. Ifo, 2017: Age, extent and carbon storage of the central Congo Basin peatland complex. *Nature*, **542**, 86–90, doi:10.1038/nature21048.

Darrah, S. E., Y. Shennan-Farpón, J. Loh, N. C. Davidson, C. M. Finlayson, R. C. Gardner, and M. J. Walpole, 2019: Improvements to the Wetland Extent Trends (WET) index as a tool for monitoring natural and human-made wetlands. *Ecol. Indic.*, **99**, 294–298, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2018.12.032. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18309671 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Davidson, N. C., 2014: How much wetland has the world lost? Long-term and recent trends in global wetland area. *Mar. Freshw. Res.*, **65**, 934, doi:10.1071/MF14173. http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=MF14173 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Davies, M. I. J., 2015: Economic Specialisation, Resource Variability, and the Origins of Intensive Agriculture in Eastern Africa. *Rural Landscapes Soc. Environ. Hist.*, **2**, doi:10.16993/rl.af. http://www.rurallandscapesjournal.com/article/view/rl.af/ (Accessed March 27, 2019).

——, and H. L. Moore, 2016: Landscape, time and cultural resilience: a brief history of agriculture in Pokot and Marakwet, Kenya. *J. East. African Stud.*, **10**, 67–87, doi:10.1080/17531055.2015.1134417. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17531055.2015.1134417 (Accessed March 27, 2019).

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake, and K. J. Gaston, 2011: Mapping an urban ecosystem service: Quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a city-wide scale. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02021.x.

Davin, E. L., N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, E. L. Davin, and N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, 2010: Climatic Impact of Global-Scale Deforestation: Radiative versus Nonradiative Processes. *J. Clim.*, **23**, 97–112, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI3102.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/2009JCLI3102.1 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Davin, E. L., S. I. Seneviratne, P. Ciais, A. Olioso, and T. Wang, 2014: Preferential cooling of hot extremes from cropland albedo management. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **111**, 9757–9761, doi:10.1073/pnas.1317323111. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24958872 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Day, J. J., and K. I. Hodges, 2018: Growing Land-Sea Temperature Contrast and the Intensification of Arctic Cyclones. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **45**, 3673–3681, doi:10.1029/2018GL077587. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2018GL077587 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

DeConto, R. M., and D. Pollard, 2016: Contribution of Antarctica to past and future sea-level rise. *Nature*, **531**, 591–597, doi:10.1038/nature17145. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature17145 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

DeHaan, L., M. Christians, J. Crain, and J. Poland, 2018: Development and Evolution of an Intermediate

Wheatgrass Domestication Program. *Sustainability*, **10**, 1499, doi:10.3390/su10051499. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/5/1499 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

DeHaan, L. R., and D. L. Van Tassel, 2014: Useful insights from evolutionary biology for developing perennial grain crops1. *Am. J. Bot.*, **101**, 1801–1819, doi:10.3732/ajb.1400084. http://doi.wiley.com/10.3732/ajb.1400084 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

DeHaan, L. R., and Coauthors, 2016: A pipeline strategy for grain crop domestication. *Crop Sci.*, **56**, 917–930, doi:10.2135/cropsci2015.06.0356.

Delgado, A., and J. A. Gómez, 2016: The Soil. Physical, Chemical and Biological Properties. *Principles of Agronomy for Sustainable Agriculture*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 15–26 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-46116-8_2 (Accessed March 4, 2019).

Dell, M., B. F. Jones, and B. A. Olken, 2009: Temperature and Income: Reconciling New Cross-Sectional and Panel Estimates. *Am. Econ. Rev.*, **99**, 198–204, doi:10.1257/aer.99.2.198. http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.99.2.198 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Demuzere, M., and Coauthors, 2014: Mitigating and adapting to climate change: Multi-functional and multi-scale assessment of green urban infrastructure. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **146**, 107–115, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2014.07.025. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479714003740 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Devendra, C., 2002: Crop–animal systems in Asia: implications for research. *Agric. Syst.*, **71**, 169–177, doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(01)00042-7. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308521X01000427 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

——, and D. Thomas, 2002: Crop–animal systems in Asia: importance of livestock and characterisation of agro-ecological zones. *Agric. Syst.*, **71**, 5–15, doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(01)00032-4. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308521X01000324 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

DG Environment News Alert Service, 2012: *The Multifunctionality of Green Infrastructure*. European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, 40 pp. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/docs/Green_Infrastructure.pdf (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Dhanush, D., and Coauthors, 2015: Impact of climate change on African agriculture: focus on pests and diseases. https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/66472 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Dignac, M.-F., and Coauthors, 2017: Increasing soil carbon storage: mechanisms, effects of agricultural practices and proxies. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, **37**, 14, doi:10.1007/s13593-017-0421-2. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13593-017-0421-2 (Accessed May 11, 2018).

Ding, F., L. Van Zwieten, W. Zhang, Z. (Han) Weng, S. Shi, J. Wang, and J. Meng, 2018: A meta-analysis and critical evaluation of influencing factors on soil carbon priming following biochar amendment. *J. Soils Sediments*, doi:10.1007/s11368-017-1899-6.

Dintwe, K., G. S. Okin, and Y. Xue, 2017: Fire-induced albedo change and surface radiative forcing in sub-Saharan Africa savanna ecosystems: Implications for the energy balance. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **122**, 6186–6201, doi:10.1002/2016JD026318. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2016JD026318 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Dixon, M. J. R., J. Loh, N. C. Davidson, C. Beltrame, R. Freeman, and M. Walpole, 2016: Tracking global change in ecosystem area: The Wetland Extent Trends index. *Biol. Conserv.*, **193**, 27–35, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2015.10.023. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0006320715301476 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Djurfeldt, A. A., E. Hillbom, W. O. Mulwafu, P. Mvula, and G. Djurfeldt, 2018: "The family farms together, the decisions, however are made by the man" —Matrilineal land tenure systems, welfare and decision making in rural Malawi. *Land use policy*, **70**, 601–610, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.10.048. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0264837717306683 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Dommain, R., A. Barthelmes, F. Tanneberger, A. Bonn, C. Bain, and H. Joosten, 2012: Peatlands - guidance for climate change mitigation through conservation, rehabilitation and sustainable use. *Mitigation of Climate Change in Agriculture (MICCA) Programme series 5*.

——, S. Frolking, A. Jeltsch-Thömmes, F. Joos, J. Couwenberg, and P. H. Glaser, 2018: A radiative forcing analysis of tropical peatlands before and after their conversion to agricultural plantations. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 5518–5533, doi:10.1111/gcb.14400.

Donner, S., 2012: Sea level rise and the ongoing Battle of Tarawa. *Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*, **93**, 169–170, doi:10.1029/2012EO170001.

Donner, S. D., and S. Webber, 2014: Obstacles to climate change adaptation decisions: a case study of sea-level rise and coastal protection measures in Kiribati. *Sustain. Sci.*, **9**, 331–345, doi:10.1007/s11625-014-0242-z.

Dooley, K., and S. Kartha, 2018: Land-based negative emissions: risks for climate mitigation and impacts on sustainable development. *Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law Econ.*, **18**, 79–98, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9382-9. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10784-017-9382-9 (Accessed March 16, 2018).

Doss, C., C. Kovarik, A. Peterman, A. Quisumbing, and M. van den Bold, 2015: Gender inequalities in ownership and control of land in Africa: myth and reality. *Agric. Econ.*, **46**, 403–434, doi:10.1111/agec.12171. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/agec.12171 (Accessed October 19, 2018).

Dotterweich, M., 2008: The history of soil erosion and fluvial deposits in small catchments of central Europe: Deciphering the long-term interaction between humans and the environment — A review. *Geomorphology*, **101**, 192–208, doi:10.1016/J.GEOMORPH.2008.05.023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X08002213#bib100 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

——, 2013: The history of human-induced soil erosion: Geomorphic legacies, early descriptions and research, and the development of soil conservation—A global synopsis. *Geomorphology*, **201**, 1–34, doi:10.1016/J.GEOMORPH.2013.07.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X1300370X (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Dow, K., F. Berkhout, and B. L. Preston, 2013a: Limits to adaptation to climate change: a risk approach. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **5**, 384–391, doi:10.1016/J.COSUST.2013.07.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343513000845 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

——, ——, B. L. Preston, R. J. T. Klein, G. Midgley, and M. R. Shaw, 2013b: Limits to adaptation. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **3**, 305–307, doi:10.1038/nclimate1847. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate1847 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Downie, A., P. Munroe, A. Cowie, L. Van Zwieten, and D. M. S. Lau, 2012: Biochar as a Geoengineering Climate Solution: Hazard Identification and Risk Management. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, doi:10.1080/10643389.2010.507980.

Dragoni, D., H. P. Schmid, C. A. Wayson, H. Potters, C. S. B. Grimmond, and J. C. Randolph, 2011: Evidence of increased net ecosystem productivity associated with a longer vegetated season in a deciduous forest in south-central Indiana, USA. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **17**, 886–897, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02281.x.

Dregne, H. E., 1998: Desertification Assessment. *Methods for assessment of soil degradation*, R. Lal, Ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, New York, Washington DC, 441–458.

Drescher, J., and Coauthors, 2016: Ecological and socio-economic functions across tropical land use systems after rainforest conversion. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, **371**, 20150275, doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0275. http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/lookup/doi/10.1098/rstb.2015.0275 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Drösler, M., L. V. Verchot, A. Freibauer, and G. Pan, 2013: Drained inland organic soils. *2013 Suppl. to 2006 IPCC Guidel. Natl. Greenh. Gas Invent. Wetl.*, 1–79.

Dugan, A. J., R. Birdsey, V. S. Mascorro, M. Magnan, C. E. Smyth, M. Olguin, and W. A. Kurz, 2018: A systems approach to assess climate change mitigation options in landscapes of the United States forest sector. *Carbon Balance Manag.*, **13**, 13, doi:10.1186/s13021-018-0100-x. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13021-018-0100-x.

Dumanski, J., and C. Pieri, 2000: Land quality indicators: research plan. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **81**, 93–102, doi:10.1016/S0167-8809(00)00183-3. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880900001833 (Accessed September 27, 2018).

Duncan, T., 2016: Case Study: Taranaki Farm Regenerative Agriculture. Pathways to Integrated Ecological Farming. *L. Restor.*, 271–287, doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-801231-4.00022-7. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128012314000227 (Accessed April 14, 2019).

Dupouey, J. L., E. Dambrine, J. D. Laffite, and C. Moares, 2002: Irreversible impact of past land use on forest soils and biodiversity. *Ecology*, **83**, 2978–2984, doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083[2978:IIOPLU]2.0.CO;2. https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1890/0012-9658%282002%29083%5B2978%3AIIOPLU%5D2.0.CO%3B2 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Dutta, D., P. K. Das, S. Paul, J. R. Sharma, and V. K. Dadhwal, 2015: Assessment of ecological disturbance in the mangrove forest of Sundarbans caused by cyclones using MODIS time-series data (2001–2011). *Nat. Hazards*, **79**, 775–790, doi:10.1007/s11069-015-1872-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11069-015-1872-x (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Duvat, V., 2013: Coastal protection structures in Tarawa Atoll, Republic of Kiribati. *Sustain. Sci.*, **8**, 363–379, doi:10.1007/s11625-013-0205-9.

Duvat, V. K. E., A. K. Magnan, S. Etienne, C. Salmon, and C. Pignon-Mussaud, 2016: Assessing the impacts of and resilience to Tropical Cyclone Bejisa, Reunion Island (Indian Ocean). *Nat. Hazards*, **83**, 601–640, doi:10.1007/s11069-016-2338-5.

Earles, J. M., S. Yeh, and K. E. Skog, 2012: Timing of carbon emissions from global forest clearance. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **2**, 682–685, doi:10.1038/nclimate1535.

Edmondson, J. L., Z. G. Davies, S. A. McCormack, K. J. Gaston, and J. R. Leake, 2011: Are soils in urban ecosystems compacted? A citywide analysis. *Biol. Lett.*, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0260.

——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2014: Land-cover effects on soil organic carbon stocks in a European city. *Sci. Total Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.11.025.

Edstedt, K., and W. Carton, 2018a: The benefits that (only) capital can see? Resource access and degradation in industrial carbon forestry, lessons from the CDM in Uganda. *Geoforum*, **97**, 315–323, doi:10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2018.09.030. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718518302896 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

——, and ——, 2018b: The benefits that (only) capital can see? Resource access and degradation in industrial carbon forestry, lessons from the CDM in Uganda. *Geoforum*, doi:10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2018.09.030. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718518302896 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Eglin, T., and Coauthors, 2010: Historical and future perspectives of global soil carbon response to climate and land-use changes. *Tellus B Chem. Phys. Meteorol.*, **62**, 700–718, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2010.00499.x. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2010.00499.x (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Ehnström, B., 2001: Leaving Dead Wood for Insects in Boreal Forests - Suggestions for the Future. *Scand. J. For. Res.*, **16**, 91–98, doi:10.1080/028275801300090681. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/028275801300090681 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Ehrenfeld, J. G., B. Ravit, and K. Elgersma, 2005: FEEDBACK IN THE PLANT-SOIL SYSTEM. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **30**, 75–115, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144212. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144212 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Eisenbies, M. H., W. M. Aust, J. A. Burger, and M. B. Adams, 2007: Forest operations, extreme flooding events, and considerations for hydrologic modeling in the Appalachians—A review. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **242**, 77–98, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2007.01.051. https://ac.els-cdn.com/S0378112707000746/1-s2.0-S0378112707000746-main.pdf?_tid=2ecd3669-3c0e-4f49-b501-b964be8ffd62&acdnat=1520241780_5f53e0bc68da2f0d2220c0d9136aa38b (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Elad, Y., E. Cytryn, Y. Meller Harel, B. Lew, and E. R. Graber, 2011: The biochar effect: Plant resistance to biotic stresses. *Phytopathol. Mediterr.*, doi:10.14601/Phytopathol_Mediterr-9807.

Ellbehri et al., 2017: *FAO-IPCC Expert Meeting on Climate Change, Land Use and Food Security: Final Meeting Report. Rome, 156 pp.*

Elliott, M., N. D. Cutts, and A. Trono, 2014: A typology of marine and estuarine hazards and risks as vectors of change: A review for vulnerable coasts and their management. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **93**, 88–99, doi:10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2014.03.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096456911400074X (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Ellis, E. C., J. O. Kaplan, D. Q. Fuller, S. Vavrus, K. Klein Goldewijk, and P. H. Verburg, 2013: Used planet: a global history. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **110**, 7978–7985, doi:10.1073/pnas.1217241110. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23630271 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Ellis, J. E., 1994: Climate variability and complex ecosystem dynamics: implications for pastoral developmen. *Living with uncertainty: New directions in pastoral development in Africa*, I. Scoones, Ed., Internmediate Technology Publications, London, 37–46.

Ellis, P. W., and Coauthors, 2019: Reduced-impact logging for climate change mitigation (RIL-C) can halve selective logging emissions from tropical forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **438**, 255–266, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2019.02.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112718322126?dgcid=rss_sd_all.

Ellison, D., and Coauthors, 2017: Trees, forests and water: Cool insights for a hot world. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **43**, 51–61, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2017.01.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378017300134 (Accessed March 13, 2019).

Elmhirst, R., 2011: Introducing new feminist political ecologies. *Geoforum*, **42**, 129–132, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.006. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S001671851100008X (Accessed April 16, 2018).

England, M. H., and Coauthors, 2014: Recent intensification of wind-driven circulation in the Pacific and the ongoing warming hiatus. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **4**, 222–227, doi:10.1038/nclimate2106. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2106 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Erb, K.-H. H., and Coauthors, 2018: Unexpectedly large impact of forest management and grazing on global vegetation biomass. *Nature*, **553**, 73–76, doi:10.1038/nature25138.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature25138 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Erwin, K. L., 2009: Wetlands and global climate change: The role of wetland restoration in a changing world. *Wetl. Ecol. Manag.*, **17**, 71–84, doi:10.1007/s11273-008-9119-1. https://www.wetlands.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Wetlands-and-Global-Climate-Change.pdf (Accessed June 19, 2018).

van der Esch, S., and Coauthors, 2017: *Exploring future changes in land use and land condition and the impacts on food, water, climate change and biodiversity: Scenarios for the Global Land Outlook*. The Hague, The Netherlands, https://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/pbl-2017-exploring-future-changes-in-land-use-and-land-condition-2076b.pdf.

Etemadi, H., S. Z. Samadi, M. Sharifikia, and J. M. Smoak, 2016: Assessment of climate change downscaling and non-stationarity on the spatial pattern of a mangrove ecosystem in an arid coastal region of southern Iran. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, **126**, 35–49, doi:10.1007/s00704-015-1552-5.

eThekwini Municipal Council, 2014: *The Durban Climate Change Strategy. Environmental Planning and Climate Protection Department (EPCPD) and the Energy Office (EO) of eThekwini Municipality, Durban, South Africa*.

European Union, 2015: Towards an EU Research and Innovation policy agenda for Nature-Based Solutions & Re-Naturing Cities. *Nature-Based Solut. Re-Naturing Cities*, doi:10.2777/765301.

Evans, C. D., F. Renou-Wilson, and M. Strack, 2016: The role of waterborne carbon in the greenhouse gas balance of drained and re-wetted peatlands. *Aquat. Sci.*, doi:10.1007/s00027-015-0447-y.

Evans, R., and J. Boardman, 2016a: A reply to panagos et al., 2016 (Environmental science & policy 59 (2016) 53–57. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **60**, 63–68, doi:10.1016/J.ENVSCI.2016.03.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901116300557 (Accessed February 20, 2019).

——, and ——, 2016b: The new assessment of soil loss by water erosion in Europe. Panagos P. et al., 2015 Environmental Science & Policy 54, 438–447—A response. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **58**, 11–15, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.013. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901115301283 (Accessed October 19, 2017).

Evans, S. E., and M. D. Wallenstein, 2014: Climate change alters ecological strategies of soil bacteria. *Ecol. Lett.*, **17**, 155–164, doi:10.1111/ele.12206. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24261594 (Accessed May 2, 2018).

Fairhead, J., and I. Scoones, 2005: Local knowledge and the social shaping of soil investments: critical perspectives on the assessment of soil degradation in Africa. *Land use policy*, **22**, 33–41, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2003.08.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837704000183 (Accessed April 28, 2018).

Fang, Y., B. P. B. Singh, and B. P. B. Singh, 2015: Effect of temperature on biochar priming effects and its stability in soils. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **80**, 136–145, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071714003496 (Accessed December 2, 2017).

——, B. P. Singh, P. Matta, A. L. Cowie, and L. Van Zwieten, 2017: Temperature sensitivity and priming of organic matter with different stabilities in a Vertisol with aged biochar. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **115**, 346–356, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2017.09.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071717304108 (Accessed December 2, 2017).

FAO, 2007: *Land evaluation: towards a revised framework. Land and Water Discussion Paper No. 6*. Rome, Italy,.

——, 2015: *FRA 2015 Terms and Definitions*. Rome, 1-81 pp.

http://www.fao.org/3/ap862e/ap862e00.pdf.

——, 2016: *Global forest resources assessment 2015 : how are the world's forests changing?* K. MacDicken, Ö. Jonsson, L.. Pina, and S. Maulo, Eds. Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Rome, 44 pp. http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=XF2017001127 (Accessed February 25, 2019).

——, 2018: *From reference levels to results reporting: REDD+ under the UNFCCC, update*. Rome, italy, http://www.fao.org/3/CA0176EN/ca0176en.pdf.

Fargione, J. E., and Coauthors, 2018: Natural climate solutions for the United States. *Sci. Adv.*, **4**, eaat1869, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aat1869. http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/4/11/eaat1869.abstract.

Fasullo, J. T., and R. S. Nerem, 2018: Altimeter-era emergence of the patterns of forced sea-level rise in climate models and implications for the future. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **115**, 12944–12949, doi:10.1073/pnas.1813233115. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30509991 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Federici, S., F. N. Tubiello, M. Salvatore, H. Jacobs, and J. Schmidhuber, 2015: Forest Ecology and Management New estimates of CO 2 forest emissions and removals : 1990 – 2015. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **352**, 89–98, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.04.022. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.04.022.

Felton, A., M. Lindbladh, J. Brunet, and Ö. Fritz, 2010: Replacing coniferous monocultures with mixed-species production stands: An assessment of the potential benefits for forest biodiversity in northern Europe. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **260**, 939–947, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2010.06.011. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2010.06.011.

Fenner, N., R. Williams, H. Toberman, S. Hughes, B. Reynolds, and C. Freeman, 2011: Decomposition 'hotspots' in a rewetted peatland: implications for water quality and carbon cycling. *Hydrobiologia*, **674**, 51–66, doi:10.1007/s10750-011-0733-1. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10750-011-0733-1 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Fensholt, R., and Coauthors, 2015: Assessing Drivers of Vegetation Changes in Drylands from Time Series of Earth Observation Data. Springer, Cham, 183–202 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-15967-6_9 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Fernandes, K., L. Verchot, W. Baethgen, V. Gutierrez-Velez, M. Pinedo-Vasquez, and C. Martius, 2017: Heightened fire probability in Indonesia in non-drought conditions: The effect of increasing temperatures. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa6884.

Ferner, J., S. Schmidtlein, R. T. Guuroh, J. Lopatin, and A. Linstädter, 2018: Disentangling effects of climate and land-use change on West African drylands' forage supply. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **53**, 24–38, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2018.08.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378018303340 (Accessed October 10, 2018).

Feyisa, G. L., K. Dons, and H. Meilby, 2014: Efficiency of parks in mitigating urban heat island effect: An example from Addis Ababa. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **123**, 87–95, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2013.12.008. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169204613002399 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Field, J. P., and Coauthors, 2010: The ecology of dust. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **8**, 423–430, doi:10.1890/090050. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/090050 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Filho, W. L., and J. Nalau, 2018: *Limits to Climate Change Adaptation*. W.L. Filho and J. Nalau, Eds. Springer International Publishing, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1-410 pp. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64599-5.

Finlayson, C. M., and Coauthors, 2017: Policy considerations for managing wetlands under a changing climate. *Mar. Freshw. Res.*, **68**, 1803, doi:10.1071/MF16244.

http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=MF16244 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Fischer, E. M., and R. Knutti, 2015: Anthropogenic contribution to global occurrence of heavy-precipitation and high-temperature extremes. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 560–564, doi:10.1038/nclimate2617. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2617 (Accessed October 19, 2018).

Fischer, F., J. Hauck, R. Brandhuber, E. Weigl, H. Maier, and K. Auerswald, 2016: Spatio-temporal variability of erosivity estimated from highly resolved and adjusted radar rain data (RADOLAN). *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **223**, 72–80, doi:10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2016.03.024. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192316302143 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Fischer, G., M. Shah, H. van Velthuizen, and F. Nachtergaele, 2009: Agro-ecological zones assessment. *Land Use, Land Cover and Soil Sciences - Volume III: Land Use Planning*, Eolss Publishers Co., Oxford, UK, 61–81 https://books.google.se/books?hl=sv&lr=&id=zIXTCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA61&dq=fischer+shah+velthuizen+nachtergaele&ots=STeVQMCmdi&sig=PuZFjsGvw2fyzxKno3HeMriYVTk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=fischer shah velthuizen nachtergaele&f=false (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Flores-Rentería, D., A. Rincón, F. Valladares, and J. Curiel Yuste, 2016: Agricultural matrix affects differently the alpha and beta structural and functional diversity of soil microbial communities in a fragmented Mediterranean holm oak forest. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **92**, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.09.015.

Foley, J., G. Asner, M. Costa, … M. C.-F. in E., and undefined 2007, Amazonia revealed: forest degradation and loss of ecosystem goods and services in the Amazon Basin. *Wiley Online Libr.*,. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1890/1540-9295(2007)5%5B25:ARFDAL%5D2.0.CO;2/full (Accessed December 28, 2017).

Foley, J. A., and Coauthors, 2005: Global consequences of land use. *Science*, **309**, 570–574, doi:10.1126/science.1111772. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16040698 (Accessed May 11, 2018).

Foley, J. A., and Coauthors, 2011: Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, **478**, 337–342, doi:10.1038/nature10452. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature10452 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Folke, C., T. Hahn, P. Olsson, and J. Norberg, 2005: ADAPTIVE GOVERNANCE OF SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **30**, 441–473, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

——, S. Carpenter, B. H. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Chapin, and J. Rockström, 2010: Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability. *Ecol. Soc.*, **15**. http://hdl.handle.net/10535/7422.

Forest Europe, 2016: Sustainable Forest Management Implementation. *Sustain. For. Manag. Implement.*,.

Forsyth, T., 1996: Science, myth and knowledge: Testing himalayan environmental degradation in Thailand. *Geoforum*, **27**, 375–392, doi:10.1016/S0016-7185(96)00020-6. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718596000206 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Frank, D. C., and Coauthors, 2015: Water-use efficiency and transpiration across European forests during the Anthropocene. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 579–583, doi:10.1038/nclimate2614. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2614 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Frei, M., and K. Becker, 2005: Integrated rice-fish culture: Coupled production saves resources. *Nat. Resour. Forum*, **29**, 135–143, doi:10.1111/j.1477-8947.2005.00122.x.

http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2005.00122.x (Accessed October 30, 2018).

French, P. W., 2001: *Coastal Defences: Processes, Problems and Solutions*. Routledge, London,.

Frenkel, O., A. K. Jaiswal, Y. Elad, B. Lew, C. Kammann, and E. R. Graber, 2017: The effect of biochar on plant diseases: what should we learn while designing biochar substrates? *J. Environ. Eng. Landsc. Manag.*, doi:10.3846/16486897.2017.1307202.

Friend, A. D., and Coauthors, 2014: Carbon residence time dominates uncertainty in terrestrial vegetation responses to future climate and atmospheric CO2. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **111**, 3280–3285, doi:10.1073/pnas.1222477110. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24344265 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Fritsche, U. R., and Coauthors, 2017: Energy and Land Use.

Fritz, H. M., C. D. Blount, S. Thwin, M. K. Thu, and N. Chan, 2009: Cyclone Nargis storm surge in Myanmar. *Nat. Geosci.*, **2**, 448–449, doi:10.1038/ngeo558. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo558 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

——, C. Blount, S. Thwin, M. K. Thu, and N. Chan, 2010: Cyclone Nargis Storm Surge Flooding in Myanmar's Ayeyarwady River Delta. *Indian Ocean Tropical Cyclones and Climate Change*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 295–303 http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/978-90-481-3109-9_34 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Frolking, S., J. Talbot, M. C. Jones, C. C. Treat, J. B. Kauffman, E.-S. Tuittila, and N. Roulet, 2011: Peatlands in the Earth's 21st century climate system. *Environ. Rev.*, **19**, 371–396, doi:10.1139/a11-014.

Froude, M. J., and D. N. Petley, 2018: Global fatal landslide occurrence from 2004 to 2016. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, **18**, 2161–2181, doi:10.5194/nhess-18-2161-2018. https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/18/2161/2018/ (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Fryd, O., S. Pauleit, and O. Bühler, 2011: The role of urban green space and trees in relation to climate change. *CAB Rev. Perspect. Agric. Vet. Sci. Nutr. Nat. Resour.*, **6**, 1–18, doi:10.1079/PAVSNNR20116053. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20113401203 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Fuangswasdi, A., S. Worakijthamrong, and S. D. Shah, 2019: Addressing Subsidence in Bangkok, Thailand and Houston, Texas: Scientific Comparisons and Data-Driven Groundwater Policies for Coastal Land-Surface Subsidence. *IAEG/AEG Annual Meeting Proceedings, San Francisco, California, 2018 - Volume 5*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 51–60 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-93136-4_7 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

Fujiki, S., and Coauthors, 2016: Large-Scale Mapping of Tree-Community Composition as a Surrogate of Forest Degradation in Bornean Tropical Rain Forests. *Land*, **5**, 45, doi:10.3390/land5040045. http://www.mdpi.com/2073-445X/5/4/45 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Fuller, D. Q., and Coauthors, 2011: The contribution of rice agriculture and livestock pastoralism to prehistoric methane levels. *The Holocene*, **21**, 743–759, doi:10.1177/0959683611398052. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0959683611398052 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Fuso Nerini, F., C. Ray, and Y. Boulkaid, 2017: The cost of cooking a meal. The case of Nyeri County, Kenya. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, 65007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa6fd0. http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6fd0.

Fuss, S., and Coauthors, 2018: Negative emissions — Part 2 : Costs , potentials and side effects OPEN ACCESS Negative emissions — Part 2 : Costs , potentials and side effects.

Gabrielsson, S., S. Brogaard, and A. Jerneck, 2013: Living without buffers—illustrating climate vulnerability in the Lake Victoria basin. *Sustain. Sci.*, **8**, 143–157, doi:10.1007/s11625-012-0191-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-012-0191-3 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Gamache, I., and S. Payette, 2005: Latitudinal Response of Subarctic Tree Lines to Recent Climate

Change in Eastern Canada. *J. Biogeogr.*, **32**, 849–862.

Gao, B., A. R. Taylor, E. B. Searle, P. Kumar, Z. Ma, A. M. Hume, and H. Y. H. Chen, 2018: Carbon Storage Declines in Old Boreal Forests Irrespective of Succession Pathway. *Ecosystems*, **21**, 1–15, doi:10.1007/s10021-017-0210-4.

Gao, Q., M. Zribi, M. Escorihuela, N. Baghdadi, Q. Gao, M. Zribi, M. J. Escorihuela, and N. Baghdadi, 2017: Synergetic Use of Sentinel-1 and Sentinel-2 Data for Soil Moisture Mapping at 100 m Resolution. *Sensors*, **17**, 1966, doi:10.3390/s17091966. http://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/17/9/1966 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Garbrecht, J. D., and X. C. Zhang, 2015: Soil Erosion from Winter Wheat Cropland under Climate Change in Central Oklahoma. *Appl. Eng. Agric.*, **31**, 439–454, doi:10.13031/aea.31.10998. http://elibrary.asabe.org/abstract.asp?aid=45622&t=3&dabs=Y&redir=&redirType= (Accessed May 23, 2018).

——, J. L. Steiner, and A. Cox, Craig, 2007: The times they are changing: soil and water conservation in the 21st century. *Hydrol. Process.*, **21**, 2677–2679.

García-Ruiz, J. M., S. Beguería, E. Nadal-Romero, J. C. González-Hidalgo, N. Lana-Renault, and Y. Sanjuán, 2015: A meta-analysis of soil erosion rates across the world. *Geomorphology*, **239**, 160–173, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.03.008. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X1500149X (Accessed October 19, 2017).

Gariano, S. L., and F. Guzzetti, 2016: Landslides in a changing climate. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **162**, 227–252, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2016.08.011. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825216302458 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Gasparatos, A., and Coauthors, 2018: Survey of local impacts of biofuel crop production and adoption of ethanol stoves in southern Africa. *Sci. data*, **5**, 180186, doi:10.1038/sdata.2018.186. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30226483.

Gauthier, S., P. Bernier, T. Kuuluvainen, A. Z. Shvidenko, and D. G. Schepaschenko, 2015: Boreal forest health and global change. *Science*, **349**, 819–822, doi:10.1126/science.aaa9092. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26293953 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Gaveau, D. L. a, and Coauthors, 2014: Major atmospheric emissions from peat fires in Southeast Asia during non-drought years: evidence from the 2013 Sumatran fires. *Sci. Rep.*, **4**, 1–7, doi:10.1038/srep06112.

Ge, J., and C. Zou, 2013: Impacts of woody plant encroachment on regional climate in the southern Great Plains of the United States. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **118**, 9093–9104, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50634. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/jgrd.50634 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Gebara, M., and A. Agrawal, 2017: Beyond Rewards and Punishments in the Brazilian Amazon: Practical Implications of the RED D+ Discourse. *Forests*, **8**, 66, doi:10.3390/f8030066. http://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/8/3/66 (Accessed May 27, 2018).

Gebara, M. F., 2018: Tenure reforms in indigenous lands: decentralized forest management or illegalism? *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **32**, 60–67, doi:10.1016/J.COSUST.2018.04.008. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343517301641 (Accessed October 19, 2018).

Geels, F. W., 2002: Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case-study. *Res. Policy*, **31**, 1257–1274, doi:10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00062-8. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733302000628 (Accessed October 5, 2018).

Van der Geest, K., and M. Schindler, 2016: *Case study report: Loss and damage from a catastrophic* *landslide in Sindhupalchok District, Nepal. Report No.1*. Bonn, Germany, 1-96 pp. https://www.raonline.ch/pages/np/pdf/UNU-EHS_Nepalstudy2016.pdf.

GEF, 2018: *GEF-7 Replenishment, Programming Directions*. Stockholm, Sweden, https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF-7 Programming Directions - GEF_R.7_19.pdf.

Genesio, L., F. Miglietta, E. Lugato, S. Baronti, M. Pieri, and F. P. Vaccari, 2012: Surface albedo following biochar application in durum wheat. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014025.

Genesio, L., F. P. Vaccari, and F. Miglietta, 2016: Black carbon aerosol from biochar threats its negative emission potential. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, doi:10.1111/gcb.13254.

Gerber, N., E. Nkonya, and J. von Braun, 2014: Land Degradation, Poverty and Marginality. *Marginality*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 181–202 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-7061-4_12 (Accessed March 5, 2019).

Gerten, D., R. Betts, and P. Döll, 2014: Cross-chapter box on the active role of vegetation in altering water flows under climate change. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, C.B. Field et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 157–161.

van Gestel, N., and Coauthors, 2018: Predicting soil carbon loss with warming. *Nature*, **554**, E4–E5, doi:10.1038/nature25745. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature25745 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Gharbaoui, D., and J. Blocher, 2016: The Reason Land Matters: Relocation as Adaptation to Climate Change in Fiji Islands. Springer, Cham, 149–173 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-42922-9_8 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Ghazoul, J., and R. Chazdon, 2017: Degradation and Recovery in Changing Forest Landscapes: A Multiscale Conceptual Framework. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **42**, 161–188, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-environ-102016-060736 (Accessed November 2, 2017).

——, Z. Burivalova, J. Garcia-Ulloa, and L. A. King, 2015: Conceptualizing Forest Degradation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **30**, 622–632, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2015.08.001. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26411619 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Ghosh, A., S. Schmidt, T. Fickert, and M. Nüsser, 2015: The Indian Sundarban Mangrove Forests: History, Utilization, Conservation Strategies and Local Perception. *Diversity*, **7**, 149–169, doi:10.3390/d7020149. http://www.mdpi.com/1424-2818/7/2/149 (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Gibbs, H. K., and J. M. Salmon, 2015: Mapping the world's degraded lands. *Appl. Geogr.*, **57**, 12–21, doi:10.1016/J.APGEOG.2014.11.024. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0143622814002793 (Accessed November 2, 2017).

Gideon Neba, S., M. Kanninen, R. Eba'a Atyi, and D. J. Sonwa, 2014: Assessment and prediction of above-ground biomass in selectively logged forest concessions using field measurements and remote sensing data: Case study in South East Cameroon. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **329**, 177–185, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2014.06.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811271400382X (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Giger, M., H. Liniger, C. Sauter, and G. Schwilch, 2018: Economic Benefits and Costs of Sustainable Land Management Technologies: An Analysis of WOCAT's Global Data. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **29**, 962–974, doi:10.1002/ldr.2429. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2429 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Giguère-Croteau, C., É. Boucher, Y. Bergeron, M. P. Girardin, I. Drobyshev, L. C. R. Silva, J.-F. Hélie, and M. Garneau, 2019: North America's oldest boreal trees are more efficient water users due to increased [CO 2], but do not grow faster. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **116**, 2749–2754, doi:10.1073/pnas.1816686116.

Gill, S. ., J. . Handley, A. . Ennos, and S. Pauleit, 2007: Adapting Cities for Climate Change: The Role of the Green Infrastructure. *Built Environ.*, **33**, 115–133, doi:10.2148/benv.33.1.115. http://openurl.ingenta.com/content/xref?genre=article&issn=0263-7960&volume=33&issue=1&spage=115 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Gingrich, S., and Coauthors, 2015: Exploring long-term trends in land use change and aboveground human appropriation of net primary production in nine European countries. *Land use policy*, **47**, 426–438, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2015.04.027. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715001374 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Giorgi, F., and P. Lionello, 2008: Climate change projections for the Mediterranean region. *Glob. Planet. Change*, **63**, 90–104, doi:10.1016/J.GLOPLACHA.2007.09.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818107001750 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Girardin, M. P., and Coauthors, 2016: No growth stimulation of Canada's boreal forest under half-century of combined warming and CO2 fertilization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **113**, E8406–E8414, doi:10.1073/pnas.1610156113. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27956624 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Glover, J. D., and Coauthors, 2010: Harvested perennial grasslands provide ecological benchmarks for agricultural sustainability. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **137**, 3–12, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2009.11.001.

Gockowski, J., and D. Sonwa, 2011: Cocoa intensification scenarios and their predicted impact on CO 2 emissions, biodiversity conservation, and rural livelihoods in the Guinea rain forest of West Africa. *Environ. Manage.*, **48**, 307–321, doi:10.1007/s00267-010-9602-3.

Gonzalez-Hidalgo, J. C., M. de Luis, and R. J. Batalla, 2009: Effects of the largest daily events on total soil erosion by rainwater. An analysis of the USLE database. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **34**, 2070–2077, doi:10.1002/esp.1892. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.1892 (Accessed March 9, 2018).

Gonzalez-Hidalgo, J. C., R. J. Batalla, A. Cerda, and M. de Luis, 2012: A regional analysis of the effects of largest events on soil erosion. *CATENA*, **95**, 85–90, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2012.03.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816212000616?via%3Dihub (Accessed March 9, 2018).

Gonzalez, P., R. P. Neilson, J. M. Lenihan, and R. J. Drapek, 2010: Global patterns in the vulnerability of ecosystems to vegetation shifts due to climate change. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **19**, 755–768, doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00558.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00558.x (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Gopal, B., and M. Chauhan, 2006: Biodiversity and its conservation in the Sundarban Mangrove Ecosystem. *Aquat. Sci.*, **68**, 338–354, doi:10.1007/s00027-006-0868-8. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00027-006-0868-8 (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Government of Tuvalu, 2006: *National Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation and Drought*. Funafuti,.

Grainger, A., 2009: The role of science in implementing international environmental agreements: The case of desertification. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **20**, 410–430, doi:10.1002/ldr.898. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.898 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Grandy, A. S., and G. P. Robertson, 2006: Aggregation and Organic Matter Protection Following Tillage of a Previously Uncultivated Soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **70**, 1398, doi:10.2136/sssaj2005.0313. https://www.soils.org/publications/sssaj/abstracts/70/4/1398

(Accessed May 21, 2018).

——, and J. C. Neff, 2008: Molecular C dynamics downstream: The biochemical decomposition sequence and its impact on soil organic matter structure and function. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **404**, 297–307, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.11.013.

Grassini, P., K. M. Eskridge, and K. G. Cassman, 2013: Distinguishing between yield advances and yield plateaus in historical crop production trends. *Nat. Commun.*, **4**, 2918, doi:10.1038/ncomms3918. http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms3918 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Gray, C., and R. Bilsborrow, 2013: Environmental Influences on Human Migration in Rural Ecuador. *Demography*, **50**, 1217–1241, doi:10.1007/s13524-012-0192-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13524-012-0192-y (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Gray, C. L., 2011: Soil quality and human migration in Kenya and Uganda. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **21**, 421–430, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2011.02.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378011000264 (Accessed March 11, 2019).

Green, A. J., and Coauthors, 2017: Creating a safe operating space for wetlands in a changing climate. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **15**, 99–107, doi:10.1002/fee.1459. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/fee.1459 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Green Surge, 2016: *Advancing approaches and strategies for UGI planning and implementation. Green Surge Deliverable 5.2. Available online: http://greensurge.eu/working-packages/wp5/files/D5_2_Hansen_et_al_2016_Advanced_UGI_Planning_and_Implementation_v3.pdf*.

Grimm, V., and J. M. Calabrese, 2011: What Is Resilience? A Short Introduction. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 3–13 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-20423-4_1 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Griscom, B. W., and Coauthors, 2017: Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **114**, 11645–11650, doi:10.1073/pnas.1710465114. http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2017/10/11/1710465114.full.pdf (Accessed October 21, 2017).

van Groenigen, J. W., C. van Kessel, B. A. Hungate, O. Oenema, D. S. Powlson, and K. J. van Groenigen, 2017: Sequestering Soil Organic Carbon: A Nitrogen Dilemma. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **51**, 4738–4739, doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b01427. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.7b01427 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Groisman, P. Y., and Coauthors, 2005: Trends in Intense Precipitation in the Climate Record. *J. Clim.*, **18**, 1326–1350, doi:10.1175/JCLI3339.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI3339.1 (Accessed March 7, 2019).

Grubler, A., and Coauthors, 2018: A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5 °C target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nat. Energy*, **3**, 515–527, doi:10.1038/s41560-018-0172-6. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41560-018-0172-6 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Guerreiro, S. B., H. J. Fowler, R. Barbero, S. Westra, G. Lenderink, S. Blenkinsop, E. Lewis, and X.-F. Li, 2018: Detection of continental-scale intensification of hourly rainfall extremes. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8**, 803–807, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0245-3. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-018-0245-3 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Gumbricht, T., R. M. Roman-Cuesta, L. Verchot, M. Herold, F. Wittmann, E. Householder, N. Herold, and D. Murdiyarso, 2017: An expert system model for mapping tropical wetlands and peatlands reveals South America as the largest contributor. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **23**, 3581–3599, doi:10.1111/gcb.13689.

Guo, J. H., and Coauthors, 2010: Significant acidification in major Chinese croplands. *Science*, **327**, 1008–1010, doi:10.1126/science.1182570. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20150447 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Guo, L. B., and R. M. Gifford, 2002: Soil carbon stocks and land use change: a meta analysis. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **8**, 345–360, doi:10.1046/j.1354-1013.2002.00486.x.

Gupta, S., and S. Kumar, 2017: Simulating climate change impact on soil erosion using RUSLE model − A case study in a watershed of mid-Himalayan landscape. *J. Earth Syst. Sci.*, **126**, 43, doi:10.1007/s12040-017-0823-1. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12040-017-0823-1 (Accessed March 13, 2019).

Haberl, H., K.-H. Erb, F. Krausmann, S. Running, T. D. Searchinger, and W. Kolby Smith, 2013: Bioenergy: how much can we expect for 2050? *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **8**, 031004, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/031004. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/8/i=3/a=031004?key=crossref.6aa16b28ce5251381d8db735788049b2 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Hadden, D., and A. Grelle, 2016: Changing temperature response of respiration turns boreal forest from carbon sink into carbon source. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **223**, 30–38, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.03.020.

Haider, G., D. Steffens, G. Moser, C. Müller, and C. I. Kammann, 2017: Biochar reduced nitrate leaching and improved soil moisture content without yield improvements in a four-year field study. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2016.12.019.

Håkansson, N. T., and M. Widgren, 2007: Labour and landscapes: the political economy of landesque capital in nineteenth century tanganyika. *Geogr. Ann. Ser. B, Hum. Geogr.*, **89**, 233–248, doi:10.1111/j.1468-0467.2007.00251.x. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2007.00251.x (Accessed March 27, 2019).

Hallegatte, S., M. Fay, and E. B. Barbier, 2018: Poverty and climate change: introduction. *Environ. Dev. Econ.*, **23**, 217–233, doi:10.1017/S1355770X18000141. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1355770X18000141/type/journal_article (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Halvorson, W. L., A. E. Castellanos, and J. Murrieta-Saldivar, 2003: Sustainable Land Use Requires Attention to Ecological Signals. *Environ. Manage.*, **32**, 551–558, doi:10.1007/s00267-003-2889-6.

Hamza, M. A., and W. K. Anderson, 2005: Soil compaction in cropping systems. *Soil Tillage Res.*, **82**, 121–145, doi:10.1016/j.still.2004.08.009. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167198704001849 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Handmer, J., and J. Nalau, 2019: Understanding Loss and Damage in Pacific Small Island Developing States. Springer, Cham, 365–381 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-72026-5_15 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Hansen, M. C., and Coauthors, 2013: High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change. *Science (80-.).*, **342**, 850–853.

Haque, F., R. M. Santos, A. Dutta, M. Thimmanagari, and Y. W. Chiang, 2019: Co-Benefits of Wollastonite Weathering in Agriculture: CO_2 Sequestration and Promoted Plant Growth. *ACS Omega*, **4**, 1425–1433, doi:10.1021/acsomega.8b02477. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsomega.8b02477 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Haregeweyn, N., and Coauthors, 2015: Soil erosion and conservation in Ethiopia. *Prog. Phys. Geogr. Earth Environ.*, **39**, 750–774, doi:10.1177/0309133315598725. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309133315598725 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Harley, M. D., and Coauthors, 2017a: Extreme coastal erosion enhanced by anomalous extratropical storm wave direction. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 6033, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05792-1.

http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-05792-1 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2017b: Extreme coastal erosion enhanced by anomalous extratropical storm wave direction. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 6033, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05792-1. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-05792-1 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Harmon, M. E., W. K. Ferrell, and J. F. Franklin, 1990: Effects on Carbon Storage of Conversion of Old-Growth Forests to Young Forests. *Science (80-.).*, **247**, 699–702.

Harper, A. B., and Coauthors, 2018: Land-use emissions play a critical role in land-based mitigation for Paris climate targets. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05340-z.

Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan, 2009: Are treelines advancing? A global meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. *Ecol. Lett.*, **12**, 1040–1049, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01355.x.

Hauer, M. E., J. M. Evans, and D. R. Mishra, 2016: Millions projected to be at risk from sea-level rise in the continental United States. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 691–695, doi:10.1038/nclimate2961. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2961 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Hayes, R., and Coauthors, 2018: The Performance of Early-Generation Perennial Winter Cereals at 21 Sites across Four Continents. *Sustainability*, **10**, 1124, doi:10.3390/su10041124. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/4/1124 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

He, Y., and Coauthors, 2017: Effects of biochar application on soil greenhouse gas fluxes: a meta-analysis. *GCB Bioenergy*, **9**, 743–755, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12376. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcbb.12376 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Hecht, and S. B., 1983: Cattle ranching in the eastern Amazon : Environmental and social implications. *The dilemma of Amazonian Development*, E.F. Moran, Ed., Westview Press, Boulder, CO, USA, 155–188 https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/10021062539/ (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Heck, V., D. Gerten, W. Lucht, and A. Popp, 2018: Biomass-based negative emissions difficult to reconcile with planetary boundaries. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8**, 151–155, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0064-y. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41558-017-0064-y.

Hellmann, J. J., J. E. Byers, B. G. Bierwagen, and J. S. Dukes, 2008: Five Potential Consequences of Climate Change for Invasive Species. *Conserv. Biol.*, **22**, 534–543, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00951.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00951.x (Accessed March 7, 2019).

Hember, R. A., W. A. Kurz, and N. C. Coops, 2016: Relationships between individual-tree mortality and water-balance variables indicate positive trends in water stress-induced tree mortality across North America. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **23**, 1691–1710, doi:10.1111/gcb.13428.

——, ——, and ——, 2017: Increasing net ecosystem biomass production of Canada's boreal and temperate forests despite decline in dry climates. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **31**, 134–158, doi:10.1002/2016GB005459. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2016GB005459 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Henry, B., B. Murphy, and A. Cowie, 2018: *Sustainable Land Management for Environmental Benefits and Food Security A synthesis report for the GEF*. Washington DC, USA, 127 pp. http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/SLM20180812.pdf.

Henttonen, H. M., P. Nöjd, and H. Mäkinen, 2017: Environment-induced growth changes in the Finnish forests during 1971–2010 – An analysis based on National Forest Inventory. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **386**, 22–36, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2016.11.044. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.11.044.

Herbert, E. R., and Coauthors, 2015: A global perspective on wetland salinization: ecological consequences of a growing threat to freshwater wetlands. *Ecosphere*, **6**, art206, doi:10.1890/ES14-00534.1. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/ES14-00534.1 (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Hergoualc'h, K., V. H. Gutiérrez-vélez, M. Menton, and L. V Verchot, 2017a: Forest Ecology and Management Characterizing degradation of palm swamp peatlands from space and on the ground : An exploratory study in the Peruvian Amazon. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **393**, 63–73, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2017.03.016.

Hergoualc'h, K., D. T. Hendry, D. Murdiyarso, and L. V. Verchot, 2017b: Total and heterotrophic soil respiration in a swamp forest and oil palm plantations on peat in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Biogeochemistry*, **135**, 203–220, doi:10.1007/s10533-017-0363-4.

Hermans, K., and T. Ide, 2019: Advancing Research on Climate Change, Conflict and Migration. *Die Erde*, **in press**.

Hernández-Morcillo, M., T. Plieninger, and C. Bieling, 2013: An empirical review of cultural ecosystem service indicators. *Ecol. Indic.*, **29**, 434–444, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2013.01.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X13000320 (Accessed February 28, 2019).

Herrick, J. E., P. Shaver, D. A. Pyke, M. Pellant, D. Toledo, and N. Lepak, 2019: A strategy for defining the reference for land health and degradation assessments. *Ecol. Indic.*, **97**, 225–230, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2018.06.065. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18305120 (Accessed February 22, 2019).

Hickey, G. M., M. Pouliot, C. Smith-Hall, S. Wunder, and M. R. Nielsen, 2016: Quantifying the economic contribution of wild food harvests to rural livelihoods: A global-comparative analysis. *Food Policy*, **62**, 122–132, doi:10.1016/J.FOODPOL.2016.06.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919216300707 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Hickler, T., L. Eklundh, J. W. Seaquist, B. Smith, J. Ardö, L. Olsson, M. T. Sykes, and M. Sjöström, 2005: Precipitation controls Sahel greening trend. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **32**, L21415, doi:10.1029/2005GL024370. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2005GL024370 (Accessed October 10, 2018).

Higginbottom, T., E. Symeonakis, T. P. Higginbottom, and E. Symeonakis, 2014: Assessing Land Degradation and Desertification Using Vegetation Index Data: Current Frameworks and Future Directions. *Remote Sens.*, **6**, 9552–9575, doi:10.3390/rs6109552. http://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/6/10/9552 (Accessed September 26, 2018).

Higgins, S., I. Overeem, A. Tanaka, and J. P. M. Syvitski, 2013: Land subsidence at aquaculture facilities in the Yellow River delta, China. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **40**, 3898–3902, doi:10.1002/grl.50758. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/grl.50758 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Hilber, I., P. Mayer, V. Gouliarmou, S. E. Hale, G. Cornelissen, H.-P. Schmidt, and T. D. Bucheli, 2017: Bioavailability and bioaccessibility of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from (post-pyrolytically treated) biochars. *Chemosphere*, **174**, 700–707, doi:10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2017.02.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045653517301923 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Hinsley, A., A. Entwistle, and D. V. Pio, 2015: Does the long-term success of REDD+ also depend on biodiversity? *Oryx*, **49**, 216–221, doi:10.1017/S0030605314000507. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0030605314000507 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Hoegh-Guldberg, O., and Coauthors, 2018: Impacts of 1.5°C global warming on natural and human systems. *Global Warming of 1.5 °C an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change* http://report.ipcc.ch/sr15/pdf/sr15_chapter3.pdf (Accessed October 29, 2018).

Hoffmann, H. K., K. Sander, M. Brüntrup, and S. Sieber, 2017: Applying the Water-Energy-Food

Nexus to the Charcoal Value Chain. *Front. Environ. Sci.*, **5**, 84. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fenvs.2017.00084.

Högy, P., and A. Fangmeier, 2008: Effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 on grain quality of wheat. *J. Cereal Sci.*, **48**, 580–591, doi:10.1016/J.JCS.2008.01.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0733521008000428 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Hojas-Gascon, L., H. Eva, D. Ehrlich, M. Pesaresi, A. Frédéric, and J. Garcia, 2016: *Urbanization and forest degradation in east Africa - a case study around Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*. IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), 7293-7295 pp.

Holmberg, M., and Coauthors, 2019: Ecosystem Services Related to Carbon Cycling – Modeling Present and Future Impacts in Boreal Forests. *Front. Plant Sci.*, **10**. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpls.2019.00343.

Holt-Giménez, E., 2002: Measuring farmers' agroecological resistance after Hurricane Mitch in Nicaragua: a case study in participatory, sustainable land management impact monitoring. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **93**, 87–105, doi:10.1016/S0167-8809(02)00006-3. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880902000063 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Holtum, J. A. M., and K. Winter, 2010: Elevated [CO_2] and forest vegetation: more a water issue than a carbon issue? *Funct. Plant Biol.*, **37**, 694, doi:10.1071/FP10001. http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=FP10001 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Homer-Dixon, T. F., J. H. Boutwell, and G. W. Rathjens, 1993: Environmental Change and Violent Conflict. *Sci. Am.*, **268**, 38–45, doi:10.2307/24941373. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24941373 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Hosonuma, N., M. Herold, V. De Sy, R. S. De Fries, M. Brockhaus, L. Verchot, A. Angelsen, and E. Romijn, 2012: An assessment of deforestation and forest degradation drivers in developing countries. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **7**, 044009, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044009. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/7/i=4/a=044009?key=crossref.1a00aa77eac35c904bf7e007011d4763 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Hou, B., H. Liao, and J. Huang, 2018: Household cooking fuel choice and economic poverty: Evidence from a nationwide survey in China. *Energy Build.*, **166**, 319–329, doi:10.1016/J.ENBUILD.2018.02.012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378778817336241 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Le Houerou, H. N., 1984: Rain use efficiency: a unifying concept in arid-land ecology. *J. Arid Environ.*, **7**, 213–247. http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=US201301473751 (Accessed January 3, 2018).

Houghton, R. A., and A. A. Nassikas, 2017: Global and regional fluxes of carbon from land use and land cover change 1850-2015. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **31**, 456–472, doi:10.1002/2016GB005546. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2016GB005546 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Houghton, R. A., and A. A. Nassikas, 2018: Negative emissions from stopping deforestation and forest degradation, globally. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 350–359, doi:10.1111/gcb.13876.

Houghton, R. A., J. I. House, J. Pongratz, G. R. Van Der Werf, R. S. Defries, M. C. Hansen, C. Le Quéré, and N. Ramankutty, 2012: Carbon emissions from land use and land-cover change. *Biogeosciences*, **9**, 5125–5142, doi:10.5194/bg-9-5125-2012.

Houspanossian, J., M. Nosetto, and E. G. Jobbágy, 2013: Radiation budget changes with dry forest clearing in temperate Argentina. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **19**, 1211–1222, doi:10.1111/gcb.12121. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12121 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Howden, S. M., F. N. Soussana, Jean-François Tubiello, N. Chhetri, M. and Dunlop, and H. Meinke, 2007: Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **104**, 19691–19696, doi:10.1073/pnas.0701890104. http://www.pnas.org/content/104/50/19691.abstract.

Hu, S., Z. Niu, Y. Chen, L. Li, and H. Zhang, 2017: Global wetlands: Potential distribution, wetland loss, and status. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **586**, 319–327, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.001. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0048969717302425 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

Hua, F., and Coauthors, 2016: Opportunities for biodiversity gains under the world's largest reforestation programme. *Nat. Commun.*, **7**, doi:10.1038/ncomms12717.

Huang, G., and Coauthors, 2018: Performance, Economics and Potential Impact of Perennial Rice PR23 Relative to Annual Rice Cultivars at Multiple Locations in Yunnan Province of China. *Sustainability*, **10**, 1086, doi:10.3390/su10041086. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/4/1086 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Huang, J., T. Wang, W. Wang, Z. Li, and H. Yan, 2014: Climate effects of dust aerosols over East Asian arid and semiarid regions. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **119**, 11,398-11,416, doi:10.1002/2014JD021796. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2014JD021796 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Huggel, C., J. J. Clague, and O. Korup, 2012: Is climate change responsible for changing landslide activity in high mountains? *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **37**, 77–91, doi:10.1002/esp.2223. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.2223 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Hulme, P. E., 2017: Climate change and biological invasions: evidence, expectations, and response options. *Biol. Rev.*, **92**, 1297–1313, doi:10.1111/brv.12282. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/brv.12282 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Hungate, B. A., and Coauthors, 2017: The economic value of grassland species for carbon storage. *Sci. Adv.*, **3**, e1601880, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1601880. http://advances.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/sciadv.1601880 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Hussain, S., T. Siddique, M. Saleem, M. Arshad, and A. Khalid, 2009: Chapter 5 Impact of Pesticides on Soil Microbial Diversity, Enzymes, and Biochemical Reactions. *Adv. Agron.*, **102**, 159–200, doi:10.1016/S0065-2113(09)01005-0. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Muhammad_Saleem22/publication/223688980_Impact_of_Pesticides_on_Soil_Microbial_Diversity_Enzymes_and_Biochemical_Reactions/links/59db7dc4aca272ab722b76ec/Impact-of-Pesticides-on-Soil-Microbial-Diversity-Enzymes-and-Bio (Accessed October 1, 2018).

HÜVE, K., I. BICHELE, B. RASULOV, and Ü. NIINEMETS, 2011: When it is too hot for photosynthesis: heat-induced instability of photosynthesis in relation to respiratory burst, cell permeability changes and H2O2 formation. *Plant. Cell Environ.*, **34**, 113–126, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2010.02229.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2010.02229.x (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Huxman, T. E., and Coauthors, 2004: Convergence across biomes to a common rain-use efficiency. *Nature*, **429**, 651–654, doi:10.1038/nature02561. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature02561 (Accessed January 3, 2018).

IEA, 2017: *World Energy Outlook 2017*. Paris,.

Illius, A., T. O.-E. applications, and undefined 1999, On the relevance of nonequilibrium concepts to arid and semiarid grazing systems. *Wiley Online Libr.*,. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1890/1051-0761(1999)009[0798:OTRONC]2.0.CO;2/full (Accessed December 28, 2017).

Imai, N., T. Seino, S. Aiba, M. Takyu, J. Titin, and K. Kitayama, 2012: Effects of selective logging on tree species diversity and composition of Bornean tropical rain forests at different spatial scales. *Plant Ecol.*, **213**, 1413–1424, doi:10.1007/s11258-012-0100-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11258-012-0100-y (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Iordan, C. M., X. Hu, A. Arvesen, P. Kauppi, and F. Cherubini, 2018: Contribution of forest wood products to negative emissions: Historical comparative analysis from 1960 to 2015 in Norway, Sweden and Finland. *Carbon Balance Manag.*, **13**, doi:10.1186/s13021-018-0101-9.

IPCC, 2006: *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme*. Tokyo, Japan, https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/0_Overview/V0_0_Cover.pdf.

——, 2012: *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, 582 pp.

——, 2013a: Annex I: Atlas of Global and Regional Climate Projections. : *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Sci - ence Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 1313–1390.

——, 2013b: Summary for Policy Makers. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, V.B. and P.M.M. Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, Ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, p. 1535.

——, 2014a: *2013 Supplement to the 2006 Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands. IPCC, Switzerland.*

——, 2014b: Summary for Policymakers. *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, O. Edenhofer et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 1–34.

——, 2018a: Summary for Policymakers. *Global Warming of 1.5 °C an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change* http://report.ipcc.ch/sr15/pdf/sr15_spm_final.pdf (Accessed October 29, 2018).

——, 2018b: *Global Warming of 1.5 °C an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change.* http://www.ipcc.ch/report/sr15/.

IPCC, 2014: Annex II, 2014c: *Glossary [Mach, K.J., S. Planton and C. von Stechow (eds.)]. In: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. P*. 117-130 pp.

IPCC WGII, 2014: *Climate Change 2014. Glossary*. 20 pp.

Islam, M. S., A. T. Wong, M. S. Islam, and A. T. Wong, 2017: Climate Change and Food In/Security: A Critical Nexus. *Environments*, **4**, 38, doi:10.3390/environments4020038. http://www.mdpi.com/2076-3298/4/2/38 (Accessed March 5, 2019).

Itkonen, P., 2016: Land rights as the prerequisite for Sámi culture: Skolt Sámi's changing relation to nature in Finland. *Indigenous Rights in Modern Landscapes*, L. Elenius, C. Allard, and C. Sandström, Eds., Routledge, 94–105 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781317059684/chapters/10.4324%2F9781315607559-12 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

IUCN, 2003: . *Environmental degradation and impacts on livelihood: Sea intrusion - a case study. International Union for Conservation of Nature, Pakistan. Sindh Programme Office.* https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pk_environmenta pp.

Jagger, P., K. Lawlor, M. Brockhaus, M. F. Gebara, D. J. Sonwa, and I. A. P. Resosudarmo, 2015:

REDD+ safeguards in national policy discourse and pilot projects. *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices*, L. Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W.D. Verchot, Ed., CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/95003 (Accessed March 26, 2019).

Jastrow, J. D., J. E. Amonette, and V. L. Bailey, 2007: Mechanisms controlling soil carbon turnover and their potential application for enhancing carbon sequestration. *Clim. Change*, **80**, 5–23, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9178-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-006-9178-3 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Jeffery, S., F. G. A. Verheijen, C. Kammann, and D. Abalos, 2016: Biochar effects on methane emissions from soils: A meta-analysis. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **101**, 251–258, doi:10.1016/J.SOILBIO.2016.07.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071716301663 (Accessed December 1, 2017).

Jerneck, A., 2018a: What about Gender in Climate Change? Twelve Feminist Lessons from Development. *Sustainability*, **10**, 627, doi:10.3390/su10030627. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/3/627 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

——, 2018b: Taking gender seriously in climate change adaptation and sustainability science research: views from feminist debates and sub-Saharan small-scale agriculture. *Sustain. Sci.*, **13**, 403–416, doi:10.1007/s11625-017-0464-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-017-0464-y (Accessed May 16, 2018).

——, and L. Olsson, 2013: More than trees! Understanding the agroforestry adoption gap in subsistence agriculture: Insights from narrative walks in Kenya. *J. Rural Stud.*, **32**, 114–125, doi:10.1016/J.JRURSTUD.2013.04.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016713000302 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

——, and ——, 2014: Food first! Theorising assets and actors in agroforestry: risk evaders, opportunity seekers and 'the food imperative' in sub-Saharan Africa. *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.*, **12**, 1–22, doi:10.1080/14735903.2012.751714. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14735903.2012.751714 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Ji, C., K. Cheng, D. Nayak, and G. Pan, 2018: Environmental and economic assessment of crop residue competitive utilization for biochar, briquette fuel and combined heat and power generation. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **192**, 916–923, doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2018.05.026. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652618313544 (Accessed April 7, 2019).

Jia, Y., Zhou, Z., Qiu, Y., 2006: The potential effect of water yield reduction caused by land conversion in the Yellow River basin. In: Zhang L, Bennett J, Wang XH, Xie C, and Zhao. A. *Study of Sustainable Use of Land Resources in Northwestern China. Beijing: China National Forestry Economics and Development Research Center*.

Jobbágy, E. G., and O. E. Sala, 2000: CONTROLS OF GRASS AND SHRUB ABOVEGROUND PRODUCTION IN THE PATAGONIAN STEPPE. *Ecol. Appl.*, **10**, 541–549, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[0541:COGASA]2.0.CO;2. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010%5B0541:COGASA%5D2.0.CO;2/full (Accessed January 3, 2018).

——, T. Tóth, M. D. Nosetto, and S. Earman, 2017: On the Fundamental Causes of High Environmental Alkalinity (pH ≥ 9): An Assessment of Its Drivers and Global Distribution. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **28**, 1973–1981, doi:10.1002/ldr.2718. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2718 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

John, R., and Coauthors, 2016: Differentiating anthropogenic modification and precipitation-driven change on vegetation productivity on the Mongolian Plateau. *Landsc. Ecol.*, **31**, 547–566, doi:10.1007/s10980-015-0261-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10980-015-0261-x (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Johnson, D. L., and L. A. Lewis, 2007: *Land degradation : creation and destruction*. Rowman & Littlefield, 303 pp.

Johnson, J. M.-F., R. R. Allmaras, and D. C. Reicosky, 2006: Estimating Source Carbon from Crop Residues, Roots and Rhizodeposits Using the National Grain-Yield Database. *Agron. J.*, **98**, 622, doi:10.2134/agronj2005.0179. https://www.agronomy.org/publications/aj/abstracts/98/3/622 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Johnson, J. M., L. J. Moore, K. Ells, A. B. Murray, P. N. Adams, R. A. MacKenzie, and J. M. Jaeger, 2015: Recent shifts in coastline change and shoreline stabilization linked to storm climate change. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **40**, 569–585, doi:10.1002/esp.3650. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3650 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Jolly, W. M., M. A. Cochrane, P. H. Freeborn, Z. A. Holden, T. J. Brown, G. J. Williamson, and D. M. J. S. Bowman, 2015: Climate-induced variations in global wildfire danger from 1979 to 2013. *Nat. Commun.*, **6**, 7537, doi:10.1038/ncomms8537. http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms8537 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

de Jong, J., C. Akselsson, G. Egnell, S. Löfgren, and B. A. Olsson, 2017: Realizing the energy potential of forest biomass in Sweden – How much is environmentally sustainable? *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **383**, 3–16, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2016.06.028. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112716303255 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Joosten, H., Tanneberger, F., 2017: Peatland use in Europe. In: Joosten H., Tanneberger F., Moen A., (Eds.), Mires and peatlands of Euopre: Status, distribution and conservation. Schweizerbart Science Publisher. Stuttgart. 151–173.

Jorgenson, M. T., and T. E. Osterkamp, 2005: Response of boreal ecosystems to varying modes of permafrost degradation. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **35**, 2100–2111, doi:10.1139/x05-153. http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/x05-153 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Joseph, J., 2013: Resilience as embedded neoliberalism: a governmentality approach. *Resilience*, **1**, 38–52, doi:10.1080/21693293.2013.765741. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/21693293.2013.765741 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Joseph, S., and Coauthors, 2013: Shifting paradigms: development of high-efficiency biochar fertilizers based on nano-structures and soluble components. *Carbon Manag.*, **4**, 323–343, doi:10.4155/cmt.13.23. http://dx.doi.org/10.4155/cmt.13.23.

Joseph, S., and Coauthors, 2018: Microstructural and associated chemical changes during the composting of a high temperature biochar: Mechanisms for nitrate, phosphate and other nutrient retention and release. *Sci. Total Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.200.

Joseph, S. D., and Coauthors, 2010: An investigation into the reactions of biochar in soil. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*.

JRC, 2018: Land Productivity Dynamics. *World Atlas Desertif.*,. https://wad.jrc.ec.europa.eu/landproductivity.

Juday, G. P., C. Alix, and T. A. Grant, 2015: Spatial coherence and change of opposite white spruce temperature sensitivities on floodplains in Alaska confirms early-stage boreal biome shift. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **350**, 46–61, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2015.04.016. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112715002212 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Kalhoro, N. ., Z. He, D. Xu, M. Faiz, L. V. Yafei, N. Sohoo, and B. A.H., 2016: Vulnerability of the Indus River delta of the North Arabian sea, Pakistan. *Glob. Nest J. (gnest). (*, **18**, 599–610.

Kalhoro, N. A., Z. He, D. Xu, I. Muhammad, and A. F. Sohoo, 2017: Seasonal variation of oceanographic processes in Indus river estuary. *Seas. Var. Oceanogr. Process. Indus river estuary.MAUSAM*, **68**, 643–654.

KAMMANN, C., and Coauthors, 2017: BIOCHAR AS A TOOL TO REDUCE THE AGRICULTURAL GREENHOUSE-GAS BURDEN – KNOWNS, UNKNOWNS AND FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS. *J. Environ. Eng. Landsc. Manag.*, **25**, 114–139, doi:10.3846/16486897.2017.1319375. http://journals.vgtu.lt/index.php/JEELM/article/view/1632 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Kaplan, J. O., K. M. Krumhardt, E. C. Ellis, W. F. Ruddiman, C. Lemmen, and K. K. Goldewijk, 2011: Holocene carbon emissions as a result of anthropogenic land cover change. *The Holocene*, **21**, 775–791, doi:10.1177/0959683610386983. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0959683610386983 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Karami, M., M. Afyuni, A. H. Khoshgoftarmanesh, A. Papritz, and R. Schulin, 2009: Grain Zinc, Iron, and Copper Concentrations of Wheat Grown in Central Iran and Their Relationships with Soil and Climate Variables. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, **57**, 10876–10882, doi:10.1021/jf902074f. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/jf902074f (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Karbassi, A., G. N. Bidhendi, A. Pejman, and M. E. Bidhendi, 2010: Environmental impacts of desalination on the ecology of Lake Urmia. *J. Great Lakes Res.*, **36**, 419–424, doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2010.06.004.

Kassa, H., S. Dondeyne, J. Poesen, A. Frankl, and J. Nyssen, 2017: Transition from Forest-based to Cereal-based Agricultural Systems: A Review of the Drivers of Land use Change and Degradation in Southwest Ethiopia. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **28**, 431–449, doi:10.1002/ldr.2575. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2575 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Kassam, A., and Coauthors, 2013: Sustainable soil management is more than what and how crops are grown. *Principles of Sustainable Soil Management in Agroecosystems*, R. Lal and B.A. Stewart, Eds., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Fl, USA, 337–400 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781466513471 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Kates, R. W., W. R. Travis, and T. J. Wilbanks, 2012: Transformational adaptation when incremental adaptations to climate change are insufficient. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **109**, 7156–7161, doi:10.1073/pnas.1115521109. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22509036 (Accessed October 19, 2018).

Kauppi, P. E., M. Posch, and P. Pirinen, 2014: Large impacts of climatic warming on growth of boreal forests since 1960. *PLoS One*, **9**, 1–6, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111340.

Kauppi, P. E., V. Sandström, and A. Lipponen, 2018: Forest resources of nations in relation to human well-being. *PLoS One*, **13**, e0196248, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0196248. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196248.

Kaye, J. P., and M. Quemada, 2017: Using cover crops to mitigate and adapt to climate change. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, **37**, 4, doi:10.1007/s13593-016-0410-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13593-016-0410-x (Accessed March 28, 2019).

Keenan, R. J., G. A. Reams, F. Achard, J. V. de Freitas, A. Grainger, and E. Lindquist, 2015: Dynamics of global forest area: Results from the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **352**, 9–20, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2015.06.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112715003400 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Keenan, T. F., D. Y. Hollinger, G. Bohrer, D. Dragoni, J. W. Munger, H. P. Schmid, and A. D. Richardson, 2013: Increase in forest water-use efficiency as atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations rise. *Nature*, **499**, 324–327, doi:10.1038/nature12291. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature12291 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

——, I. C. Prentice, J. G. Canadell, C. A. Williams, H. Wang, M. Raupach, and G. J. Collatz, 2017: Corrigendum: Recent pause in the growth rate of atmospheric CO2 due to enhanced terrestrial carbon uptake. *Nat. Commun.*, **8**, 16137, doi:10.1038/ncomms16137. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms16137.

Keith, H., D. Lindenmayer, B. Mackey, D. Blair, L. Carter, L. McBurney, S. Okada, and T. Konishi-Nagano, 2014: Managing temperate forests for carbon storage: impacts of logging versus forest protection on carbon stocks. *Ecosphere*, **5**, art75, doi:10.1890/ES14-00051.1.

Kelly (Letcher), R. A., and Coauthors, 2013: Selecting among five common modelling approaches for integrated environmental assessment and management. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, **47**, 159–181, doi:10.1016/J.ENVSOFT.2013.05.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364815213001151?via%3Dihub (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Kendon, E. J., N. M. Roberts, H. J. Fowler, M. J. Roberts, S. C. Chan, and C. A. Senior, 2014: Heavier summer downpours with climate change revealed by weather forecast resolution model. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **4**, 570–576, doi:10.1038/nclimate2258. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nclimate2258 (Accessed November 14, 2017).

Keogh, M. E., and T. E. Törnqvist, 2019: Measuring rates of present-day relative sea-level rise in low-elevation coastal zones: a critical evaluation. *Ocean Sci.*, **15**, 61–73, doi:10.5194/os-15-61-2019. https://www.ocean-sci.net/15/61/2019/ (Accessed April 7, 2019).

Kerns, B. K., J. B. Kim, J. D. Kline, and M. A. Day, 2016: US exposure to multiple landscape stressors and climate change. *Reg. Environ. Chang.*, **16**, 2129–2140, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0934-2. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10113-016-0934-2 (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Kerr, J. M., J. V. DePinto, D. McGrath, S. P. Sowa, and S. M. Swinton, 2016: Sustainable management of Great Lakes watersheds dominated by agricultural land use. *J. Great Lakes Res.*, **42**, 1252–1259, doi:10.1016/J.JGLR.2016.10.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S038013301630185X (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Kessler, C. A., and L. Stroosnijder, 2006: Land degradation assessment by farmers in Bolivian mountain valleys. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **17**, 235–248, doi:10.1002/ldr.699. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.699 (Accessed April 28, 2018).

Keys, P. W., L. Wang-Erlandsson, L. J. Gordon, V. Galaz, and J. Ebbesson, 2017: Approaching moisture recycling governance. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **45**, 15–23, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2017.04.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378016306902 (Accessed March 13, 2019).

Kiage, L. M., 2013: Perspectives on the assumed causes of land degradation in the rangelands of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.*, **37**, 664–684, doi:10.1177/0309133313492543.

Kidane, D., and B. Alemu, 2015: The Effect of Upstream Land Use Practices on Soil Erosion and Sedimentation in the Upper Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia. *Res. J. Agric. Environ. Manag.*, **4**, 55–68. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Binyam_Alemu/publication/324845331_The_Effect_of_Upstream_Land_Use_Practices_on_Soil_Erosion_and_Sedimentation_in_the_Upper_Blue_Nile_Basin_Ethiopia/links/5ae79275aca2725dabb33f77/The-Effect-of-Upstream-Land-Use-Practi.

Kilpeläinen, A., H. Strandman, T. Grönholm, V. P. Ikonen, P. Torssonen, S. Kellomäki, and H. Peltola, 2017: Effects of Initial Age Structure of Managed Norway Spruce Forest Area on Net Climate Impact of Using Forest Biomass for Energy. *Bioenergy Res.*, **10**, 499–508, doi:10.1007/s12155-017-9821-z.

Kim, G. S., C.-H. H. Lim, S. J. Kim, J. Lee, Y. Y. Y. Son, and W.-K. K. Lee, 2017: Effect of National-Scale Afforestation on Forest Water Supply and Soil Loss in South Korea, 1971–2010. *Sustainability*, **9**, 1017, doi:10.3390/su9061017. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/9/6/1017 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Kim, K. H., and L. Zsuffa, 1994: Reforestation of South Korea: The history and analysis of a unique case in forest tree improvement and forestry. *For. Chron.*, **70**, 58–64, doi:10.5558/tfc70058-1. http://pubs.cif-ifc.org/doi/pdf/10.5558/tfc70058-1 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Kim, M., W. Lee, W. Kurz, D. Kwak, S. Morken, C. Smyth, and D. Ryu, 2016: Estimating carbon dynamics in forest carbon pools under IPCC standards in South Korea using CBM-CFS3. *iForest - Biogeosciences For.*, **10**, 83–92, doi:10.3832/ifor2040-009. http://www.sisef.it/iforest/?doi=ifor2040-009 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Kiruki, H. M., E. H. van der Zanden, Ž. Malek, and P. H. Verburg, 2017: Land Cover Change and Woodland Degradation in a Charcoal Producing Semi-Arid Area in Kenya. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **28**, 472–481, doi:10.1002/ldr.2545. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2545.

Kirwan, M. L., A. B. Murray, J. P. Donnelly, and D. R. Corbett, 2011: Rapid wetland expansion during European settlement and its implication for marsh survival under modern sediment delivery rates. *Geology*, **39**, 507–510, doi:10.1130/G31789.1. http://pubs.geoscienceworld.org/geology/article/39/5/507/130567/Rapid-wetland-expansion-during-European-settlement (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Klein, R.J.T., G.F. Midgley, B.L. Preston, M. Alam, F.G.H. Berkhout, K. Dow, and M. R. S., 2014: Adaptation opportunities, constraints, and limits. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.D.M. Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, S.M. T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, and And L.L.W. P.R. Mastrandrea, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 899–943.

Klemm, W., B. G. Heusinkveld, S. Lenzholzer, and B. van Hove, 2015: Street greenery and its physical and psychological impact on thermal comfort. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **138**, 87–98, doi:10.1016/J.LANDURBPLAN.2015.02.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204615000407 (Accessed March 10, 2019).

Klöck, C., and P. D. Nunn, 2019: Adaptation to Climate Change in Small Island Developing States: A Systematic Literature Review of Academic Research. *J. Environ. Dev.*, 107049651983589, doi:10.1177/1070496519835895. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1070496519835895 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Knapp, A. K., and M. D. Smith, 2001: Variation Among Biomes in Temporal Dynamics of Aboveground Primary Production. *Science (80-.).*, **291**, 481–484, doi:10.1126/science.291.5503.481. http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.291.5503.481 (Accessed January 3, 2018).

Knorr, W., L. Jiang, and A. Arneth, 2016: Climate, CO 2 and human population impacts on global wildfire emissions. *Biogeosciences*, **13**, 267–282, doi:10.5194/bg-13-267-2016. www.biogeosciences.net/13/267/2016/ (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Knutson, T. R., and Coauthors, 2010: Tropical cyclones and climate change. *Nat. Geosci.*, **3**, 157–163, doi:10.1038/ngeo779. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo779 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

——, J. J. Sirutis, M. Zhao, R. E. Tuleya, M. Bender, G. A. Vecchi, G. Villarini, and D. Chavas, 2015: Global projections of intense tropical cyclone activity for the late twenty-first century from dynamical downscaling of CMIP5/RCP4.5 scenarios. *J. Clim.*, **28**, 7203–7224, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0129.1.

Köhl, M., P. R. Neupane, and N. Lotfiomran, 2017: The impact of tree age on biomass growth and carbon accumulation capacity: A retrospective analysis using tree ring data of three tropical tree species grown in natural forests of Suriname. *PLoS One*, **12**, e0181187, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181187. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181187 (Accessed March 26, 2019).

Kolinjivadi, V. K., and T. Sunderland, 2012: A review of two payment schemes for watershed services from China and Vietnam: The interface of government control and PES theory. *Ecol. Soc.*, doi:10.5751/ES-05057-170410.

Kolton, M., E. R. Graber, L. Tsehansky, Y. Elad, and E. Cytryn, 2017: Biochar-stimulated plant performance is strongly linked to microbial diversity and metabolic potential in the rhizosphere. *New Phytol.*, doi:10.1111/nph.14253.

Koohafkann, P., and M. A. Altieri, 2011: *Agricultural Heritage Systems: A legacy for the future*. Rome, Italy, 49 pp. http://worldagriculturalheritage.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/GIAHS_Booklet_EN_WEB2011.pdf.

Koplitz, S. N., and Coauthors, 2016: Public health impacts of the severe haze in Equatorial Asia in September-October 2015: Demonstration of a new framework for informing fire management strategies to reduce downwind smoke exposure. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/094023.

van de Koppel, J., M. Rietkerk, and F. J. Weissing, 1997: Catastrophic vegetation shifts and soil degradation in terrestrial grazing systems. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **12**, 352–356, doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(97)01133-6. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534797011336?via%3Dihub (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Korea Forest Service, 2017: *Statistical yearbook of forestry*. Korea Forest Service, Ed. Deajeon, Korea, http://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/agriculture-forestry-and-fishery/general-statistics/statistical-yearbook-of-forestry/ (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Korhonen-Kurki, K., and Coauthors, 2018: What drives policy change for REDD+? A qualitative comparative analysis of the interplay between institutional and policy arena factors. *Clim. Policy*, 1–14, doi:10.1080/14693062.2018.1507897. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14693062.2018.1507897 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Kosec, K., H. Ghebru, B. Holtemeyer, V. Mueller, and E. Schmidt, 2018: The Effect of Land Access on Youth Employment and Migration Decisions: Evidence from Rural Ethiopia. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.*, **100**, 931–954, doi:10.1093/ajae/aax087. https://academic.oup.com/ajae/article/100/3/931/4781351 (Accessed April 6, 2019).

Kosmas, C., and Coauthors, 2014: Evaluation and Selection of Indicators for Land Degradation and Desertification Monitoring: Methodological Approach. *Environ. Manage.*, **54**, 951–970, doi:10.1007/s00267-013-0109-6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-013-0109-6.

Kossin, J. P., 2018: A global slowdown of tropical-cyclone translation speed. *Nature*, **558**, 104–107, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0158-3. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0158-3 (Accessed October 14, 2018).

Krause, A., and Coauthors, 2018: Large uncertainty in carbon uptake potential of land-based climate-change mitigation efforts. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 3025–3038, doi:10.1111/gcb.14144. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.14144 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Kreamer, D. K., 2012: The Past, Present, and Future of Water Conflict and International Security. *J. Contemp. Water Res. Educ.*, **149**, 87–95, doi:10.1111/j.1936-704X.2012.03130.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2012.03130.x (Accessed January 9, 2018).

Kristjanson, P., and Coauthors, 2017: Addressing gender in agricultural research for development in the face of a changing climate: where are we and where should we be going? *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.*, **15**, 482–500, doi:10.1080/14735903.2017.1336411. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14735903.2017.1336411 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Kroeger, A., S. Koenig, A. Thomson, C. Streck, P.-H. Weiner, and H. Bakhtary, 2017: *Forest- and Climate-Smart Cocoa in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana, Aligning Stakeholders to Support Smallholders in Deforestation-Free Cocoa*. World Bank, Washington, DC, https://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/29014.

Kulakowski, D., T. T. Veblen, and P. Bebi, 2003: Effects of fire and spruce beetle outbreak legacies on the disturbance regime of a subalpine forest in Colorado. *J. Biogeogr.*, **30**, 1445–1456, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2699.2003.00912.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-2699.2003.00912.x (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Kumar, N., and A. R. Quisumbing, 2015: Policy Reform toward Gender Equality in Ethiopia: Little by Little the Egg Begins to Walk. *World Dev.*, **67**, 406–423, doi:10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2014.10.029. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X14003441 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Kuppusamy, S., P. Thavamani, M. Megharaj, K. Venkateswarlu, and R. Naidu, 2016: Agronomic and remedial benefits and risks of applying biochar to soil: Current knowledge and future research directions. *Environ. Int.*, **87**, 1–12, doi:10.1016/J.ENVINT.2015.10.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412015300842 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Kurz, W. A., S. J. Beukema, and M. J. Apps, 1998a: Carbon budget implications of the transition fro m natural to managed disturbance regimes in forest landscapes. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **2**, 405–421.

Kurz, W. A., S. J. Beukema, and M. J. Apps, 1998b: Carbon Budget Implications of the Transition from Natural to Managed Disturbance Regimes in Forest Landscapes. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **2**, 405–421, doi:10.1023/b:miti.0000004486.62808.29.

Kurz, W. A., C. C. Dymond, G. Stinson, G. J. Rampley, E. T. Neilson, A. L. Carroll, T. Ebata, and L. Safranyik, 2008: Mountain pine beetle and forest carbon feedback to climate change. *Nature*, **452**, 987–990, doi:10.1038/nature06777. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature06777 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Kurz, W. A., and Coauthors, 2013: Carbon in Canada's boreal forest — A synthesis. *Environ. Rev.*, **21**, 260–292, doi:10.1139/er-2013-0041. http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/er-2013-0041 (Accessed October 20, 2017).

——, C. Smyth, and T. Lemprière, 2016: Climate change mitigation through forest sector activities: principles, potential and priorities. *Unasylva*, **67**, 61–67.

Van der Laan, C., B. Wicke, P. A. Verweij, and A. P. C. Faaij, 2017: Mitigation of unwanted direct and indirect land-use change - an integrated approach illustrated for palm oil, pulpwood, rubber and rice production in North and East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *GCB Bioenergy*, **9**, 429–444, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12353. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcbb.12353 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Labrière, N., B. Locatelli, Y. Laumonier, V. Freycon, and M. Bernoux, 2015: Soil erosion in the humid tropics: A systematic quantitative review. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **203**, 127–139, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2015.01.027. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880915000468 (Accessed February 20, 2019).

Laderach, P., M. Lundy, A. Jarvis, J. Ramirez, E. P. Portilla, K. Schepp, and A. Eitzinger, 2011: Predicted Impact of Climate Change on Coffee Supply Chains. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 703–723 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-14776-0_42 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Ladha, J. K., H. Pathak, T. J. Krupnik, J. Six, and C. van Kessel, 2005: Efficiency of Fertilizer Nitrogen in Cereal Production: Retrospects and Prospects. *Adv. Agron.*, **87**, 85–156, doi:10.1016/S0065-2113(05)87003-8. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0065211305870038 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Lado, M., M. Ben-Hur, and I. Shainberg, 2004: Soil Wetting and Texture Effects on Aggregate Stability, Seal Formation, and Erosion. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **68**, 1992, doi:10.2136/sssaj2004.1992. https://www.soils.org/publications/sssaj/abstracts/68/6/1992 (Accessed November 14, 2017).

Laganière, J., D. Paré, E. Thiffault, and P. Y. Bernier, 2017: Range and uncertainties in estimating delays in greenhouse gas mitigation potential of forest bioenergy sourced from Canadian forests.

GCB Bioenergy, **9**, 358–369, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12327.

Lal, R., 2003: Soil erosion and the global carbon budget. *Environ. Int.*, **29**, 437–450, doi:10.1016/S0160-4120(02)00192-7. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0160412002001927 (Accessed May 7, 2018).

Lamb, D., 2014: *Large-scale Forest Restoration*. Routledge, London, UK, https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780203071649 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Lambin, E. F., and P. Meyfroidt, 2011: Global land use change, economic globalization, and the looming land scarcity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **108**, 3465–3472, doi:10.1073/pnas.1100480108. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21321211 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Lambin, E. F., and Coauthors, 2001: The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **11**, 261–269, doi:10.1016/S0959-3780(01)00007-3. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378001000073 (Accessed October 19, 2017).

——, H. J. Geist, and E. Lepers, 2003: D YNAMICS OF L AND -U SE AND L AND -C OVER C HANGE IN T ROPICAL R EGIONS. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **28**, 205–241, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105459. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105459 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2018: The role of supply-chain initiatives in reducing deforestation. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8**, 109–116, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0061-1. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-017-0061-1 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Lamers, L. P. M., and Coauthors, 2015: Ecological restoration of rich fens in Europe and North America: from trial and error to an evidence-based approach. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, doi:10.1111/brv.12102.

Lamichhane, J. R., and Coauthors, 2015: Robust cropping systems to tackle pests under climate change. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, **35**, 443–459, doi:10.1007/s13593-014-0275-9. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13593-014-0275-9 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Landauer, M., and S. Juhola, 2019: Loss and Damage in the Rapidly Changing Arctic. Springer, Cham, 425–447 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-72026-5_18 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Laniak, G. F., and Coauthors, 2013: Integrated environmental modeling: A vision and roadmap for the future. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.09.006.

Lau, K. M., and K. M. Kim, 2007: Cooling of the Atlantic by Saharan dust. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **34**, n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2007GL031538. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2007GL031538 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Lavers, T., 2017: Land Registration and Gender Equality in Ethiopia: How State-Society Relations Influence the Enforcement of Institutional Change. *J. Agrar. Chang.*, **17**, 188–207, doi:10.1111/joac.12138. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/joac.12138 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Law, B. E., T. W. Hudiburg, L. T. Berner, J. J. Kent, P. C. Buotte, and M. E. Harmon, 2018: Land use strategies to mitigate climate change in carbon dense temperate forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **115**, 3663–3668, doi:10.1073/pnas.1720064115. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29555758 (Accessed March 26, 2019).

Lawhon, M., and J. T. Murphy, 2012: Socio-technical regimes and sustainability transitions. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, **36**, 354–378, doi:10.1177/0309132511427960. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132511427960 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Lawrence, D., and K. Vandecar, 2015: Effects of tropical deforestation on climate and agriculture. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 27–36, doi:10.1038/nclimate2430. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2430 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Lawson, I. T., and Coauthors, 2015: Improving estimates of tropical peatland area, carbon storage, and greenhouse gas fluxes. *Wetl. Ecol. Manag.*, doi:10.1007/s11273-014-9402-2.

Le, Q. B., E. Nkonya, and A. Mirzabaev, 2016: Biomass Productivity-Based Mapping of Global Land Degradation Hotspots. *Economics of Land Degradation and Improvement -- A Global Assessment for Sustainable Development*, E. Nkonya, A. Mirzabaev, and J. Von Braun, Eds., Springer International Publishing, Cham, 55–84 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19168-3_4.

Lecina-Diaz, J., A. Alvarez, A. Regos, P. Drapeau, A. Paquette, C. Messier, and J. Retana, 2018: The positive carbon stocks-biodiversity relationship in forests: co-occurrence and drivers across five subclimates. *Ecol. Appl.*, **28**, 1481–1493, doi:10.1002/eap.1749. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/eap.1749 (Accessed March 26, 2019).

Lee, D. K., P. S. Park, and Y. D. Park, 2015: Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation in the Republic of Korea. *Restoration of Boreal and Temperate Forests*, J.A. Stanturf, Ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 230–245 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781482211979/chapters/10.1201%2Fb18809-10 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Lee, H.-L., 2009: The impact of climate change on global food supply and demand, food prices, and land use. *Paddy Water Environ.*, **7**, 321–331, doi:10.1007/s10333-009-0181-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10333-009-0181-y (Accessed January 9, 2018).

Lee, J., and Coauthors, 2014: Estimating the carbon dynamics of South Korean forests from 1954 to 2012. *Biogeosciences*, **11**, 4637–4650, doi:10.5194/bg-11-4637-2014. http://www.biogeosciences.net/11/4637/2014/ (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Lee, J., C.-H. H. Lim, G. S. Kim, A. Markandya, S. Chowdhury, S. J. Kim, W.-K. K. Lee, and Y. Son, 2018a: Economic viability of the national-scale forestation program: The case of success in the Republic of Korea. *Ecosyst. Serv.*, **29**, 40–46, doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.11.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212041617304953 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Lee, S. G., H.-A. A. Choi, H. Yoo, C. Song, S. Cha, S.-W. W. Bae, Y. Son, and W.-K. K. Lee, 2018b: Restoration plan for degraded forest in the democratic people's republic of Korea considering suitable tree species and spatial distribution. *Sustain.*, **10**, 856, doi:10.3390/su10030856. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/3/856 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Lehmann, J., and M. Kleber, 2015: The contentious nature of soil organic matter. *Nature*, **528**, 60, doi:10.1038/nature16069. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature16069 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

——, and J. Stephen, 2015: *Biochar for Environmental Management: Science, Technology and Implementation*.

Lei, Y., R. Treuhaft, M. Keller, M. dos-Santos, F. Gonçalves, and M. Neumann, 2018: Quantification of selective logging in tropical forest with spaceborne SAR interferometry. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **211**, 167–183, doi:10.1016/J.RSE.2018.04.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425718301548 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Leifeld, J., and L. Menichetti, 2018: The underappreciated potential of peatlands in global climate change mitigation strategies. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**, 1071, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-03406-6. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-03406-6 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Lemprière, T. C., and Coauthors, 2013: Canadian boreal forests and climate change mitigation. *Environ. Rev.*, **21**, 293–321, doi:10.1139/er-2013-0039. http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/er-2013-0039 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Di Leo, N., F. J. Escobedo, and M. Dubbeling, 2016: The role of urban green infrastructure in mitigating land surface temperature in Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **18**, 373–392, doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9653-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10668-015-9653-y (Accessed

May 17, 2018).

Lesk, C., E. Coffel, A. W. D'Amato, K. Dodds, and R. Horton, 2017: Threats to North American forests from southern pine beetle with warming winters. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 713–717, doi:10.1038/nclimate3375. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nclimate3375 (Accessed October 22, 2017).

Lewis, S. L., Y. Malhi, and O. L. Phillips, 2004: Fingerprinting the impacts of global change on tropical forests. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*, **359**, 437–462, doi:10.1098/rstb.2003.1432. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15212095 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Lewis, S. L., C. E. Wheeler, E. T. A. Mitchard, and A. Koch, 2019: Restoring natural forests is the best way to remove atmospheric carbon. *Nature,* **568**, 25–28. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-01026-8.

Li, D., S. Niu, and Y. Luo, 2012: Global patterns of the dynamics of soil carbon and nitrogen stocks following afforestation: a meta-analysis. *New Phytol.*, **195**, 172–181, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04150.x.

Li, Q., M. Ma, X. Wu, and H. Yang, 2018a: Snow Cover and Vegetation-Induced Decrease in Global Albedo From 2002 to 2016. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **123**, 124–138, doi:10.1002/2017JD027010. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2017JD027010 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Li, W., N. MacBean, P. Ciais, P. Defourny, C. Lamarche, S. Bontemps, R. A. Houghton, and S. Peng, 2018b: Gross and net land cover changes in the main plant functional types derived from the annual ESA CCI land cover maps (1992–2015). *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, **10**, 219–234, doi:10.5194/essd-10-219-2018. https://www.earth-syst-sci-data.net/10/219/2018/ (Accessed February 25, 2019).

Li, Y., M. Zhao, S. Motesharrei, Q. Mu, E. Kalnay, and S. Li, 2015: Local cooling and warming effects of forests based on satellite observations. *Nat. Commun.*, **6**, doi:10.1038/ncomms7603.

——, E. Kalnay, S. Motesharrei, J. Rivas, F. Kucharski, D. Kirk-Davidoff, E. Bach, and N. Zeng, 2018c: Climate model shows large-scale wind and solar farms in the Sahara increase rain and vegetation. *Science (80-.).*, **361**, 1019–1022, doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.AAR5629. http://science.sciencemag.org/content/361/6406/1019 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Li, Z., and H. Fang, 2016: Impacts of climate change on water erosion: A review. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **163**, 94–117, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2016.10.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825216303555 (Accessed March 9, 2018).

Liljedahl, A. K., and Coauthors, 2016: Pan-Arctic ice-wedge degradation in warming permafrost and its influence on tundra hydrology. *Nat. Geosci.*, **9**, 312–318, doi:10.1038/ngeo2674. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2674 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Lilleskov, E., and Coauthors, 2019: Is Indonesian peatland loss a cautionary tale for Peru? A two-country comparison of the magnitude and causes of tropical peatland degradation. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **24**, 591–623, doi:10.1007/s11027-018-9790-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11027-018-9790-3 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Lin, K.-C., S. P. Hamburg, L. Wang, C.-T. Duh, C.-M. Huang, C.-T. Chang, and T.-C. Lin, 2017: Impacts of increasing typhoons on the structure and function of a subtropical forest: reflections of a changing climate. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 4911, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05288-y. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-05288-y (Accessed March 4, 2019).

Lin, M., and P. Huybers, 2012: Reckoning wheat yield trends. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **7**, 024016, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/2/024016. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/7/i=2/a=024016?key=crossref.7861e7550adf3d2b7bf0eb905e7c49df (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Lin, N., and K. Emanuel, 2016a: Grey swan tropical cyclones. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 106–111, doi:10.1038/nclimate2777. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2777 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

——, and ——, 2016b: Grey swan tropical cyclones. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 106–111, doi:10.1038/nclimate2777. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2777 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Lindenmayer, D. B., C. R. Margules, and D. B. Botkin, 2000: Indicators of Biodiversity for Ecologically Sustainable Forest Management. *Conserv. Biol.*, **14**, 941–950, doi:10.1046/j.1523-1739.2000.98533.x.

Lindner, M., and Coauthors, 2010: Climate change impacts, adaptive capacity, and vulnerability of European forest ecosystems. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **259**, 698–709, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2009.09.023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112709006604 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Lindquist, E. J., and R. D'Annunzio, 2016: Assessing global forest land-use change by object-based image analysis. *Remote Sens.*, **8**, doi:10.3390/rs8080678.

Linham, M. M., and R. J. Nicholls, 2010: Technologies for climate change adaptation: coastal erosion and flooding. *Technol. Clim. Chang. Adapt. Coast. Eros. flooding.*,. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20113337532 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Liniger, H. P., M. Studer, R. C. Hauert, and M. Gurtner, 2011: *Sustainable Land Management in Practice. Guidelines and Best Practices for Sub-Saharan Africa*. Rome, Italy, 13 pp. http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i1861e/i1861e00.pdf.

Liu, F., Huang C, He T, Qian X, Liu Y, and L. H., 2002: Role of Grain to Green Program in reducing loss of phosphorus from yellow soil in hilly areas. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 20–23.

Liu, C. L. C., O. Kuchma, and K. V. Krutovsky, 2018a: Mixed-species versus monocultures in plantation forestry: Development, benefits, ecosystem services and perspectives for the future. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **15**, e00419, doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00419.

Liu, J., and J. Diamond, 2008: Science and government: Revolutionizing China's environmental protection. *Science (80-.).*, doi:10.1126/science.1150416.

Liu, J., S. Li, Z. Ouyang, C. Tam, and X. Chen, 2008: Ecological and socioeconomic effects of China's policies for ecosystem services. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, doi:10.1073/pnas.0706436105.

Liu, J. Z., W. Ouyang, W. Yang, and S. L. Xu, 2013: in Encyclopedia of Biodiversity, S. A. Levin, Academic Press, Waltham, MA, ed. 2. 372–384.

Liu, S. C., C. Fu, C.-J. Shiu, J.-P. Chen, and F. Wu, 2009: Temperature dependence of global precipitation extremes. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **36**, L17702, doi:10.1029/2009GL040218. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2009GL040218 (Accessed March 14, 2018).

Liu, T., R. Bruins, and M. Heberling, 2018b: Factors Influencing Farmers' Adoption of Best Management Practices: A Review and Synthesis. *Sustainability*, **10**, 432, doi:10.3390/su10020432. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/2/432 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Liu, Y., and Coauthors, 2018c: Mechanisms of rice straw biochar effects on phosphorus sorption characteristics of acid upland red soils. *Chemosphere*, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.05.086.

Liu, Y. Y., A. I. J. M. van Dijk, R. A. M. de Jeu, J. G. Canadell, M. F. McCabe, J. P. Evans, and G. Wang, 2015a: Recent reversal in loss of global terrestrial biomass. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 470–474, doi:10.1038/nclimate2581. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2581 (Accessed September 26, 2018).

——, ——, ——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2015b: Recent reversal in loss of global terrestrial biomass. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 470–474, doi:10.1038/nclimate2581.

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nclimate2581 (Accessed December 20, 2017).

Long, H. L., G. K. Heilig, J. Wang, X. B. Li, M. Luo, X. Q. Wu, and M. Zhang, 2006: Land use and soil erosion in the upper reaches of the Yangtze River: Some socio-economic considerations on China's Grain-for-Green Programme. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, doi:10.1002/ldr.736.

López-Carr, D., 2012: Agro-ecological drivers of rural out-migration to the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **7**, 045603, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/045603. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/7/i=4/a=045603?key=crossref.7030d175e5edb8d437c3072f9d22408e (Accessed May 15, 2018).

López-Portillo, J., R. R. Lewis, P. Saenger, A. Rovai, N. Koedam, F. Dahdouh-Guebas, C. Agraz-Hernández, and V. H. Rivera-Monroy, 2017: Mangrove Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation. *Mangrove Ecosystems: A Global Biogeographic Perspective*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 301–345 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-62206-4_10 (Accessed July 30, 2018).

López-Rosas, H., P. Moreno-Casasola, F. López-Barrera, L. E. Sánchez-Higueredo, V. Espejel-González, and J. Vázquez, 2013: Interdune wetland restoration in central Veracruz, Mexico: plant diversity recovery mediated by the hydroperiod. *Restoration of Coastal Dunes*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 255–269 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-33445-0_16 (Accessed July 18, 2018).

Lorimer, C. G., and A. S. White, 2003: Scale and frequency of natural disturbances in the northeastern US: Implications for early successional forest habitats and regional age distributions. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **185**, 41–64, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(03)00245-7.

Loucks, C., S. Barber-Meyer, M. A. A. Hossain, A. Barlow, and R. M. Chowdhury, 2010: Sea level rise and tigers: predicted impacts to Bangladesh's Sundarbans mangroves. *Clim. Change*, **98**, 291–298, doi:10.1007/s10584-009-9761-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-009-9761-5 (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Lovo, S., 2016: Tenure Insecurity and Investment in Soil Conservation. Evidence from Malawi. *World Dev.*, **78**, 219–229, doi:10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2015.10.023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X15002454 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Luetz, J., 2018: Climate Change and Migrationin Bangladesh: Empirically DerivedLessons and Opportunities for PolicyMakers and Practitioners. *Limits to Climate Change Adaptation*, W.L. Filho and J. Nalau, Eds., Springer International Publishing, Berlin, Heidelberg, 59–105.

Lukas, M. C., 2014: Eroding battlefields: Land degradation in Java reconsidered. *Geoforum*, **56**, 87–100, doi:10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2014.06.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718514001444#b0100 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Luke, D., K. McLaren, and B. Wilson, 2016: Modeling Hurricane Exposure in a Caribbean Lower Montane Tropical Wet Forest: The Effects of Frequent, Intermediate Disturbances and Topography on Forest Structural Dynamics and Composition. *Ecosystems*, **19**, 1178–1195, doi:10.1007/s10021-016-9993-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10021-016-9993-y (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Lund, J. F., E. Sungusia, M. B. Mabele, and A. Scheba, 2017: Promising Change, Delivering Continuity: REDD+ as Conservation Fad. *World Dev.*, **89**, 124–139, doi:10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2016.08.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X15312821 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Lundmark, T., and Coauthors, 2014: Potential roles of Swedish forestry in the context of climate change mitigation. *Forests*, **5**, 557–578, doi:10.3390/f5040557.

Luo, P., M. Zhou, H. Deng, J. Lyu, W. Cao, K. Takara, D. Nover, and S. Geoffrey Schladow, 2018: Impact of forest maintenance on water shortages: Hydrologic modeling and effects of climate change. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **615**, 1355–1363, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.09.044. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969717323859 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Lutz, A. F., W. W. Immerzeel, A. B. Shrestha, and M. F. P. Bierkens, 2014: Consistent increase in High Asia's runoff due to increasing glacier melt and precipitation. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **4**, 587–592, doi:10.1038/nclimate2237. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2237 (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Luyssaert, S., and Coauthors, 2018: Trade-offs in using European forests to meet climate objectives. *Nature*, **562**, 259–262, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0577-1. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0577-1.

Lyons-White, J., and A. T. Knight, 2018: Palm oil supply chain complexity impedes implementation of corporate no-deforestation commitments. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **50**, 303–313, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2018.04.012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0959378017310117 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

MA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment), 2005: *Millennium ecosystem assessment synthesis report.* 155 pp.

Ma, S., T. Zhou, A. Dai, Z. Han, S. Ma, T. Zhou, A. Dai, and Z. Han, 2015: Observed Changes in the Distributions of Daily Precipitation Frequency and Amount over China from 1960 to 2013. *J. Clim.*, **28**, 6960–6978, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0011.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0011.1 (Accessed March 7, 2019).

——, and Coauthors, 2017: Detectable Anthropogenic Shift toward Heavy Precipitation over Eastern China. *J. Clim.*, **30**, 1381–1396, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0311.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0311.1 (Accessed March 7, 2019).

MacDicken, K. G., P. Sola, J. E. Hall, C. Sabogal, M. Tadoum, and C. de Wasseige, 2015: Global progress toward sustainable forest management. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **352**, 47–56, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.02.005. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.02.005.

Macfadyen, S., G. McDonald, and M. P. Hill, 2018: From species distributions to climate change adaptation: Knowledge gaps in managing invertebrate pests in broad-acre grain crops. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **253**, 208–219, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2016.08.029. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880916304327 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Machisa, M., J. Wichmann, and P. S. Nyasulu, 2013: Biomass fuel use for household cooking in Swaziland: is there an association with anaemia and stunting in children aged 6-36 months? *Trans. R. Soc. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, **107**, 535–544, doi:10.1093/trstmh/trt055. https://academic.oup.com/trstmh/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/trstmh/trt055 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Mackey, B., I. C. Prentice, W. Steffen, J. I. House, D. Lindenmayer, H. Keith, and S. Berry, 2013: Untangling the confusion around land carbon science and climate change mitigation policy. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **3**, 552–557, doi:10.1038/nclimate1804.

——, and Coauthors, 2015: Policy Options for the World's Primary Forests in Multilateral Environmental Agreements. *Conserv. Lett.*, **8**, 139–147, doi:10.1111/conl.12120. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/conl.12120 (Accessed October 19, 2018).

Maes, J., and S. Jacobs, 2017: Nature-Based Solutions for Europe's Sustainable Development. *Conserv. Lett.*, doi:10.1111/conl.12216.

Maestre, F. T., and Coauthors, 2009: Shrub encroachment can reverse desertification in semi-arid Mediterranean grasslands. *Ecol. Lett.*, **12**, 930–941, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01352.x.

http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01352.x (Accessed May 8, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2013: Changes in biocrust cover drive carbon cycle responses to climate change in drylands. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **19**, 3835–3847, doi:10.1111/gcb.12306. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12306 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Magnan, A. K., and Coauthors, 2016: Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 646–665, doi:10.1002/wcc.409.

Mander, S., K. Anderson, A. Larkin, C. Gough, and N. Vaughan, 2017: The Role of Bio-energy with Carbon Capture and Storage in Meeting the Climate Mitigation Challenge: A Whole System Perspective. *Energy Procedia*, **114**, 6036–6043, doi:10.1016/J.EGYPRO.2017.03.1739. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876610217319410 (Accessed March 16, 2018).

Marino, E., and H. Lazrus, 2015: Migration or Forced Displacement?: The Complex Choices of Climate Change and Disaster Migrants in Shishmaref, Alaska and Nanumea, Tuvalu. *Hum. Organ.*, **74**, 341–350, doi:10.17730/0018-7259-74.4.341.

Marjani, A., and M. Jamali, 2014: Role of exchange flow in salt water balance of Urmia Lake. *Dyn. Atmos. Ocean.*, **65**, 1–16, doi:10.1016/j.dynatmoce.2013.10.001.

Martin-Ortega, J., T. E. H. Allott, K. Glenk, and M. Schaafsma, 2014: Valuing water quality improvements from peatland restoration: Evidence and challenges. *Ecosyst. Serv.*, doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.06.00.

Masera, O. R., R. Bailis, R. Drigo, A. Ghilardi, and I. Ruiz-Mercado, 2015: Environmental Burden of Traditional Bioenergy Use. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **40**, 121–150, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-102014-021318. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-environ-102014-021318 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Matata, P. Z., L. W. Masolwa, S. Ruvuga, and F. M. Bagarama, 2013: Dissemination pathways for scaling-up agroforestry technologies in western Tanzania. *J. Agric. Ext. Rural Dev.*, **5**, 31–36.

Mateos, E., J. M. Edeso, and L. Ormaetxea, 2017: Soil Erosion and Forests Biomass as Energy Resource in the Basin of the Oka River in Biscay, Northern Spain. *Forests*, **8**, 258, doi:10.3390/f8070258.

Matthews, R., G. Hogan, and E. Mackie, 2018: Carbon impacts of biomass consumed in the EU. *Res. Agency For. Comm.*, 61. https://europeanclimate.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/CIB-Summary-report-for-ECF-v10.5-May-20181.pdf.

Mbow, C., P. Smith, D. Skole, L. Duguma, and M. Bustamante, 2014: Achieving mitigation and adaptation to climate change through sustainable agroforestry practices in Africa. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **6**, 8–14, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.09.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343513001255 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

McDowell, N. G., D. J. Beerling, D. D. Breshears, R. A. Fisher, K. F. Raffa, and M. Stitt, 2011: The interdependence of mechanisms underlying climate-driven vegetation mortality. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **26**, 523–532, doi:10.1016/J.TREE.2011.06.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534711001698 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

McGrath, M. J., and Coauthors, 2015: Reconstructing European forest management from 1600 to 2010. *Biogeosciences*, **12**, 4291–4316, doi:10.5194/bg-12-4291-2015.

McInnes, K. L., T. A. Erwin, and J. M. Bathols, 2011: Global Climate Model projected changes in 10 m wind speed and direction due to anthropogenic climate change. *Atmos. Sci. Lett.*, **12**, 325–333, doi:10.1002/asl.341. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/asl.341 (Accessed March 6, 2018).

McIntire, J., D. (Daniel) Bourzat, and P. L. Pingali, 1992: *Crop-livestock interaction in Sub-Saharan Africa*. World Bank, 246 pp. https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/65734 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

McLauchlan, K., 2006: The Nature and Longevity of Agricultural Impacts on Soil Carbon and Nutrients: A Review. *Ecosystems*, **9**, 1364–1382, doi:10.1007/s10021-005-0135-1. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10021-005-0135-1 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

McLeman, R., 2017: *Migration and land degradation: Recent experience and future trends. Working paper for the Global Land Outlook, 1st edition.* UNCCD, Bonn, 45 pp.

——, and B. Smit, 2006: Migration as an Adaptation to Climate Change. *Clim. Change*, **76**, 31–53, doi:10.1007/s10584-005-9000-7. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-005-9000-7 (Accessed October 30, 2018).

McLeman, R. A., J. Dupre, L. Berrang Ford, J. Ford, K. Gajewski, and G. Marchildon, 2014: What we learned from the Dust Bowl: lessons in science, policy, and adaptation. *Popul. Environ.*, **35**, 417–440, doi:10.1007/s11111-013-0190-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11111-013-0190-z (Accessed October 30, 2018).

McNicol, G., and W. L. Silver, 2014: Separate effects of flooding and anaerobiosis on soil greenhouse gas emissions and redox sensitive biogeochemistry. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, **119**, 557–566, doi:10.1002/2013JG002433. https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2013JG002433 (Accessed May 8, 2018).

McNicol, I. M., C. M. Ryan, and E. T. A. Mitchard, 2018: Carbon losses from deforestation and widespread degradation offset by extensive growth in African woodlands. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**, 3045, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05386-z. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05386-z.

McVicar, T. R., and M. L. Roderick, 2010: Winds of change. *Nat. Geosci.*, **3**, 747–748, doi:10.1038/ngeo1002. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo1002 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Meijer, S. S., D. Catacutan, O. C. Ajayi, G. W. Sileshi, and M. Nieuwenhuis, 2015: The role of knowledge, attitudes and perceptions in the uptake of agricultural and agroforestry innovations among smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.*, **13**, 40–54, doi:10.1080/14735903.2014.912493. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14735903.2014.912493 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

Meisner, A., S. Jacquiod, B. L. Snoek, F. C. ten Hooven, and W. H. van der Putten, 2018: Drought Legacy Effects on the Composition of Soil Fungal and Prokaryote Communities. *Front. Microbiol.*, **9**, 294, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2018.00294. http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2018.00294/full (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Mekuriaw, A., A. Heinimann, G. Zeleke, and H. Hurni, 2018: Factors influencing the adoption of physical soil and water conservation practices in the Ethiopian highlands. *Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res.*, **6**, 23–30, doi:10.1016/J.ISWCR.2017.12.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095633917302058 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

Mendum, R., and M. Njenga, 2018: *Recovering bioenergy in Sub-Saharan Africa: gender dimensions, lessons and Challenges*. Inernational Water Managment Institute (IWMI), Colombo, Sri Lanka, 1-83 pp. https://books.google.se/books?hl=sv&lr=&id=Nm18DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=biomass+cooking+women+youth&ots=IA8ciTkXzH&sig=sbEH1LUT_FXDseWOt-fC98tL8fY&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=biomass cooking women youth&f=false (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Meng, W., M. He, B. Hu, X. Mo, H. Li, B. Liu, and Z. Wang, 2017: Status of wetlands in China: A review of extent, degradation, issues and recommendations for improvement. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **146**, 50–59, doi:10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2017.06.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0964569117305550?_rdoc=1&_fmt=high&_origin=gateway&_docanchor=&md5=b8429449ccfc9c30159a5f9aeaa92ffb&dgcid=raven_sd_re

commender_email#bib50 (Accessed July 18, 2018).

Mengel, M., A. Levermann, K. Frieler, A. Robinson, B. Marzeion, and R. Winkelmann, 2016: Future sea level rise constrained by observations and long-term commitment. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **113**, 2597–2602, doi:10.1073/PNAS.1500515113. https://www.pnas.org/content/113/10/2597.short (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Mentaschi, L., M. I. Vousdoukas, J.-F. Pekel, E. Voukouvalas, and L. Feyen, 2018: Global long-term observations of coastal erosion and accretion. *Sci. Rep.*, **8**, 12876, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30904-w. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-30904-w (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Mercer, D. E., 2004: Adoption of agroforestry innovations in the tropics: A review. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **61–62**, 311–328, doi:10.1023/B:AGFO.0000029007.85754.70. http://link.springer.com/10.1023/B:AGFO.0000029007.85754.70 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Meyfroidt, P., and E. F. Lambin, 2011: *Global Forest Transition: Prospects for an End to Deforestation*. 343-371 pp. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-environ-090710-143732.

Micklin, P., 2010: The past, present, and future Aral Sea. *Lakes Reserv. Res. Manag.*, **15**, 193–213, doi:10.1111/j.1440-1770.2010.00437.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1440-1770.2010.00437.x (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Middleton, N. J., and D. S. Thomas, 1997: *World Atlas of Desertification.* http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12345678 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Midgley, G. F., and W. J. Bond, 2015: Future of African terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystems under anthropogenic climate change. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **5**, 823–829, doi:10.1038/nclimate2753. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2753 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Miettinen, J., C. Shi, and S. C. Liew, 2016: Land cover distribution in the peatlands of Peninsular Malaysia, Sumatra and Borneo in 2015 with changes since 1990. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **6**, 67–78, doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2016.02.004.

Miles, L., and Coauthors, 2015: *Mitigation potential from forestrelated activities and incentives for enhanced action in developing countries*. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, http://www.forskningsdatabasen.dk/en/catalog/2290491813 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Millennium Assessment, 2005: *Ecosystems and Human Well-being, Synthesis*. Island Press, Washington DC, USA, 155 pp.

Minasny, B., and Coauthors, 2017: Soil carbon 4 per mille. *Geoderma*, **292**, 59–86, doi:10.1016/J.GEODERMA.2017.01.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706117300095 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Minderhoud, P. S. J., G. Erkens, V. H. Pham, V. T. Bui, L. Erban, H. Kooi, and E. Stouthamer, 2017: Impacts of 25 years of groundwater extraction on subsidence in the Mekong delta, Vietnam. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, 064006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa7146. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/12/i=6/a=064006?key=crossref.687693ccba9bba2f8d848aa7018a5625 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Minkkinen, K., P. Ojanen, T. Penttilä, M. Aurela, T. Laurila, J.-P. Tuovinen, and A. Lohila, 2018: Persistent carbon sink at a boreal drained bog forest. *Biogeosciences*, **15**, 3603–3624, doi:10.5194/bg-15-3603-2018.

Minx, J. C., and Coauthors, 2018: Negative emissions - Part 1: Research landscape and synthesis. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabf9b.

Mirzabaev, A., E. Nkonya, and J. von Braun, 2015: Economics of sustainable land management. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **15**, 9–19, doi:10.1016/J.COSUST.2015.07.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343515000688 (Accessed April 18,

2019).

——, ——, J. Goedecke, T. Johnson, and W. Anderson, 2016: Global Drivers of Land Degradation and Improvement. *Economics of Land Degradation and Improvement – A Global Assessment for Sustainable Development*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 167–195 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-19168-3_7 (Accessed January 12, 2018).

Mitchard, E. T. A., 2018: The tropical forest carbon cycle and climate change. *Nature*, **559**, 527–534, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0300-2.

Mittler, R., 2006: Abiotic stress, the field environment and stress combination. *Trends Plant Sci.*, **11**, 15–19, doi:10.1016/J.TPLANTS.2005.11.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1360138505002918 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Mokria, M., A. Gebrekirstos, E. Aynekulu, and A. Bräuning, 2015: Tree dieback affects climate change mitigation potential of a dry afromontane forest in northern Ethiopia. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **344**, 73–83, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.02.008. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0378112715000596 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Mondal, A., D. Khare, and S. Kundu, 2016: Change in rainfall erosivity in the past and future due to climate change in the central part of India. *Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res.*, **4**, 186–194, doi:10.1016/J.ISWCR.2016.08.004. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095633916300053 (Accessed December 5, 2017).

Montanarella, L., R. Scholes, and A. Brainich, 2018: *The IPBES assessment report on land degradation and restoration*. Bonn, Germany,.

Montgomery, D. R., 2007a: Soil erosion and agricultural sustainability. **104**, 13268–13272. http://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/104/33/13268.full.pdf (Accessed April 2, 2018).

Montgomery, D. R., 2007b: *Dirt: the Erosion of Civilizations*. University of California Press, 285 pp.

Moore, P. D., 2002: *The future of cool temperate bogs. Environmental Conservation. 29, 3-20. National Climate Commission.2009. Belgium's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Famework Convention on Climte Change. Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Saft.*

Moore, S., and Coauthors, 2013: Deep instability of deforested tropical peatlands revealed by fluvial organic carbon fluxes. *Nature*, **493**, 660–663, doi:10.1038/nature11818.

Morgan, R. P. C., 2005a: *Soil Erosion and Conservation*. 3rd ed. Blackwell Science Ltd, Malden, USA,.

Morgan, R. P. C. (Royston P. C., 2005b: *Soil erosion and conservation*. 2nd ed. Blackwell Pub, Harlow, Essex, UK, 198 pp.

Mori, N., T. Yasuda, H. Mase, T. Tom, and Y. Oku, 2010: Projection of Extreme Wave Climate Change under Global Warming. *Hydrol. Res. Lett.*, **4**, 15–19, doi:10.3178/hrl.4.15. https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/hrl/4/0/4_0_15/_article (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Morrissey, J. W., 2013: Understanding the relationship between environmental change and migration: The development of an effects framework based on the case of northern Ethiopia. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **23**, 1501–1510, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2013.07.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378013001271 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Morse, J. L., and E. S. Bernhardt, 2013: Using15N tracers to estimate N2O and N2emissions from nitrification and denitrification in coastal plain wetlands under contrasting land-uses. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.07.025.

Morton, J. F., 2007: The impact of climate change on smallholder and subsistence agriculture. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **104**, 19680–19685, doi:10.1073/pnas.0701855104. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18077400 (Accessed January 9, 2018).

Mudombi, S., and Coauthors, 2018: Multi-dimensional poverty effects around operational biofuel projects in Malawi, Mozambique and Swaziland. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **114**, 41–54, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.09.003. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0961953416302938.

Muir, D., J. A. G. Cooper, and G. Pétursdóttir, 2014: Challenges and opportunities in climate change adaptation for communities in Europe's northern periphery. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **94**, 1–8, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.03.017.

Mullan, D., 2013: Soil erosion under the impacts of future climate change: Assessing the statistical significance of future changes and the potential on-site and off-site problems. *CATENA*, **109**, 234–246, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2013.03.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816213000696 (Accessed March 15, 2018).

——, D. Favis-Mortlock, and R. Fealy, 2012: Addressing key limitations associated with modelling soil erosion under the impacts of future climate change. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **156**, 18–30, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.12.004. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192311003418 (Accessed November 15, 2017).

Munang, R., I. Thiaw, K. Alverson, and Z. Han, 2013: The role of ecosystem services in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **5**, 47–52, doi:10.1016/J.COSUST.2013.02.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343513000080 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Munson, S. M., J. Belnap, and G. S. Okin, 2011: Responses of wind erosion to climate-induced vegetation changes on the Colorado Plateau. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **108**, 3854–3859, doi:10.1073/pnas.1014947108. http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1014947108 (Accessed November 14, 2017).

Murphy, J. M., D. M. H. Sexton, D. N. Barnett, G. S. Jones, M. J. Webb, M. Collins, and D. A. Stainforth, 2004: Quantification of modelling uncertainties in a large ensemble of climate change simulations. *Nature*, **430**, 768–772, doi:10.1038/nature02771. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature02771 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Murthy, K., and S. Bagchi, 2018: Spatial patterns of long-term vegetation greening and browning are consistent across multiple scales: Implications for monitoring land degradation. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **29**, 2485–2495, doi:10.1002/ldr.3019. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.3019 (Accessed October 10, 2018).

Murty, D., M. U. F. Kirschbaum, R. E. Mcmurtrie, and H. Mcgilvray, 2002: Does conversion of forest to agricultural land change soil carbon and nitrogen? a review of the literature. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **8**, 105–123, doi:10.1046/j.1354-1013.2001.00459.x.

Mutoko, M. C., C. A. Shisanya, and L. Hein, 2014: Fostering technological transition to sustainable land management through stakeholder collaboration in the western highlands of Kenya. *Land use policy*, **41**, 110–120, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2014.05.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837714001112?via%3Dihub (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Mycoo, M., and A. Chadwick, 2012: Adaptation to climate change: the coastal zone of Barbados. *Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng. - Marit. Eng.*, **165**, 159–168, doi:10.1680/maen.2011.19.

Naamwintome, B. A., and E. Bagson, 2013: Youth in agriculture: Prospects and challenges in the Sissala area of Ghana. *Net J. Agric. Sci.*, **1**, 60–68. http://www.netjournals.org/z_NJAS_13_023.html (Accessed April 6, 2019).

Nabuurs, G. J., and Coauthors, 2007: In Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Forestry, 542–584.

Nabuurs, G. J., P. Delacote, D. Ellison, M. Hanewinkel, L. Hetemäki, M. Lindner, and M. Ollikainen, 2017: By 2050 the mitigation effects of EU forests could nearly double through climate smart forestry. *Forests*, **8**, 1–14, doi:10.3390/f8120484.

Nachtergaele, F. O., M. Petri, R. Biancalani, G. V. Lynden, H. V. Velthuizen, and M. Bloise, 2011: *Nachtergaele, F. O., et al. Global Land Degradation Information System (GLADIS) Version 1.0. An Information database for Land Degradation Assessment at Global Level. LADA Technical Report 17*. Rome, italy, 1-110 pp.

Nalau, J., J. Handmer, J. Nalau, and J. Handmer, 2018: Improving Development Outcomes and Reducing Disaster Risk through Planned Community Relocation. *Sustainability*, **10**, 3545, doi:10.3390/su10103545. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/10/3545 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Nampak, H., B. Pradhan, H. Mojaddadi Rizeei, and H.-J. Park, 2018: Assessment of land cover and land use change impact on soil loss in a tropical catchment by using multitemporal SPOT-5 satellite images and Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation model. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, doi:10.1002/ldr.3112. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.3112 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Nasi, R., F. E. Putz, P. Pacheco, S. Wunder, and S. Anta, 2011: Sustainable forest management and carbon in tropical latin America: The case for REDD+. *Forests*, **2**, 200–217, doi:10.3390/f2010200.

Nath, T. K., M. Jashimuddin, M. Kamrul Hasan, M. Shahjahan, and J. Pretty, 2016: The sustainable intensification of agroforestry in shifting cultivation areas of Bangladesh. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **90**, 405–416, doi:10.1007/s10457-015-9863-1. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10457-015-9863-1 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

National Research Centre for Agroforestry, J., and Coauthors, 1999: *Indian journal of agroforestry*. Indian Society for Agroforestry, Research Centre for Agroforestry, 1-10 pp. http://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ijaf&volume=20&issue=1&article=001 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Ndegwa, G. M., U. Nehren, F. Grüninger, M. Iiyama, and D. Anhuf, 2016: Charcoal production through selective logging leads to degradation of dry woodlands: a case study from Mutomo District, Kenya. *J. Arid Land*, **8**, 618–631, doi:10.1007/s40333-016-0124-6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40333-016-0124-6.

Nearing, M. A., F. F. Pruski, and M. R. O'Neal, 2004a: Expected climate chnage impacts on soil erosion rates: A review. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, **59**, 43–50. http://www.jswconline.org/content/59/1/43.short (Accessed December 5, 2017).

Nearing, M. A., F. F. Pruski, and M. R. O'Neal, 2004b: Expected climate change impacts on soil erosion rates: A review. **59**, 43–50. https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0742319939&origin=resultslist&sort=cp-f&src=s&st1=%22climate+change%22+and+soil+erosion+and+%28water+or+hydric%29&nlo=&nlr=&nls=&sid=f321ece3d740bda383b499527e324fdb&sot=b&sdt=b&sl=70&s=TITLE-ABS-KEY%28 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Nearing, M. A., and Coauthors, 2005: Modeling response of soil erosion and runoff to changes in precipitation and cover. *CATENA*, **61**, 131–154, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2005.03.007. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816205000512 (Accessed November 14, 2017).

Nemet, G. F., and Coauthors, 2018: Negative emissions - Part 3: Innovation and upscaling. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabff4.

Nesshöver, C., and Coauthors, 2017: The science, policy and practice of nature-based solutions: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **579**, 1215–1227, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.11.106.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325578 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Netting, R. M., 1993: *Smallholders, householders : farm families and the ecology of intensive, sustainable agriculture*. Stanford University Press, 389 pp.

Neumann, B., A. T. Vafeidis, J. Zimmermann, and R. J. Nicholls, 2015: Future Coastal Population Growth and Exposure to Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Flooding - A Global Assessment. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0118571, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118571. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118571 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Neupane, R. P., and S. Kumar, 2015: Estimating the effects of potential climate and land use changes on hydrologic processes of a large agriculture dominated watershed. *J. Hydrol.*, **529**, 418–429, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2015.07.050. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169415005569 (Accessed March 14, 2018).

Newton, P., J. A Oldekop, G. Brodnig, B. K. Karna, and A. Agrawal, 2016: Carbon, biodiversity, and livelihoods in forest commons: synergies, trade-offs, and implications for REDD+. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 044017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/044017. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=4/a=044017?key=crossref.e432d29d21198b79ca24de2b3805cbde (Accessed May 27, 2018).

Nguyen, T. T. N., C. Y. Xu, I. Tahmasbian, R. Che, Z. Xu, X. Zhou, H. M. Wallace, and S. H. Bai, 2017: Effects of biochar on soil available inorganic nitrogen: A review and meta-analysis. *Geoderma*, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.11.004.

Nicholls, R. J., N. Marinova, J. A. Lowe, S. Brown, P. Vellinga, D. de Gusmão, J. Hinkel, and R. S. J. Tol, 2011: Sea-level rise and its possible impacts given a “beyond 4°C world” in the twenty-first century. *Philos. Trans. A. Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, **369**, 161–181, doi:10.1098/rsta.2010.0291. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21115518 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Nicholls, R. J., C. Woodroffe, and V. Burkett, 2016: Coastline Degradation as an Indicator of Global Change. *Clim. Chang.*, 309–324, doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-63524-2.00020-8. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444635242000208 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

——, and Coauthors, 2018: Stabilization of global temperature at 1.5°C and 2.0°C: implications for coastal areas. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Eng. Sci.*, **376**, 20160448, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0448. http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/lookup/doi/10.1098/rsta.2016.0448 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Niedertscheider, M., T. Kastner, T. Fetzel, H. Haberl, C. Kroisleitner, C. Plutzar, and K.-H. Erb, 2016: Mapping and analysing cropland use intensity from a NPP perspective. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 014008, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/1/014008. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=1/a=014008?key=crossref.d5afd2fdaa12ac43b37c6c621dd3291a (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Nielsen, D. L., and M. A. Brock, 2009: Modified water regime and salinity as a consequence of climate change: prospects for wetlands of Southern Australia. *Clim. Change*, **95**, 523–533, doi:10.1007/s10584-009-9564-8. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-009-9564-8 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Nitcheu Tchiadje, S., D. J. Sonwa, B.-A. Nkongmeneck, L. Cerbonney, and R. Sufo Kankeu, 2016: Preliminary estimation of carbon stock in a logging concession with a forest management plan in East Cameroon. *J. Sustain. For.*, **35**, 355–368, doi:10.1080/10549811.2016.1190757. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10549811.2016.1190757 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Njenga, M., J. K. Gitau, M. Iiyama, R. Jamnadassa, Y. Mahmoud, and N. Karanja, 2019: innovative biomass cooking approaches for sub-Saharan Africa. *African J. Food, Agric. Nutr. Dev.*, **19**, 14066–14087. https://www.ajfand.net/Volume19/No1/BLFB1031.pdf.

Nkonya, E., M. Winslow, M. S. Reed, M. Mortimore, and A. Mirzabaev, 2011: Monitoring and assessing the influence of social, economic and policy factors on sustainable land management in drylands. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **22**, 240–247, doi:10.1002/ldr.1048. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.1048 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Nkonya, E., A. Mirzabaev, and J. von Braun, 2016: *Economics of Land Degradation and Improvement - A Global Assessment for Sustainable Development*. E. Nkonya, A. Mirzabaev, and J. Von Braun, Eds. Springer, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London, 695 pp. http://www.awdflibrary.org/handle/123456789/289 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Noordin, Q., A. Niang, B. Jama, and M. Nyasimi, 2001: Scaling up adoption and impact of agroforestry technologies: Experiences from western Kenya. *Dev. Pract.*, **11**, 509–523, doi:10.1080/09614520120066783. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09614520120066783 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Noormets, A., D. Epron, J. C. Domec, S. G. Mcnulty, T. Fox, G. Sun, and J. S. King, 2015: Effects of forest management on productivity and carbon sequestration : A review and hypothesis q. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **355**, 124–140, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.05.019. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.05.019.

Norby, R. J., J. M. Warren, C. M. Iversen, B. E. Medlyn, and R. E. McMurtrie, 2010: CO2 enhancement of forest productivity constrained by limited nitrogen availability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **107**, 19368–19373, doi:10.1073/pnas.1006463107/-/DCSupplemental.www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1006463107.

Norton, J. B., L. J. Jungst, U. Norton, H. R. Olsen, K. W. Tate, and W. R. Horwath, 2011: Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Storage in Upper Montane Riparian Meadows. *Ecosystems*, **14**, 1217–1231, doi:10.1007/s10021-011-9477-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10021-011-9477-z (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Nugent, K. A., I. B. Strachan, M. Strack, N. T. Roulet, and L. Rochefort, 2018: Multi-year net ecosystem carbon balance of a restored peatland reveals a return to carbon sink. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, doi:10.1111/gcb.14449.

Nunes, J. P., and M. A. Nearing, 2011: Modelling Impacts of Climate Change: Case studies using the new generation of erosion models. *Handbook of Erosion Modelling*, R.P.C. Morgan and M.A. Nearing, Eds., Wiley, Chichester, West Sussex, UK, p. 400.

Nurse, L. A., R. F. McLean, J. Agard, L. Briguglio, V. Duvat-Magnan, N. Pelesikoti, E. L. Tompkins, and A. P. Webb, 2014: Small islands. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, V.R. Barros et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York, 1613–1654.

Nyland, R. D., 1992: Exploitation and Greed in Eastern Hardwood Forests. *J. For.*, **90**, 33–37, doi:10.1093/jof/90.1.33. https://academic.oup.com/jof/article-abstract/90/1/33/4635445 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

O'Brien, K., and Coauthors, 2004: Mapping vulnerability to multiple stressors: climate change and globalization in India. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **14**, 303–313, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2004.01.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095937800400010X (Accessed May 14, 2018).

O'Connell, D., and Coauthors, 2016: Designing projects in a rapidly changing world: guidelines for embedding resilience, adaptation and transformation into sustainable development projects. *Glob. Environ. Facil. Washingt.*,. http://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines.

O'Connor, D., T. Peng, J. Zhang, D. C. W. Tsang, D. S. Alessi, Z. Shen, N. S. Bolan, and D. Hou, 2018: Biochar application for the remediation of heavy metal polluted land: A review of in situ field trials. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **619–620**, 815–826, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.132. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S004896971733190X (Accessed December 2, 2017).

O'Driscoll, C., J. Sheahan, F. Renou-Wilson, P. Croot, F. Pilla, B. Misstear, and L. Xiao, 2018: National scale assessment of total trihalomethanes in Irish drinking water. *J. Environ. Manage.*, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.01.070.

O'Gorman, P. A., 2015: Precipitation Extremes Under Climate Change. *Curr. Clim. Chang. Reports*, **1**, 49–59, doi:10.1007/s40641-015-0009-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40641-015-0009-3 (Accessed March 7, 2019).

O'Neal, M. R., M. A. Nearing, R. C. Vining, J. Southworth, and R. A. Pfeifer, 2005: Climate change impacts on soil erosion in Midwest United States with changes in crop management. *CATENA*, **61**, 165–184, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2005.03.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816205000421 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Odgaard, M. V., M. T. Knudsen, J. E. Hermansen, and T. Dalgaard, 2019: Targeted grassland production – A Danish case study on multiple benefits from converting cereal to grasslands for green biorefinery. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **223**, 917–927, doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2019.03.072. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652619307632 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Oertel, C., J. Matschullat, K. Zurba, F. Zimmermann, and S. Erasmi, 2016: Greenhouse gas emissions from soils—A review. *Chemie der Erde - Geochemistry*, **76**, 327–352, doi:10.1016/J.CHEMER.2016.04.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009281916300551#bib0460 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Ogle, S. M., A. Swan, and K. Paustian, 2012: No-till management impacts on crop productivity, carbon input and soil carbon sequestration. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **149**, 37–49, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2011.12.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880911004361 (Accessed March 31, 2019).

Ojanen, P., A. Lehtonen, J. Heikkinen, T. Penttilä, and K. Minkkinen, 2014: Soil CO2 balance and its uncertainty in forestry-drained peatlands in Finland. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **325**, 60–73, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2014.03.049.

Ojeda, G., J. Patrício, S. Mattana, and A. J. F. N. Sobral, 2016: Effects of biochar addition to estuarine sediments. *J. Soils Sediments*, **16**, 2482–2491, doi:10.1007/s11368-016-1493-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11368-016-1493-3 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Ojima, D. S., K. A. Galvin, and B. L. Turner, 1994: The Global Impact of Land-Use Change. *Bioscience*, **44**, 300–304, doi:10.2307/1312379. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article-lookup/doi/10.2307/1312379 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Oktarita, S., K. Hergoualc 'h, S. Anwar, and L. V Verchot, 2017: Environmental Research Letters Substantial N 2 O emissions from peat decomposition and N fertilization in an oil palm plantation exacerbated by hotspots Substantial N 2 O emissions from peat decomposition and N fertilization in an oil palm plantation exac. *Environ. Res. Lett*, **12**.

Oldeman, L. R., and G. W. J. van Lynden, 1998: Revisiting the Glasod Methodology. *Methods for Assessment of Soil Degradation*, R. Lal, W.H. Blum, C. Valentine, and B.A. Stewart, Eds., CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, New York, Washington D.C., 423–440.

Olguin, M., and Coauthors, 2018: Applying a systems approach to assess carbon emission reductions from climate change mitigation in Mexico's forest sector. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaaa03.

de Oliveira, G., N. A. Brunsell, C. E. Sutherlin, T. E. Crews, and L. R. DeHaan, 2018: Energy, water and carbon exchange over a perennial Kernza wheatgrass crop. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **249**, 120–

137, doi:10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2017.11.022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192317303957 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Oliver, D. M., R. D. Fish, M. Winter, C. J. Hodgson, A. L. Heathwaite, and D. R. Chadwick, 2012: Valuing local knowledge as a source of expert data: Farmer engagement and the design of decision support systems. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, **36**, 76–85, doi:10.1016/J.ENVSOFT.2011.09.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364815211002118 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Olsson, L., and Coauthors, 2014a: Cross-chapter box on heat stress and heat waves. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, K.J. Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, A. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 109–111.

Olsson, L., M. Opondo, P. Tschakert, A. Agrawal, S. Eriksen, S. Ma, L. Perch, and S. Zakieldeen, 2014b: Livelihoods and Poverty. *Climate change 2014 : impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability: Working Group II contribution to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, C.B. Field, V.R. Barros, and Et al, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, USA, 793–832 https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/2387830 (Accessed December 9, 2017).

Olsson, L., A. Jerneck, H. Thoren, J. Persson, and D. O'Byrne, 2015: Why resilience is unappealing to social science: Theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Sci. Adv.*, **1**, e1400217–e1400217, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1400217. http://advances.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/sciadv.1400217 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Omondi, M. O., X. Xia, A. Nahayo, X. Liu, P. K. Korai, and G. Pan, 2016: Quantification of biochar effects on soil hydrological properties using meta-analysis of literature data. *Geoderma*, **274**, 28–34, doi:10.1016/J.GEODERMA.2016.03.029. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706116301471 (Accessed December 2, 2017).

Orr, B. J., and Coauthors, 2017a: Scientific conceptual framework for land degradation neutrality. *A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany*.

——, and Coauthors, 2017b: *Scientific conceptual framework for land degradation neutrality*. Bonn, Germany,.

Osborne, T. M., 2011: Carbon forestry and agrarian change: access and land control in a Mexican rainforest. *J. Peasant Stud.*, **38**, 859–883, doi:10.1080/03066150.2011.611281. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03066150.2011.611281 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Osland, M. J., N. M. Enwright, R. H. Day, C. A. Gabler, C. L. Stagg, and J. B. Grace, 2016: Beyond just sea-level rise: considering macroclimatic drivers within coastal wetland vulnerability assessments to climate change. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **22**, 1–11, doi:10.1111/gcb.13084. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13084 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Ostrom, E., 2009: A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, **325**, 419–422, doi:10.1126/science.1172133. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19628857 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Ovalle-Rivera, O., P. Läderach, C. Bunn, M. Obersteiner, and G. Schroth, 2015: Projected Shifts in Coffea arabica Suitability among Major Global Producing Regions Due to Climate Change. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0124155, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0124155. http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0124155 (Accessed May 22, 2018).

Owour, B., W. Mauta, and S. Eriksen, 2011: Sustainable adaptation and human security: Interactions between pastoral and agropastoral groups in dryland Kenya. *Clim. Dev.*, **3**, 42–58, doi:10.3763/cdev.2010.0063. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3763/cdev.2010.0063 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Paetsch, L., C. W. Mueller, I. Kögel-Knabner, M. Von Lützow, C. Girardin, and C. Rumpel, 2018: Effect of in-situ aged and fresh biochar on soil hydraulic conditions and microbial C use under drought conditions. *Sci. Rep.*, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-25039-x.

Page, S. E., F. Siegert, J. O. Rieley, H.-D. V. Boehm, A. Jaya, and S. Limin, 2002: The amount of carbon released from peat and forest fires in Indonesia during 1997. *Nature*, **420**, 61–65, doi:10.1038/nature01131. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature01131 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Paladino, S., and S. J. Fiske, 2017: *The carbon fix : forest carbon, social justice, and environmental governance*. Routledge, New York, United States, 320 pp.

Palm, C., H. Blanco-Canqui, F. DeClerck, L. Gatere, and P. Grace, 2014: Conservation agriculture and ecosystem services: An overview. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **187**, 87–105, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2013.10.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880913003502 (Accessed February 21, 2019).

Pan, Y., and Coauthors, 2011: A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests. *Science (80-.).*, **333**, 988–993, doi:10.1126/science.1201609.

Panagos, P., P. Borrelli, K. Meusburger, C. Alewell, E. Lugato, and L. Montanarella, 2015: Estimating the soil erosion cover-management factor at the European scale. *Land use policy*, **48**, 38–50, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2015.05.021. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715001611 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Panfil, S. N., and C. A. Harvey, 2016: REDD+ and Biodiversity Conservation: A Review of the Biodiversity Goals, Monitoring Methods, and Impacts of 80 REDD+ Projects. *Conserv. Lett.*, **9**, 143–150, doi:10.1111/conl.12188. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/conl.12188 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Panthou, G., T. Vischel, and T. Lebel, 2014: Recent trends in the regime of extreme rainfall in the Central Sahel. *Int. J. Climatol.*, **34**, 3998–4006, doi:10.1002/joc.3984. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/joc.3984 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Parajuli, P. B., P. Jayakody, G. F. Sassenrath, and Y. Ouyang, 2016: Assessing the impacts of climate change and tillage practices on stream flow, crop and sediment yields from the Mississippi River Basin. *Agric. Water Manag.*, **168**, 112–124, doi:10.1016/J.AGWAT.2016.02.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378377416300427 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Pardini, R., A. de A. Bueno, T. A. Gardner, P. I. Prado, and J. P. Metzger, 2010: Beyond the Fragmentation Threshold Hypothesis: Regime Shifts in Biodiversity Across Fragmented Landscapes. *PLoS One*, **5**, e13666, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013666. http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013666 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Parry, L. E., J. Holden, and P. J. Chapman, 2014: Restoration of blanket peatlands. *J. Environ. Manage.*, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.11.033.

Pataki, D. E., and Coauthors, 2011: Coupling biogeochemical cycles in urban environments: ecosystem services, green solutions, and misconceptions. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **9**, 27–36, doi:10.1890/090220. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/090220 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Patange, O. S., and Coauthors, 2015: Reductions in Indoor Black Carbon Concentrations from Improved Biomass Stoves in Rural India. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **49**, 4749–4756, doi:10.1021/es506208x. https://doi.org/10.1021/es506208x.

Pattanayak, S. K., D. Evan Mercer, E. Sills, and J.-C. Yang, 2003: Taking stock of agroforestry adoption studies. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **57**, 173–186, doi:10.1023/A:1024809108210. http://link.springer.com/10.1023/A:1024809108210 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Paustian, K., J. Lehmann, S. Ogle, D. Reay, G. P. Robertson, and P. Smith, 2016: Climate-smart soils. *Nature*, **532**, 49–57, doi:10.1038/nature17174. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature17174 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Payo, A., and Coauthors, 2016: Projected changes in area of the Sundarban mangrove forest in Bangladesh due to SLR by 2100. *Clim. Change*, **139**, 279–291, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1769-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-016-1769-z (Accessed June 19, 2018).

Pearson, T. R. H., S. Brown, and F. M. Casarim, 2014: Carbon emissions from tropical forest degradation caused by logging. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **9**, 034017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/034017. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/9/i=3/a=034017?key=crossref.c4aa12693bdced1aa5b0b6cf0316f44d (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Pearson, T. R. H., S. Brown, L. Murray, and G. Sidman, 2017: Greenhouse gas emissions from tropical forest degradation: an underestimated source. *Carbon Balance Manag.*, **12**, 3, doi:10.1186/s13021-017-0072-2. http://cbmjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s13021-017-0072-2 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Pedlar, J. H., and Coauthors, 2012: Placing Forestry in the Assisted Migration Debate. *Bioscience*, **62**, 835–842, doi:10.1525/bio.2012.62.9.10. https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2012.62.9.10.

Pellegrini, A. F. A., and Coauthors, 2018: Fire frequency drives decadal changes in soil carbon and nitrogen and ecosystem productivity. doi:10.1038/nature24668. https://www.nature.com/articles/nature24668.pdf?origin=ppub (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Van Pelt, R. S., S. X. Hushmurodov, R. L. Baumhardt, A. Chappell, M. A. Nearing, V. O. Polyakov, and J. E. Strack, 2017: The reduction of partitioned wind and water erosion by conservation agriculture. *CATENA*, **148**, 160–167, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2016.07.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816216302636 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Peltzer, D. A., A. R. B., G. M. Lovett, D. Whitehead, and D. A. Wardle, 2010: Effects of biological invasions on forest carbon sequestration. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **16**, 732–746, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02038.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02038.x (Accessed February 28, 2019).

Pendergrass, A. G., 2018: What precipitation is extreme? *Science (80-.).*, **360**, 1072–1073, doi:10.1126/science.aat1871.

——, and R. Knutti, 2018: The Uneven Nature of Daily Precipitation and Its Change. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **45**, 11,980-11,988, doi:10.1029/2018GL080298. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2018GL080298 (Accessed April 18, 2019).

——, ——, F. Lehner, C. Deser, and B. M. Sanderson, 2017: Precipitation variability increases in a warmer climate. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 17966, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-17966-y. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-17966-y (Accessed April 18, 2019).

Pendleton, L., and Coauthors, 2012: Estimating Global "Blue Carbon" Emissions from Conversion and Degradation of Vegetated Coastal Ecosystems. *PLoS One*, **7**, e43542, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043542. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22962585 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Peng, X., and Coauthors, 2016: Response of changes in seasonal soil freeze/thaw state to climate change from 1950 to 2010 across china. *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surf.*, **121**, 1984–2000, doi:10.1002/2016JF003876. http://westdc.westgis.ac.cn/ (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Peng, X., Y. Deng, Y. Peng, and K. Yue, 2018: Effects of biochar addition on toxic element concentrations in plants: A meta-analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **616–617**, 970–977.

Percival, V., and T. Homer-Dixon, 1995: Environmental scarcity and violent conflict: the case of Rwanda. https://www.popline.org/node/296916 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Peres, C. A., T. Emilio, J. Schietti, S. J. M. Desmoulière, and T. Levi, 2016: Dispersal limitation induces long-term biomass collapse in overhunted Amazonian forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **113**, 892–897, doi:10.1073/pnas.1516525113. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26811455 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Perugini, L., L. Caporaso, S. Marconi, A. Cescatti, B. Quesada, N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, J. I. House, and A. Arneth, 2017: Biophysical effects on temperature and precipitation due to land cover change. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, 053002, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa6b3f. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/12/i=5/a=053002?key=crossref.c8fcedc7f3570d3a8b7baf3fe79f149c (Accessed December 26, 2017).

Peters, P. E., 2004: Inequality and Social Conflict Over Land in Africa. *J. Agrar. Chang.*, **4**, 269–314, doi:10.1111/j.1471-0366.2004.00080.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2004.00080.x (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Petzold, J., 2016: Limitations and opportunities of social capital for adaptation to climate change: a case study on the Isles of Scilly. *Geogr. J.*, **182**, 123–134, doi:10.1111/geoj.12154.

——, and A. K. Magnan, 2019: Climate change: thinking small islands beyond Small Island Developing States (SIDS). *Clim. Change*, **152**, 145–165, doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2363-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-018-2363-3 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Phelps, J., E. L. Webb, and A. Agrawal, 2010: Does REDD+ threaten to recentralize forest governance? *Science (80-.).*, **328**, 312–313, doi:10.1126/science.1187774. http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.1187774 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Pielke, R. A., J. Adegoke, A. BeltraáN-Przekurat, C. A. Hiemstra, J. Lin, U. S. Nair, D. Niyogi, and T. E. Nobis, 2007: An overview of regional land-use and land-cover impacts on rainfall. *Tellus B Chem. Phys. Meteorol.*, **59**, 587–601, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2007.00251.x. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2007.00251.x (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Piguet, E., R. Kaenzig, and J. Guélat, 2018: The uneven geography of research on "environmental migration." *Popul. Environ.*, 1–27, doi:10.1007/s11111-018-0296-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11111-018-0296-4 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Piñeiro, G., J. M. Paruelo, M. Oesterheld, and E. G. Jobbágy, 2010: Pathways of Grazing Effects on Soil Organic Carbon and Nitrogen. *Rangel. Ecol. Manag.*, **63**, 109–119, doi:10.2111/08-255.1. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1550742410500083 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Pingoud, K., T. Ekholm, R. Sievänen, S. Huuskonen, and J. Hynynen, 2018: Trade-offs between forest carbon stocks and harvests in a steady state – A multi-criteria analysis. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **210**, 96–103, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.12.076.

Pinty, B., J.-L. Widlowski, M. M. Verstraete, I. Andredakis, O. Arino, M. Clerici, T. Kaminski, and M. Taberner, 2011: Snowy backgrounds enhance the absorption of visible light in forest canopies. doi:10.1029/2010GL046417. https://lpdaac.usgs.gov/ (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Piovano, E. L., D. Ariztegui, S. M. Bernasconi, and J. A. McKenzie, 2004: Stable isotopic record of hydrological changes in subtropical Laguna Mar Chiquita (Argentina) over the last 230 years. *The Holocene*, **14**, 525–535, doi:10.1191/0959683604hl729rp. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1191/0959683604hl729rp (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Plangoen, P., and M. S. Babel, 2014: Projected rainfall erosivity changes under future climate in the Upper Nan Watershed, Thailand. *J. Earth Sci. Clim. Change*, **5**.

Planque, C., D. Carrer, and J.-L. Roujean, 2017: Analysis of MODIS albedo changes over steady woody covers in France during the period of 2001–2013. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **191**, 13–29, doi:10.1016/J.RSE.2016.12.019. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425716304989 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Poeplau, C., and A. Don, 2015: Carbon sequestration in agricultural soils via cultivation of cover crops – A meta-analysis. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **200**, 33–41, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2014.10.024. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880914004873 (Accessed May 11, 2018).

Poesen, J., J. Nachtergaele, G. Verstraeten, and C. Valentin, 2003: Gully erosion and environmental change: importance and research needs. *CATENA*, **50**, 91–133, doi:10.1016/S0341-8162(02)00143-1. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816202001431 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Poesen, J. W. A., and J. M. Hooke, 1997: Erosion, flooding and channel management in Mediterranean environments of southern Europe. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.*, **21**, 157–199, doi:10.1177/030913339702100201. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/030913339702100201 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Poff, N. L., 2002: Ecological response to and management of increased flooding caused by climate change. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, **360**, 1497–1510, doi:10.1098/rsta.2002.1012. http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/cgi/doi/10.1098/rsta.2002.1012 (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Pokam, W. M., C. L. Bain, R. S. Chadwick, R. Graham, D. J. Sonwa, and F. M. Kamga, 2014: Identification of Processes Driving Low-Level Westerlies in West Equatorial Africa. *J. Clim.*, **27**, 4245–4262, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00490.1. http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00490.1 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Polley, H. W., D. D. Briske, J. A. Morgan, K. Wolter, D. W. Bailey, and J. R. Brown, 2013: Climate Change and North American Rangelands: Trends, Projections, and Implications. *Rangel. Ecol. Manag.*, **66**, 493–511, doi:10.2111/REM-D-12-00068.1. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1550742413500595 (Accessed March 6, 2018).

Pontee, N., 2013: Defining coastal squeeze: A discussion. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **84**, 204–207, doi:10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2013.07.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0964569113001786 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Poorter, L., and Coauthors, 2016: Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature*, **530**, 211–214. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16512.

Porter-Bolland, L., E. A. Ellis, M. R. Guariguata, I. Ruiz-Mallén, S. Negrete-Yankelevich, and V. Reyes-García, 2012: Community managed forests and forest protected areas: An assessment of their conservation effectiveness across the tropics. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **268**, 6–17, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2011.05.034. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112711003215 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Porter, J., and Coauthors, 2014: Climate change 2014 : impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability : Working Group II contribution to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Climate change 2014: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A: global and sectoral aspects*, Christopher B. Field et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, New York, United States, 485–533 https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:353459 (Accessed March 15, 2018).

Porter, J. H., M. L. Parry, and T. R. Carter, 1991: The potential effects of climatic change on agricultural insect pests. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **57**, 221–240, doi:10.1016/0168-1923(91)90088-8.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0168192391900888 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Post, W. M., and K. C. Kwon, 2000: Soil carbon sequestration and land-use change: processes and potential. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **6**, 317–327, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.2000.00308.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2000.00308.x (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Potapov, P., and Coauthors, 2008: Mapping the World's Intact Forest Landscapes by Remote Sensing. *Ecol. Soc.*, **13**, art51, doi:10.5751/ES-02670-130251. http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art51/ (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Potschin, M., R. H. (Roy H. . Haines-Young, R. Fish, and R. K. Turner, 2016: *Routledge handbook of ecosystem services*. 629 pp.

Poulton, P., J. Johnston, A. Macdonald, R. White, and D. Powlson, 2018: Major limitations to achieving "4 per 1000" increases in soil organic carbon stock in temperate regions: Evidence from long-term experiments at Rothamsted Research, United Kingdom. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 2563–2584, doi:10.1111/gcb.14066. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.14066 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Powell, B., J. Hall, and T. Johns, 2011: Forest cover, use and dietary intake in the East Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. *Int. For. Rev.*, **13**, 305–317, doi:10.1505/146554811798293944. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/10.1505/146554811798293944 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Powlson, D. S., C. M. Stirling, M. L. Jat, B. G. Gerard, C. A. Palm, P. A. Sanchez, and K. G. Cassman, 2014: Limited potential of no-till agriculture for climate change mitigation. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **4**, 678–683, doi:10.1038/nclimate2292. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2292 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Prein, A. F., C. Liu, K. Ikeda, S. B. Trier, R. M. Rasmussen, G. J. Holland, and M. P. Clark, 2017: Increased rainfall volume from future convective storms in the US. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 880–884, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0007-7. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-017-0007-7.pdf (Accessed March 16, 2018).

Preti, F., and N. Romano, 2014: Terraced landscapes: From an old best practice to a potential hazard for soil degradation due to land abandonment. *Anthropocene*, **6**, 10–25, doi:10.1016/J.ANCENE.2014.03.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213305414000113 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2018: Conceptualization of Water Flow Pathways in Agricultural Terraced Landscapes. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **29**, 651–662, doi:10.1002/ldr.2764. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2764 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Price, D. T., and Coauthors, 2013: Anticipating the consequences of climate change for Canada' s boreal forest ecosystems. *Environ. Rev.*, **21**, 322–365, doi:10.1139/er-2013-0042.

Price, R., 2017: *"Clean" Cooking Energy in Uganda – technologies, impacts, and key barriers and enablers to market acceleration*. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK, https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/13234 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Prince, S., and Coauthors, 2018: Status and trends of land degradation and restoration and associated changes in biodiversity and ecosystem fundtions. *The IPBES assessment report on land degradation and restoration*, L. Montanarella, R. Scholes, and A. Brainich, Eds., Bonn, Germanu, 221–338.

Prince, S. D., 2016: Where Does Desertification Occur? Mapping Dryland Degradation at Regional to Global Scales. *The End of Desertification*, R. Behnke and M. Mortimore, Eds., Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 225–263 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-16014-1_9 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Prince, S. D., E. B. De Colstoun, and L. L. Kravitz, 1998: Evidence from rain-use efficiencies does not indicate extensive Sahelian desertification. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **4**, 359–374, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.1998.00158.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-2486.1998.00158.x (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Pritchard, S. G., 2011: Soil organisms and global climate change. *Plant Pathol.*, **60**, 82–99, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3059.2010.02405.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2010.02405.x (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Pritchard, W. R., and Coauthors, 1992: *Assessment of animal agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Morrilton : Winrock International, 169p. pp.

Pryor, S. C., and R. J. Barthelmie, 2010: Climate change impacts on wind energy: A review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **14**, 430–437, doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2009.07.028. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032109001713 (Accessed March 14, 2018).

Pulido, M., S. Schnabel, J. F. L. Contador, J. Lozano-Parra, and Á. Gómez-Gutiérrez, 2017: Selecting indicators for assessing soil quality and degradation in rangelands of Extremadura (SW Spain). *Ecol. Indic.*, **74**, 49–61, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2016.11.016. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X16306537#bib0280 (Accessed September 27, 2018).

Pureswaran, D. S., L. De Grandpré, D. Paré, A. Taylor, M. Barrette, H. Morin, J. Régnière, and D. D. Kneeshaw, 2015: Climate-induced changes in host tree–insect phenology may drive ecological state-shift in boreal forests. *Ecology*, **96**, 1480–1491, doi:10.1890/13-2366.1. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/13-2366.1 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Putz, F. E., and Coauthors, 2012: Sustaining conservation values in selectively logged tropical forests: the attained and the attainable. *Conserv. Lett.*, **5**, 296–303, doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00242.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00242.x (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Qiu, B., G. Chen, Z. Tang, D. Lu, Z. Wang, and C. Chen, 2017: Assessing the Three-North Shelter Forest Program in China by a novel framework for characterizing vegetation changes. *ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, **133**, 75–88, doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2017.10.003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2017.10.003.

Le Quéré, C., and Coauthors, 2013: The global carbon budget 1959-2011. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, **5**, 165–185, doi:10.5194/essd-5-165-2013.

Quilliam, R. S., S. Rangecroft, B. A. Emmett, T. H. Deluca, and D. L. Jones, 2013: Is biochar a source or sink for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) compounds in agricultural soils? *GCB Bioenergy*, **5**, 96–103, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12007. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcbb.12007 (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Quin, P. R., and Coauthors, 2014: Oil mallee biochar improves soil structural properties-A study with x-ray micro-CT. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2014.03.022.

Quinlan, A. E., M. Berbés-Blázquez, L. J. Haider, and G. D. Peterson, 2016: Measuring and assessing resilience: broadening understanding through multiple disciplinary perspectives. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **53**, 677–687, doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12550. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1365-2664.12550 (Accessed October 29, 2018).

Quiñonero-Rubio, J. M., E. Nadeu, C. Boix-Fayos, and J. de Vente, 2016: Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Forest Restoration and Check-Dams to Reduce Catchment Sediment Yield. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 1018–1031, doi:10.1002/ldr.2331. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2331 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Quinton, J. N., G. Govers, K. van Oost, R. D. Bardgett, K. Van Oost, and R. D. Bardgett, 2010: The impact of agricultural soil erosion on biogeochemical cycling. *Nat. Geosci.*, **3**, 311–314, doi:10.1038/ngeo838. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20103162956 (Accessed May 7, 2018).

Qureshi, A. S., 2011: Water Management in the Indus Basin in Pakistan: Challenges and Opportunities. *Mt. Res. Dev.*, **31**, 252–260, doi:10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-11-00019.1. http://www.bioone.org/doi/10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-11-00019.1 (Accessed April 14, 2019).

Rabalais, N. N., and Coauthors, 2014: Eutrophication-Driven Deoxygenation in the Coastal Ocean. *Oceanography*, **27**, 172–183, doi:10.2307/24862133. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24862133 (Accessed March 20, 2019).

Rahmstorf, S., 2010: A new view on sea level rise. *Nat. Reports Clim. Chang.*, 44–45, doi:10.1038/climate.2010.29. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/climate.2010.29 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Raleigh, C., and H. Urdal, 2007: Climate change, environmental degradation and armed conflict. *Polit. Geogr.*, **26**, 674–694, doi:10.1016/J.POLGEO.2007.06.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096262980700087X (Accessed October 19, 2017).

Ramankutty, N., J. A. Foley, J. Norman, and K. McSweeney, 2002: The global distribution of cultivable lands: current patterns and sensitivity to possible climate change. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **11**, 377–392, doi:10.1046/j.1466-822x.2002.00294.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1466-822x.2002.00294.x (Accessed May 22, 2018).

Ramchunder, S. J., L. E. Brown, and J. Holden, 2012: Catchment-scale peatland restoration benefits stream ecosystem biodiversity. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02075.x.

Rametsteiner, E., and M. Simula, 2003: Forest certification - An instrument to promote sustainable forest management? *J. Environ. Manage.*, **67**, 87–98, doi:10.1016/S0301-4797(02)00191-3.

Ramisch, J., J. Keeley, I. Scoones, and W. Wolmer, 2002: Crop-Livestock policy in Africa: What is to be done? *Pathways of change in Africa: crops, livestock & livelihoods in Mali, Ethiopia & Zimbabwe*, I. Scoones and W. Wolmer, Eds., James Currey Ltd.

Rasul, G., a Mahmood, a Sadiq, and S. I. Khan, 2012: Vulnerability of the Indus Delta to Climate Change in Pakistan. *Pakistan J. Meteorol.*, **8**, 89–107.

Ratcliffe, S., and Coauthors, 2017: Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning relations in European forests depend on environmental context. *Ecol. Lett.*, **20**, 1414–1426, doi:10.1111/ele.12849. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ele.12849 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

Ratter, B. M. W., J. Petzold, and K. Sinane, 2016: Considering the locals: coastal construction and destruction in times of climate change on Anjouan, Comoros. *Nat. Resour. Forum*, **40**, 112–126, doi:10.1111/1477-8947.12102.

Ravi, S., D. D. Breshears, T. E. Huxman, and P. D'Odorico, 2010: Land degradation in drylands: Interactions among hydrologic–aeolian erosion and vegetation dynamics. *Geomorphology*, **116**, 236–245, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2009.11.023. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169555X09005108 (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Reed, M. S., 2005: *Participatory rangeland monitoring and management in the Kalahari, Botswana*. University of Leeds, http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/376/ (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Reed, M. S., and L. . Stringer, 2016a: *Land degradation, desertification and climate change: anticipating, assessing and adapting to future change. New York, NY: Routledge*.

Reed, M. S., and L. C. Stringer, 2016b: *Land Degradation, Desertification and Climate Change*. Taylor and Francis, Milton Park, Abingdon, UK, 178 pp.

Reed, M. S., A. J. Dougill, and M. J. Taylor, 2007: Integrating local and scientific knowledge for adaptation to land degradation: Kalahari rangeland management options. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **18**, 249–268, doi:10.1002/ldr.777. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.777 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Reed, S. C., K. K. Coe, J. P. Sparks, D. C. Housman, T. J. Zelikova, and J. Belnap, 2012: Changes to dryland rainfall result in rapid moss mortality and altered soil fertility. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **2**, 752–

755, doi:10.1038/nclimate1596. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate1596 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Reenberg, A., T. Birch-Thomsen, O. Mertz, B. Fog, and S. Christiansen, 2008: Adaptation of Human Coping Strategies in a Small Island Society in the SW Pacific—50 Years of Change in the Coupled Human–Environment System on Bellona, Solomon Islands. *Hum. Ecol.*, **36**, 807–819, doi:10.1007/s10745-008-9199-9. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10745-008-9199-9 (Accessed May 14, 2018).

Regina, K., J. Sheehy, and M. Myllys, 2015: Mitigating greenhouse gas fluxes from cultivated organic soils with raised water table. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **20**, 1529–1544, doi:10.1007/s11027-014-9559-2.

Reid, P., and C. Vogel, 2006: Living and responding to multiple stressors in South Africa—Glimpses from KwaZulu-Natal. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **16**, 195–206, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2006.01.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095937800600015X (Accessed May 14, 2018).

Reinwarth, B., R. Petersen, and J. Baade, 2019: Inferring mean rates of sediment yield and catchment erosion from reservoir siltation in the Kruger National Park, South Africa: An uncertainty assessment. *Geomorphology*, **324**, 1–13, doi:10.1016/J.GEOMORPH.2018.09.007. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X18303647 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Reis, V., V. Hermoso, S. K. Hamilton, D. Ward, E. Fluet-Chouinard, B. Lehner, and S. Linke, 2017: A Global Assessment of Inland Wetland Conservation Status. *Bioscience*, **67**, 523–533, doi:10.1093/biosci/bix045. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/biosci/bix045 (Accessed April 16, 2019).

REN21, 2018: *Renewables 2018: Global status report*. Paris, France, 325 pp. http://www.ren21.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/17-8652_GSR2018_FullReport_web_-1.pdf.

Rengasamy, P., 2006: World salinization with emphasis on Australia. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **57**, 1017–1023, doi:10.1093/jxb/erj108. http://academic.oup.com/jxb/article/57/5/1017/641287/World-salinization-with-emphasis-on-Australia (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Renou-Wilson, F., G. Moser, D. Fallon, C. A. Farrell, C. Müller, and D. Wilson, 2018: Rewetting degraded peatlands for climate and biodiversity benefits: Results from two raised bogs. *Ecological Engineering*.

Reyer, C. P. O., and Coauthors, 2015: Forest resilience and tipping points at different spatio-temporal scales: approaches and challenges. *J. Ecol.*, **103**, 5–15, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12337. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12337.

Richards, C., and K. Lyons, 2016: The new corporate enclosures: Plantation forestry, carbon markets and the limits of financialised solutions to the climate crisis. *Land use policy*, **56**, 209–216, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2016.05.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837716304562 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Rist, L., A. Felton, L. Samuelsson, C. Sandström, and O. Rosvall, 2013: A new paradigm for adaptive management. *Ecol. Soc.*, **18**, doi:10.5751/ES-06183-180463.

Ritzema, H., S. Limin, K. Kusin, J. Jauhiainen, and H. Wösten, 2014: Canal blocking strategies for hydrological restoration of degraded tropical peatlands in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Catena*, **114**, 11–20, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2013.10.009.

Rivera-Ferre, M. G., F. López-i-Gelats, M. Howden, P. Smith, J. F. Morton, and M. Herrero, 2016: Re-framing the climate change debate in the livestock sector: mitigation and adaptation options. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 869–892, doi:10.1002/wcc.421.

Rizwan, M., S. Ali, M. F. Qayyum, M. Ibrahim, M. Zia-ur-Rehman, T. Abbas, and Y. S. Ok, 2016: Mechanisms of biochar-mediated alleviation of toxicity of trace elements in plants: a critical review. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, **23**, 2230–2248, doi:10.1007/s11356-015-5697-7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5697-7.

Roberts, D., 2010: Prioritizing climate change adaptation and local level resilience in Durban, South Africa. *Environ. Urban.*, doi:10.1177/0956247810379948.

Roberts, D., and S. O'Donoghue, 2013: Urban environmental challenges and climate change action in Durban, South Africa. *Environ. Urban.*, **25**, 299–319, doi:10.1177/0956247813500904. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0956247813500904 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Roberts, M. W., A. W. D'Amato, C. C. Kern, and B. J. Palik, 2016: Long-term impacts of variable retention harvesting on ground-layer plant communities in Pinus resinosa forests. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **53**, 1106–1116, doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12656.

Robinson, N., R. J. Harper, and K. R. J. Smettem, 2006: Soil water depletion by Eucalyptus spp. integrated into dryland agricultural systems. *Plant Soil*, **286**, 141–151, doi:10.1007/s11104-006-9032-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-006-9032-4 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Rogelj, J., and Coauthors, 2018: Mitigation pathways compatible with 1.5°C in the context of sustainable development. *Global Warming of 1.5 °C an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change,* Masson-Delmotte, S.C. V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, and And T.W. J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, Eds., 93–174 http://www.ipcc.ch/report/sr15/.

Roman-Cuesta, R. M., and Coauthors, 2016: Hotspots of gross emissions from the land use sector: patterns, uncertainties, and leading emission sources for the period 2000–2005 in the tropics. *Biogeosciences*, **13**, 4253–4269, doi:10.5194/bg-13-4253-2016.

Romero, C., and F. E. Putz, 2018: Theory-of-change development for the evaluation of forest stewardship council certification of sustained timber yields from natural forests in Indonesia. *Forests*, **9**, doi:10.3390/f9090547.

Romo-Leon, J. R., W. J. D. van Leeuwen, and A. Castellanos-Villegas, 2014: Using remote sensing tools to assess land use transitions in unsustainable arid agro-ecosystems. *J. Arid Environ.*, **106**, 27–35, doi:10.1016/j.jaridenv.2014.03.002.

Rosenzweig, C., and D. Hillel, 1998: *Climate change and the global harvest: potential impacts of the greenhouse effect on agriculture.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 324 pp. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19990707862 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Rosenzweig, C., A. Iglesias, X. B. Yang, P. R. Epstein, and E. Chivian, 2001: Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events; Implications for Food Production, Plant Diseases, and Pests. *Glob. Chang. Hum. Heal.*, **2**, 90–104, doi:10.1023/A:1015086831467. http://link.springer.com/10.1023/A:1015086831467 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2014: Assessing agricultural risks of climate change in the 21st century in a global gridded crop model intercomparison. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **111**, 3268–3273, doi:10.1073/pnas.1222463110. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24344314 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Ross, N. J., 2011: Modern tree species composition reflects ancient Maya "forest gardens" in northwest Belize. *Ecol. Appl.*, **21**, 75–84, doi:10.1890/09-0662.1. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-0662.1 (Accessed October 29, 2018).

Rossi, V., and Coauthors, 2017: Could REDD+ mechanisms induce logging companies to reduce forest degradation in Central Africa? *J. For. Econ.*, **29**, 107–117, doi:10.1016/J.JFE.2017.10.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1104689917301800 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Rotenberg, E., and D. Yakir, 2010: Contribution of semi-arid forests to the climate system. *Science*, **327**, 451–454, doi:10.1126/science.1179998. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20093470 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Routschek, A., J. Schmidt, and F. Kreienkamp, 2014: Impact of climate change on soil erosion — A high-resolution projection on catchment scale until 2100 in Saxony/Germany. *CATENA*, **121**, 99–109, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2014.04.019. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816214001283 (Accessed October 28, 2017).

Royal Society, L., 2016: *Resilience to Extreme Weather. Royal Society, London*.

Rudel, T., and Coauthors, 2016: Do Smallholder, Mixed Crop-Livestock Livelihoods Encourage Sustainable Agricultural Practices? A Meta-Analysis. *Land*, **5**, 6, doi:10.3390/land5010006. http://www.mdpi.com/2073-445X/5/1/6 (Accessed October 30, 2018).

Ruggiero, P., 2013: Is the Intensifying Wave Climate of the U.S. Pacific Northwest Increasing Flooding and Erosion Risk Faster Than Sea-Level Rise? *J. Waterw. Port, Coastal, Ocean Eng.*, **139**, 88–97, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)WW.1943-5460.0000172. http://ascelibrary.org/doi/10.1061/%28ASCE%29WW.1943-5460.0000172 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Rumpel, C., F. Amiraslani, L.-S. Koutika, P. Smith, D. Whitehead, and E. Wollenberg, 2018: Put more carbon in soils to meet Paris climate pledges. *Nature*, **564**, 32–34, doi:10.1038/d41586-018-07587-4. http://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-07587-4 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Ruppert, J. C., A. Holm, S. Miehe, E. Muldavin, H. A. Snyman, K. Wesche, and A. Linstädter, 2012: Meta-analysis of ANPP and rain-use efficiency confirms indicative value for degradation and supports non-linear response along precipitation gradients in drylands. *J. Veg. Sci.*, **23**, 1035–1050, doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2012.01420.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2012.01420.x (Accessed January 3, 2018).

Russell, M. B., S. Fraver, T. Aakala, J. H. Gove, C. W. Woodall, A. W. D'Amato, and M. J. Ducey, 2015: Quantifying carbon stores and decomposition in dead wood: A review. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **350**, 107–128, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.04.033. https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/S0378112715002558/1-s2.0-S0378112715002558-main.pdf?_tid=b79add30-d563-11e7-8a2b-00000aacb35f&acdnat=1512001172_93eebe3892e73dfc4cda94ac809eda6d (Accessed November 29, 2017).

Rutherford, W. A., T. H. Painter, S. Ferrenberg, J. Belnap, G. S. Okin, C. Flagg, and S. C. Reed, 2017: Albedo feedbacks to future climate via climate change impacts on dryland biocrusts. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 44188, doi:10.1038/srep44188. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep44188 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Ryan, M. R., T. E. Crews, S. W. Culman, L. R. DeHaan, R. C. Hayes, J. M. Jungers, and M. G. Bakker, 2018: Managing for Multifunctionality in Perennial Grain Crops. *Bioscience*, **68**, 294–304, doi:10.1093/biosci/biy014. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/68/4/294/4942086 (Accessed March 25, 2019).

Sachs, J. D., 2007: Poverty and environmental stress fuel Darfur crisis. *Nature*, **449**, 24–24, doi:10.1038/449024a. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/449024a (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Sainju, U. M., B. L. Allen, A. W. Lenssen, and R. P. Ghimire, 2017: Root biomass, root/shoot ratio, and soil water content under perennial grasses with different nitrogen rates. *F. Crop. Res.*, **210**, 183–191, doi:10.1016/J.FCR.2017.05.029. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378429017301132 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Salehyan, I., 2008: From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet. *J. Peace Res.*, **45**, 315–326, doi:10.1177/0022343308088812. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022343308088812 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Sanderman, J., T. Hengl, and G. J. Fiske, 2017: Soil carbon debt of 12,000 years of human land use. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **114**, 9575–9580, doi:10.1073/pnas.1706103114. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28827323 (Accessed March 27, 2019).

Sanquetta, C. R., A. P. Dalla Corte, A. L. Pelissari, M. Tomé, G. C. B. Maas, and M. N. I. Sanquetta, 2018: Dynamics of carbon and CO2 removals by Brazilian forest plantations during 1990-2016. *Carbon Balance Manag.*, **13**, doi:10.1186/s13021-018-0106-4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13021-018-0106-4.

Santos, M. J., S. C. Dekker, V. Daioglou, M. C. Braakhekke, and D. P. van Vuuren, 2017: Modeling the Effects of Future Growing Demand for Charcoal in the Tropics. *Front. Environ. Sci.*, **5**, 28. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fenvs.2017.00028.

Sasaki, N., and F. E. Putz, 2009: Critical need for new definitions of "forest" and "forest degradation" in global climate change agreements. *Conserv. Lett.*, **2**, 226–232, doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2009.00067.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2009.00067.x.

Sasaki, T., T. Okayasu, U. Jamsran, and K. Takeuchi, 2007: Threshold changes in vegetation along a grazing gradient in Mongolian rangelands. *J. Ecol.*, **0**, 071106211313003–???, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2007.01315.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2007.01315.x (Accessed December 28, 2017).

Saugier, B., 2001: Estimations of Global Terrestrial Productivity: Converging Toward a Single Number? *Terrestrial Global Productivity*, J. Roy, Ed., Academic Press, San Diego, CA, CA, 543–556.

Savard, J.-P., P. Bernatchez, F. Morneau, and F. Saucier, 2009: Vulnérabilité des communautés côtières de l'est du Québec aux impacts des changements climatiques. *La Houille Blanche*, 59–66, doi:10.1051/lhb/2009015. http://www.shf-lhb.org/10.1051/lhb/2009015 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Sayer, J., and Coauthors, 2013: Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation, and other competing land uses. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **110**, 8349–8356, doi:10.1073/pnas.1210595110. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23686581 (Accessed March 15, 2019).

La Scala Júnior, N., E. De Figueiredo, and A. Panosso, 2012: A review on soil carbon accumulation due to the management change of major Brazilian agricultural activities. *Brazilian J. Biol.*, **72**, 775–785, doi:10.1590/S1519-69842012000400012. http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1519-69842012000400012&lng=en&tlng=en (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Scarano, F. R., 2017: Ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change: concept, scalability and a role for conservation science. *Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.*, **15**, 65–73, doi:10.1016/J.PECON.2017.05.003. https://www-sciencedirect-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/science/article/pii/S1679007316301621 (Accessed March 28, 2019).

Schaefer, H., and Coauthors, 2016: A 21st-century shift from fossil-fuel to biogenic methane emissions indicated by $^{13}CH_4$. *Science*, **352**, 80–84, doi:10.1126/science.aad2705. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26966190 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Scharlemann, J. P., E. V. Tanner, R. Hiederer, and V. Kapos, 2014: Global soil carbon: understanding and managing the largest terrestrial carbon pool. *Carbon Manag.*, **5**, 81–91, doi:10.4155/cmt.13.77. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.4155/cmt.13.77 (Accessed February 22, 2019).

Scheffers, B. R., and Coauthors, 2016: The broad footprint of climate change from genes to biomes to people. *Science (80-.).*, **354**, aaf7671, doi:10.1126/science.aaf7671.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27846577 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Scheffran, J., M. Brzoska, J. Kominek, P. M. Link, and J. Schilling, 2012: Disentangling the climate-conflict nexus: empirical and theoretical assessment of vulnerabilities and pathways. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, **4**, 1. http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/res/article/view/19277/13740 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Scheidel, A., and C. Work, 2018: Forest plantations and climate change discourses: New powers of ‘green’ grabbing in Cambodia. *Land use policy*, **77**, 9–18, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2018.04.057. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0264837717312401 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Scherr, S. J., 2000: A downward spiral? Research evidence on the relationship between poverty and natural resource degradation. *Food Policy*, **25**, 479–498, doi:10.1016/S0306-9192(00)00022-1. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919200000221 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Schlautman, B., S. Barriball, C. Ciotir, S. Herron, and A. Miller, 2018: Perennial Grain Legume Domestication Phase I: Criteria for Candidate Species Selection. *Sustainability*, **10**, 730, doi:10.3390/su10030730. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/3/730 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Schlesinger, W. H., 2009: On the fate of anthropogenic nitrogen. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **106**, 203 LP-208. http://www.pnas.org/content/106/1/203.abstract.

Schlesinger, W. H., and S. Jasechko, 2014: Transpiration in the global water cycle. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **189–190**, 115–117, doi:10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2014.01.011. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192314000203#bib0060 (Accessed March 5, 2018).

——, and R. Amundson, 2018: Managing for soil carbon sequestration: Let’s get realistic. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **25**, gcb.14478, doi:10.1111/gcb.14478. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.14478 (Accessed April 5, 2019).

Schleussner, C.-F., and Coauthors, 2016: Science and policy characteristics of the Paris Agreement temperature goal. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 827–835, doi:10.1038/nclimate3096. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3096 (Accessed March 15, 2018).

Schmidt, M. W. I., and Coauthors, 2011: Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property. *Nature*, **478**, 49–56, doi:10.1038/nature10386. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature10386.

Schnitzer, S. A., and Coauthors, 2011: Soil microbes drive the classic plant diversity–productivity pattern. *Ecology*, **92**, 296–303.

Schoenholtz, S. ., H. V. Miegroet, and J. . Burger, 2000: A review of chemical and physical properties as indicators of forest soil quality: challenges and opportunities. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **138**, 335–356, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(00)00423-0. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112700004230 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Schofield, R. V., and M. J. Kirkby, 2003: Application of salinization indicators and initial development of potential global soil salinization scenario under climatic change. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **17**, n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2002GB001935. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2002GB001935 (Accessed December 27, 2017).

Schuerch, M., and Coauthors, 2018a: Future response of global coastal wetlands to sea-level rise. *Nature*, **561**, 231–234, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0476-5. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0476-5 (Accessed October 5, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2018b: Future response of global coastal wetlands to sea-level rise. *Nature*, **561**, 231–234, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0476-5. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0476-5

(Accessed March 14, 2019).

Schut, A. G. T., E. Ivits, J. G. Conijn, B. ten Brink, and R. Fensholt, 2015: Trends in Global Vegetation Activity and Climatic Drivers Indicate a Decoupled Response to Climate Change. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0138013, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138013. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138013 (Accessed February 20, 2019).

Schuur, E. A. G., and Coauthors, 2015: Climate change and the permafrost carbon feedback. *Nature*, **520**, 171–179, doi:10.1038/nature14338. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature14338 (Accessed March 22, 2019).

Schwilch, G., and Coauthors, 2011: Experiences in monitoring and assessment of sustainable land management. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **22**, 214–225, doi:10.1002/ldr.1040. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.1040 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Scoones, I., and W. Wolmer, 2002: Pathways of Change: Crop-Livestock Integration in Africa. *Pathways of change in Africa: crops, livestock & livelihoods in Mali, Ethiopia & Zimbabwe*, I. Scoones and W. Wolmer, Eds., James Currey Ltd.

Sealey, N. E., 2006: The cycle of casuarina-induced beach erosion - A case study from Andros, Bahamas. *12th Symp. Geol. Bahamas other Carbonate Reg. San Salvador. Bahamas*, 196–204.

Seaquist, J. W., T. Hickler, L. Eklundh, J. Ardö, and B. W. Heumann, 2009: Disentangling the effects of climate and people on Sahel vegetation dynamics. *Biogeosciences*, **6**, 469–477, doi:10.5194/bg-6-469-2009. http://www.biogeosciences.net/6/469/2009/ (Accessed October 10, 2018).

Sedano, F., and Coauthors, 2016: The impact of charcoal production on forest degradation: a case study in Tete, Mozambique. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 094020, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/094020. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=9/a=094020?key=crossref.a3ab07e751e2b171e389c7728e1c82fc (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Segura, C., G. Sun, S. McNulty, and Y. Zhang, 2014: Potential impacts of climate change on soil erosion vulnerability across the conterminous United States. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, **69**, 171–181, doi:10.2489/jswc.69.2.171. http://www.jswconline.org/cgi/doi/10.2489/jswc.69.2.171 (Accessed March 11, 2019).

Seidl, R., W. Rammer, D. Jäger, W. S. Currie, and M. J. Lexer, 2007: Assessing trade-offs between carbon sequestration and timber production within a framework of multi-purpose forestry in Austria. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **248**, 64–79, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2007.02.035. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112707002101.

——, and Coauthors, 2017: Forest disturbances under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 395–402, doi:10.1038/nclimate3303. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3303 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Serpa, D., and Coauthors, 2015: Impacts of climate and land use changes on the hydrological and erosion processes of two contrasting Mediterranean catchments. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **538**, 64–77, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2015.08.033. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969715305386?via%3Dihub (Accessed March 14, 2018).

Seto, K. C., and Coauthors, 2012: Urban land teleconnections and sustainability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **109**, 7687–7692, doi:10.1073/pnas.1117622109.

Settele, J., and Coauthors, 2015: Terrestrial and Inland Water Systems. *Climate Change 2014 Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, C.B. Field, V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, and M.D. Mastrandrea, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 271–360 http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781107415379A025 (Accessed January 2, 2018).

Seymour, F., and A. Angelsen, 2012: Summary and Conclusions: REDD+ without regrets. *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices*, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia, 317–334 https://www.cifor.org/library/3832/ (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Shadkam, S., F. Ludwig, P. van Oel, ï¿½ağla Kirmit, and P. Kabat, 2016: Impacts of climate change and water resources development on the declining inflow into Iran's Urmia Lake. *J. Great Lakes Res.*, **42**, 942–952, doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2016.07.033.

Shakesby, R. A., 2011: Post-wildfire soil erosion in the Mediterranean: Review and future research directions. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **105**, 71–100, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2011.01.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S001282521100002X (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Shames, S., M. Hill Clarvis, and G. Kissinger, 2014: *Financing Strategies for Integrated Landscape Investment*. Washington DC, USA, 1-60 pp.

Shanahan, T. M., and Coauthors, 2016: CO2 and fire influence tropical ecosystem stability in response to climate change. *Sci. Rep.*, **6**, 29587, doi:10.1038/srep29587. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep29587 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Shao, Y., 2008: *Physics and modelling of wind erosion*. Springer, 452 pp.

Sharmila, S., and K. J. E. Walsh, 2018: Recent poleward shift of tropical cyclone formation linked to Hadley cell expansion. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8**, 730–736, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0227-5. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-018-0227-5 (Accessed October 14, 2018).

Sheffield, J., E. F. Wood, and M. L. Roderick, 2012: Little change in global drought over the past 60 years. *Nature*, **491**, 435–438, doi:10.1038/nature11575. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature11575 (Accessed February 14, 2018).

Sheil, D., and D. Murdiyarso, 2009: How Forests Attract Rain: An Examination of a New Hypothesis. *Bioscience*, **59**, 341–347, doi:10.1525/bio.2009.59.4.12. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article-lookup/doi/10.1525/bio.2009.59.4.12 (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Shi, H., and Coauthors, 2017a: Assessing the ability of MODIS EVI to estimate terrestrial ecosystem gross primary production of multiple land cover types. *Ecol. Indic.*, **72**, 153–164, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2016.08.022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X16304836 (Accessed March 22, 2019).

——, and Coauthors, 2017b: Assessing the ability of MODIS EVI to estimate terrestrial ecosystem gross primary production of multiple land cover types. *Ecol. Indic.*, **72**, 153–164, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.08.022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X16304836 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Shi, S., W. Zhang, P. Zhang, Y. Yu, and F. Ding, 2013: A synthesis of change in deep soil organic carbon stores with afforestation of agricultural soils. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **296**, 53–63, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2013.01.026. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.01.026.

Shindell, D., and Coauthors, 2012: Simultaneously Mitigating Near-Term Climate Change and Improving Human Health and Food Security. *Science (80-.).*, **335**, 183 LP-189, doi:10.1126/science.1210026. http://science.sciencemag.org/content/335/6065/183.abstract.

Shirzaei, M., and R. Bürgmann, 2018: Global climate change and local land subsidence exacerbate inundation risk to the San Francisco Bay Area. *Sci. Adv.*, **4**, eaap9234, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aap9234. http://advances.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aap9234 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

Showers, K. B., 2005: *Imperial gullies : soil erosion and conservation in Lesotho*. Ohio University Press, 346 pp.

Shuab, R., R. Lone, J. Ahmad, and Z. A. Reshi, 2017: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi: A Potential Tool for Restoration of Degraded Land. *Mycorrhiza - Nutrient Uptake, Biocontrol, Ecorestoration*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 415–434 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-68867-1_22 (Accessed March 6, 2019).

Siahaya, M. E., T. R. Hutauruk, H. S. E. S. Aponno, J. W. Hatulesila, and A. B. Mardhanie, 2016: Traditional ecological knowledge on shifting cultivation and forest management in East Borneo, Indonesia. *Int. J. Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Manag.*, **12**, 14–23, doi:10.1080/21513732.2016.1169559. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21513732.2016.1169559 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Simon, J., A. Diego, P. Marija, B. Ana Catarina, G. Jan Willem van, A. H. Bruce, and V. Frank, 2017: Biochar boosts tropical but not temperate crop yields. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, 53001. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/12/i=5/a=053001.

Simonsen, S. H., and Coauthors, 2014: *Applying resilience thinking: seven principles for building resilience in social-ecological systems*. http://stockholmresilience.org/download/18.10119fc11455d3c557d6928/1459560241272/SRC+Applying+Resilience+final.pdf.

Sims, N. C., J. R. England, G. J. Newnham, S. Alexander, C. Green, S. Minelli, and A. Held, 2019: Developing good practice guidance for estimating land degradation in the context of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **92**, 349–355, doi:10.1016/J.ENVSCI.2018.10.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901118305768 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Singh, B. P., and A. L. Cowie, 2014: Long-term influence of biochar on native organic carbon mineralisation in a low-carbon clayey soil. *Sci. Rep.*, **4**, 3687, doi:10.1038/srep03687https://www.nature.com/articles/srep03687#supplementary-information. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep03687.

Singh, B. P., B. J. Hatton, S. Balwant, and a L. Cowie, 2010: The role of biochar in reducing nitrous oxide emissions and nitrogen leaching from soil. *Proc. 19th World Congr. Soil Sci. Soil Solut. a Chang. world, Brisbane, Aust. 1-6 August 2010. Congr. Symp. 4 Greenh. gases from soils*, 257–259, doi:10.2134/jeq2009.0138.

Singh, B. P., A. L. Cowie, and R. J. Smernik, 2012: Biochar Carbon Stability in a Clayey Soil As a Function of Feedstock and Pyrolysis Temperature. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, doi:10.1021/es302545b. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es302545b.

——, Y. Fang, M. Boersma, D. Collins, L. Van Zwieten, and L. M. Macdonald, 2015: In Situ Persistence and Migration of Biochar Carbon and Its Impact on Native Carbon Emission in Contrasting Soils under Managed Temperate Pastures. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0141560, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141560. http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141560 (Accessed December 1, 2017).

Sinha, D., and M. R. Ray, 2015: Health Effects of Indoor Air Pollution Due to Cooking with Biomass Fuel. Humana Press, Cham, 267–302 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-19096-9_14 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Siry, J. P., F. W. Cubbage, and M. R. Ahmed, 2005: Sustainable forest management: Global trends and opportunities. *For. Policy Econ.*, **7**, 551–561, doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2003.09.003.

Sklenicka, P., K. J. Molnarova, M. Salek, P. Simova, J. Vlasak, P. Sekac, and V. Janovska, 2015: Owner or tenant: Who adopts better soil conservation practices? *Land use policy*, **47**, 253–261, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2015.04.017. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837715001192 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Skoufias, E., M. Rabassa, and S. Olivieri, 2011: *The poverty impacts of climate change: A review of the evidence*. The World Bank, http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/book/10.1596/1813-9450-5622

(Accessed March 8, 2019).

Ben Slimane, A., D. Raclot, O. Evrard, M. Sanaa, I. Lefevre, and Y. Le Bissonnais, 2016: Relative Contribution of Rill/Interrill and Gully/Channel Erosion to Small Reservoir Siltation in Mediterranean Environments. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 785–797, doi:10.1002/ldr.2387. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2387 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Sloan, S., and J. A. Sayer, 2015: Forest Resources Assessment of 2015 shows positive global trends but forest loss and degradation persist in poor tropical countries. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **352**, 134–145, doi:10.1016/J.FORECO.2015.06.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112715003394 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Slobbe, E., H. J. Vriend, S. Aarninkhof, K. Lulofs, M. Vries, and P. Dircke, 2013: Building with Nature: in search of resilient storm surge protection strategies. *Nat. Hazards*, **65**, 947–966, doi:10.1007/s11069-012-0342-y.

Smeets, E., F. X. Johnson, and G. Ballard-Tremeer, 2012: Traditional and Improved Use of Biomass for Energy in Afric. *Bioenergy for Sustainable Development in Africa*, R. Janssen and D. Rutz, Eds., Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 3–12.

Smith, H. E., F. Eigenbrod, D. Kafumbata, M. D. Hudson, and K. Schreckenberg, 2015: Criminals by necessity: the risky life of charcoal transporters in Malawi. *For. Trees Livelihoods*, **24**, 259–274, doi:10.1080/14728028.2015.1062808. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14728028.2015.1062808 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Smith, J., D. R. Nayak, and P. Smith, 2012: Renewable energy: Avoid constructing wind farms on peat. *Nature*, doi:10.1038/489033d.

Smith, P., 2016: Soil carbon sequestration and biochar as negative emission technologies. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **22**, 1315–1324, doi:10.1111/gcb.13178. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13178 (Accessed December 1, 2017).

——, and Coauthors, 2016a: Global change pressures on soils from land use and management. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **22**, 1008–1028, doi:10.1111/gcb.13068. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13068 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

——, and Coauthors, 2016b: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO2 emissions. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6**, 42–50, doi:10.1038/nclimate2870. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2870 (Accessed March 16, 2018).

Smith, P. and M. B., and Coauthors, 2014: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, O. Edenhofer et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, p. 83.

Smyth, C., W. A. Kurz, G. Rampley, T. C. Lemprière, and O. Schwab, 2017: Climate change mitigation potential of local use of harvest residues for bioenergy in Canada. *GCB Bioenergy*, **9**, 817–832, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12387.

Smyth, C. E. E., G. Stinson, E. Neilson, T. C. C. Lemprière, M. Hafer, G. J. J. Rampley, and W. A. A. Kurz, 2014: Quantifying the biophysical climate change mitigation potential of Canada's forest sector. *Biogeosciences*, **11**, 3515–3529, doi:10.5194/bg-11-3515-2014. www.biogeosciences.net/11/3515/2014/ (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Sobel, A. H., S. J. Camargo, T. M. Hall, C.-Y. Lee, M. K. Tippett, and A. A. Wing, 2016: Human influence on tropical cyclone intensity. *Science*, **353**, 242–246, doi:10.1126/science.aaf6574. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27418502 (Accessed April 10, 2019).

Sokolik, I. N., and O. B. Toon, 1996: Direct radiative forcing by anthropogenic airborne mineral aerosols. *Nature*, **381**, 681–683, doi:10.1038/381681a0.

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/381681a0 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Solly, E. F., B. D. Lindahl, M. A. Dawes, M. Peter, R. C. Souza, C. Rixen, and F. Hagedorn, 2017: Experimental soil warming shifts the fungal community composition at the alpine treeline. *New Phytol.*, **215**, 766–778, doi:10.1111/nph.14603. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/nph.14603 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Solomon, N., E. Birhane, C. Gordon, M. Haile, F. Taheri, H. Azadi, and J. Scheffran, 2018: Environmental impacts and causes of conflict in the Horn of Africa: A review. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **177**, 284–290, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2017.11.016. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825217301356 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Song, X.-P., M. C. Hansen, S. V. Stehman, P. V. Potapov, A. Tyukavina, E. F. Vermote, and J. R. Townshend, 2018: Global land change from 1982 to 2016. *Nature*, **560**, 639–643, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0411-9. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0411-9 (Accessed October 29, 2018).

Sonneveld, B. G. J. S., and D. L. Dent, 2009: How good is GLASOD? *J. Environ. Manage.*, **90**, 274–283, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2007.09.008. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479707003441 (Accessed May 11, 2018).

Sonwa, D. J., S. Walker, R. Nasi, and M. Kanninen, 2011a: Potential synergies of the main current forestry efforts and climate change mitigation in Central Africa. *Sustain. Sci.*, **6**, 59–67, doi:10.1007/s11625-010-0119-8. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-010-0119-8 (Accessed March 22, 2019).

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2011b: Potential synergies of the main current forestry efforts and climate change mitigation in Central Africa. *Sustain. Sci.*, **6**, 59–67, doi:10.1007/s11625-010-0119-8. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-010-0119-8 (Accessed March 26, 2019).

——, S. F. Weise, G. Schroth, M. J. J. Janssens, and Howard-Yana Shapiro, 2014: Plant diversity management in cocoa agroforestry systems in West and Central Africa—effects of markets and household needs. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **88**, 1021–1034, doi:10.1007/s10457-014-9714-5.

——, ——, B. A. Nkongmeneck, M. Tchatat, and M. J. J. Janssens, 2017: Structure and composition of cocoa agroforests in the humid forest zone of Southern Cameroon. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **91**, 451–470, doi:10.1007/s10457-016-9942-y.

Sonwa, F., S. F. Weise, M. Tchatat, B. A. Nkongmeneck, A. A. Adesina, O. Ndoye, and J. Gockowski, 2001: *The role of cocoa agroforests in rural and community forestry in Southern Cameroon*. Overseas Development Institute, London, 1-10 pp. https://www.odi.org/resources/docs/1226.pdf.

Soule, M. J., A. Tegene, and K. D. Wiebe, 2000: Land Tenure and the Adoption of Conservation Practices. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.*, **82**, 993–1005, doi:10.1111/0002-9092.00097. https://academic.oup.com/ajae/article-lookup/doi/10.1111/0002-9092.00097 (Accessed February 28, 2019).

Sousa, F. F. de, C. Vieira-da-Silva, and F. B. Barros, 2018: The (in)visible market of miriti (Mauritia flexuosa L.f.) fruits, the “winter acai”, in Amazonian riverine communities of Abaetetuba, Northern Brazil. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **14**, e00393, doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00393.

Soussana, J.-F., and G. Lemaire, 2014: Coupling carbon and nitrogen cycles for environmentally sustainable intensification of grasslands and crop-livestock systems. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **190**, 9–17, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2013.10.012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880913003526 (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Soussana, J.-F., P. Loiseau, N. Vuichard, E. Ceschia, J. Balesdent, T. Chevallier, and D. Arrouays, 2006: Carbon cycling and sequestration opportunities in temperate grasslands. *Soil Use Manag.*, **20**, 219–230, doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.2004.tb00362.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1475-

2743.2004.tb00362.x (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Soussana, J.-F., and Coauthors, 2019: Matching policy and science: Rationale for the '4 per 1000 - soils for food security and climate' initiative. *Soil Tillage Res.*, **188**, 3–15, doi:10.1016/J.STILL.2017.12.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167198717302271 (Accessed April 13, 2019).

Sovacool, B. K., 2012: Perceptions of climate change risks and resilient island planning in the Maldives. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **17**, 731–752, doi:10.1007/s11027-011-9341-7.

Sparrevik, M., C. Adam, V. Martinsen, Jubaedah, and G. Cornelissen, 2015: Emissions of gases and particles from charcoal/biochar production in rural areas using medium-sized traditional and improved "retort" kilns. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **72**, 65–73, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2014.11.016. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0961953414005170.

Specht, M. J., S. R. R. Pinto, U. P. Albuquerque, M. Tabarelli, and F. P. L. Melo, 2015: Burning biodiversity: Fuelwood harvesting causes forest degradation in human-dominated tropical landscapes. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **3**, 200–209, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2014.12.002. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2351989414000894.

Spence, J. R., 2001: The new boreal forestry: adjusting timber management to accommodate biodiversity. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **16**, 591–593, doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02335-7. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534701023357 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Spencer, T., and Coauthors, 2016: Global coastal wetland change under sea-level rise and related stresses: The DIVA Wetland Change Model. *Glob. Planet. Change*, **139**, 15–30, doi:10.1016/J.GLOPLACHA.2015.12.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818115301879 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Sprunger, C. D., S. W. Culman, G. P. Robertson, and S. S. Snapp, 2018: Perennial grain on a Midwest Alfisol shows no sign of early soil carbon gain. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*, **33**, 360–372, doi:10.1017/S1742170517000138. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1742170517000138/type/journal_article (Accessed April 3, 2019).

St.Clair, S. B., and J. P. Lynch, 2010: The opening of Pandora's Box: climate change impacts on soil fertility and crop nutrition in developing countries. *Plant Soil*, **335**, 101–115, doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0328-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-010-0328-z (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Stafford Smith, D. M., G. M. McKeon, I. W. Watson, B. K. Henry, G. S. Stone, W. B. Hall, and S. M. Howden, 2007: Learning from episodes of degradation and recovery in variable Australian rangelands. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **104**, 20690–20695, doi:10.1073/pnas.0704837104. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18093932 (Accessed March 1, 2019).

ter Steege, H., and Coauthors, 2013: Hyperdominance in the Amazonian Tree Flora. *Science (80-.).*, **342**, 1243092–1243092, doi:10.1126/science.1243092.

Steffen, W. L., and Coauthors, 2005: *Global change and the earth system : a planet under pressure*. Springer, Berlin, Germany, 336 pp.

Steinkamp, J., and T. Hickler, 2015: Is drought-induced forest dieback globally increasing? *J. Ecol.*, **103**, 31–43, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12335. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1365-2745.12335 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Stevens, P., T. Roberts, and S. Lucas, 2015: Life on mars: Using micro-topographic relief to secure soil, water and biocapacity. Barton ACT, Australia, Engineers Australia https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=732466230109912;res=IELENG (Accessed April 14, 2019).

Steward, P. R., A. J. Dougill, C. Thierfelder, C. M. Pittelkow, L. C. Stringer, M. Kudzala, and G. E. Shackelford, 2018: The adaptive capacity of maize-based conservation agriculture systems to climate stress in tropical and subtropical environments: A meta-regression of yields. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **251**, 194–202, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2017.09.019. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016788091730419X (Accessed May 14, 2018).

Stocking, M. A., N. Murnaghan, and N. Murnaghan, 2001: *A Handbook for the Field Assessment of Land Degradation*. Routledge, https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781849776219 (Accessed April 28, 2018).

Stoorvogel, J. J., M. Bakkenes, A. J. A. M. Temme, N. H. Batjes, and B. J. E. ten Brink, 2017: S-World: A Global Soil Map for Environmental Modelling. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **28**, 22–33, doi:10.1002/ldr.2656. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2656 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Strefler, J., T. Amann, N. Bauer, E. Kriegler, and J. Hartmann, 2018: Potential and costs of carbon dioxide removal by enhanced weathering of rocks. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, 034010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaa9c4. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/13/i=3/a=034010?key=crossref.9d7613c7d9e3b6224a40aa812b709bfe (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Stringer, L. C., M. Akhtar-Schuster, M. J. Marques, F. Amiraslani, S. Quatrini, and E. M. Abraham, 2011: Combating land degradation and desertification and enhancing food security: Towards integrated solutions. *Ann. Arid Zone*, **50**, 1–23. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259459727 (Accessed May 15, 2018).

Strunz, S., 2012: Is conceptual vagueness an asset? Arguments from philosophy of science applied to the concept of resilience. *Ecol. Econ.*, **76**, 112–118, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLECON.2012.02.012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800912000766 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Sturm, M., 2005: Changing snow and shrub conditions affect albedo with global implications. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **110**, G01004, doi:10.1029/2005JG000013. https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2005JG000013 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Sturrock, R. N., S. J. Frankel, A. V. Brown, P. E. Hennon, J. T. Kliejunas, K. J. Lewis, J. J. Worrall, and A. J. Woods, 2011: Climate change and forest diseases. *Plant Pathol.*, **60**, 133–149, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3059.2010.02406.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2010.02406.x (Accessed March 5, 2018).

Sufo Kankeu, R., D. J. Sonwa, R. Eba'a Atyi, and N. M. Moankang Nkal, 2016: Quantifying post logging biomass loss using satellite images and ground measurements in Southeast Cameroon. *J. For. Res.*, **27**, 1415–1426, doi:10.1007/s11676-016-0277-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11676-016-0277-3 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Sulaiman, C., A. S. Abdul-Rahim, H. O. Mohd-Shahwahid, and L. Chin, 2017: Wood fuel consumption, institutional quality, and forest degradation in sub-Saharan Africa: Evidence from a dynamic panel framework. *Ecol. Indic.*, **74**, 414–419, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.11.045. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X16306938.

Sundström, J. F., and Coauthors, 2014: Future threats to agricultural food production posed by environmental degradation, climate change, and animal and plant diseases – a risk analysis in three economic and climate settings. *Food Secur.*, **6**, 201–215, doi:10.1007/s12571-014-0331-y. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12571-014-0331-y (Accessed May 14, 2018).

Sussams, L. W., W. R. Sheate, and R. P. Eales, 2015: Green infrastructure as a climate change adaptation policy intervention: Muddying the waters or clearing a path to a more secure future? *J. Environ. Manage.*, **147**, 184–193, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2014.09.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479714004411 (Accessed May 17,

2018).

Swails, E., D. Jaye, L. Verchot, K. Hergoualc'h, M. Schirrmann, N. Borchard, N. Wahyuni, and D. Lawrence, 2018: Will CO2 Emissions from Drained Tropical Peatlands Decline Over Time? Links Between Soil Organic Matter Quality, Nutrients, and C Mineralization Rates. *Ecosystems*, **21**, 868–885, doi:10.1007/s10021-017-0190-4.

Sydeman, W. J., M. García-Reyes, D. S. Schoeman, R. R. Rykaczewski, S. A. Thompson, B. A. Black, and S. J. Bograd, 2014: Climate change. Climate change and wind intensification in coastal upwelling ecosystems. *Science*, **345**, 77–80, doi:10.1126/science.1251635. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24994651 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Szabo, S., and Coauthors, 2016: Population dynamics, delta vulnerability and environmental change: comparison of the Mekong, Ganges–Brahmaputra and Amazon delta regions. *Sustain. Sci.*, **11**, 539–554, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0372-6. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-016-0372-6 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Tacoli, C., 2009: Crisis or adaptation? Migration and climate change in a context of high mobility. *Environ. Urban.*, **21**, 513–525, doi:10.1177/0956247809342182. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0956247809342182 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Tadesse, G., 2001: Land Degradation: A Challenge to Ethiopia. *Environ. Manage.*, **27**, 815–824, doi:10.1007/s002670010190. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs002670010190.pdf (Accessed March 15, 2018).

Tadesse, G., B. Algieri, M. Kalkuhl, and J. von Braun, 2014: Drivers and triggers of international food price spikes and volatility. *Food Policy*, **47**, 117–128, doi:10.1016/J.FOODPOL.2013.08.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919213001188 (Accessed March 11, 2019).

Tamarin-Brodsky, T., and Y. Kaspi, 2017: Enhanced poleward propagation of storms under climate change. *Nat. Geosci.*, **10**, 908–913, doi:10.1038/s41561-017-0001-8. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41561-017-0001-8 (Accessed March 16, 2018).

Tang, J., S. Luyssaert, A. D. Richardson, W. Kutsch, and I. A. Janssens, 2014: Steeper declines in forest photosynthesis than respiration explain age-driven decreases in forest growth. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **111**, 8856–8860, doi:10.1073/pnas.1320761111.

Tarfasa, S., B. B. Balana, T. Tefera, T. Woldeamanuel, A. Moges, M. Dinato, and H. Black, 2018: Modeling Smallholder Farmers' Preferences for Soil Management Measures: A Case Study From South Ethiopia. *Ecol. Econ.*, **145**, 410–419, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.11.027. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S092180091631583X (Accessed April 16, 2018).

Van Tassel, D. L., and Coauthors, 2017: Accelerating silphium domestication: An opportunity to develop new crop ideotypes and breeding strategies informed by multiple disciplines. *Crop Sci.*, **57**, 1274–1284, doi:10.2135/cropsci2016.10.0834.

Taufik, M., P. J. J. F. Torfs, R. Uijlenhoet, P. D. Jones, D. Murdiyarso, and H. A. J. Van Lanen, 2017: Amplification of wildfire area burnt by hydrological drought in the humid tropics. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 428–431, doi:10.1038/nclimate3280. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3280 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Taylor, A. R., M. Seedre, B. W. Brassard, and H. Y. H. Chen, 2014: Decline in Net Ecosystem Productivity Following Canopy Transition to Late-Succession Forests. *Ecosystems*, **17**, 778–791, doi:10.1007/s10021-014-9759-3.

Taylor, L. L., D. J. Beerling, S. Quegan, and S. A. Banwart, 2017: Simulating carbon capture by enhanced weathering with croplands: an overview of key processes highlighting areas of future model development. *Biol. Lett.*, **13**, 20160868, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2016.0868. http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/lookup/doi/10.1098/rsbl.2016.0868 (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Tengberg, A., and S. Valencia, 2018: Integrated approaches to natural resources management-Theory and practice. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **29**, 1845–1857, doi:10.1002/ldr.2946. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2946 (Accessed October 5, 2018).

Tengberg, A., S. Fredholm, I. Eliasson, I. K.-E. Services, and U. 2012, 2012: Cultural ecosystem services provided by landscapes: Assessment of heritage values and identity. *Ecosyst. Serv.*, **2**, 14–26. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212041612000113 (Accessed February 28, 2019).

Tengberg, A., F. Radstake, K. Zhang, and B. Dunn, 2016: Scaling up of Sustainable Land Management in the Western People's Republic of China: Evaluation of a 10-Year Partnership. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, doi:10.1002/ldr.2270.

Ter-Mikaelian, M. T., S. J. Colombo, and J. Chen, 2013: Effects of harvesting on spatial and temporal diversity of carbon stocks in a boreal forest landscape. *Ecol. Evol.*, **3**, 3738–3750, doi:10.1002/ece3.751.

——, ——, and ——, 2014: The Burning Question: Does Forest Bioenergy Reduce Carbon Emissions? A Review of Common Misconceptions about Forest Carbon Accounting. *J. For.*, **113**, 57–68, doi:10.5849/jof.14-016.

Terrer, C., S. Vicca, B. A. Hungate, R. P. Phillips, and I. C. Prentice, 2016: Mycorrhizal association as a primary control of the CO_2 fertilization effect. *Science*, **353**, 72–74, doi:10.1126/science.aaf4610. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27365447 (Accessed March 4, 2019).

Terry, J. P., and A. Y. A. Lau, 2018: Magnitudes of nearshore waves generated by tropical cyclone Winston, the strongest landfalling cyclone in South Pacific records. Unprecedented or unremarkable? *Sediment. Geol.*, **364**, 276–285, doi:10.1016/J.SEDGEO.2017.10.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0037073817302282 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Tesfaye, A., R. Brouwer, P. van der Zaag, and W. Negatu, 2016: Assessing the costs and benefits of improved land management practices in three watershed areas in Ethiopia. *Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res.*, **4**, 20–29, doi:10.1016/J.ISWCR.2016.01.003. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095633915301015 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Teshome, A., J. de Graaff, C. Ritsema, and M. Kassie, 2016: Farmers' Perceptions about the Influence of Land Quality, Land Fragmentation and Tenure Systems on Sustainable Land Management in the North Western Ethiopian Highlands. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 884–898, doi:10.1002/ldr.2298. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2298 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Tessler, Z. D., C. J. Vörösmarty, M. Grossberg, I. Gladkova, H. Aizenman, J. P. M. Syvitski, and E. Foufoula-Georgiou, 2015: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE. Profiling risk and sustainability in coastal deltas of the world. *Science*, **349**, 638–643, doi:10.1126/science.aab3574. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26250684 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Tessler, Z. D., C. J. Vörösmarty, M. Grossberg, I. Gladkova, and H. Aizenman, 2016: A global empirical typology of anthropogenic drivers of environmental change in deltas. *Sustain. Sci.*, **11**, 525–537, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0357-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11625-016-0357-5 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Testa, S., K. Soudani, L. Boschetti, and E. Borgogno Mondino, 2018: MODIS-derived EVI, NDVI and WDRVI time series to estimate phenological metrics in French deciduous forests. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf.*, **64**, 132–144, doi:10.1016/j.jag.2017.08.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030324341730171X (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Thies, J. E., M. C. Rillig, and E. R. Graber, 2015: Biochar effects on the abundance, activity and diversity of the soil biota. *Biochar for Environmental Management: Science, Technology and*

Implementation.

Thompson, I., B. Mackey, S. McNulty, and A. Mosseler, 2009: Forest resilience, biodiversity, and climate change. *A synthesis of the biodiversity/resilience/stability relationship in forest ecosystems. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal. Technical Series*, Vol. 43 of, 67.

Thomson, J., and W. E. Rogers, 2014: Swell and sea in the emerging Arctic Ocean. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **41**, 3136–3140, doi:10.1002/2014GL059983. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2014GL059983 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Thomson, L. J., S. Macfadyen, and A. A. Hoffmann, 2010: Predicting the effects of climate change on natural enemies of agricultural pests. *Biol. Control*, **52**, 296–306, doi:10.1016/J.BIOCONTROL.2009.01.022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1049964409000413 (Accessed May 14, 2018).

Thorén, H., and L. Olsson, 2018: Is resilience a normative concept? *Resilience*, **6**, 112–128, doi:10.1080/21693293.2017.1406842. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21693293.2017.1406842 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Tian, F., M. Brandt, Y. Y. Liu, K. Rasmussen, and R. Fensholt, 2017: Mapping gains and losses in woody vegetation across global tropical drylands. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **23**, 1748–1760, doi:10.1111/gcb.13464. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13464 (Accessed December 20, 2017).

Tian, H., and Coauthors, 2015: North American terrestrial CO2 uptake largely offset by CH4 and N2O emissions: toward a full accounting of the greenhouse gas budget. *Clim. Change*, **129**, 413–426, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1072-9. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-014-1072-9 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Tighe, M., C. Muñoz-Robles, N. Reid, B. Wilson, and S. V Briggs, 2012: Hydrological thresholds of soil surface properties identified using conditional inference tree analysis. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*, **37**, 620–632, doi:10.1002/esp.3191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/esp.3191.

Tilman, D., C. Balzer, J. Hill, and B. L. Befort, 2011: Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **108**, 20260–20264, doi:10.1073/pnas.1116437108. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22106295 (Accessed March 15, 2018).

Tonosaki K, Kawai S, T. K., 2014: Cooling Potential of Urban Green Spaces in Summer. *Designing Low Carbon Societies in Landscapes.Editors Nakagoshi N, Mabuhay AJ.*, Springer, Tokyo, 15–34.

Torquebiau, E., 1992: Are tropical agroforestry home gardens sustainable? *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **41**, 189–207, doi:10.1016/0167-8809(92)90109-O. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/016788099290109O (Accessed October 29, 2018).

Toth, G. G., P. K. Ramachandran Nair, M. Jacobson, Y. Widyaningsih, and C. P. Duffy, 2017: Malawi's Energy Needs and Agroforestry: Adoption Potential of Woodlots. *Hum. Ecol.*, **45**, 735–746, doi:10.1007/s10745-017-9944-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10745-017-9944-z (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Toulmin, C., 2009: Securing land and property rights in sub-Saharan Africa: The role of local institutions. *Land use policy*, **26**, 10–19, doi:10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2008.07.006. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837708000811 (Accessed April 16, 2018).

——, and K. Brock, 2016: Desertification in the Sahel: Local Practice Meets Global Narrative. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 37–63 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-16014-1_2 (Accessed May 12, 2018).

Trahan, M. W., and B. A. Schubert, 2016: Temperature-induced water stress in high-latitude forests in response to natural and anthropogenic warming. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **22**, 782–791, doi:10.1111/gcb.13121. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13121 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Trenberth, K. E., 1999: Conceptual Framework for Changes of Extremes of the Hydrological Cycle With Climate Change. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 327–339 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-015-9265-9_18 (Accessed November 14, 2017).

——, 2011: Changes in precipitation with climate change. *Clim. Res.*, **47**, 123–138, doi:10.2307/24872346. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24872346 (Accessed March 9, 2018).

Trofymow, J. A., G. Stinson, and W. A. Kurz, 2008: Derivation of a spatially explicit 86-year retrospective carbon budget for a landscape undergoing conversion from old-growth to managed forests on Vancouver Island, BC. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **256**, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.02.056.

Trumbore, S., P. Brando, and H. Hartmann, 2015: Forest health and global change. *Science*, **349**, 814–818, doi:10.1126/science.aac6759. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26293952 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Tu, S., F. Xu, and J. Xu, 2018: Regime shift in the destructiveness of tropical cyclones over the western North Pacific. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, 094021, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aade3a. http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/13/i=9/a=094021?key=crossref.784ca4128f17cd025d409d28964630a8 (Accessed October 14, 2018).

Turetsky, M. R., and Coauthors, 2014: A synthesis of methane emissions from 71 northern, temperate, and subtropical wetlands. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **20**, 2183–2197, doi:10.1111/gcb.12580. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12580 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Turner, B. L., and J. A. Sabloff, 2012: Classic Period collapse of the Central Maya Lowlands: insights about human-environment relationships for sustainability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **109**, 13908–13914, doi:10.1073/pnas.1210106109. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22912403 (Accessed October 29, 2018).

——, E. F. Lambin, and A. Reenberg, 2007: The emergence of land change science for global environmental change and sustainability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **104**, 20666–20671, doi:10.1073/pnas.0704119104. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18093934 (Accessed October 3, 2018).

Turner, B. L. (Billie L., W. C. Clark, R. W. Kates, J. F. Richards, T. Mathews, Jessica, and W. B. Meyer, eds., 1990: *The Earth as transformed by human action : global and regional changes in the biosphere over the past 300 years*. Cambridge University Press with Clark University, Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, 713 pp.

Turner, K. G., and Coauthors, 2016: A review of methods, data, and models to assess changes in the value of ecosystem services from land degradation and restoration. *Ecol. Modell.*, **319**, 190–207, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLMODEL.2015.07.017. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380015003233 (Accessed February 21, 2019).

Turner, W., 2014: Conservation. Sensing biodiversity. *Science*, **346**, 301–302, doi:10.1126/science.1256014. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25324372 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Tzoulas, K., K. Korpela, S. Venn, V. Yli-Pelkonen, A. Kaźmierczak, J. Niemela, and P. James, 2007: Promoting ecosystem and human health in urban areas using Green Infrastructure: A literature review. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **81**, 167–178, doi:10.1016/J.LANDURBPLAN.2007.02.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204607000503 (Accessed May 17, 2018).

Uddameri, V., S. Singaraju, and E. A. Hernandez, 2014: Impacts of sea-level rise and urbanization on groundwater availability and sustainability of coastal communities in semi-arid South Texas.

Environ. Earth Sci., **71**, 2503–2515, doi:10.1007/s12665-013-2904-z. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12665-013-2904-z (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Uitto, J. I., 2016: Evaluating the environment as a global public good. *Evaluation*, **22**, 108–115, doi:10.1177/1356389015623135. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1356389015623135 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Umunay, P. M., T. G. Gregoire, T. Gopalakrishna, P. W. Ellis, and F. E. Putz, 2019: Selective logging emissions and potential emission reductions from reduced-impact logging in the Congo Basin. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **437**, 360–371, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2019.01.049.

UNCCD, 1994: United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

——, 2016a: *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twelfth session, held in Ankara from 12 to 23 October 2015*. Bon, Germany, https://www2.unccd.int/sites/default/files/sessions/documents/ICCD_COP12_20_Add.1/20add1eng.pdf.

——, 2016b: *Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting – A Technical Guide. Land degradation neutrality target setting programme.* Bonn, Germany, https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/inline-files/LDN TS Technical Guide_Draft_English.pdf.

——, 2017: *The Global Land Outloook*. 1st ed. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Bonn, Germany, 340 pp.

UNDP, 2017: *Valuation of reforestation in terms of disaster risk reduction: A technical study from the Republic of Korea*.

UNEP, 2007: *Sudan Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment*. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 358 pp. http://www.unep.org (Accessed May 15, 2018).

UNFCCC, 2013: Reporting and accounting of LULUCF activities under the Kyoto Protocol.

United Nations, 2015: *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, NewYork*. https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/publications/files/wup pp.

Upadhyay, H., D. Mohan, and D. Mohan, 2017: Migrating to adapt? *Climate Change, Vulnerability and Migration*, Routledge India, 43–58 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781351375580/chapters/10.4324/9781315147741-3 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Valade, A., V. Bellassen, C. Magand, and S. Luyssaert, 2017: Sustaining the sequestration efficiency of the European forest sector. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **405**, 44–55, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2017.09.009.

VandenBygaart, A. J., 2016: The myth that no-till can mitigate global climate change. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **216**, 98–99, doi:10.1016/J.AGEE.2015.09.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880915300797 (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Vanek, S. J., and J. Lehmann, 2015: Phosphorus availability to beans via interactions between mycorrhizas and biochar. *Plant Soil*, doi:10.1007/s11104-014-2246-y.

Vasconcellos, R. L. F., J. A. Bonfim, D. Baretta, and E. J. B. N. Cardoso, 2016: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi and Glomalin-Related Soil Protein as Potential Indicators of Soil Quality in a Recuperation Gradient of the Atlantic Forest in Brazil. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 325–334, doi:10.1002/ldr.2228. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2228 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Vaughan, D. G., and Coauthors, 2013: Observations: Cryosphere. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, T.F. Stocker et al., Eds., Cambrdige, UK and New York, USA, p. 317-.

Vautard, R., J. Cattiaux, P. Yiou, J.-N. Thépaut, and P. Ciais, 2010: Northern Hemisphere atmospheric stilling partly attributed to an increase in surface roughness. *Nat. Geosci.*, **3**, 756–761, doi:10.1038/ngeo979. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo979 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Vavrus, S. J., F. He, J. E. Kutzbach, W. F. Ruddiman, and P. C. Tzedakis, 2018: Glacial Inception in Marine Isotope Stage 19: An Orbital Analog for a Natural Holocene Climate. *Sci. Rep.*, **8**, 10213, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-28419-5. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-28419-5 (Accessed October 2, 2018).

Vecchi, G. A., K. L. Swanson, B. J. Soden, J. J. Sirutis, G. A. Vecchi, S. T. Garner, and I. M. Held, 2008: Climate change. Whither hurricane activity? *Science*, **322**, 687–689, doi:10.1126/science.1164396. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18974337 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Vedeld, P., A. Angelsen, J. Bojö, E. Sjaastad, and G. Kobugabe Berg, 2007: Forest environmental incomes and the rural poor. *For. Policy Econ.*, **9**, 869–879, doi:10.1016/J.FORPOL.2006.05.008. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1389934106001146 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

van der Ven, H., and B. Cashore, 2018: Forest certification: the challenge of measuring impacts. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **32**, 104–111, doi:10.1016/J.COSUST.2018.06.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343517302658 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

——, C. Rothacker, and B. Cashore, 2018: Do eco-labels prevent deforestation? Lessons from non-state market driven governance in the soy, palm oil, and cocoa sectors. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **52**, 141–151, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2018.07.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0959378017304545 (Accessed March 29, 2019).

Venter, O., and Coauthors, 2016: Sixteen years of change in the global terrestrial human footprint and implications for biodiversity conservation. *Nat. Commun.*, **7**, 12558, doi:10.1038/ncomms12558. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms12558 (Accessed October 25, 2018).

Ventura, M., and Coauthors, 2015: Biochar mineralization and priming effect on SOM decomposition in two European short rotation coppices. *GCB Bioenergy*, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12219.

Verdone, M., and A. Seidl, 2017: Time, space, place, and the Bonn Challenge global forest restoration target. *Restor. Ecol.*, **25**, 903–911, doi:10.1111/rec.12512. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/rec.12512 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Verhoeven, E., E. Pereira, C. Decock, E. Suddick, T. Angst, and J. Six, 2017: Toward a Better Assessment of Biochar–Nitrous Oxide Mitigation Potential at the Field Scale. *J. Environ. Qual.*, doi:10.2134/jeq2016.10.0396.

Viger, M., R. D. Hancock, F. Miglietta, and G. Taylor, 2015: More plant growth but less plant defence? First global gene expression data for plants grown in soil amended with biochar. *GCB Bioenergy*, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12182.

Vincent, K. E., P. Tschakert, J. Barnett, M. G. Rivera-Ferre, and A. Woodward, 2014: Cross-chapter box on gender and climate chan. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Chang*, C.B. Field et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, 105–107.

Virapongse, A., B. A. Endress, M. P. Gilmore, C. Horn, and C. Romulo, 2017: Ecology, livelihoods, and management of the Mauritia flexuosa palm in South America. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **10**, 70–92, doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2016.12.005.

Viscarra Rossel, R. A., R. Webster, E. N. Bui, and J. A. Baldock, 2014: Baseline map of organic carbon in Australian soil to support national carbon accounting and monitoring under climate change. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **20**, 2953–2970, doi:10.1111/gcb.12569. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12569 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Vitousek, S., P. L. Barnard, C. H. Fletcher, N. Frazer, L. Erikson, and C. D. Storlazzi, 2017: Doubling of coastal flooding frequency within decades due to sea-level rise. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 1399, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-01362-7. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-01362-7 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

Vogl, A. L., B. P. Bryant, J. E. Hunink, S. Wolny, C. Apse, and P. Droogers, 2017: Valuing investments in sustainable land management in the Upper Tana River basin, Kenya. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **195**, 78–91, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2016.10.013. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030147971630785X (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Vogt, J. V., U. Safriel, G. Von Maltitz, Y. Sokona, R. Zougmore, G. Bastin, and J. Hill, 2011: Monitoring and assessment of land degradation and desertification: Towards new conceptual and integrated approaches. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **22**, 150–165, doi:10.1002/ldr.1075. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.1075 (Accessed September 26, 2018).

Volkova, L., H. Bi, J. Hilton, and C. J. Weston, 2017: Impact of mechanical thinning on forest carbon, fuel hazard and simulated fire behaviour in Eucalyptus delegatensis forest of south-eastern Australia. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **405**, 92–100, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2017.09.032.

——, S. H. Roxburgh, C. J. Weston, R. G. Benyon, A. L. Sullivan, and P. J. Polglase, 2018: Importance of disturbance history on net primary productivity in the world’s most productive forests and implications for the global carbon cycle. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **24**, 4293–4303, doi:10.1111/gcb.14309.

van Wagner, C. E., 1978: Age-class distribution and the forest fire cycle. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **8**, 220–227, doi:10.1139/x78-034. http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/x78-034 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Wagner, L. E., 2013: A history of Wind Erosion Prediction Models in the United States Department of Agriculture: The Wind Erosion Prediction System (WEPS). *Aeolian Res.*, **10**, 9–24, doi:10.1016/J.AEOLIA.2012.10.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1875963712000389 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Wairiu, M., 2017: Land degradation and sustainable land management practices in Pacific Island Countries. *Reg. Environ. Chang.*, **17**, 1053–1064, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1041-0.

Waldron, A., D. Garrity, Y. Malhi, C. Girardin, D. C. Miller, and N. Seddon, 2017: Agroforestry Can Enhance Food Security While Meeting Other Sustainable Development Goals. *Trop. Conserv. Sci.*, **10**, 194008291772066, doi:10.1177/1940082917720667. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940082917720667 (Accessed May 21, 2018).

Walsh, J. R., S. R. Carpenter, and M. J. Vander Zanden, 2016a: Invasive species triggers a massive loss of ecosystem services through a trophic cascade. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **113**, 4081–4085, doi:10.1073/pnas.1600366113. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1600366113 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Walsh, K. J. E., and Coauthors, 2016b: Tropical cyclones and climate change. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 65–89, doi:10.1002/wcc.371. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/wcc.371 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

Walter Anthony, K., R. Daanen, P. Anthony, T. Schneider von Deimling, C.-L. Ping, J. P. Chanton, and G. Grosse, 2016: Methane emissions proportional to permafrost carbon thawed in Arctic lakes since the 1950s. *Nat. Geosci.*, **9**, 679–682, doi:10.1038/ngeo2795. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2795 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Wang, G., S. Mang, H. Cai, S. Liu, Z. Zhang, L. Wang, and J. L. Innes, 2016a: Integrated watershed management: evolution, development and emerging trends. *J. For. Res.*, **27**, 967–994, doi:10.1007/s11676-016-0293-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11676-016-0293-3 (Accessed April 17, 2019).

Wang, J., Z. Xiong, and Y. Kuzyakov, 2016b: Biochar stability in soil: meta-analysis of decomposition and priming effects. *GCB Bioenergy*, **8**, 512–523, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12266. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcbb.12266 (Accessed December 1, 2017).

Wang, J., S. Yi, M. Li, L. Wang, and C. Song, 2018: Effects of sea level rise, land subsidence, bathymetric change and typhoon tracks on storm flooding in the coastal areas of Shanghai. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **621**, 228–234, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.11.224. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969717332825 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

Wang, W., J. Sardans, C. Wang, C. Zeng, C. Tong, D. Asensio, and J. Peñuelas, 2017a: Relationships between the potential production of the greenhouse gases CO2, CH4 and N2O and soil concentrations of C, N and P across 26 paddy fields in southeastern China. *Atmos. Environ.*, **164**, 458–467, doi:10.1016/J.ATMOSENV.2017.06.023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231017304041 (Accessed November 2, 2018).

Wang, Z., T. Hoffmann, J. Six, J. O. Kaplan, G. Govers, S. Doetterl, and K. Van Oost, 2017b: Human-induced erosion has offset one-third of carbon emissions from land cover change. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 345–349, doi:10.1038/nclimate3263. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nclimate3263 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Ward, C., L. Stringer, and G. Holmes, 2018: Changing governance, changing inequalities: Protected area co-management and access to forest ecosystem services: a Madagascar case study. *Ecosyst. Serv.*, **30**, 137–148, doi:10.1016/J.ECOSER.2018.01.014. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212041617304291 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Ward, D., 2005: Do we understand the causes of bush encroachment in African savannas? *African J. Range Forage Sci.*, **22**, 101–105, doi:10.2989/10220110509485867. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2989/10220110509485867 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Warren, A., 2002: Land degradation is contextual. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **13**, 449–459, doi:10.1002/ldr.532. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.532 (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Warren, R., J. Price, J. VanDerWal, S. Cornelius, and H. Sohl, 2018: The implications of the United Nations Paris Agreement on climate change for globally significant biodiversity areas. *Clim. Change*, **147**, 395–409, doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2158-6. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10584-018-2158-6 (Accessed March 14, 2019).

Watson, R. T., I. R. Noble, B. Bolin, N. H. Ravindranath, D. J. Verardo, and D. J. Dokken, 2000: *Land use, land-use change, and forestry*. R.T. Watson, I.R. Noble, B. Bolin, N.H. Ravindranath, D.J. Verardo, and D.J. Dokken, Eds. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 370 pp. http://98.131.92.124/sites/default/files/2000 Watson IPCC.pdf (Accessed May 16, 2018).

Webb, N. P., and Coauthors, 2016: The National Wind Erosion Research Network: Building a standardized long-term data resource for aeolian research, modeling and land management. *Aeolian Res.*, **22**, 23–36, doi:10.1016/J.AEOLIA.2016.05.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1875963716300568 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

——, and Coauthors, 2017a: Enhancing Wind Erosion Monitoring and Assessment for U.S. Rangelands. *Rangelands*, **39**, 85–96, doi:10.1016/J.RALA.2017.04.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0190052817300160 (Accessed March 18, 2019).

——, N. A. Marshall, L. C. Stringer, M. S. Reed, A. Chappell, and J. E. Herrick, 2017b: Land degradation and climate change: building climate resilience in agriculture. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **15**, 450–459, doi:10.1002/fee.1530. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/fee.1530 (Accessed December 20, 2017).

Wei, W., and Coauthors, 2016: Global synthesis of the classifications, distributions, benefits and issues of terracing. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **159**, 388–403, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2016.06.010. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825216301313 (Accessed October 28, 2018).

Wei, X., M. Shao, W. Gale, and L. Li, 2015: Global pattern of soil carbon losses due to the conversion of forests to agricultural land. *Sci. Rep.*, **4**, 4062, doi:10.1038/srep04062. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep04062 (Accessed February 22, 2019).

Weichselgartner, J., and I. Kelman, 2015: Geographies of resilience. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, **39**, 249–267, doi:10.1177/0309132513518834. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132513518834 (Accessed March 30, 2019).

Weinzierl, T., J. Wehberg, J. Böhner, and O. Conrad, 2016: Spatial Assessment of Land Degradation Risk for the Okavango River Catchment, Southern Africa. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **27**, 281–294, doi:10.1002/ldr.2426.

Weng, Z., and Coauthors, 2017: Biochar built soil carbon over a decade by stabilizing rhizodeposits. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 371–376, doi:10.1038/nclimate3276http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v7/n5/abs/nclimate3276.html #supplementary-information. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3276.

Weng, Z. (Han), L. Van Zwieten, B. P. Singh, E. Tavakkoli, S. Kimber, S. Morris, L. M. Macdonald, and A. Cowie, 2018: The accumulation of rhizodeposits in organo-mineral fractions promoted biochar-induced negative priming of native soil organic carbon in Ferralsol. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **118**, 91–96, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2017.12.008.

Weng, Z. H. (Han), L. Van Zwieten, B. P. Singh, S. Kimber, S. Morris, A. Cowie, and L. M. Macdonald, 2015: Plant-biochar interactions drive the negative priming of soil organic carbon in an annual ryegrass field system. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **90**, 111–121, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.08.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071715002746 (Accessed December 2, 2017).

Wentworth, J., 2017: *Urban Green Infrastructure and Ecosystem Services*. London, UK, UK, 24 pp. https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/POST-PB-0026.

van der Werf, G. R., and Coauthors, 2017: Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, **9**, 697–720, doi:10.5194/essd-9-697-2017.

Werner, F., R. Taverna, P. Hofer, E. Thürig, and E. Kaufmann, 2010: National and global greenhouse gas dynamics of different forest management and wood use scenarios: a model-based assessment. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **13**, 72–85, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2009.10.004. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901109001622 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Wessels, K. ., S. . Prince, P. . Frost, and D. van Zyl, 2004: Assessing the effects of human-induced land degradation in the former homelands of northern South Africa with a 1 km AVHRR NDVI time-series. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **91**, 47–67, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2004.02.005. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425704000653 (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Wessels, K. J., S. D. Prince, J. Malherbe, J. Small, P. E. Frost, and D. VanZyl, 2007: Can human-induced land degradation be distinguished from the effects of rainfall variability? A case study in South Africa. *J. Arid Environ.*, **68**, 271–297, doi:10.1016/j.jaridenv.2006.05.015. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S014019630600190X (Accessed October 19, 2017).

——, F. van den Bergh, and R. J. Scholes, 2012: Limits to detectability of land degradation by trend analysis of vegetation index data. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **125**, 10–22, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2012.06.022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425712002581 (Accessed May 25,

2018).

Westra, S., and Coauthors, 2014: Future changes to the intensity and frequency of short-duration extreme rainfall. *Rev. Geophys.*, **52**, 522–555, doi:10.1002/2014RG000464. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2014RG000464 (Accessed October 26, 2018).

White, J. W., G. Hoogenboom, B. A. Kimball, and G. W. Wall, 2011: Methodologies for simulating impacts of climate change on crop production. *F. Crop. Res.*, **124**, 357–368, doi:10.1016/J.FCR.2011.07.001. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378429011002395 (Accessed May 31, 2018).

Wicke, B., E. Smeets, V. Dornburg, B. Vashev, T. Gaiser, W. Turkenburg, and A. Faaij, 2011: The global technical and economic potential of bioenergy from salt-affected soils. *Energy Environ. Sci.*, **4**, 2669, doi:10.1039/c1ee01029h.

——, P. Verweij, H. van Meijl, D. P. van Vuuren, and A. P. Faaij, 2012: Indirect land use change: review of existing models and strategies for mitigation. *Biofuels*, **3**, 87–100, doi:10.4155/bfs.11.154. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.4155/bfs.11.154 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Widgren, M., and J. E. G. Sutton, 2004: *Islands of intensive agriculture in Eastern Africa : past & present*. Ohio University Press, Currey, Oxford, 160 pp. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A185221&dswid=-9114 (Accessed March 27, 2019).

Wieczorek, A. J., 2018: Sustainability transitions in developing countries: Major insights and their implications for research and policy. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **84**, 204–216, doi:10.1016/J.ENVSCI.2017.08.008. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901117308092 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Wiesmair, M., A. Otte, and R. Waldhardt, 2017: Relationships between plant diversity, vegetation cover, and site conditions: implications for grassland conservation in the Greater Caucasus. *Biodivers. Conserv.*, **26**, 273–291, doi:10.1007/s10531-016-1240-5. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10531-016-1240-5 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Wigley, B. J., W. J. Bond, and M. T. Hoffman, 2010: Thicket expansion in a South African savanna under divergent land use: local vs. global drivers? *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **16**, 964–976, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02030.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02030.x (Accessed February 16, 2018).

Van Wilgen, B. W., N. Govender, H. C. Biggs, D. Ntsala, and X. N. Funda, 2004: Response of Savanna Fire Regimes to Changing Fire-Management Policies in a Large African National Park. *Conserv. Biol.*, **18**, 1533–1540, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00362.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00362.x (Accessed May 8, 2018).

Wilhelm, J. A., and R. G. Smith, 2018: Ecosystem services and land sparing potential of urban and peri-urban agriculture: A review. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*, **33**, 481–494, doi:10.1017/S1742170517000205. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1742170517000205/type/journal_article (Accessed October 31, 2018).

Wilson, D., and Coauthors, 2016: Greenhouse gas emission factors associated with rewetting of organic soils. *Mires Peat*, doi:10.19189/MaP.2016.OMB.222.

Wilson, G. A., and Coauthors, 2017: Social Memory and the Resilience of Communities Affected by Land Degradation. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **28**, 383–400, doi:10.1002/ldr.2669. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2669 (Accessed April 6, 2019).

Winder, R., E. Nelson, and T. Beardmore, 2011: Ecological implications for assisted migration in Canadian forests. *For. Chron.*, **87**, 731–744, doi:10.5558/tfc2011-090. https://doi.org/10.5558/tfc2011-090.

WOCAT, WOCAT (World overview of conservation approaches and technologies). *Glossary*,. https://www.wocat.net/en/glossary.

Wong, P. P., I. J. Losada, J. P. Gattuso, J. Hinkel, A. Khattabi, K. L. McInnes, Y. Saito, and A. Sallenger, 2014: Coastal systems and low-lying areas. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, C.B. Field et al., Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 361–409.

Woods, J., L. R. Lynd, M. Laser, M. Batistella, V. D. de Castro, K. Kline, and A. Faaij, 2015: Land and Bioenergy. *Bioenergy & Sustainability: bridging the gaps - Scope Bioenergy*, G.M. Souza, R.L. Victoria, C.A. Joly, and L.M. Verdade, Eds., SCOPE, Paris, 258–300 http://www.bioenfapesp.org/scopebioenergy/index.php/32-uncategorised/100-scope-synthesis-volume (Accessed April 12, 2019).

Woolf, D., J. E. Amonette, F. A. Street-Perrott, J. Lehmann, and S. Joseph, 2010: Sustainable biochar to mitigate global climate change. *Nat. Commun.*, **1**, 56.

——, and Coauthors, 2018: Biochar for Climate Change Mitigation. *Soil and Climate*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL : CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. | Series: Advances in soil science, 219–248 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780429945458/chapters/10.1201/b21225-8 (Accessed April 7, 2019).

World Bank, 2009: *Environmental crisis or sustainable development opportunity? Transforming the charcoal sector in Tanzania*. Washington, DC, https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2865/551400ESW0P1201PE1Charcoal1TZ1FINAL.pdf?sequence=1.

——, 2016: *The Role of Green Infrastructure Solutions in Urban Flood Risk Management*. Washington DC, USA, USA, 18 pp. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/841391474028584058/text/108291-WP-P156654-PUBLIC-ABSTRACT-SENT-WBUFCOPKnowledgeNoteGreenInfrastructureSolutions.txt.

Wu, H., and Coauthors, 2017a: The interactions of composting and biochar and their implications for soil amendment and pollution remediation: a review. *Crit. Rev. Biotechnol.*, **37**, 754–764, doi:10.1080/07388551.2016.1232696. https://doi.org/10.1080/07388551.2016.1232696.

Wu, J., J. Xiong, C. Hu, Y. Shi, K. Wang, and D. Zhang, 2015: Temperature sensitivity of soil bacterial community along contrasting warming gradient. *Appl. Soil Ecol.*, **94**, 40–48, doi:10.1016/J.APSOIL.2015.04.018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0929139315300044 (Accessed May 2, 2018).

Wu, Y., E. Chan, J. R. Melton, and D. L. Verseghy, 2017b: A map of global peatland distribution created using machine learning for use in terrestrial ecosystem and earth system models. *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss*, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-152.

Wu, Z., P. Dijkstra, G. W. Koch, J. Peñuelas, and B. A. Hungate, 2011: Responses of terrestrial ecosystems to temperature and precipitation change: a meta-analysis of experimental manipulation. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, **17**, 927–942, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02302.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02302.x (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Wuest, S. B., J. D. Williams, and H. T. Gollany, 2006: Journal of soil and water conservation. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, **61**, 218–223. http://www.jswconline.org/content/61/4/218.short (Accessed October 18, 2018).

Xiao, L., X. Yang, H. Cai, L. Xiao, X. Yang, and H. Cai, 2017: The Indirect Roles of Roads in Soil Erosion Evolution in Jiangxi Province, China: A Large Scale Perspective. *Sustainability*, **9**, 129, doi:10.3390/su9010129. http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/9/1/129 (Accessed March 5, 2019).

Xie, J., and Coauthors, 2016: Ten-year variability in ecosystem water use efficiency in an oak-dominated temperate forest under a warming climate. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **218–219**, 209–217, doi:10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2015.12.059. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168192315300204 (Accessed March 14,

2019).

Xu, G., Y. Zhang, H. Shao, and J. Sun, 2016: Pyrolysis temperature affects phosphorus transformation in biochar: Chemical fractionation and 31P NMR analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.*, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.081.

Xu, J., R. Yin, Z. Li, and C. Liu, 2006: China's ecological rehabilitation: Unprecedented efforts, dramatic impacts, and requisite policies. *Ecol. Econ.*, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.05.008.

Xu, J., P. J. Morris, J. Liu, and J. Holden, 2018a: PEATMAP: Refining estimates of global peatland distribution based on a meta-analysis. *Catena*, **160**, 134–140, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2017.09.010.

Xu, X., K. Cheng, H. Wu, J. Sun, Q. Yue, and G. Pan, 2019: Greenhouse gas mitigation potential in crop production with biochar soil amendment-a carbon footprint assessment for cross-site field experiments from China. *GCB Bioenergy*, **11**, 592–605, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12561. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcbb.12561 (Accessed April 7, 2019).

Xu, Z., C. E. Smyth, T. C. Lemprière, G. J. Rampley, and W. A. Kurz, 2018b: Climate change mitigation strategies in the forest sector: biophysical impacts and economic implications in British Columbia, Canada. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **23**, 257–290, doi:10.1007/s11027-016-9735-7. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11027-016-9735-7 (Accessed May 26, 2018).

Yamanoi, K., Y. Mizoguchi, and H. Utsugi, 2015: Effects of a windthrow disturbance on the carbon balance of a broadleaf deciduous forest in Hokkaido, Japan. *Biogeosciences*, **12**, 6837–6851, doi:10.5194/bg-12-6837-2015.

Yang, J., G. Cao, D. Han, H. Yuan, Y. Hu, P. Shi, and Y. Chen, 2019: Deformation of the aquifer system under groundwater level fluctuations and its implication for land subsidence control in the Tianjin coastal region. *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, **191**, 162, doi:10.1007/s10661-019-7296-4. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10661-019-7296-4 (Accessed March 17, 2019).

Yang, M., F. E. Nelson, N. I. Shiklomanov, D. Guo, and G. Wan, 2010: Permafrost degradation and its environmental effects on the Tibetan Plateau: A review of recent research. *Earth-Science Rev.*, **103**, 31–44, doi:10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2010.07.002. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825210000826 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Yang, Y., R. J. Donohue, T. R. McVicar, M. L. Roderick, and H. E. Beck, 2016: Long-term CO_2 fertilization increases vegetation productivity and has little effect on hydrological partitioning in tropical rainforests. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, **121**, 2125–2140, doi:10.1002/2016JG003475. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2016JG003475 (Accessed October 24, 2018).

Yao, L., L. Chen, W. Wei, and R. Sun, 2015: Potential reduction in urban runoff by green spaces in Beijing: A scenario analysis. *Urban For. Urban Green.*, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2015.02.014.

Yengoh, G. T., and J. Ardö, 2014: Crop Yield Gaps in Cameroon. *Ambio*, **43**, 175–190, doi:10.1007/s13280-013-0428-0. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13280-013-0428-0 (Accessed October 31, 2018).

——, D. Dent, L. Olsson, A. Tengberg, and C. J. Tucker, 2015: *Use of the normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) to assess land degradation at multiple scales : current status, future trends, and practical considerations*. Springer, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London, 110 pp.

Yin, R., 2009: *An Integrated Assessment of China's Ecological Restoration Programs. Spronger, NewYork*.

Young, A., 1995: *Agroforestry for soil conservation*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 194 pp. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19986773686 (Accessed October 22, 2018).

Young, A., 1999: Is there Really Spare Land? A Critique of Estimates of Available Cultivable Land in Developing Countries. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **1**, 3–18, doi:10.1023/A:1010055012699.

http://link.springer.com/10.1023/A:1010055012699 (Accessed April 11, 2019).

Young, E., D. Muir, A. Dawson, and S. Dawson, 2014: Community driven coastal management: An example of the implementation of a coastal defence bund on South Uist, Scottish Outer Hebrides. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **94**, 30–37, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.01.001.

Yu, H., and Coauthors, 2015: The fertilizing role of African dust in the Amazon rainforest: A first multiyear assessment based on data from Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **42**, 1984–1991, doi:10.1002/2015GL063040. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2015GL063040 (Accessed February 27, 2019).

Zabel, F., B. Putzenlechner, and W. Mauser, 2014: Global Agricultural Land Resources – A High Resolution Suitability Evaluation and Its Perspectives until 2100 under Climate Change Conditions. *PLoS One*, **9**, e107522, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107522. http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107522 (Accessed May 22, 2018).

Zahawi, R. A., G. Duran, and U. Kormann, 2015: Sixty-Seven Years of Land-Use Change in Southern Costa Rica. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0143554, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0143554. http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143554 (Accessed October 1, 2018).

Zedler, J. B., 2000: Progress in wetland restoration ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **15**, 402–407, doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01959-5. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534700019595 (Accessed May 24, 2018).

Zeng, Z., and Coauthors, 2017: Climate mitigation from vegetation biophysical feedbacks during the past three decades. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **7**, 432–436, doi:10.1038/nclimate3299. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3299 (Accessed March 16, 2019).

Zhang, M., and Coauthors, 2017: A global review on hydrological responses to forest change across multiple spatial scales: Importance of scale, climate, forest type and hydrological regime. *J. Hydrol.*, **546**, 44–59, doi:10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2016.12.040. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169416308307 (Accessed October 27, 2018).

Zhang, P., G. Shao, G. Zhao, D. C. Le Master, G. R. Parker, J. B. Dunning, and Q. Li, 2000: China's forest policy for the 21st century. *Science (80-.).*, doi:10.1126/science.288.5474.2135.

Zhang, X., and Coauthors, 2013: Using biochar for remediation of soils contaminated with heavy metals and organic pollutants. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, doi:10.1007/s11356-013-1659-0.

Zhang, X. C., and M. A. Nearing, 2005: Impact of climate change on soil erosion, runoff, and wheat productivity in central Oklahoma. *CATENA*, **61**, 185–195, doi:10.1016/J.CATENA.2005.03.009. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0341816205000494 (Accessed May 23, 2018).

Zhou, Z., C. Wang, and Y. Luo, 2018: Effects of forest degradation on microbial communities and soil carbon cycling: A global meta-analysis. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **27**, 110–124, doi:10.1111/geb.12663. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/geb.12663 (Accessed September 27, 2018).

Zhu, Q., X. Yang, B. Yu, M. Tulau, S. McInnes-Clarke, R. H. Nolan, Z. Du, and Q. Yu, 2019: Estimation of event-based rainfall erosivity from radar after wildfire. *L. Degrad. Dev.*, **30**, 33–48, doi:10.1002/ldr.3146. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.3146 (Accessed March 8, 2019).

Zimmerer, K. S., 1993: Soil Erosion and Social (Dis)Courses in Cochabamba, Bolivia: Perceiving the Nature of Environmental Degradation. *Econ. Geogr.*, **69**, 312, doi:10.2307/143453. https://www.jstor.org/stable/143453?origin=crossref (Accessed April 28, 2018).

Zölch, T., J. Maderspacher, C. Wamsler, and S. Pauleit, 2016: Using green infrastructure for urban climate-proofing: An evaluation of heat mitigation measures at the micro-scale. *Urban For. Urban Green.*, **20**, 305–316, doi:10.1016/J.UFUG.2016.09.011. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1618866716301686 (Accessed May 17,

2018).

Zomer, R. J., H. Neufeldt, J. Xu, A. Ahrends, D. Bossio, A. Trabucco, M. van Noordwijk, and M. Wang, 2016: Global Tree Cover and Biomass Carbon on Agricultural Land: The contribution of agroforestry to global and national carbon budgets. *Sci. Rep.*, **6**, 29987, doi:10.1038/srep29987. http://www.nature.com/articles/srep29987 (Accessed April 3, 2019).

Zulu, L. C., 2010: The forbidden fuel: Charcoal, urban woodfuel demand and supply dynamics, community forest management and woodfuel policy in Malawi. *Energy Policy*, **38**, 3717–3730, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.02.050. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510001540.

Zulu, L. C., and R. B. Richardson, 2013: Charcoal, livelihoods, and poverty reduction: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **17**, 127–137, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2012.07.007. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0973082612000506.

Van Zwieten, L., S. Kimber, S. Morris, K. Y. Chan, A. Downie, J. Rust, S. Joseph, and A. Cowie, 2010: Effects of biochar from slow pyrolysis of papermill waste on agronomic performance and soil fertility. *Plant Soil*, **327**, 235–246, doi:10.1007/s11104-009-0050-x. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-009-0050-x (Accessed April 2, 2019).

Van Zwieten, L., T. Rose, D. Herridge, S. Kimber, J. Rust, A. Cowie, and S. Morris, 2015: Enhanced biological N2 fixation and yield of faba bean (Vicia faba L.) in an acid soil following biochar addition: dissection of causal mechanisms. *Plant Soil*, **395**, 7–20, doi:10.1007/s11104-015-2427-3. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-015-2427-3 (Accessed April 2, 2019).