December 2010



ESA, San Diego

Assessing ecosystem services provided by invertebrates in farmland: A 'bottomup' approach

> Steve Wratten Bio-Protection Research Centre Lincoln University









Ecosystem function + value to mankind = Ecosystem service

e.g. predation (an EF) + value to mankind becomes an ES (biological control)



Valuable ecosystem services provided by invertebrates include: pollination biological control nutrient cycling





13 years ago, ES globally were worth US\$33 trillion/year

(Costanza et al.)



But Costanza seriously under-valued farmland ES



Table 2 Summary of	average glo	bal value of	f annual ec	osystem se	rvices															
								Ecosy	vstem seriv	ces (1994 L	JS\$ ha ⁻¹ yr-	1)								
Biome	Area (ha $\times 10^6$)	1 Gas regulation	2 Climate regulation	3 Disturbance regulation	4 Water regulation	5 Water supply	6 Erosion control	7 Soil formation	8 Nutrient cycling	9 Waste treatment	10 Pollination	11 Biological control	12 Habitat/ refugia	13 Food production	14 Raw materials	15 Genetic resources	16 Recreation	17 Cultural	Total value per ha (\$ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	Total global flow value (\$yr ⁻¹ × 10 ⁹)
Marine	36,302																		577	20,949
Open ocean	33,200	38							118			5		15	0			76	252	8,381
Coastal	3,102			88					3,677			38	8	93	4		82	62	4,052	12,568
Estuaries Seagrass/ algae beds Coral reefs Shelf	180 200 62 2,660			567 2,750					21,100 19,002 1,431	58		78 5 39	131 7	521 220 68	25 2 27 2		381 3,008	29 1 70	22,832 19,004 6,075 1,610	4,110 3,801 375 4,283
Terrestrial	15,323																		804	12,319
Forest	4,855		141	2	2	3	96	10	361	87		2		43	138	16	66	2	969	4,706
Tropical Temperate/boreal	1,900 2,955		223 88	5	6 0	8	245	10 10	922	87 87		4		32 50	315 25	41	112 36	2 2	2,007 302	3,813 894
Grass/rangelands	3,898	7	0		3		29	1		87	25	23		67		0	2		232	906
Wetlands	330	133		4,539	15	3,800				4,177			304	256	106	92	574	881	14,785	4,879
Tidal marsh/ mangroves Swamps/ floodplains	165 165	265		1,839 7,240	30	7,600				6,696 1,659			169 439	466 47	162 49		658 491	1,761	9,990 19,580	1,648 3,231
Lakes/rivers	200				5,445	2,117				665				41			230		8,498	1,700
Desert	1,925																			
Tundra	743																			
lce/rock	1,640																		\frown	
Cropland	1,400										14	24		54					92	128
Urban	332																			
Total	51,625	1,341	684	1,779	1,115	1,692	576	53	17,075	2,277	117	417	124	1,386	721	79	815	3,015		33,268

Numbers in the body of the table are in ha^{-1} yr⁻¹. Row and column totals are in $yr^{-1} \times 10^9$, column totals are the sum of the products of the per ha services in the table and the area of each biome, not the sum of the per ha services themselves. Shaded cells indicate services that do not occur or are known to be negligible. Open cells indicate lack of available information.

Bio-Protection

Therefore, a challenge to 'invertebrate' agro-ecologists – to quantify and enhance farmland ES, ideally addressing multiple ES













But biological control can be a powerful ES











A British monoculture





An Australian monoculture 📢





A New Zealand monoculture? Photo: Kevin Judd – with permission





Biodiversity loss and reduced ecological resistance in 'engineered' landscapes is normal but the consequences of the loss can be difficult to detect





So, use prey baits to detect declines in background biocontrol of pests







Economic value of biological control of aphids in organic fields



Economic value of biological control of aphids in conventional fields



Total avoided cost includes external cost



But how much biodiversity and what type?









Even as a single hair casts a shadow does a weed steal profit from the harvest.



Biodiversity - Ecosystem functioning debate



Biodiversity (species richness)

Cardinale *et al.* 2006 (*Nature*) used a meta-analysis to conclude:



Biodiversity - Ecosystem functioning debate



Biodiversity (species richness)

But Heemsbergen *et al* 2004 (*Science*) said **traits** more important



Trait diversity and system functioning



Functioning related to trait diversity

Key species:

Lumbricus rubellus



Heemsbergen et al. 2004







Shefter Nector Alternative prey Releative prey







Nectar sugar ratios for SNAP?



Sugar ratio of various plant species



Bio-Protection

Parasitoid longevity on a range of sugar ratios



Bio-Protection



—Thomas Henry Huxley





Not eclectic choices of species – lab and field experimentation on traits first









Earthbound Farms, Mission Organics, CA: sweet alyssum, Lobularia maritima in lettuce crops – an eclectic choice, but it works













and buckwheat













The key biocontrol agents targetted include parasitic wasps





Buckwheat in vines also provides SNAP



Light brown apple moth Epiphyas damage



Proportion of bunches infested with leafrollers. Economic threshold for leafrollers shown



Native plants in NZ vines to provide multiple ES



Native plants under grape vines









The vineyard landscape of the future?





What if we engineered farming for more ES e.g., combined food, energy and ecosystem services (CFEES)?

















Bait lamina probes





If 25% of EU25 farmland could enhance these two ES to their level in organic farms, their total ES value would be \$160 billion pa. EU subsidies are \$150 billion p.a., for 'environmental' schemes which largely don't work (Kleijn et al. 2006)



Message: enhance invertebrate-driven multiple ES on farmland



December 2010



ESA, San Diego

Assessing ecosystem services provided by invertebrates in farmland: A 'bottomup' approach

> Steve Wratten Bio-Protection Research Centre Lincoln University

