

CARBON SEQUESTRATION IN AGROFORESTRY SYSTEMS BETWEEN CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE AND CONVENTIONAL PRACTICE IN THE ASAL AREA OF MACHAKOS COUNTY, KENYA

Vincent Rabach*^{1,2}, James Koske², Monicah Mucheru Muna², Jonathan Muriuki¹, Innocent Osoro Ngare³

¹ World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Nairobi, Kenya

² School of Environmental Studies, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya

³ School of Postgraduate and Research, Amoud University, Private Bag, Amoud Valley, Borama

*Corresponding author

Email: rabachv@gmail.com

Abstract. Dryland ecosystems have always been prone to relatively high vegetation and general environmental degradation; translating to changes in soil physical and chemical properties and massive carbon losses. Despite their vast surface area, Carbon sequestration therein still remains low. However, this low carbon means they are less saturated and therefore a tremendous potential therein to sequester more Carbon. Conservation agriculture with trees (CAWT) presents an opportunity to reduce the degradation and enhance the carbon stocks. This study was set to compare the biomass productivity and carbon sequestration potential of agroforestry between conventional and conservation agriculture practice. The study was carried out as part of ongoing experimentation established in short rain (SR) season of 2012 by the World Agroforestry Centre in a trial site at the Agricultural Training Centre (ATC) in Machakos county, Kenya. The trials adopted a split plot arranged in a randomized complete block design with two farming systems (conventional and conservation agriculture) as the main blocks, 7 treatments and three replicates, summing to a total of 42 plots. In the fields, two shrub species (*Calliandra calothyrsus* Meissn. and *Gliricidia sepium* Jacq.) were planted in three different spacing (1.5x1 m, 3x1 m, 4.5x1 m) for maize-legume intercropped. Trees were harvested by coppicing, weighed and leaf/twig samples taken for determination of biomass, which was then converted to Carbon using a conversion factor 0.5. The data was statistically analyzed using ANOVA and means separated using LSD at $p < 0.05$. Results showed significant increase in carbon sequestration under conservation agriculture ($p < 0.001$), with a yearly sequestration potential of between 12.8 and 24 Mg C/ha/yr compared to 11.6-23 Mg C/ha/yr for conventional practice. *Calliandra* also sequestered more carbon than *Gliricidia*. CAWT is therefore concluded to be a feasible way of increasing carbon stocks in the drylands.

Keywords: agroforestry; carbon sequestration; conventional agriculture; conservation agriculture with trees; carbon

1. Introduction

The large surface area of dry lands {about 6.15 billion hectares according to Lal, (2004) } gives them a more significant carbon sequestration potential (Lal et al., 2018) all over the globe although the plant biomass per unit area of dry lands is low (about 6 kilograms/m²) compared with many terrestrial ecosystems (about 10–18 kilograms) (UNDP et al., 2009). However, dryland soils being degraded is an implication that they are currently far from saturated with carbon and their potential to sequester carbon may be very high (Farage et al., 2003; Akpa et al., 2016). Alluding from the IPCC Synthesis Report, land degradation, common in the dry lands, is one of the most

important sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions globally, causing carbon emissions through vegetation destruction and aggravated soil erosion (IPCC, 2007b). These reduce the primary productivity and suppress the potential of the soil to store carbon besides losing the stored organic matter (IPCC, 2007a; Lal, 2011). The world agro ecosystem soils (including semi-arid lands) have lost 25 to 75% (78 ± 12 billion tons) of carbon through historic soil degradation and land use (Lal, 2011). There is need therefore to enhance carbon pool to improve soil quality and cope with climatic changes.

It is estimated that the dryland soils all over the globe contain about 40 times of carbon that is added to the atmosphere (241 pegas of soil organic carbon in dryland soils (Eswaran et al., 2000) compared to 6.3 pegas of carbon per year added to the atmosphere in the 1990s (Schimel et al., 2001). These areas therefore form a crucial part of the global carbon cycle and as such the proper management of this pool would aid in reduction in the emission of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere as Lal (2002) explains. It is however of deep concern that land degradation, desertification and environmental degradation have continued accentuating carbon loss (Hassan et al., 2016) in these regions, leading to further emissions (Lal, 2004). This is amidst the estimates of Lal (2001) that the dry lands have the potential to sequester 0.4-0.6 GtC annually upon restoration of their soils and prevention of more degradation. There is thus, in overall, a significant scope of sequestration that lies untapped and which can be done through improved land management practices.

Of importance to the improvement of soil organic pools is the enhancement of the efficiency of water use through prevention of losses due to evapotranspiration, surface run off and retention residue to decrease the soil temperatures (Batiano et al., 2000; Lal, 2004; Semenov et al., 2019). Moreover, there is need to improve soil quality, structure and moisture through conservation tillage (crop rotations, leguminous cover crops, minimum tillage) which will in turn lessen the risks of soil degradation and enhance soil organic pools in the dryland areas (Dalal, 1992; Ryan et al., 1997; Stewart and Robinson, 2000). That dryland carbon sequestration is also affected by biomass carbon sequestration warrants that biomass productivity in these areas is enhanced. Afforestation and agroforestry therefore come in handy in increasing the biomass productivity and thus enhance biomass carbon sequestration. The role of conservation agriculture with trees can therefore not be overlooked when it comes to dryland carbon sequestration.

Conservation agriculture with trees involves the intercropping of trees with crops (agroforestry) alongside practicing minimum tillage, soil cover and crops rotation (conservation agriculture) (Garrity, 2011) The two systems i.e. conservation agriculture and agroforestry have been practiced variedly. Conservation agriculture has been practiced for long especially in Zambia

and Malawi where farmers practice minimum tillage and integrate nitrogen fixing trees (*Faidherbia albida* Delile A. Chev.) within the crop fields (Garrity et al., 2010). He continues to elaborate that this is because most small holder farmers farm without mineral fertilizers and as such they fail to produce enough to sell in the market and thus need affordable means of production. Combining conservation agriculture and agroforestry practices maximizes the benefits of both in one system-conservation agriculture with trees (CAWT); which has several benefits as maintaining vegetative cover all year round; improving soil structure and infiltration; production of fodder, food, fuel and fiber; enhancement of carbon storage above and below ground and enhancing greater organic matter in soil surface residues (Makumba et al., 2007). Garrity (2011) note that conservation agriculture with trees sequesters much more carbon than conservation agriculture alone both above and below ground ($2.0-4.0 \text{ t C ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ and $0.2-0.4 \text{ t C ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$, respectively). This is about ten times faster than conservation agriculture only, meaning that conservation agriculture with tree systems have considerable potential for attraction of carbon offset payments that stimulate more carbon sequestration in food crop systems; thus enhancing the environment and small holder livelihoods.

Since carbon losses in dry lands are mainly from soil erosion and vegetation loss, options that reverse these two would be most appropriate in enhancing the soil carbon and increasing the carbon stock (Lal, 2002, 2015). A number of such strategies have been presented in order to enhance the soil carbon of the dry land zones. These are afforestation and tree maintenance, no-till farming, nutrient management, fallow, agroforestry, mulching, organic matter input maximization and the use of legumes (FAO, 2004; Lal, 2004; Lal, 2002). The interest in knowing the carbon sequestration potential of such strategies has thus grown over the recent years and conservation agriculture with trees fits in well since it combines all these strategies.

The inclusion of trees in agricultural landscapes often improves productivity of the farming systems thereby providing relevant opportunities to create carbon sinks (Albrecht & Kandji, 2003; Garrity et al., 2010; Rahman et al., 2016). In agroforestry systems, abundant litter from pruning biomass and root decay improves the soil physical properties and increase soil organic matter (SOM). Albrecht & Kandji (2003) further explain that establishment of agroforestry on land is currently one of the most promising strategies to raise carbon stocks on currently productive land without compromising food and fiber production. Agroforestry systems have higher potential to sequester carbon than crop fields and lead to a higher efficiency in biomass production and carbon sequestration vis-a-vis monoculture systems (Aertsens et al., 2013)

Conservation agriculture as the other component in conservation agriculture with trees operates on a principle of minimum soil disturbance and raises the SOC concentration both near

the surface and in deeper layers compared to conventional tillage, which induces rapid mineralization of organic matter, leading to carbon and nitrogen losses from the soil (Chivenge et al., 2007). Aertsens et al., (2013) noted that reduced tillage has a potential effect on carbon sequestration. Conservation agriculture therefore is among the panaceas to the low carbon in the arid and semi-arid zones amongst other problems of soil fertility and moisture scarcity. Smith et al., (2005) suggest that other management strategies that can be combined with such no-tillage practices to increase the production of crops and contribute to carbon sequestration include increase in organic inputs through manure; mulching; cover crops; improved rotations and agroforestry.

In line with this background therefore, the study was set to 1) determine above and below ground biomass when trees are integrated into farms both conventionally and under conservation agriculture, 2) estimate and compare the quantity of carbon sequestered for conservation (CA) and conventional agriculture (CoA) both with and without trees and 3) determine the carbon sequestration potential for the two farming systems when trees are integrated with crops at different spatial patterns.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

The study was carried out at on-station demonstration plots earlier established by ICRAF at the Machakos Agricultural Training Centre at coordinates E037°14.303' and S 01°32.738' in Machakos County (Figure 1). Machakos is an administrative County in Kenya and lies in the sub-humid and semi-arid eastern, Kenya covering an area of about 6,281.4km² located 64 km southeast of Nairobi city. It stretches from latitudes 0° 4' to 1° 31' South and longitudes 36° 45' to 37° 45' east and is administratively divided into 12 divisions, 62 locations and 225 sub locations (Jaertzold et al., 2007). The region experiences annual mean temperature and rainfall range of 17.7 to 24.5° C and 700 to 1300 mm respectively. The rainfall is bimodal with long rains (LR) from mid-March to June and short rains (SR) from late October to December hence potential of two annual cropping seasons. The average seasonal average rainfall range is 250mm and 400mm, but highly variable (coefficient of variation range of 45% to 58 %), characterized by prolonged dry-spells, frequent crop failure and high food insecurity (KARI, 1997) The soils are predominantly Luvisols, Ferralsols and Acrisols (FAO, 2009), which are characteristic of low water holding capacity, shallow and sandy, high deficiency in phosphorus and nitrogen and low organic carbon contents of between 0.5 – 1.0% (Gicheru and Ita, 1987; Jaertzold et al., 2007).




Figure 1: Map of study area-Machakos Agricultural Training Centre

2.2. Experimental Design

The experiment ran from Long Rains 2013 (LR 2013) to Long Rains 2014 (LR 2014). At the inception of the project, researcher managed trials on integration of selected leguminous shrubs (*Gliricidia sepium*, *Calliandra calothyrsus* and *Cajanas cajan* (Pigeon pea)) into a maize-legume intercropping system under CA and Conventional agriculture (henceforth COA) were set-up at the Agricultural Training Centre (ATC) in Machakos. The trials utilized a split plot arranged in randomized block design with two main blocks -CA and COA, each with 7 treatments, replicated thrice. Thus, a total of 21 demonstration plots measuring 12 by 12 m in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) were established on each of the main block, summing up to 42 demonstration plots. *Gliricidia sepium* and *Calliandra calothyrsus* were integrated at different inter-row spacing of 4.5m, 3.0m or 1.5m; and an intra-row spacing of 1m between individual trees. Pure maize-legume plots without any trees acted as the control treatments in each block. Harvested stovers, haulms and tree biomass were totally removed from conventional plots and fully retained in the conservation agriculture plots.

2.3. Data Collection

Measurements of root collar diameter (RCD), heights and canopy width were taken and the short rotation trees were then harvested through coppicing (cutting the trees at 30 cm from the ground to allow regeneration) at the end of each season from which wood and leaf/twig samples

from the harvested trees were taken (three trees per row-3 rows for 4.5m inter-row spacing, 9 rows for 1.5m inter-row spacing and 5 rows for 3.0m inter-row spacing) for the purposes of above ground biomass estimation. The harvesting of trees commenced after two seasons of establishment (in SR 2012) and was done just before planting the crops for each of the subsequent seasons LR 2013, SR 2013 and LR 2014.

The fresh weights of samples were recorded in the field and then oven dried at 70⁰ Celsius for 48 hours to obtain the dry mass (Bi et al., 2015; Verwijst et al, 1999). Water content for the samples was calculated as:

$$\text{Water content} = \frac{\text{Fresh weight} - \text{Oven dry weight}}{\text{Fresh weight}} \quad \text{and the dry wood mass was determined by}$$

multiplying wet mass by (1-Water content) as per the formula by Almulqu et al., (2019).

Total/Overall biomass (TB) was afterwards calculated as:

TB (Mg ha⁻¹) = above ground biomass (AGB) + below ground biomass (BGB) (Saint-André et al., 2005).

Where below ground biomass was estimated at 20% of the above ground biomass - which is widely accepted by researchers (Cairns et al.,1997; Mokany et al., 2006) - and the above ground biomass as the summation of twig biomass and wood biomass. The calculated total biomass was then converted to carbon concentration by multiplying with a carbon conversion factor default value of 0.46 (Hairiah et al., 2011) approximated as 0.5 based on the assumption that about 50% of tree biomass (Mokany et al., 2006) is carbon.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze variations in means of biomass produced and carbon sequestered, while Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) was used to separate the means at $p \leq 0.05$. The statistical tests were conducted with the aid of GENSTAT statistical software version 14. For post hoc analysis, multiple comparisons of means were done using both Fisher's unprotected least significance test and Bonferroni test at 95% confidence interval.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Tree Biomass Yield

Above and below ground biomass (AGB and BGB) production was significant among treatments ($p < 0.001$) but not between the two tillage systems. Closely spaced trees produced the highest biomass (Table 1). *Calliandra* at 1.5m inter-row spacing for instance produced the highest leaf biomass of 6.37 Mg ha⁻¹ under CA (Table 1) compared to *Gliricidia* at 1.5m under COA which only produced 4.06 Mg ha⁻¹ of leaf biomass in LR 2013. In the first season, three treatments

(Calliandra at 3.3m, calliandra at 4.5m and Gliricidia at 1.5m) produced more wood biomass than twig biomass.

The lowest biomass production was realized on Gliricidia at 4.5m treatments under conventional agriculture for season LR 2013. Productivity however generally increased after each test season for most treatments (Table 1) and this can be attributed to the fact that the trees were coppiced at the end of every season, resulting to more shoot development and growth leading to increased biomass in both leaf and wood. The productivity of biomass was high under conservation practice in all the seasons, with the long rain seasons exhibiting the highest, an indication that rainfall and moisture content influenced the production of biomass of the trees.

3.2. Carbon Sequestration between Conservation Agriculture and Conventional Practice

The amount of carbon dioxide encapsulated and stored as structural carbon compound in biomass in trees differed significantly among seasons and among treatments ($p < 0.001$), ranging from 2.4 metric tons in the first season SR 13 to 10.32 metric tons per hectare in the third season LR14 . The season LR14 had the highest of carbon sequestered (mean = 3.882 compared to 2.64 in LR13 and 2.59 in SR13) both for conventional and conservation agriculture, with conservation agriculture recording a high of 8.18 Mg ha⁻¹ compared to conventional agriculture's 7.34 Mg ha⁻¹. *Calliandra calothyrsus* was also found to have sequestered more carbon than *Gliricidia sepium* as evidenced in Table 2. Closely spaced trees at 1.5m inter-row spacing had the highest carbon storage. For instance, on average, carbon stored in calliandra at 1.5m > carbon stored in calliandra at 3m > carbon stored in calliandra at 4.5m (7.74 > 7.509 > 5.298).

From Table 2 conservation agriculture practice encapsulated more carbon both above and below ground than conventional farming in all the seasons. This indeed confirms that conservation agriculture serves as a panacea for raising carbon stocks in agricultural lands and this is even elevated when trees are integrated within the conservation agriculture practice. The season SR 2013 however recorded the lowest Carbon encapsulated compared to the immediate preceding LR 2013. This increased in the succeeding season of Long rains 2014. The explanations to the variations are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs of the section. Table 3 shows the mean seasonal carbon sequestration and the potential thereof of each treatment to store carbon per year per hectare.

Table 1. Overall biomass productivity among treatments under conservation and conventional agriculture in Machakos in the seasons LR13, SR13 and LR14

Treatment*Tillage	Season														
	LR 13					SR 13					LR 14				
	TB	WB	AGB	BGB	OB	TB	WB	AGB	BGB	OB	TB	WB	AGB	BGB	OB
Conventional															
Calliandra at 1.5m	9.31	5.09	14.40	2.88	17.28	5.24	5.24	10.48	2.10	12.58	7.50	7.50	15.00	3.00	18
Conservation															
Calliandra at 1.5 m	6.37	5.23	11.60	2.32	13.92	5.26	5.26	10.52	2.10	12.62	7.70	7.70	15.4	3.08	18.48
Conventional															
Calliandra at 3m	4.24	5.06	9.30	1.86	11.16	5.16	5.16	10.32	2.06	12.38	7.50	7.50	15.00	3.00	18
Conservation															
Calliandra at 3m	5.90	6.59	12.49	2.50	14.99	5.39	5.39	10.78	2.16	12.94	8.60	8.60	17.2	3.44	20.64
Conventional															
Calliandra at 4.5m	2.79	3.14	5.93	1.19	7.12	2.18	2.18	4.36	0.87	5.23	5.60	5.60	11.20	2.24	13.44
Conservation															
Calliandra at 4.5m	3.91	5.32	9.23	1.85	11.08	3.33	3.33	6.66	1.33	7.99	7.80	7.80	15.6	3.12	18.72
Conventional															
Gliricidia at 1.5m	4.06	4.03	8.09	1.62	9.71	4.17	4.17	8.34	1.67	10.01	6.50	6.50	13.00	2.60	15.6
Conservation															
Gliricidia at 1.5m	3.86	3.02	6.88	1.38	8.26	5.11	5.11	10.22	2.04	12.26	5.50	5.50	11	2.2	13.2
Conventional															
Gliricidia at 4.5m	2.99	1.07	4.06	0.81	4.87	4.18	4.18	8.36	1.67	10.03	3.50	3.50	7.00	1.40	8.4
Conservation															
Gliricidia at 4.5m	3.94	2.08	6.02	1.20	7.22	3.14	3.14	6.28	1.26	7.54	4.50	4.50	9	1.8	10.8
<i>P</i>	<.001	<.001	0.39	0.39	<.001	<.001	<.001	0.39	0.39	<.001	<.001	<.001	0.39	0.39	<.001
<i>LSD</i>	1.81	1.82	03.44	0.68	4.13	1.81	1.82	3.44	0.68	4.13	1.81	1.82	3.44	0.68	4.13
<i>Treatments</i>															
Calliandra at 1.5 m	7.84	5.16	13	2.6	15.6	5.25	5.25	10.5	2.1	12.6	7.6	7.6	15.2	3.04	18.24
Calliandra at 3 m	5.01	5.83	10.9	2.18	13.07	5.28	5.28	10.55	2.11	12.66	8.05	8.05	16.1	23.22	19.32
Calliandra at 4.5 m	3.35	4.23	7.58	1.56	9.1	2.76	2.76	5.51	1.1	6.61	6.7	6.7	13.4	2.68	16.08
Gliricidia at 1.5 m	3.96	3.53	7.49	1.5	8.98	4.64	4.64	9.28	1.86	11.14	6	6	12	2.4	14.4
Gliricidia at 4.5m	4.47	1.58	5.04	1.01	6.05	3.66	3.66	7.32	1.46	8.78	4	4	8	1.6	9.6
<i>P</i>	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
<i>LSD</i>	3.12	1.14	2.3	0.22	2.76	1.32	1.42	2.3	0.22	2.76	1.37	1.14	2.3	0.22	2.76
<i>Tillage system</i>															
Conventional	2.34	1.84	4.18	0.84	5.01	2.09	2.09	4.19	0.84	5.02	3.06	3.06	6.12	1.22	7.34
Conservation	2.40	2.22	4.62	0.92	5.55	2.22	2.22	4.45	0.89	5.33	3.41	3.41	6.82	1.37	8.18
<i>p</i>	0.96	0.73	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83
<i>LSD</i>	2.68	2.3	4.86	0.97	5.84	2.26	2.26	4.52	0.91	5.43	2.1	3.38	6.76	1.35	8.11

TB=Twig biomass; WB=Wood Biomass; AGB= Above ground biomass (TB+WB); BGB= Below ground biomass; OB= Overall biomass (BGB+AGB)

1 Table 2. Comparison of tree biomass carbon sequestration among treatments between
 2 conservation agriculture and conventional practice in Machakos for the seasons LR
 3 2013, SR 2013 and LR 2014

Treatment	Carbon sequestered per season per farming system (Mg/ha)					
	LR 2013		SR 2013		LR 2014	
	CA	COA	CA	COA	CA	COA
<i>Calliandra</i> at 1.5 m	6.96	8.64 (0.67)	6.312	6.288 (0.99)	9.24	9.0 (0.96)
<i>Calliandra</i> at 3 m	7.494	5.58 (0.6)	6.468	6.192 (0.94)	10.32	9.0 (0.76)
<i>Calliandra</i> at 4.5 m	5.538	3.558 (0.51)	3.996	2.616 (0.59)	9.36	6.72 (0.51)
<i>Gliricidia</i> at 1.5 m	4.128	4.854 (0.8)	6.132	5.004 (0.74)	6.6	7.8 (0.75)
<i>Gliricidia</i> at 4.5 m	3.612	2.436 (0.63)	3.768	5.016 (0.67)	5.4	4.2 (0.7)
LSD	2.917	2.917	2.71	2.71	4.05	4.05
<i>P</i>	0.85	0.85	0.91	0.91	0.83	0.83
Mean C	2.77	2.51	2.67	2.51	4.01	3.67

4 *In parenthesis are t-test p values comparing significance of carbon sequestered per treatment between*
 5 *conservation agriculture (CA) and conventional agriculture (COA) for each season*

6 Table 3. Mean seasonal and predicted potential carbon sequestration between conservation and
 7 conventional practice potential per year in Machakos during LR 2013, SR 2013 and
 8 LR 2014

Treatment	Mean seasonal carbon sequestration		Predicted potential carbon sequestration per year (Mg/ha)	
	CA	COA	CA	COA
<i>Calliandra</i> at 1.5m	7.504 ^{ab}	7.976 ^a	22.512	23.928 (0.84)
<i>Calliandra</i> at 3m	8.094 ^a	6.924 ^{ab}	24.282	20.772 (0.6)
<i>Calliandra</i> at 4.5m	6.298 ^{abc}	4.298 ^{cd}	18.894	12.894 (0.29)
<i>Gliricidia</i> at 1.5m	5.62 ^{bcd}	5.886 ^{bcd}	16.86	17.658 (0.89)
<i>Gliricidia</i> at 4.5m	4.26 ^{cd}	3.884 ^d	12.78	11.652 (0.82)

9 *Different superscripts show differences in means of treatments between farming systems. CA and COA denote*
 10 *conservation and conventional agriculture, respectively. In parenthesis are t-test p values comparing significance*
 11 *of predicted carbon sequestration for treatments between farming systems.*

12 The encapsulation potential of carbon for conservation agriculture with trees in this study
 13 was found to be between 12.8 and 24 tons/Mg per hectare per year when trees are integrated
 14 into farming systems at the same time while practicing conservation agriculture. This is
 15 consistent with the projections of other researchers, who found the potential carbon
 16 sequestration for conservation agriculture to be between 24-40 Mg/ha/year (Lal, 2003) The
 17 amount of carbon sequestered is noted to be increasing in parallel to the amount of biomass in
 18 the trees as was also noted by Shively et al., (2004) who in their study highlighted that the
 19 carbon stored is an increasing function of above and below ground biomass.

20 According to Sanchez et al., (2006), less moisture leads to stunted plant growth (Mbah
 21 & Nwunuji, 2016) and ultimate consequences in lesser production of both fresh and dry matter.

22 This was evident in the short rain seasons from the study (LR 2013 had total rainfall of 321.1
23 mm compared to 269.7 mm and 266.2 mm in SR 2013 and LR 2014 respectively.

24 Nolte et al., (2003) corroborates the findings of this study which show that closely spaced
25 trees yield more biomass than widely spaced trees .In their study to compare the effects of
26 spatial patterns of *Calliandra* trees, they found out that those planted in closely spaced clusters
27 of 0.4m × 0.4m yielded more biomass than equidistant pattern. This can be attributed to
28 competition for below and above ground resources (Nair et al., 2009), meaning that more
29 crowded species will compete for nutrients, water and sunlight and as such don't get enough,
30 rendering low productivity since the plants photosynthesize less and less photosynthesis means
31 that the growth is minimal and less biomass is one of the ultimate outcomes (UNDP, 2009).
32 This abundance of biomass under conservation farming involving no -till and minimum tillage
33 practices has been proven to be greater compared to conventional tillage (Frey et al., 1999;
34 Hackman, 2018) and the present study has shared in the same findings. The production of more
35 wood biomass for three treatments in the first season is also found to be phenomenal with the
36 study of Almulqu et al. (2019) who in their findings realized more stem biomass than leaf
37 biomass and root component biomass.

38 Biomass production being affected adversely by planting density has also been confirmed
39 by other researchers other than Nolte et al. (2003). In a study to evaluate the effects of different
40 planting densities and cutting frequencies of *Moringa oleifera* plants, Sanchez et al., (2006)
41 found that plant densities of 750,000 plants per hectare produced more biomass than density of
42 500,000 plants per hectare. This however reduced in the succeeding year where 500,000
43 plants/ha plant density produced higher biomass. The reduction was attributed to competition
44 for resources which led to slow growth (Ball et al., 2000).This could also explain the cases
45 from the study where inter-row spacing of 3.0m and 4.5 m led to higher biomass production
46 (calliandra at 3.0 m for instance had 14.99 Mg/ha while calliandra at 1.5 m had 13.92 Mg/ha
47 of biomass in LR 13 under conservation agriculture).

48 More biomass under conservation agriculture compared to traditional tillage practices
49 has been proven both as sole and with the integration. Ngwira et al., (2012) for instance found
50 more biomass production under conservation agriculture intercrop fields followed by sole
51 conservation agriculture, with the least production realized in conventional practice. This has
52 also been corroborated by this study where in all seasons, conventional tillage recorded low
53 biomass production. The higher production of biomass under CA could be attributed to better
54 plant water balance (Soutou et al., 2005) as was caused by improved moisture conditions,
55 meaning better water utilization and more growth.

56 Conservation tillage practices involving no till, minimum till and ground cover have been
57 found to increase biological diversity of soils both below and above ground (Jaipal et al., 2002;
58 Riley et al., 2005; Roldan et al., 2003; Leskovar et al., 2016), implying that these biologically
59 diverse flora and fauna ultimately contribute to the biomass of the soils (Hobbs, 2007). The
60 general ecology of the soil has been known to improve under conservation agriculture and
61 therefore better ecology, leading to more biomass especially microbial biomass which adds to
62 the total biomass production of the soils therein (Madejón et al., 2007; Nolte et al., 2003). This
63 could have led to increment of below ground biomass and could therefore explain the higher
64 biomass productivity under conservation agriculture with trees in the study, corroborating the
65 findings of previous research.

66 On the basis of the findings of Kabi & Bareeba (2008) that productivity of biomass is
67 possible to the tune of 45.9 Mg ha⁻¹yr⁻¹ at a pruning frequency of four months (an equivalent
68 of one season in this study), the biomass production potential of trees from this study would be
69 threefold in a year (three prunnings of four months). This being the case, the biomass
70 production potential for the treatments in the study per year per hectare are estimated as 45.02
71 and 47.29 in *Calliandra* at 1.5m; 48.56 and 41.54 in *Calliandra* at 3.0m; 37.79 and 25.79 in
72 *Calliandra* at 4.5m; 33.72 and 35.32 in *Gliricidia* at 1.5 and 25.56 and 23.30 Mg/ha/year in
73 *Gliricidia* at 4.5 m for Conservation and conventional agriculture respectively. The study of
74 Kabi and Bareeba (2008) therefore corroborates the present study, and their estimated potential
75 of 45.9Mg/ha/year is surpassed by *Calliandra* at 3.0m and at 1.5m inter-row spacing (48.56
76 and 47.28 Mg/ha/yr.).

77 The principles of conservation agriculture serve as best management practices (BMPs)
78 and adopting such practices have always improved carbon sinks and encapsulation functions
79 of agricultural systems (Rodríguez-Entrena et al., 2014; Hati et al., 2019; Yadav et al., 2019)
80 as was also realized in the study. The two techniques – conservation agriculture and
81 agroforestry have been recommended by other researchers as methods for increasing carbon
82 stocks in woody vegetation of agricultural lands. Niles et al., (2002) enlists adoption of
83 minimum/zero tillage, use of cover crops and green manure and increasing tree cover through
84 agroforestry on arable lands as the ideal solutions through which more carbon can be achieved.
85 These are the principles of conservation agriculture with trees and therefore more Carbon
86 sequestered in tree treatments under conservation agriculture affirms the role of conservation
87 agriculture with trees in raising carbon stocks, which is important in improving soil fertility
88 and thus productivity in the drylands.

89

4. Conclusions

90 Carbon sequestration both above and below ground has been found to be highly
91 significant under conservation agriculture and higher in all treatments except *Gliricidia* at 1.5
92 m where conventional agriculture practice sequestered more carbon than CA. *Calliandra* is
93 seen to sequester more carbon than *Gliricidia*. The carbon encapsulation also increases in
94 parallel with the biomass production of trees, with closely spaced trees at 1.5 m having more
95 biomass, thus more carbon encapsulated. The practice of conservation agriculture with integration
96 of tree component within farms therefore is a feasible way to increase the carbon stocks in the
97 drylands and serve as a mitigation and adaptation strategy for climatic changes. It is worth
98 noting however that extensive research over prolonged periods of time need to be carried out
99 in the dry lands to further monitor the trends of carbon stocks in the dry lands upon injecting
100 smart farming techniques.

101

5. Acknowledgement

102 We acknowledge the Evergreen Agriculture Project developed by World Agroforestry
103 Centre, and the funding from the European Commission (EC) and International Fund for
104 Agriculture and Development (IFAD) which enabled the success of the project and the writing
105 of this paper. We thank also the the management of Machakos ATC for donating the land for
106 researcher managed trials for the entire project period. Further gratitude goes to Chester Kalinda
107 and Silas Muthuri for helping with collection and management of Samples. Special thank you
108 to Sstanley Kitiki an the ICRAF labs team for the cooperation in handling the samples and
109 helping in analysis.

110

References

- 111 Aertsens, J., De Nocker, L., & Gobin, A. (2013). Valuing the carbon sequestration potential
112 for European agriculture. *Land Use Policy*, 31, 584–594.
113 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.09.003>
- 114 Akpa, S. I., Odeh, I. O., Bishop, T. F., Hartemink, A. E., & Amapu, I. Y. (2016). Total soil
115 organic carbon and carbon sequestration potential in Nigeria. *Geoderma*, 271, 202–215.
- 116 Albrecht, A., & Kandji, S. T. (2003). Carbon sequestration in tropical agroforestry systems.
117 *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 99(1–3), 15–27.
118 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(03\)00138-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(03)00138-5)
- 119 Almulqu, A. A., Arpornpong, N., and Boonyanuphap, J. (2019). Biomass estimation and
120 allometric equation for tree species in dry forest of East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia.
121 *Forestry Ideas*, vol. 25, No 2 (58), 369–384. [http://oaji.net/articles/2020/6191-](http://oaji.net/articles/2020/6191-1577993745.pdf)
122 [1577993745.pdf](http://oaji.net/articles/2020/6191-1577993745.pdf)
- 123 Ball, R. A., Purcell, L. C & Vories, E. D. (2000). Short-season soybean yield compensation in
124 response to population and water regime. *Crop Science*, 40(4), 1070–1078.
- 125 Batiano, A., Wani, S. P., Biielders , C. L., Vlek, P. L. G. & Mokuwunye, A. U. (2000). Crop

- 126 residue and fertilizer management to improve soil organic carbon content, soil quality
 127 and productivity in the desert margins of West Africa. In and B. A. S. R. Lal, J. M.
 128 Kimble (Ed.), *Global climate change and tropical ecosystems* (pp. 117–145).
 129 CRC/Lewis Publishers.
- 130 Bi, H., Murphy, S., Volkova, L., Weston, C., Fairman, T., Li, Y., ... & Caccamo, G. (2015).
 131 Additive biomass equations based on complete weighing of sample trees for open
 132 eucalypt forest species in south-eastern Australia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 349,
 133 106-121
- 134 Cairns, M. A., Brown, S., Helmer, E. H. & Baumgardner, G. A. (1997). Root biomass
 135 allocation in the world's upland forests. *Oecologia*, 111, 1–11.
- 136 Chivenge, P. P., Murwira, H. K., Giller, K. E., Mapfumo, P. & Six, J. (2007). Long-term impact
 137 of reduced tillage and residue management on soil carbon stabilization: Implications for
 138 conservation agriculture on contrasting soils. *Soil & Tillage Research*, 94(2).
- 139 Dalal, R. C. (1992). Long-term trends in total nitrogen of a Vertisol subjected to zero tillage,
 140 nitrogen application and stubble retention. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*, 30(2),
 141 223–231.
- 142 Eswaran, H., Reich, P. F., Kimble, J. M., Beinroth, F. H., Padamnabhan, E., Moncharoen, P.,
 143 & Kimble, J. M. (2000). Global carbon stocks. Pages 15–250 in Lal, R., Eswaran, H., &
 144 Stewart, B. A.. Eds, *Global climate change and pedogenic carbonates*. Boca Raton,
 145 Florida: Lewis Publishers.
- 146 Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO]. (2004). *Carbon Sequestration in Dryland Soils:*
 147 *World Soils Resources Reports 102*.
- 148 Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO]. (2009). *Enhancing Crop-livestock Systems in*
 149 *Conservation Agriculture for Sustainable Production Intensification: A Farmer*
 150 *Discovery Process Going to Scale in Burkina Faso. Integrated Crop Management 7*.
- 151 Farage, P., Pretty, J. & Ball, A. (2003). *Biophysical Aspects of Carbon Sequestration in*
 152 *Drylands*. University of Essex.
- 153 Garrity, D.P. (2011). Making Conservation Agriculture ever green. *Resilient Food Systems for*
 154 *a Changing World: Proceedings of the 5th World Congress on Conservation Agriculture.*
 155 *25 – 29th September 2011, Brisbane, Australia*, 14–15.
- 156 Garrity, Dennis Philip, Akinnifesi, F. K., Ajayi, O. C., Weldesemayat, S. G., Mowo, J. G.,
 157 Kalinganire, A., Larwanou, M., & Bayala, J. (2010). Evergreen Agriculture: A robust
 158 approach to sustainable food security in Africa. *Food Security*, 2(3), 197–214.
 159 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-010-0070-7>
- 160 Gicheru, P. T. & Ita, B. N. (1987). *Detailed soil survey of the Katumani National Dryland*
 161 *Farming Research station farms (Machakos District). Detailed soil survey report No. D-*
 162 *43*.
- 163 Hackman, J. J. (2018). *The Effects of Cover Crops on the Soil Microbiome: A Metagenomics*
 164 *Study*. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- 165 Hairiah, K., Dewi, S., Agus, F., Velarde, S., Ekadinata, A., Rahayu, S. & van Noordwijk, M.
 166 (2011). *Measuring Carbon Stocks Across Land Use Systems: A Manual*. World
 167 Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) SEA Regional Office.
- 168 Hassan, A., Ijaz, S. S., Lal, R., Ali, S., Hussain, Q., Ansar, M., ... & Baloch, M. S. (2016).
 169 Depth distribution of soil organic carbon fractions in relation to tillage and cropping
 170 sequences in some dry lands of Punjab, Pakistan. *Land Degradation & Development*,
 171 27(4), 1175-1185.
- 172 Hati, K. M., Biswas, A. K., Somasundaram, J., Mohanty, M., Singh, R. K., Sinha, N. K., &
 173 Chaudhary, R. S. (2019). 12 Soil Organic Carbon Dynamics and Carbon Sequestration
 174 Under. *Carbon Management in Tropical and Sub-Tropical Terrestrial Systems*, 201.
- 175 Hobbs, P. (2007). Conservation agriculture: what is it and why is it important for future

- 176 sustainable food production? *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 145(2), 127–137.
- 177 Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC]. (2007a). *Climate Change 2007: Impacts,*
178 *Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth
179 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Parry, M.L.,
180 Canziani, O. F., Palutikof, J. P., van der Linden, P. J. & Hanson, C.E. (Eds.), UK:
181 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 182 Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC]. (2007b). *Climate Change 2007:*
183 *Synthesis Report*. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment
184 Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core writing team, Pachauri,
185 R. K & Reisinger, A.(eds.)]. IPCC: Geneva, Switzerland.
- 186 Jaertzold, R., Schmidt, H., Hornetz ,B. & Shisanya, C. (2007). *Farm management handbooks*
187 *of Kenya, Vol. II: Natural Conditions and Farm Management Information, Part C East*
188 *Kenya, Subpart C1 Eastern Province*. Ministry of Agriculture and GTZ.
- 189 Jaipal, S., Singh, S., Yadav, A., Malik, R.K. & Hobbs, P. (2002). Species diversity and
190 population density of macro-fauna of rice-wheat cropping habitat in semi-arid
191 subtropical northwest India in relation to modified tillage practices of wheat sowing. In
192 S. K. Malik, R. K., Balyan, R. S., Yadav, A. & Pahwa (Ed.), *Herbicide-Resistance*
193 *Management and Zero-Tillage in the Rice-Wheat Cropping System. Proceedings of an*
194 *International Workshop, Hissar, India, 4–6 March 2002* (pp. 166–171). CCS Haryana
195 University.
- 196 Kabi, F. & Bareeba, F. B. (2008). Herbage biomass production and nutritive value of mulberry
197 (*Morus alba*) and *Calliandra calothyrsus* harvested at different cutting frequencies.
198 *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 140(1–2), 178–190.
- 199 Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). (1997). Annual Report 1995. *Agris*, 01, 209.
- 200 Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change. *Geoderma*, 123(1–2), 1–
201 22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.01.032>
- 202 Lal, R. (2001). Potential of desertification control to sequester carbon and mitigate the
203 greenhouse effect. *Climatic Change*, 51(1), 35–72.
- 204 Lal, R. (2002). Soil carbon dynamics in cropland and rangeland. *Environmental Pollution*,
205 116(3), 353–362.
- 206 Lal, R., Smith, P., Jungkunst, H. F., Mitsch, W. J., Lehmann, J., Nair, P. R., ... & Skorupa, A.
207 L. (2018). The carbon sequestration potential of terrestrial ecosystems. *Journal of Soil*
208 *and Water Conservation*, 73(6), 145A-152A.
- 209 Lal, R. (2003). Global potential of soil carbon sequestration to mitigate the greenhouse effect.
210 *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 22(2), 151–184.
- 211 Lal, R. (2011). Sequestering carbon in soils of agro-ecosystems. *Food Policy*, 36, 33–39.
- 212 Lal, R. (2015). Sequestering carbon and increasing productivity by conservation agriculture.
213 *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 70(3), 55A-62A.
- 214 Leskovar, D., Othman, Y., & Dong, X. (2016). Strip tillage improves soil biological activity,
215 fruit yield and sugar content of triploid watermelon. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 163, 266-
216 273.
- 217 Madejón, E., Moreno, F., Murillo, J. M. & Pelegrín, F. (2007). Soil biochemical response to
218 long-term conservation tillage under semi-arid Mediterranean conditions. *Soil and*
219 *Tillage Research*, 94(2), 346–352.
- 220 Makumba, W., Akinnifesi F. K., Janssen, B., & Oenema, O. (2007). Long-term impact of a
221 gliricidia-maize intercropping system on carbon sequestration in southern Malawi.
222 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 118(1–4), 237–243.
- 223 Mbah, E. N., & Nwunuji, R. (2016). Factors Limiting Adaptation to Climate Change among
224 Farmers in Taraba State, Nigeria. *Agricultural Development*, 1, 1-5.
- 225 Mokany, K., Raison, R. J. & Prokushkin, A. S. (2006). Critical analysis of root: Shoot ratios in

- 226 terrestrial biomes. *Global Change Biology*, 12(1), 84–96.
- 227 Nair, P. K. R., Kumar, B. M., & Nair, V. D. (2009). Agroforestry as a strategy for carbon
228 sequestration. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 172(1), 10–23.
229 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.200800030>
- 230 Ngwira, R. A., Aune, J. B. & Mkwinda, S. (2012). On-farm evaluation of yield and economic
231 benefit of short term maize legume intercropping systems under conservation agriculture
232 in Malawi. *Field Crops Research*, 132, 149–157.
- 233 Niles, J. O., Brown, S., Pretty, J., Ball, A. S. & Fay, J. (2002). Potential carbon mitigation and
234 income in developing countries from changes in use and management of agricultural and
235 forest lands. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A Mathematical Physical
236 and Engineering Sciences*, 360(1797), 1621–1639.
- 237 Nolte, C., Tiki-Manga, T., Badjel-Badjel, S., Gockowski, J., Hauser S. & Weise, S. F. (2003).
238 Effects of Calliandra planting pattern on biomass production and nutrient accumulation
239 in planted fallows of southern Cameroon. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 179(1–3),
240 535–545.
- 241 Rahman, S. A., Sunderland, T., Kshatriya, M., Roshetko, J. M., Pagella, T., & Healey, J. R.
242 (2016). Towards productive landscapes: Trade-offs in tree-cover and income across a
243 matrix of smallholder agricultural land-use systems. *Land Use Policy*, 58, 152-164.
- 244 Riley, H. C. F., Bleken, M. A., Abrahamsen, S., Olsen, A. K.B. & Bakken, A. K. (2005). Effects
245 of alternative tillage systems on soil quality and yields of spring cereals on silty clay loam
246 and sandy loam soils in cool, wet climate of central Norway. *Soil and Tillage Research*,
247 80(1–2), 79–93.
- 248 Rodríguez-Entrena, M., Espinosa-Goded, M., & Barreiro-Hurlé, J. (2014). The role of ancillary
249 benefits on the value of agricultural soils carbon sequestration programmes: Evidence
250 from a latent class approach to Andalusian olive groves. *Ecological Economics*, 99, 63–
251 73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.01.006>
- 252 Roldan, A., Caravaca, F., Hernandez, M.T., Garcia, C., Sanchez-Brito, C., Velasquez, M. &
253 Tiscareno, M. (2003). No-tillage on soil quality characteristics under maize in Patzcuaro
254 watershed (Mexico). *Soil and Tillage Research*, 72, 65–73.
- 255 Ryan, J., Masri, S., Garabet, S. & Harris, H. (1997). Changes in organic matter and nitrogen
256 with a cereal legume rotation trial. In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Accomplishment and future
257 challenges in dryland soil fertility research in the Mediterranean area* (pp. 79–87).
258 ICARDA.
- 259 Saint-André, L., M'Bou, A. T., Mabilia, A., Mouvondy, W., Jourdan, C., Roupsard, O., ... &
260 Nouvellon, Y. (2005). Age-related equations for above-and below-ground biomass of a
261 Eucalyptus hybrid in Congo. *Forest ecology and management*, 205(1-3), 199-214.
- 262 Sanchez, N. R., Ledin, S., & Ledin, I. (2006). Biomass production and chemical composition
263 of *Moringa oleifera* under different management regimes in Nicaragua. *Agroforestry
264 Systems*, 66, 231–242.
- 265 Schimel, D. S., House, J. I., Hibbard, K. A., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Peylin, P., ..., Wirth, C.
266 (2001). Recent patterns and mechanisms of carbon exchange by terrestrial ecosystems.
267 *Nature*, 414(6860), 169–172.
- 268 Semenov, V. M., Pautova, N. B., Lebedeva, T. N., Khromyckina, D. P., Semenova, N. A., &
269 de Gerenyu, V. L. (2019). Plant residues decomposition and formation of active organic
270 matter in the soil of the incubation experiments. *Eurasian Soil Science*, 52(10), 1183-
271 1194.
- 272 Shively, G. E., Zelek, C. A., Midmore, D. J. & Nissen, T. M. (2004). Carbon sequestration in
273 a tropical landscape: an economic model to measure its incremental cost. *Agroforestry
274 Systems*, 60(3), 189–197.
- 275 Smith, P., Andren, O., Karlsson, T., Perala, P., Regina, K., Rounsevell, M. & Wesemaels, B.

- 276 V. (2005). Carbon sequestration potential in European croplands has been overestimated.
277 *Global Change Biology*, 11(12), 2153–2163.
- 278 Soutou, G., Naudin, K. & Scopel, E. (2005). Crop water balance in conventional and direct
279 seeding mulch-based cotton cropping systems in North Cameroon. *3rd World Congress*
280 *on Conservation Agriculture*.
- 281 Stewart, B. A. & Robinson, C. A. (2000). Land use impact on carbon dynamics in soils of the
282 arid and semi-arid tropics. In B. A. Lal, R., Kimble, J. M., & Stewart (Ed.), *Global*
283 *climate change and tropical ecosystems* (pp. 251–257). CRC/ Lewis Publishers.
- 284 UNDP, UNCCD. & UNEP. (2009). *Climate Change in the African Dry lands: Options and*
285 *Opportunities for Adaptation and Mitigation*. Nairobi: UNON Publishing
- 286 Verwijst, T., & Telenius, B. (1999). Biomass estimation procedures in short rotation forestry.
287 *Forest ecology and management*, 121(1-2), 137-146.
- 288 Yadav, G. S., Lal, R., Meena, R. S., Babu, S., Das, A., Bhowmik, S. N., ... & Saha, P. (2019).
289 Conservation tillage and nutrient management effects on productivity and soil carbon
290 sequestration under double cropping of rice in north eastern region of India. *Ecological*
291 *Indicators*, 105, 303-315.