Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques

# ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE OF AGRICULTURE IN OECD COUNTRIES SINCE 1990:

# New Zealand Country Section

This country section is an extract from chapter 3 of the OECD publication (2008) ***Environmental Performance of Agriculture in OECD countries since 1990***, which is available at the OECD website indicated below.

This text should be cited as follows: OECD (2008), *Environmental Performance of Agriculture in OECD countries since 1990*, Paris, France

A summary version of this report is published as ***Environmental Performance of Agriculture: At a Glance***, see the OECD website which also contains the agri-environmental indicator time series database at: http://www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators

## TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT

## BACKGROUND TO THE COUNTRY SECTIONS

### *Structure*

This chapter provides an analysis of the trends of environmental conditions related to agriculture for each of the 30 OECD member countries since 1990, including an overview of the European Union, and the supporting agri-environmental database can be accessed at *www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators*. Valuable input for each country section was provided by member countries, in addition to other sources noted below. The country sections are introduced by a figure showing the national agri-environmental and economic profile over the period 2002-04, followed by the text, structured as follows:

- ***Agricultural sector trends and policy context:*** The policy description in this section draws on various OECD policy databases, including the *Inventory of Policy Measures Addressing Environmental Issues in Agriculture* (*www.oecd.org/tad/env*) and the Producer and Consumer Support Estimates (*www.oecd.org/tad.support/pse*).
- ***Environmental performance of agriculture:*** The review of environmental performance draws on the country responses to the OECD agri-environmental questionnaires (unpublished) provided by countries and the OECD agri-environmental database supporting Chapter 1 (see website above).
- ***Overall agri-environmental performance:*** This section gives a summary overview and concluding comments.
- ***Bibliography:*** The OECD Secretariat, with the help of member countries, has made an extensive search of the literature for each country section. While this largely draws on literature available in English and French, in many cases member countries provided translation of relevant literature in other languages.

***At the end of each country section a standardised page is provided consisting of three figures.*** The first figure, which is the same for every country, compares respective national performance against the OECD overall average for the period since 1990. The other two figures focus on specific agri-environmental themes important to each respective country.

Additional information is also provided for each country on the OECD agri-environmental indicator website (see address above) concerning:

- Details of national agri-environmental indicator programmes.
- National databases relevant to agri-environmental indicators.
- Websites relevant to the national agri-environmental indicators (*e.g.* Ministries of Agriculture)
- A translation of the country section into the respective national language, while all 30 countries are available in English and French.

### *Coverage, caveats and limitations*

A number of issues concerning the coverage, caveats and limitations need to be borne in mind when reading the country sections, especially in relation to making comparisons with other countries:

***Coverage:*** The analysis is confined to examination of agri-environmental trends. The influence on these trends of policy and market developments, as well as structural changes in the industry, are outside the scope of these sections. Moreover, the country sections do not examine the impacts of changes in environmental conditions on agriculture (*e.g.* native and non-native wild species, droughts and floods, climate change); the impact of genetically modified organisms on the environment; or human health and welfare consequences of the interaction between agriculture and the environment.

***Definitions and methodologies for calculating indicators*** are standardised in most cases but not all, in particular those for biodiversity and farm management. For some indicators, such as greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), the OECD and the UNFCCC are working toward further improvement, such as by incorporating agricultural carbon sequestration into a net GHG balance.

- ***Data availability, quality and comparability*** are as far as possible complete, consistent and harmonised across the various indicators and countries. But deficiencies remain such as the absence of data series (*e.g.* biodiversity), variability in coverage (*e.g.* pesticide use), and differences related to data collection methods (*e.g.* the use of surveys, census and models).
- ***Spatial aggregation*** of indicators is given at the national level, but for some indicators (*e.g.* water quality) this can mask significant variations at the regional level, although where available the text provides information on regionally disaggregated data.
- ***Trends and ranges in indicators***, rather than absolute levels, enable comparisons to be made across countries in many cases, especially as local site specific conditions can vary considerably. But absolute levels are of significance where: limits are defined by governments (*e.g.* nitrates in water); targets agreed under national and international agreements (*e.g.* ammonia emissions); or where the contribution to global pollution is important (*e.g.* greenhouse gases).
- ***Agriculture's contribution to specific environmental impacts*** is sometimes difficult to isolate, especially for areas such as soil and water quality, where the impact of other economic activities is important (*e.g.* forestry) or the "natural" state of the environment itself contributes to pollutant loadings (*e.g.* water may contain high levels of naturally occurring salts), or invasive species that may have upset the "natural" state of biodiversity.
- ***Environmental improvement or deterioration*** is in most individual indicator cases clearly revealed by the direction of change in the indicators but is more difficult when considering a set of indicators. For example, the greater uptake of conservation tillage can lower soil erosion rates and energy consumption (from less ploughing), but at the same time may result in an increase in the use of herbicides to combat weeds.
- ***Baselines, threshold levels or targets for indicators*** are generally not appropriate to assess indicator trends as these may vary between countries and regions due to difference in environmental and climatic conditions, as well as national regulations. But for some indicators threshold levels are used to assess indicator change (*e.g.* drinking water standards) or internationally agreed targets compared against indicators trends (*e.g.* ammonia emissions and methyl bromide use).

# 3.20. NEW ZEALAND

Figure 3.20.1. **National agri-environmental and economic profile, 2002-04: New Zealand**




StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/300760536460

1. Data refer to the year 2004.

*Source:* OECD Secretariat. For full details of these indicators, see Chapter 1 of the *Main Report*.

## *3.20.1. Agricultural sector trends and policy context*

***The agricultural sector is important to the New Zealand economy.*** It contributes about 4% to GDP and 8% to employment, while farm exports accounted for over 50% of the value of merchandise exports in 2004 [1] (Figure 3.20.1).

***Agriculture has undergone substantial structural change over the past 20 years***, since the government's commitments to economic liberalisation, including the removal of most agricultural support. The farming sector has responded with further diversification, the area under horticulture and vines rose by over 20% and forestry plantations by 40%; and intensification, with some sectors (dairy) relying on greater use of inputs (*e.g.* fertilisers) to increase production, and others (horticulture) focusing on raising value and quality [2]. As a result, the volume of agricultural production grew by 38% over the period 1990-92 to 2002-04 on a declining area of farmland (–3%) (Figure 3.20.2). Also the use of purchased farm inputs (volume) grew more rapidly than output, revealing the intensification of production over the same period, with inorganic nitrogen and phosphate fertiliser use rising by around 420% and 100% respectively; direct on-farm energy consumption 22%; but pesticide use by only 4% (Figure 3.20.2) [3, 4, 5, 6]. Overall this has resulted in improvements over 1985 to 2006 compared to 1972 to 1984 (numbers in brackets), in the total output per annum; input productivity; and factor productivity, by 1.7% (1.1%), 1.9% (0.2%), and 3.1% (–0.5%) respectively [7].

***Support to agriculture is the lowest in the OECD.*** Producer support fell from a peak of over 30% of farm receipts in the mid-1980s to 2% in 2002-04 (as measured by the OECD's Producer Support Estimate) compared to the OECD average of 30% [8]. Support to agriculture is mainly directed at research, pest and disease control, agri-environmental

measures and climatic disaster relief. Budgetary expenditure on agri-environmental measures has grown from about NZD 80 (USD 50) million in 1997 to almost NZD 100 (USD 60) million by 2004 or around 15% of total agricultural support [8, 9].

***A range of policy instruments are used by government to achieve agri-environmental objectives*** [9]. Almost 90% of government agri-environmental budgetary expenditure is provided for research and education, such as the *Public Good Science and Technology Fund* [9]. The *Sustainable Farming Fund* (SFF, established in 2000), has seen an increase in funding for projects up to 2009 at around NZD 10 (USD 6) million annually. SFF projects seek to transfer information and technology from experts to primary producers in order to improve the financial and environmental performance of agriculture and forestry [8, 10]. In 2003 a *Dairying and Clean Streams Accord* was agreed between Fonterra (a private company controlling over 95% of New Zealand's milk supply), the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment, and regional councils, to work together to improve water quality in dairying areas by using voluntary guidance and information tools, such as the adoption of nutrient budgeting [8].

***Agriculture is affected by national and international environmental policies.*** The ***national environmental policy framework*** affecting agriculture is characterised by decentralisation of decision-making and devolution of responsibility to 74 territorial authorities and 12 regional councils. Authorities charge farmers in order to recover the costs associated with programmes and applications, while responsibility for resource management remains with the farmers [7]. Three nationwide overarching policies address environmental concerns: the *Resource Management Act* (RMA, 1991); the *Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act* (HSNO, 1996); and the *Biosecurity Act* 1993. The RMA integrates measures governing resource management, and its key themes are: sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources; safeguarding the quality of soil, water, air, and ecosystems; and avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment. With respect to water, while use permits are issued under the RMA through regional councils, there is no direct government funding for irrigation development and farmers pay the full recovery costs for water [11]. The HSNO aims to protect the environment by preventing and managing the adverse effects of hazardous substances, including pesticides and new organisms not currently present in New Zealand. The *Biosecurity Act* is designed to systematically protect the nation's biological system – introduced and indigenous – from the harmful effects of pests and diseases. Farming is also affected by New Zealand's commitments under ***international environmental agreements*** including eliminating the use of methyl bromide (an ozone depleting substance) under the *Montreal Protocol*; safeguarding biodiversity under the *Convention on Biological Diversity*; and reducing greenhouse gas emissions under the UNFCCC and its *Kyoto Protocol*.

### *3.20.2. Environmental performance of agriculture*

***The key environmental challenges concerning the agricultural sector*** include: soil management, water quality, biodiversity and climate change. Pesticide and energy use and the growing demand for water for irrigation are also important. Agriculture dominates land and water use, accounting for 47% of total land use and around 75% of water use. While the area under grazing, arable fodder and fallow land has declined over the 1990s, there has been rapid growth in the area under horticulture, but its share of the agricultural land area is only 1%. With the first Polynesian settlement, but especially since European settlement from the mid-19th century, the establishment of agriculture initiated dramatic

deforestation and impacts on indigenous wildlife. A combination of temperate climate and youthful geology have resulted in "natural" soil erosion rates ten times the world average in some locations, and high average annual yields of soil sediment loss to the ocean [2, 12].

***Soil quality has come under pressure from overgrazing*** [1]. A 2004 assessment of soil quality indicates that about 80% of agricultural land fell within target ranges identified as desirable to maintain soil quality for production and environmental objectives [13]. Overall, however, soil erosion (water and wind) is not a significant issue, mainly because over 75% of farmland is permanent pasture. About 5% of farmland is estimated to suffer moderate to severe rates of erosion (11 tonnes and above of soil loss/hectare/year), but there are no time series data available to assess trends. However, research suggests that soil erosion and loss of organic carbon have been reduced on steep pasture areas, mainly through reversion to forestry and improved management within pastoral systems [13].

***Under cropping soils, loss of organic matter; severe degradation and compaction, are still concerns despite the relatively small area involved*** [13]. The annual expenditure on mitigating soil erosion was estimated in 2002 at NZD 26 (USD 12) million [14], while the annual cost of soil erosion (including agriculture and natural sources) was estimated in 1998 at NZD 127 (USD 68) million [2]. Localised build-up of nitrogen and phosphate under dairy pastures with the potential to pollute water bodies, *i.e.* rivers, lakes, groundwater and coastal waters, is a growing issue [13]. Streams draining catchments with pasture have been estimated to contain 2.5 to 7 times more sediment, phosphorus and nitrogen than streams draining forest catchments [5].

***Agriculture, especially since the mid-1990s, has led to deteriorating water quality.*** Some rivers in farming areas, particularly those flowing through lowland pastoral land, fail to meet environmental water guidelines, while shallow aquifers in dairying and horticultural areas have elevated nitrate levels [2]. Overall, the quality of water bodies is high by international standards, but it is hard to identify trends due to the lack of a national water quality monitoring network [15]. Intensive farming practices are seen as increasing pressure on water quality, especially as urban discharges are being controlled [16]. Nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) are the main pollutants of water bodies, but there are concerns in some areas over water pollution from microbial contaminants and soil sediments.

***Agricultural nutrient surpluses have risen substantially over the past decade***, but surpluses per hectare of farmland are about half the OECD average for nitrogen balance surplus, but slightly above the average for phosphorus (Figure 3.20.2). Between 1990-92 and 2002-04, the increase in tonnes of nutrient surplus (input minus output) has been most marked for phosphorus at nearly 130% compared to nitrogen rising by over 40%. The main reason for the rise in nutrient surpluses over the past decade is that nutrient inputs (mainly inorganic fertiliser use) have grown much more rapidly than nutrient outputs, and the reduction in pasture area (*i.e.* lowering nutrient uptake). The nitrogen content of livestock manure, 95% of which is deposited onto pastures, rose by almost 25% (in terms of tonnes of nitrogen) between 1990-92 and 2002-04 (largely due to the reduction in sheep numbers being more than offset by the growth in cattle numbers). Over the same period inorganic nitrogen fertiliser use increased by over 420%. Dairy farming is the major user of nitrogen fertilisers and accounts for much of the growth in its use, especially for increasing rates of pasture growth [2, 5]. These developments have resulted in increased nitrogen and phosphorus pollution of some rivers and lakes, such as Lake Taupo, a UNESCO *World Heritage Site* [17], and in intensive farming regions such as Waikato and Canterbury.

***Farming is estimated to contribute 75% of total nitrogen input to surface water*** [2], with this share likely rising as other sources of nitrogen pollution (*e.g.* urban sources) are controlled [5]. Over the 2000-03 period less than 30% of dairy farms were using a formal nutrient management plan and regularly testing the soil for nutrient levels [18], but these shares have increased since then. In parts of a few intensively farmed areas, such as Canterbury and Waikato, concentration of nitrate in groundwater exceeds the maximum allowable value for drinking water [2, 19]. There are also localised concerns with microbial pollution from livestock farming (*e.g.* faecal coliforms and *campylobacter*) of water bodies [2, 20, 21], leading to some cases of human infections above reported levels in other OECD countries [15].

***While there was a small increase in pesticide use over the past decade the intensity of use is low by OECD standards*** (Figure 3.20.2). This is because of the dominance of pastoral farming and a limited arable crop and horticultural sector [22]. The trend in pesticide use was variable over the period 1994 to 2003 with about 13% of pesticide use accounted for by the forestry sector, although the current quality of pesticide use (sales) data are poor [23]. Between 1995 and 1998 pesticide use fell, probably due to various initiatives in the horticultural sector to reduce and use pesticides more efficiently (*e.g.* KiwiGreen). From 1999 to 2004 the use of pesticides grew by 27%, but only in 2002 and 2003 did usage surpass the levels of the early 1990s.

***The growth in pesticides over this period was in part due to higher viticulture plantings*** [23]. While horticulture is the most intensive user of pesticides, over 13 kg of active ingredients (a.i.) per hectare (kg a.i./ha) compared to less than 3 kg a.i./ha for other users (*e.g.* arable and pastoral), it is also the most progressive in adopting practices to limit usage and damage to human health and the environment (Figure 3.20.3) [23, 24]. Even so, over the 2000-03 period only 10% of the total arable and permanent crop area was under integrated pest management [18], and the area farmed under certified organic practices was less than 0.5% of the total area farmed in 2003. The monitoring of pesticide residues in water and food indicates pollution is a rare occurrence and contamination levels are very low [24], although there is no regular monitoring of pesticides in water bodies [4].

***Demand for irrigation water by the agricultural sector is growing rapidly.*** Agriculture uses less than 1% of available water resources, but accounts for 75% of total water use, of which nearly 80% is used for irrigation. Over 40% of water used for irrigation is derived from groundwater [2]. But, there are regions where water is becoming scarce through changes in supply and demand patterns, especially the Canterbury region where 70% of the total irrigated area is located. This is leading to growing competition between farming and other water users, and concerns over the maintenance of environmental flows to protect aquatic ecosystems, and for social and cultural values associated with water [2, 11, 16, 25].

***The area irrigated almost doubled over the period 1990-92 to 2001-03 with two-thirds of it pasture.*** While only 4% of total area farmed is irrigated (2001-03), produce from irrigated land accounted for over 10% of agriculture GDP and 12% of farm export value in 2002/03 [11]. Projections indicate that the rapid expansion in agricultural water demand is likely to continue, especially with the expected growth in the dairy and horticultural sectors, and with climate change. Demand for irrigation water is projected to rise by nearly 30% between 2000 and 2010 [2, 26]. Around 40-50% of the irrigated area is under less efficient water application systems, but the horticultural sector is increasingly using micro/drip irrigation systems [11]. A survey also revealed that only 10-12% of irrigators regularly measure soil moisture [2].

***Agricultural air emissions are significant in terms of the environmental pressure from greenhouse gases, but less so for ammonia and methyl bromide.*** While data on agricultural ammonia emissions are limited, what information is available suggests that the critical threshold level for damage to ecosystems is unlikely to be exceeded [27]. New Zealand has agreed, as a signatory to the *Montreal Protocol*, to phase out its use of ***methyl bromide*** by 2005, and by 2004 it was reduced by over 80% compared to 1991 levels. In 2005 "Critical Use Exemption" (CUE), which under the Protocol allows farmers more time to find substitutes, was agreed for up to 24 tonnes (ozone depleting potential), with only strawberry growers seeking to continue use under CUE status [28].

***New Zealand is unique among OECD countries in that agriculture is a key sector in national climate change mitigation policy.*** The sector contributed 49% of total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (average 2002-04), with the main sources of emissions originating from livestock (methane). However, there has been a change in the emissions profile due to expansion in dairy and contraction in sheep numbers, while there has also been a large increase in nitrogen fertiliser use, mainly on dairy farms [29]. The growth in agricultural emissions over the period 1990-92 to 2002-04 (14%) was among the highest across the OECD (–3%) (Figure 3.20.2), but slightly below the rate of emission growth for the New Zealand economy (19%), although well above the nation's 0% commitment by 2008-12 under the *Kyoto Protocol*. New Zealand farm emissions, however, contributed only 3% to total OECD agricultural GHG emissions, and enteric methane emissions from dairy cattle per litre of milk per annum declined between 1990 and 2004 (Figure 3.20.4).

***Projections suggest that agricultural GHGs will continue to grow up to 2010 but at a slower rate than over the 1990s*** [29]. While agriculture's capacity to ***sequester carbon*** in soils appears to have declined [13], the conversion of pasture to forestry has led to a net removal of $CO_2$ through forest sinks. Improvements in energy efficiency in agriculture can also help reduce or lower the rate of GHG emissions, although $CO_2$ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in farming are only a small share of total agricultural GHGs. ***Direct on-farm energy consumption*** grew substantially less (22%) than the increase in farm production volume (38%), over the period 1990-92 to 2002-04, suggesting an increase in on-farm energy efficiency. Dairy farming, for example, used 1% less direct energy in 2002 than it did in 1996 [2], despite the considerable increase in average production per hectare [30].

***New Zealand has been identified as a "biodiversity hotspot" because of the uniqueness of its wild species*** [31, 32]. Trends in ***agricultural genetic resources*** show that extensive *in situ* conservation is taking place for crops, but that it is under pressure from non-native animals and plant pests. A large part of native flora is represented in *ex situ* collections, but information exchange between collections is poor [18]. For livestock genetic resources there is little information [18].

***Overall conservation of wild species and ecosystems has shown mixed results over the past decade***, with the decline of many native species and habitats being halted through preservation, improved management, and restoration [33]. Assessing the impact of agriculture on ecosystems and species is difficult because of a lack of data and monitoring [4], and because the interactions between farming and ecosystems are complex. While the quantity of indigenous woody vegetation is increasing with the contraction in the area under pastoral farming, there are signs that the quality of these habitats continues to deteriorate [32]. Also, the intensity and frequency of grazing of natural grasslands affects vegetation cover and the balance of dominant species.

***Some farmers have entered into open space covenants through the Queen Elizabeth 2nd National Trust***, a non-governmental organisation [31]. The *Trust* provides limited support to protect certain areas of farmers land while they retain ownership. Currently under 0.5% of farmland is included under the covenants. In some areas, elevated nutrient loadings of rivers and lakes from livestock have had adverse impacts on aquatic ecosystems [31]. But in some regions, however, where riparian management programmes are used, water quality has remained stable or improved, even though stock numbers have increased. In the case of the Taranaki region, for example, cow numbers doubled over the past 20 years while most water quality indicators remained the same or improved over this period [34].

### *3.20.3. Overall agri-environmental performance*

***New Zealand has a high degree of dependence on its biological assets for generating much of the nation's wealth.*** Levels of "natural" soil erosion for most land in the country are above the global average. Increasing climatic instability is heightening risks and costs for farmers, and is focusing attention on water resources in some drier regions. Biodiversity conservation is a challenge for farmers, but agriculture also incurs significant costs and threats associated with invasive species.

***OECD projections from 2006 to 2015 indicate a continued expansion in farm production***, but at a lower rate of growth than over the period 1990-2005 [35]. Higher farm output is most likely to derive from improvements in productivity rather than an extension of the area farmed or greater livestock numbers [35]. For example, the projected rise in milk production of 1.7%/annum (2006-15), in contrast to 4.4%/annum over the period 1990-2005, is expected to result mainly from raising dairy cow yields (1.2%/annum) compared to higher cow numbers (0.5%/annum).

***A key impediment to adequately assessing environmental performance in agriculture is the limited availability of nationally comparable data.*** With the projected expansion in the agricultural sector up to 2015 [35], this heightens the widely recognised need for an improved monitoring system [2, 4] to provide a baseline for tracking the state and trends of: soil [36, 37, 38]; water [15]; biodiversity resources [32]; pesticides [23, 24]; and energy use in agriculture [30]. However, New Zealand uses indicators and other quantitative data extensively in agri-environmental policy assessment, and recently instituted a *Linked Indicator Project*, which examines a range of economic, social, cultural and environmental measures significant to communities and their well-being. These indicators will provide information to support the monitoring and reporting requirements of local authorities, and will cover both urban and rural councils. The project aims to include measures of: energy use, water use, land use and cover, economic and industry activity, as well as a range of standard of living indicators.

***Policy changes and voluntary actions by farmers over the past decade suggest the future prospects of reducing agriculture's pressure on the environment are encouraging.*** After a phase of uncertainty following the comprehensive economic and political reforms in the 1980s, a process of stakeholder consultation, outreach and education across the agro-food sector [39], reinforced by the *Resource Management Act*, has led to growing use of environmental farm plans and farmer investment to address environmental issues [3, 40]. While the uptake of these plans by dairy farmers was initially low [39], the number of plans developed by farmers is increasing.

***The 2003 agreement between the dairy industry and the government (Dairying and Clean Streams Accord) to address environmental issues, is a promising development*** [15, 41]. In 2004, national and local governments have agreed to fund a total package of nearly NZD 82 (USD 54) million that is intended to limit nutrient flows from agriculture into Lake Taupo, such as restrictions on land use and allowing nitrogen trading to occur [8, 16]. Research indicates that to maintain current water quality in the Lake will require a 20% reduction in nitrogen from farming and urban areas [2].

***The government has notified the strawberry industry that after 2007 it will no longer seek Critical Use Exemption of methyl bromide, under the* Montreal Protocol**. This development which should see the end of the use of this ozone depleting substance in New Zealand [28].

***Biosecurity programmes seek to benefit productive farming and forestry systems by controlling or eradicating various pests***, which may also help to enhance biodiversity conservation and bring other environmental benefits. For example, the increasingly widespread threat to nitrogen fixation in clover pasture (which accounts for over 50% of the nitrogen inputs into agriculture) from the clover root weevil (*Sitona lepidus*) may encourage farmers to use greater nitrogen fertiliser applications [2].

***Overall the quality of the environment impacted by agriculture is high but there are areas of concern***, especially given the projected growth in the agricultural sector over the next decade. The agricultural policy reforms from 1984 reduced environmental pressure on marginal land, especially soil erosion, and encouraged forestation and reversion to native bush. Over the 1990s up to 2004 there has been a significant intensification of agriculture, especially dairying, and further diversification, such as into deer farming, horticulture and forestry [2]. This has led, in particular, to elevated levels of nutrients in soils and water bodies, growth in direct on-farm energy consumption, and higher emissions of greenhouse gases from agriculture. Despite the growing demand for water by irrigators in certain regions where scarcity and competition are increasing, there has been little strategic consideration of regional water resources to provide incentives to invest in water or encourage irrigators to use water more efficiently. The government, however, is currently examining the water allocation system under the *Water Programme of Action* [2, 11, 16, 42, 43].

***There are many initiatives to encourage greater adoption of environmentally beneficial farm management practices.*** Moreover, rates of adoption of environmental farm management practices have grown rapidly over the past decade [2], but overall adoption rates remain low. Over the 2000-03 period, for example, less than 30% of dairy farms were using a formal nutrient management plan and regularly testing the soil for nutrient levels, 10% of the total arable and permanent crop area was under integrated pest management [18], and only 10-12% of irrigators regularly monitor soil moisture content [2]. But a joint government and agriculture greenhouse gas research strategy was developed in 2003 to seek to lower emissions [8].

Figure 3.20.2. **National agri-environmental performance compared to the OECD average**

Percentage change 1990-92 to 2002-04[1]




Absolute and economy-wide change/level

| Variable | Unit | | New Zealand | **OECD** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agricultural production volume | Index (1999-01 = 100) | 1990-92 to 2002-04 | 138 | 105 |
| Agricultural land area | 000 hectares | 1990-92 to 2002-04 | –396 | –48 901 |
| Agricultural nitrogen (N) balance | Kg N/hectare | 2002-04 | 46 | 74 |
| Agricultural phosphorus (P) balance | Kg P/hectare | 2002-04 | 14 | 10 |
| Agricultural pesticide use | Tonnes | 1990-92 to 2001-03 | +150 | –46 762 |
| Direct on-farm energy consumption | 000 tonnes of oil equivalent | 1990-92 to 2002-04 | +57 | +1 997 |
| Agricultural water use | Million $m^3$ | 1990-92 to 2001-03 | n.a. | +8 102 |
| Irrigation water application rates | Megalitres/ha of irrigated land | 2001-03 | n.a. | 8.4 |
| Agricultural ammonia emissions | 000 tonnes | 1990-92 to 2001-03 | n.a. | +115 |
| Agricultural greenhouse gas emissions | 000 tonnes $CO_2$ equivalent | 1990-92 to 2002-04 | +4 668 | –30 462 |

n.a.: Data not available. Zero equals value between –0.5% to < +0.5%.

1. For agricultural water use, pesticide use, irrigation water application rates, and agricultural ammonia emissions the % change is over the period 1990-92 to 2001-03.
2. Percentage change in nitrogen and phosphorus balances in tonnes.

*Source:* OECD Secretariat. For full details of these indicators, see Chapter 1 of the *Main Report*.

Figure 3.20.3. **Sectoral use of pesticides: 2004**




*Source:* Ministry for the Environment, New Zealand.

Figure 3.20.4. **Dairy cattle enteric methane emissions per litre of milk**




*Source:* The National Inventory Report and Common Reporting Format: New Zealand's Greenhouse Gas Inventory 1990-2004 and New Zealand's Greenhouse Gas Inventory 1990-2005.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/300767207204

## *Bibliography*

[1] Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2006), *Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Statistics webpage*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.maf.govt.nz/statistics/index.htm*.

[2] Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (2004), *Growing for good: Intensive farming, sustainability and New Zealand's environment*, Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.pce.govt.nz*.

[3] Smith, W. and H. Montgomery (2003), "Revolution or evolution? New Zealand agriculture since 1984", *GeoJournal*, Vol. 59, Issue No. 2, pp. 107-118

[4] MacLeod, C.J. and H. Moller (2006), "Intensification and diversification of New Zealand agriculture since 1960: An evaluation of current indicators of land use change", *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Vol. 115, pp. 201-218.

[5] Barnett, J. and J. Pauling (2005), "The environmental effects of New Zealand's free-market reforms", *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, Vol. 7, pp. 271-289.

[6] Valentine, I., E. Hurley, J. Reid and W. Allen (2004), "Principles and Processes for Effecting Change in Environmental Management", in OECD, *Farm Management and the Environment: Developing Indicators for Policy Analysis*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators*.

[7] New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2007), "Situation and Outlook for New Zealand Agriculture and Forestry", Wellington, New Zealand, August, *www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/statistics-and-forecasts/sonzaf/index.htm*.

[8] OECD (2005), *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: Monitoring and Evaluation 2005*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/agr/policy*.

[9] Fraser, N., G. King and L. Knight (2005), *Policy Measures Addressing Environmental Issues in New Zealand Agriculture: The OECD Inventory*, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Technical Paper No. 2005/05, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.maf.govt.nz/oublications*.

[10] Steele, K. (2005), "Evaluation of the New Zealand Sustainable Farming Fund: A Work in Progress", in OECD, *Evaluating Agri-environmental Policies: Design, Practice and Results*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env*.

[11] Doak, M. (2006), "Value of irrigation in New Zealand", in OECD, *Water and Agriculture: Sustainability, Markets and Policies*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env*.

[12] Krausse, M., G. Eyles, A Mackay, G. Sparling, P. Stephens and A. Fenemor (2004), "Farm Soil and Land Management Indicators – Lessons from Soil Conservation Policy and Practice in New Zealand", in OECD, *Farm Management and the Environment: Developing Indicators for Policy Analysis*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators*.

[13] Sparling, G. and L. Schipper (2004), "Soil quality monitoring in New Zealand: trends and issues arising from a broad-scale survey", *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Vol. 104, pp. 545-552.

[14] Fenemor, A., N. Preston, M. Page, N. Trustrum, L. Basher, C. Phillips, M. Marden and M. Lawson (2003), "The role of agriculture and forestry in mitigating landslides and floods in New Zealand", in OECD, *Agriculture and Land Conservation: Developing Indicators for Policy Analysis*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators*.

[15] OECD (2004), "Reducing Water Pollution", pp. 161-165, in OECD, *Economic Survey: New Zealand*, Paris, France.

[16] Martel, R. (2006), "New Zealand's Sustainable Water Programme of Action", in OECD, *Water and Agriculture: Sustainability, Markets and Policies*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env*.

[17] Environment Waikato (2003), *Protecting Lake Taupo – A Long Term Strategic Partnership*, Environment Waikato Regional Council, Hamilton East, New Zealand, *www.ew.govt.nz/enviroinfo/water/lakes/laketaupo/index.htm*.

[18] New Zealand's response to the OECD Agri-environmental Indicators Questionnaire, unpublished.

[19] Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2000), *Implications of Groundwater Nitrate Standards for Agricultural Management*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/resource-management/groundwater-nitrate/httoc.htm*.

[20] Statistics New Zealand (2002), *Monitoring Progress towards a Sustainable New Zealand*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.stats.govt.nz*.

[21] Journeaux, P. (2006), "Farmed Livestock as a Source of Microbial Contamination of Water", in OECD, *Water and Agriculture: Sustainability, Markets and Policies*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env*.

[22] Holland, P. and A. Rahman (1999), *Review of Trends in Agricultural Pesticide Use in New Zealand*, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Policy Technical Paper 99/11, Wellington, New Zealand, *http://202.78.129.207/mafnet/publications/techpap.html*.

[23] Manktelow, D., P. Stevens, J. Walker, S. Gurnsey, N. Park, J. Zabkiewicz, D. Reulon and A. Rahman (2005), *Trends in Pesticide Use in New Zealand: 2004*, report for the Ministry for the Environment, prepared by HortResearch, Havelock North, New Zealand, *www.hortresearch.co.nz/files/science/ifp/nz-pesticide-trends.pdf*.

[24] Ministry for the Environment (2002), *Towards a Pesticides Risk Reduction Policy for New Zealand*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/hazardous/*.

[25] Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2004), *The Economic Value of Irrigation in New Zealand*, MAF Technical Paper No. 04/01, Wellington, New Zealand, *http://202.78.129.207/mafnet/publications/techpap.html*.

[26] Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2002), *Future Water Allocation Issues*, Wellington, New Zealand, *http://202.78.129.207/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/water-efficiency/index.htm*.

[27] Stevenson, C., V. Hally and M. Noonan (2000), *Effects of Air Contaminants on Ecosystems and Recommended Critical Levels and Critical Loads*, Air Quality Technical Report No. 15, Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/air/ecosystem-effects-oct00.pdf*.

[28] UNEP (2006), *New Zealand National Management Strategy for the phase-out of Methyl Bromide Critical Use Exemptions*, prepared by the Ministry of Economic Development in co-operation with Strawberry Growers New Zealand Inc. and in consultation with the Ministry for the Environment, UNEP Ozone Secretariat, Nairobi, Kenya, *http://hq.unep.org/ozone/Information_for_the_Parties/Decisions/Dec_ExI_4-3/newzealand.pdf*.

[29] Ministry for the Environment (2005), *Review of Climate Change Policies*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.climatechange.govt.nz/resources/reports/index.html*.

[30] Wells, C. (2001), *Total Energy Indicators of Agricultural Sustainability: Dairy Farming Case Study*, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Policy, Technical Paper 2001/03, Wellington, New Zealand, *http://202.78.129.207/mafnet/publications/techpap.html*.

[31] Dodd, M., B. Burns and A. MacKay (2004), "Biodiversity Indicators for Farm Management: Building on a New Zealand Perspective", in OECD, *Farm Management and the Environment: Developing Indicators for Policy Analysis*, Paris, France, *www.oecd.org/tad/env/indicators*.

[32] Perley, C., H. Moller; J. Hutcheson and W. Hamilton (2001), *Toward Safeguarding New Zealand's Agricultural Biodiversity: Research Gaps, Priorities and Potential Case Studies*, New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Wellington, New Zealand, Consultant Report, *http://202.78.129.207/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/biodiversity/index.htm*.

[33] Central Government Coordinating Group for Biodiversity (2003), *New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy Third Annual Report 2002/03*, Report for Biodiversity Ministers, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.biodiversity.govt.nz/news/publications/index.html*.

[34] Taranaki Regional Council (2003), *Taranaki – our place, our future – Report on the state of the environment of the Taranaki region – 2003*, Stratford, New Zealand, *www.trc.govt.nz/state_of_environment/index.html*.

[35] OECD (2006), *Agricultural Commodities Outlook Database*, Paris, France.

[36] Sparling, G.A., L.A. Schipper, W. Bettjeman and R. Hill (2004), "Soil quality monitoring in New Zealand: practical lessons from a 6-year trial", *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Vol. 104, pp. 523-534.

[37] Lilburne, L., G.A. Sparling and L. Schipper (2004), "Soil quality monitoring in New Zealand: practical lessons from a 6-year trial", *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Vol. 104, pp. 535-544.

[38] Sumits A.P. and J.I. Morrison (2001), *Creating a Framework for Sustainability in California: Lessons Learned from the New Zealand Experience*, A report of the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment and Security, Oakland, California, United States, *www.pacinst.org/reports/*.

[39] Ministry for the Environment (2003), *Review of New Zealand Environmental Farm Plans*, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/land/*.

[40] Fairweather, J. and H. R. Campbell (2003), "Environmental beliefs and farm practices of New Zealand farmers: Contrasting pathways to sustainability", *Agriculture and Human Values*, Vol. 20, pp. 287-300.

[41] OECD (2004), *Agriculture, Trade and the Environment: The Dairy Sector*, Paris, France.

[42] Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2005), "The Water Programme of Action", *RMupdate*, Issue 16, Wellington, New Zealand, *www.maf.govt.nz*.

[43] OECD (2005), "Review of Water Allocation Rights", *Economic Survey of New Zealand*, pp. 58-60, Paris, France.