Journal of Veterinary Medicine and Health

Extended Abstract Open Access

Integrating root crops with animal husbandry for providing renewable energy in rural remote regions

Widodo Yudi

Indonesian Legume and Tuber Crops Research Institute, Indonesia

Abstract

Energy has to be available everywhere in any location including in rural remote areas where communities live. A major figure in developing countries, poor electricity were suffered by inhabitants of rural remote areas, due to wire connection from state is not available. Electrical fascility is providing for community who able to buy energy for their daily life. In fact at rural remote areas whereas agriculture is existing, biomass produced as byproduct from existing agriculture can be used as raw material to provide renewable energy with ecologically friendly. At least two of daily basic needs namely food preparation and light or heat have to be available. Cassava, sweet potato and the other root crops are mostly grown by farmers in rural areas. The main economical yield in the form of starchy root and tuber are directly for human consumption, however the abundance of biomass aside as source of feed, it also provide potential renewable energy by mixing with animal dunks. Methane released from this integration system can be burnt to prepare food as well as to provide light. By implementing this method, free methane emission into atmospheric zones is avoided, so indirectly converting methane as renewable energy is a part of the endeavor to reduce global warming. Waste from methane digester can be mixed with organic material for worm rearing as source of protein for fish and chicken as well. Worm dunk is spent for organic fertilizer of agricultural field to attain greener environment.

Introduction

Paradoxically, the quantity of crop–livestock farms is declining across Europe, despite the very fact that crop-livestock farms ar on paper optimum to boost the property of agriculture. to resolve this issue, crop–livestock integration could also be organized on the far side the farm level. for example, native teams of farmers will negociate land-use allocation patterns and exchange materials like manure, grain, and straw. Development of such a collective agricultural system raises queries, seldom documented within the literature, regarding the way to integrate crops and stock among farms, and also the consequences, impacts, and conditions of group action them. Here, we tend to review the various styles of crop–livestock integration on the far side the farm level, their potential advantages, and also the options of call support systems (DSS) required for the mixing method. we tend to establish 3 styles of crop–livestock integration on the far side the farm level: native existence, complementarity, and synergism, every with more and more stronger temporal, spatial, and structure coordination among farms.We tend to claim that the styles of integration enforced outline the character, area, and spatial configuration of crops, grasslands, and animals in farms and landscapes. In turn, these configurations influence the availability of scheme services. for example, we tend to show that the synergism variety of integration promotes soil fertility, erosion management, and field-level biological regulation services through structure coordination among farmers and spatiotemporal integration between crops, grasslands, and animals. we tend to found that social advantages of the synergism variety of integration embrace collective management of farmers. we tend to claim that style of the complementarity and synergism styles of crop–livestock integration will best be supported by collective democratic workshops involving farmers, agricultural consultants, and researchers. In these workshops, spatialized simulation modeling of crop–livestock integration among farms is that the basis for achieving the upscaling method concerned in group action on the far side the farm level. Facilitators of those workshops need to listen to the implications on governance and equity problems among farmers teams.

Agriculture of the hemisphere has long been driven by trends of specialization and intensification obligatory by regulation, political, and economic constraints (Lemaire et al. 2014; Peyraud et al. 2014; Russelle et al. 2007; Sulc and player 2007; Wilkins 2008). In specialised and intensive agricultural systems, management practices ar standardized, and supported the employment of technology like artificial inputs (e.g., pesticides and mineral fertilizers) and superior machinery. The offered technology is especially expected (i) to handle biophysical limits for agricultural production; (ii) to cut back the vulnerability of agricultural systems to external perturbations by artificializing agroecosystems, e.g., irrigation to supplement rainfall; and (iii) to cut back the work of farmers. Today, environmental and social impacts (water pollution, food pollution, etc.) associated with specialised and intensive agricultural systems (Horrigan et al. 2002) aren't any longer accepted by some members of society. As a response to those problems, many authors recommend developing a lot of integrated styles of agriculture to revive the property of agricultural systems (Bell and Moore 2012; Hendricksonetal. 2008; Russelle et al. 2007). Diversified and (horizontally) integrated agricultural systems promote ecological interactions over area and time between system elements (e.g., crops, grasslands, and animals) and make opportunities for synergistic resource transfers between them (Hendrickson et al. 2008; Kremen et al. 2012). they provide opportunities to substitute technologies (e.g., artificial inputs) and superior machinery employed in specialised and intensive agricultural systems with scheme services, like soil fertility or biological regulation of pests and diseases (Duru et al. 2015; Horlings and Marsden 2011; Power 2010). In AN agricultural context, scheme services ar the merchandise of interactions between farmland diversity (i.e., planned biodiversity—crops, animals, hedgerows, etc.—and associated biodiversity—soil flora and fauna, herbivores, etc. colonizing the farm; Altieri 1999) and tailored management practices that ar integrated over completely different temporal and spatial scales (Altieri 1999; Kremen et al. 2012). whereas soil fertility is managed at the sector level through acceptable crop rotations, intercropping, and tillage practices, biological regulation of pests is additionally managed at the landscape level thanks to the key role of crop spatial distribution, field margins, and hedges (Garbach et al. 2014; GABA et al. 2014; Landis et al. 2000; Power 2010; Rusch et al. 2010).

Crop–livestock systems (Fig. 1) ar advised as a theoretical ideal for implementing the principles of diversified and (horizontally) integrated agriculture (Hendrickson et al. 2008; Herrero et al. 2010; Lemaire et al. 2014; Ryschawy et al. 2014). nevertheless they need already declined in range in countries of the hemisphere, and also the trend towards specialization continues (Russelle et al. 2007; Peyraud et al. 2014; Veysset et al. 2014). to investigate this decline, 2 dynamics of specialization (i.e., a technique of production involving few or only 1 cropping or stock system; genus Bos and van Diamond State Ven 1999) should be assessed: specialization of crop production and of animal production implying abandonment of animal production and crop production, severally (Billen et al. 2010). Specialization of crop production is increasing, particularly in areas dominated by massive farm units (Peyraud et al. 2014). Integrated crop–livestock farmers abandon animal production for many reasons: (i) prices of energy and mineral chemical for specialised cereal cropping increase a lot of slowly than prices of labor needed for animal production (Peyraud et al. 2014); (ii) work simplification and management (especially by eliminating milking and calving) (Bell and Moore 2012; Bell et al. 2014; Doole et al. 2009; Sulcand player 2007);(iii) ever-changing laws, like norms on stock buildings, build upgrading farms prohibitively costly (Peyraud et al. 2014); and (iv) disappearance of offer chains that method and sell animal merchandise (e.g.,concentration of milk industries in specialised regions, disappearance of tiny slaughterhouses) (Moraine et al. 2014).