

CONTEXT PROFILE





FARMER

Luís Mendes – Herdade da Defesa da Pedra Alçada



INNOVATION

Forest management plan





MAIN DOMAIN OF THE INNOVATION

Improvement of grassland management



SOIL TYPE

Loam



AGROCLIMATIC AREA

Mediterranean south



MANAGEMENT

Pasture beef



TECHNICAL

Easy



FINANCE/INVESTMENT

Mid



MARKET

Local-rural



SOCIAL

Part-time farmer









Case Study: PT_04	Agroclimatic Zone								
Item (Key Innovation Elements)	Alpine	Atlantic Central	Atlantic North	Atlantic South	Boreal	Continental North	Continental South	Mediterranean North	Mediterranean South
Reduced paddock/field sizes for better management (30 ha/padock)	++	++	++	++	+	++	+++	+++	+++
Sire breed	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++
Forestry management plan	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++
Sheep to manage vegetation in olive groves	X	X	X	X	+	Χ	X	++	++
Agro-forestry – montado	+++	++	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	++	++













Implementation Gaps

- How did reduced sheep and cattle numbers affect profit
- Were the cork trees sown or already on the farm
- What is the benefit of the forest management plan
- What grasses were sown
- What are the benefits of the smaller paddock size

Research Gaps

- Best types of grasses to sow
- Optimum forest management plan

Suggestions to Adapt

- Demonstration
- Identification of markets





COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

INVESTMENT COSTS

Total initial investment costs at start up:	low
Initial authorisation costs (e.g. sanitary, veterinary, etc.)	not applicable/not known
Initial advisory costs	mid
Initial buildings and machineries	not applicable/not known
Initial certification costs	not applicable/not known
Initial working capital (personal qualification, marketing and promotion, etc.)	not applicable/not known

ON-GOING COSTS

On-going advisory costs	not applicable/not known
On-going certification costs	not applicable/not known
On-going buildings and machinery costs	high
On-going working capital	high

BENEFITS RELATIVE TO ORIGINAL SYSTEM

Economic

Reduction in energy consumption (electricity; fuel consumption)	high
Reduction in input use (fertilizers; pesticides; feed) etc.	mid
Payback period	high
Product value added	none or low
Additional farm income through agroecological/agri-environmental payment schemes	not applicable/not known

Environmental

Animal feed self-sufficiency increase	none or low
Biodiversity increase	none or low
Improved nitrogen cycling	none or low
Soil regeneration	none or low
Animal health and welfare improvement	none or low

Social

Workload reduction	none or low
Engagement of young generation	none or low

Literature

English

- Almeida, M., Azeda, C., Guiomar, N. et al. The effects of grazing management in montado fragmentation and heterogeneity. Agroforest Syst 90, 69–85 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-014-9778-2
- Godinho, S., Guiomar, N., Machado, R. et al. Assessment of environment, land management, and spatial variables on recent changes in montado land cover in southern Portugal. Agroforest Syst 90, 177–192 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-014-9757-7
- https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(99)00036-5
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2023.101524