World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Land use dynamics and bioenergy: A critical review of environmental and socioeconomic interactions

Ikponmwosa Aiguobarueghian [1, *], Uwaga Monica Adanma [2] and Eseoghene Kupa [3]

[1] *Independent Researcher, Southampton, UK.*
[2] *Department of Forestry and Environmental Management, Micheal Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Nigeria.*
[3] *Matrix Limited Energy, Lagos, Nigeria.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 23(01), 540–549

Publication history: Received on 23 May 2024; revised on 06 July 2024; accepted on 08 July 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.1.2039

Abstract

This review paper examines the intricate environmental and socioeconomic interactions associated with land use dynamics and bioenergy production. Through an analysis of existing literature, the paper explores the impacts of bioenergy production on ecosystems, climate change, rural development, land tenure systems, and food security. Environmental interactions encompass biodiversity loss, soil degradation, water resource depletion, and carbon sequestration dynamics, with ecosystem integrity and climate resilience implications. Socioeconomic interactions encompass changes in land tenure arrangements, rural livelihoods, and food production systems, highlighting trade-offs and potential synergies between bioenergy production and other land uses. The paper concludes with implications for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers, emphasizing the need for integrated land use planning, sustainable land management practices, and policy interventions to promote environmental and socioeconomic sustainability in bioenergy production systems.

Keywords: Bioenergy; Environmental Interactions; Socioeconomic Interactions; Sustainability; Rural Development

1. Introduction

In the modern era, the intricate interplay between land use dynamics and bioenergy has emerged as a focal point of global discourse, driven by the urgent need to address environmental sustainability and socioeconomic development challenges. This paper delves into the nexus of land use dynamics and bioenergy, critically examining their environmental and socioeconomic interactions. Through this exploration, we aim to unravel the complexities, challenges, and opportunities inherent in the utilization of land for bioenergy production, shedding light on its implications for both natural ecosystems and human societies.

As a finite resource, land is the cornerstone of numerous human activities, ranging from agriculture and urban development to conservation and energy production. However, land use dynamics are undergoing profound transformations spurred by population growth, urbanization, and climate change. Within this dynamic landscape, bioenergy has emerged as a promising alternative to fossil fuels, offering the potential to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, enhance energy security, and foster rural development (Dirisu et al., 2024; Jha & Schmidt, 2021).

Bioenergy encompasses various renewable energy sources from organic materials, including biomass, biofuels, and biogas. These resources hold significant promise for reducing dependence on fossil fuels and transitioning towards a more sustainable energy future (Barot, 2022; Czekała, 2022). Yet, the production and utilization of bioenergy are intricately intertwined with land use patterns, raising complex environmental and socioeconomic considerations.

---

[*] Corresponding author: Ikponmwosa Aiguobarueghian

Against this backdrop, this paper's primary aim is to comprehensively examine the environmental and socioeconomic interactions inherent in the nexus of land use dynamics and bioenergy. Specifically, we seek to achieve the following objectives:

- To analyze the environmental impacts of land use changes associated with bioenergy production, including implications for biodiversity, soil health, water resources, and carbon sequestration.
- To assess the socioeconomic implications of bioenergy production on rural communities, focusing on aspects such as land tenure, livelihoods, and food security.
- To critically evaluate the trade-offs and synergies between bioenergy production and other land uses, consider competing land resource demands and potential conflicts with food production, conservation, and other ecosystem services.
- To identify key challenges, opportunities, and policy implications arising from the intersection of land use dynamics and bioenergy, to inform policy, practice, and research decision-making processes.

The study of environmental and socioeconomic interactions in the context of land use dynamics and bioenergy holds profound significance for policy, practice, and research. At the policy level, insights gleaned from this research can inform the development of evidence-based strategies and regulatory frameworks to promote sustainable land use and energy transitions. By understanding bioenergy production's environmental impacts and socioeconomic implications, policymakers can devise more effective measures to mitigate negative externalities, enhance rural livelihoods, and safeguard ecosystem integrity.

Furthermore, this research offers valuable insights into the complexities of integrating bioenergy production into existing land use systems for practitioners engaged in land management, energy planning, and rural development initiatives. By identifying potential synergies and trade-offs between bioenergy production and other land uses, practitioners can design more holistic and integrated approaches that optimize resource allocation, minimize conflicts, and maximize socioeconomic benefits. Finally, from a research perspective, this study advances our knowledge of the intricate linkages between land use dynamics and bioenergy, paving the way for future investigations into emerging issues, innovative technologies, and novel policy interventions. This research seeks to catalyze progress towards more sustainable and resilient energy systems that harmonize environmental conservation, socioeconomic development, and energy security objectives by fostering interdisciplinary dialogue and collaboration.

2. Conceptual Framework

Understanding the intricate interplay between land use dynamics, bioenergy, environmental interactions, and socioeconomic interactions requires a clear delineation of key terms and a solid theoretical foundation. In this section, we define these terms, elucidate relevant theoretical frameworks, and synthesize existing literature to contextualize our analysis.

2.1. Define Key Terms

Land Use Dynamics: Land use dynamics refer to the temporal and spatial patterns of changes in land cover and land use types over time. Various factors, including demographic shifts, economic activities, technological advancements, and policy interventions influence these changes. Land use dynamics encompass urbanization, deforestation, agricultural expansion, and land degradation, which have profound implications for ecosystems, human societies, and the climate system (Zhai et al., 2021).

Bioenergy: Bioenergy is a renewable energy resource derived from organic materials, such as biomass, biofuels, and biogas. Biomass can be sourced from a variety of feedstocks, including agricultural residues, forest residues, energy crops, and organic waste. Bioenergy production involves converting these biomass resources into heat, electricity, or liquid fuels through combustion, fermentation, and gasification processes. Bioenergy is touted as a promising alternative to fossil fuels, offering the potential to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, enhance energy security, and promote rural development (Azeez & Al-Zuhairi, 2020; Dhanya, Mishra, Chandel, & Verma, 2020).

Environmental Interactions: Environmental interactions refer to the reciprocal relationships between bioenergy production systems and the natural environment. These interactions encompass a range of ecological processes and phenomena, including impacts on biodiversity, soil quality, water resources, air quality, and carbon cycling. Environmental interactions also encompass broader considerations such as climate change mitigation, adaptation, and resilience, as bioenergy production can influence the carbon balance of ecosystems and the Earth's climate system (Gavrilescu, 2021).

Socioeconomic Interactions: Socioeconomic interactions pertain to bioenergy production's social and economic dimensions and its effects on human societies. These interactions include land tenure systems, property rights, livelihoods, employment opportunities, income distribution, food security, and rural development. Socioeconomic interactions also involve equity, justice, and governance considerations, as bioenergy production can have differential impacts on different social groups and communities (Heckwolf et al., 2021).

2.2. Theoretical Underpinning

Several theoretical frameworks and conceptual models provide insights into analyzing environmental and socioeconomic interactions in the context of land use dynamics and bioenergy. One such framework is the socio-ecological systems approach, which recognizes the interconnectedness of social, ecological, and economic systems and emphasizes the importance of understanding feedback loops, resilience, and adaptive governance mechanisms (McKay, 2021). Another relevant theoretical perspective is the land sparing vs land sharing debate, which explores trade-offs between agricultural intensification (land sparing) and biodiversity conservation (land sharing) and their implications for sustainable land use planning and biodiversity conservation (Baudron, Govaerts, Verhulst, McDonald, & Gérard, 2021; Loconto, Desquilbet, Moreau, Couvet, & Dorin, 2020).

Furthermore, theories of sustainable development, environmental governance, and political ecology offer valuable lenses for examining power dynamics, institutional arrangements, and policy processes shaping land use decisions and bioenergy development pathways. By drawing on these theoretical perspectives, researchers can unpack the complexities of environmental and socioeconomic interactions, identify leverage points for intervention, and devise strategies for promoting more sustainable and equitable outcomes (Elsässer, Hickmann, Jinnah, Oberthür, & Van de Graaf, 2022; Partelow et al., 2020).

A review of previous research on similar topics reveals a growing body of literature examining the environmental and socioeconomic dimensions of bioenergy production and land use dynamics. Studies have investigated the impacts of bioenergy feedstock cultivation on biodiversity, soil erosion, water quality, and carbon sequestration, highlighting both positive and negative effects depending on factors such as crop choice, management practices, and landscape context. Moreover, research has explored the socioeconomic implications of bioenergy production for rural livelihoods, agricultural productivity, land tenure systems, and food security, revealing complex trade-offs and distributional effects across different regions and social groups. However, gaps in knowledge persist regarding the long-term sustainability of bioenergy production systems, the scalability of alternative feedstock sources, and the implications of bioenergy policies for global land use patterns and carbon emissions (Abaku & Odimarha, 2024; Emmanuel, Edunjobi, & Agnes, 2024; Omole, Olajiga, & Olatunde, 2024c).

Emerging trends in the literature include the integration of spatially explicit modeling approaches, remote sensing techniques, and interdisciplinary methodologies to assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of bioenergy production at multiple scales. Additionally, there is growing recognition of the importance of stakeholder engagement, participatory decision-making processes, and multi-level governance mechanisms in shaping more inclusive and sustainable bioenergy development pathways.

Overall, the literature review underscores the need for a holistic and integrated approach to analyzing environmental and socioeconomic interactions in the context of land use dynamics and bioenergy. By synthesizing insights from diverse disciplinary perspectives and empirical studies, this research endeavour aims to advance our understanding of the complex dynamics shaping the sustainability of bioenergy production systems and their broader implications for human well-being and ecosystem integrity.

3. Environmental Interactions

3.1. Impact on Ecosystems

Bioenergy production often entails significant land use changes, including converting natural habitats such as forests, grasslands, and wetlands into bioenergy feedstock cultivation areas. These land use changes can profoundly impact biodiversity, soil quality, water resources, and carbon sequestration, altering ecosystem structure and function.

Biodiversity: The conversion of natural habitats for bioenergy feedstock cultivation can lead to habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation, resulting in declines in biodiversity and ecosystem services. Intensive monoculture plantations, such as those for dedicated energy crops like corn, soybeans, or palm oil, may reduce habitat complexity and species diversity, displacing native flora and fauna and disrupting ecological processes. Fragmentation of habitats can also increase edge effects, making ecosystems more susceptible to invasive species and disturbances (Gorman et al., 2023; Rai, 2022; Smith et al., 2022).

Soil Quality: The cultivation of bioenergy feedstocks can impact soil quality through changes in land management practices, such as tillage, fertilization, and irrigation. Intensive agriculture for bioenergy production may contribute to soil erosion, nutrient depletion, and soil compaction, impairing soil fertility and productivity over time. Moreover, agrochemicals, such as pesticides and fertilizers, can contaminate soils and water bodies, posing risks to human health and ecosystem integrity (Cherubin et al., 2021; Liu, Kwon, Northrup, & Wang, 2020; Vera et al., 2022).

Water Resources: Bioenergy production can affect water resources through land use patterns, hydrological cycles, and water quality alterations. Irrigation of bioenergy crops may increase water demand and competition for limited freshwater resources, exacerbating water scarcity in water-stressed regions. Moreover, runoff from agricultural fields can carry sediment, nutrients, and agrochemicals into water bodies, leading to eutrophication, algal blooms, and aquatic habitat degradation (de Mello et al., 2020; Lana-Renault, Morán-Tejeda, de las Heras, Lorenzo-Lacruz, & López-Moreno, 2020).

Carbon Sequestration: Land use changes for bioenergy production can affect carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions. While bioenergy crops such as trees and perennial grasses have the potential to sequester carbon in biomass and soils, the conversion of forests or grasslands into bioenergy plantations can result in the release of stored carbon, particularly if the land was a carbon sink prior to conversion. Moreover, changes in land management practices, such as increased tillage or fertilizer application, can accelerate soil carbon losses, offsetting potential carbon gains from bioenergy crop growth (Cheng et al., 2022; Field et al., 2020).

3.2. Climate Change Implications

The role of bioenergy in mitigating or exacerbating climate change is a subject of considerable debate and scrutiny, with conflicting perspectives on its carbon neutrality, emissions intensity, and overall climate benefits. Bioenergy production can influence climate change through various mechanisms, including carbon emissions, land conversion, and land management practices.

Carbon Emissions: The combustion of bioenergy feedstocks releases carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) into the atmosphere, contributing to climate change. However, unlike fossil fuels, bioenergy is often considered carbon neutral over time, as the carbon emitted during combustion is offset by the carbon absorbed during the growth of biomass feedstocks. This concept of carbon neutrality assumes that the carbon released from bioenergy combustion is reabsorbed by regrowing biomass within a relatively short time, thus maintaining a net zero carbon balance (Bessou, Ferchaud, Gabrielle, & Mary, 2011; de Carvalho Macedo, Nassar, Cowiec, Seabra, & Marellid, 2015).

Land Conversion: The conversion of natural habitats, such as forests or grasslands, into bioenergy plantations, can result in the loss of carbon stocks and the release of stored carbon into the atmosphere. Forest conversion, in particular, can have significant climate implications, as forests serve as important carbon sinks, sequestering carbon in biomass and soils. The loss of forests for bioenergy production can lead to substantial carbon emissions, particularly if the carbon released from deforestation exceeds the carbon sequestered by bioenergy crops over time (Ostle, Levy, Evans, & Smith, 2009).

Land Management Practices: The choice of land management practices for bioenergy production can influence its climate change mitigation potential. Sustainable land management practices, such as agroforestry, perennial cropping systems, and conservation agriculture, can enhance carbon sequestration, soil organic matter accumulation, and ecosystem resilience, thereby mitigating climate change impacts. Conversely, intensive land management practices, such as monoculture plantations, excessive fertilization, and soil tillage, may exacerbate greenhouse gas emissions, soil degradation, and biodiversity loss.

3.3. Environmental Sustainability

Assessing the overall environmental sustainability of bioenergy production systems requires a holistic and integrated approach that considers trade-offs and potential synergies with other land uses and the broader socio-ecological context in which bioenergy operates.

Trade-offs: Bioenergy production often entails trade-offs between environmental, social, and economic objectives, as competing land uses vie for limited resources and ecosystem services. For example, the expansion of bioenergy feedstock cultivation may displace food crops, exacerbating food insecurity and land competition. Similarly, intensifying bioenergy production through monoculture plantations may compromise biodiversity conservation efforts, leading to habitat loss and ecosystem degradation. Balancing these trade-offs requires careful consideration of ecosystem resilience, social equity, economic viability, stakeholder engagement, and participatory decision-making processes (Gissi, Gaglio, Aschonitis, Fano, & Reho, 2018; Longato, Gaglio, Boschetti, & Gissi, 2019).

Synergies: Despite potential trade-offs, bioenergy production systems can also offer synergies with other land uses, enhancing environmental sustainability and multifunctionality. For instance, agroforestry systems that integrate bioenergy crops with food crops or native vegetation can promote soil conservation, biodiversity conservation, and carbon sequestration while providing additional ecosystem services such as shade, windbreaks, and water retention. Similarly, bioenergy production from waste streams, such as agricultural residues, forestry residues, and organic waste, can reduce landfill emissions, promote resource recovery, and contribute to circular economy principles.

Policy and Governance: The environmental sustainability of bioenergy production systems is heavily influenced by policy and governance frameworks that shape land use decisions, incentivize sustainable practices, and regulate environmental impacts. Effective policies and regulations should promote land use planning, environmental impact assessments, and certification schemes that ensure the sustainable management of bioenergy feedstock production areas. Moreover, governance mechanisms should foster transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation in decision-making processes, empowering local communities and indigenous peoples to engage in land stewardship and resource management (Odimarha, Ayodeji, & Abaku, 2024a, 2024b; Omole, Olajiga, & Olatunde, 2024b).

In conclusion, achieving environmental sustainability in bioenergy production requires a nuanced understanding of its impacts on ecosystems, climate systems, and overall environmental quality. By considering trade-offs, potential synergies with other land uses, and the role of policy and governance in shaping land use decisions, bioenergy can contribute to a more sustainable energy future that balances environmental conservation, socioeconomic development, and climate resilience. However, realizing this vision necessitates a holistic and integrated approach prioritising ecosystem integrity, social equity, and long-term sustainability.

4. Socioeconomic Interactions

4.1. Land Tenure and Ownership

Bioenergy production can profoundly affect land tenure systems, property rights, and access to land for different stakeholders, particularly in regions where land is a scarce and valuable resource. The expansion of bioenergy feedstock cultivation often involves large-scale land acquisitions, land lease agreements, or land concessions, which can lead to changes in land tenure arrangements and patterns of land ownership. These changes can have implications for land access, control, and distribution among various stakeholders, including smallholder farmers, indigenous communities, and agribusiness corporations.

Smallholder Farmers: In many cases, farmers are at the forefront of bioenergy feedstock production, cultivating crops such as sugarcane, maize, or oil palm for biofuel production. While bioenergy production can offer smallholders opportunities for income diversification and rural development, it can also pose risks to their land tenure security and livelihoods. Land lease agreements with bioenergy companies may entail loss of land control and autonomy for smallholders, who may be vulnerable to displacement, land grabbing, or marginalization in the absence of adequate legal protections and institutional support (Kabir, 2021; Kiptoo, Waswa, & Kagendo, 2023; Sakai et al., 2020).

Indigenous Communities: Indigenous communities often inhabit areas targeted for bioenergy feedstock cultivation, such as forests, grasslands, and marginal lands. The expansion of bioenergy production into indigenous territories can result in conflicts over land rights, resource access, and cultural heritage, as indigenous peoples seek to defend their customary land tenure systems and traditional livelihoods. Moreover, bioenergy projects may exacerbate existing inequalities and power imbalances, as indigenous communities may lack legal recognition of their land rights or face coercive pressures to relinquish control over their territories to external actors (Dale, Kline, Wiens, & Fargione, 2010; Montefrio, 2012).

Agribusiness Corporations: Large-scale bioenergy projects often involve corporate investments, agro-industrial complexes, and plantation economies that consolidate land ownership and control in the hands of agribusiness corporations. These corporations may benefit from economies of scale, access to capital, and political influence, enabling them to acquire vast tracts of land for bioenergy feedstock cultivation. However, such consolidation of land ownership can marginalize smallholders, displace rural communities, and exacerbate social inequalities, as corporate interests prioritize profit maximization over local development and environmental sustainability (Bastos Lima, 2021).

4.2. Rural Development

Bioenergy production has the potential to stimulate rural development, generate employment opportunities, and stimulate local economies in rural areas, where poverty, unemployment, and economic marginalization are often prevalent. By diversifying agricultural activities, enhancing infrastructure, and fostering value-added industries, bioenergy projects can contribute to rural revitalization and economic transformation, empowering communities to improve their livelihoods and quality of life.

Bioenergy production can create jobs along the bioenergy value chain, from crop cultivation and harvesting to processing, transportation, and distribution. In rural areas with limited employment opportunities, bioenergy projects can offer seasonal or permanent employment opportunities for local residents, including farmers, laborers, technicians, and service providers. Moreover, bioenergy projects may stimulate ancillary industries, such as agro-processing, biofuel refineries, and biomass power plants, creating additional job opportunities and income streams for rural communities. Bioenergy production can alos generate income for rural households through crop sales, wage labor, and value-added activities. Farmers who cultivate bioenergy feedstocks may benefit from stable markets, guaranteed prices, and long-term contracts with bioenergy companies, providing them with a reliable source of income and financial security. Moreover, bioenergy projects may enable farmers to diversify their income sources, reduce economic vulnerability, and invest in agricultural productivity improvements, thereby enhancing their resilience to external shocks and market fluctuations (Aturamu, Thompson, & Banke, 2021; Eyo-Udo, Odimarha, & Kolade, 2024; Osuagwu, Uwaga, & Inemeawaji, 2023).

Bioenergy projects can stimulate local economies by attracting investments, stimulating demand for goods and services, and generating tax revenues for local governments. In regions where bioenergy feedstock cultivation becomes a dominant economic activity, bioenergy projects may catalyze infrastructure development, such as roads, schools, healthcare facilities, and marketplaces, improving rural communities' living standards and social welfare. Moreover, bioenergy projects may foster entrepreneurship, innovation, and knowledge transfer, as local businesses and research institutions collaborate to develop bioenergy technologies and value chains.

However, the socioeconomic benefits of bioenergy production are not evenly distributed, and rural development outcomes can vary depending on factors such as market dynamics, institutional capacity, and social inclusion. Achieving inclusive and sustainable rural development in the context of bioenergy production requires proactive policies, targeted investments, and community empowerment strategies that address underlying drivers of poverty, inequality, and social exclusion.

4.3. Food Security and Land Competition

Bioenergy production has the potential to compete with food production for land, water, and resources, raising concerns about its implications for food security, nutrition, and agricultural sustainability. As bioenergy feedstock cultivation expands, it may encroach upon agricultural lands, displacing food crops, reducing arable land availability, and exacerbating land competition pressures in regions already facing food insecurity and malnutrition.

Land Competition: The expansion of bioenergy production can intensify competition for land resources, as bioenergy feedstock crops compete with food crops for limited arable land. In regions where agricultural land is scarce or degraded, the cultivation of bioenergy feedstocks may lead to land use conflicts, land grabs, and displacement of smallholder farmers. Moreover, bioenergy projects may exacerbate land degradation, soil erosion, and deforestation, further reducing land productivity and agricultural resilience in vulnerable areas.

Food Security: Bioenergy production can affect food security and nutrition, particularly in regions where food production is the primary source of livelihoods and sustenance for rural communities. Bioenergy feedstocks' displacement of food crops may reduce food availability, increase food prices, and exacerbate food insecurity, especially for vulnerable populations such as smallholder farmers, landless laborers, and marginalized groups. Moreover, bioenergy projects may divert resources away from food production, such as water, fertilizers, and labor, thereby limiting investments in agricultural productivity improvements and rural development initiatives.

Strategies for Addressing Land Use Trade-offs: To address land use trade-offs between bioenergy production and food security, policymakers, practitioners, and stakeholders can adopt a range of strategies that promote sustainable land use planning, integrated landscape management, and multi-functional land use systems. These strategies include (Ibe, Ezenwa, Uwaga, & Ngwuli, 2018; Omole, Olajiga, & Olatunde, 2024a; Thompson, Akintuyi, Omoniyi, & Fatoki, 2022):

Agroforestry and Agroecology: Promoting agroforestry systems that integrate bioenergy crops with food crops, native vegetation, and ecosystem services can enhance land productivity, biodiversity conservation, and climate resilience, while minimizing trade-offs between bioenergy production and food security. Agroforestry practices such as alley cropping, windbreaks, and silvopasture provide biomass for bioenergy production and enhance soil fertility, water retention, and carbon sequestration, thereby supporting sustainable land management and livelihood diversification. Similarly, adopting agroecological principles such as crop diversification, organic farming, and soil conservation practices can improve agricultural sustainability, increase resilience to climate change, and enhance food security. By promoting ecological intensification and resource efficiency, agroecology offers holistic solutions to the challenges of land degradation, resource depletion, and food system resilience, aligning with the principles of sustainable development and environmental stewardship.

Integrated Landscape Management: Implementing integrated landscape management approaches that coordinate land use planning, conservation, and development activities across multiple stakeholders and land uses. Integrated landscape management seeks to optimize the allocation of land resources, reconcile competing land use demands, and enhance ecosystem services, while promoting social equity and economic prosperity. Integrating landscape management can help identify win-win solutions that maximize synergies and minimize trade-offs between bioenergy production and food security by fostering collaboration between agriculture, forestry, energy, and conservation sectors.

Sustainable Intensification: Embracing sustainable intensification practices that enhance agricultural productivity while minimizing environmental impacts and resource use. Sustainable intensification involves optimizing input use, improving crop yields, and increasing production efficiency through techniques such as precision agriculture, improved crop varieties, and efficient irrigation systems. By intensifying production on existing agricultural lands while conserving natural habitats and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, sustainable intensification can help meet growing food and energy demands without compromising environmental sustainability or exacerbating land competition pressures.

Land Use Planning and Zoning: Strengthening land use planning and zoning regulations to guide the spatial distribution of bioenergy production activities and protect critical food production areas. Land use planning tools such as land use maps, zoning ordinances, and land use planning commissions can help identify suitable locations for bioenergy projects, taking into account factors such as soil suitability, water availability, biodiversity conservation priorities, and proximity to markets. Land use planning can ensure sustainable land use allocation and prevent land use conflicts by designating areas for bioenergy production that minimize conflicts with food production, sensitive ecosystems, and water resources.

Payment for Ecosystem Services: Implementing payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes that incentivize farmers and landowners to adopt land management practices that enhance ecosystem services, such as carbon sequestration, water purification, and biodiversity conservation. PES schemes provide financial incentives, subsidies, or market-based mechanisms for land managers to conserve natural habitats, restore degraded lands, and adopt sustainable land use practices that benefit both biodiversity and human well-being. PES schemes can align economic incentives with environmental objectives by rewarding land stewardship and environmental conservation, promoting sustainable land management and enhancing ecosystem services in bioenergy production landscapes.

Addressing land use trade-offs between bioenergy production and food security requires a multifaceted approach that integrates diverse strategies to promote environmental sustainability, socioeconomic development, and food system resilience. Agroforestry and agroecology offer promising solutions for enhancing land productivity, biodiversity conservation, and climate resilience while minimizing trade-offs between bioenergy production and food security. Additionally, integrated landscape management, sustainable intensification, land use planning and zoning, payment for ecosystem services, and capacity building initiatives play crucial roles in reconciling competing land use demands, fostering collaboration across sectors, and empowering stakeholders to adopt sustainable land management practices.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have explored the environmental and socioeconomic interactions related to land use dynamics and bioenergy production, highlighting the complexities, challenges, and opportunities inherent in the utilization of land for bioenergy purposes. Through our analysis, several key insights and conclusions have emerged, shedding light on the multifaceted nature of these interactions and their implications for environmental sustainability, socioeconomic development, and food security.

Our examination of environmental interactions revealed that land use changes for bioenergy production can significantly impact ecosystems, including biodiversity loss, soil degradation, water resource depletion, and alterations in carbon sequestration dynamics. While bioenergy production has the potential to mitigate climate change by substituting for fossil fuels and sequestering carbon in biomass and soils, its overall climate benefits are contingent upon sustainable land management practices and policy interventions that address land conversion, emissions intensity, and ecosystem conservation. On the socioeconomic front, our analysis highlighted the ways in which bioenergy production influences land tenure systems, rural development trajectories, and food security dynamics. The expansion of bioenergy feedstock cultivation can lead to changes in land ownership patterns, displacement of local communities, and competition with food production, raising concerns about equity, livelihoods, and social inclusion. However, bioenergy production also offers opportunities for rural development, job creation, and economic diversification, particularly in regions with predominant agricultural activities and high poverty rates.

The findings of this research have several practical implications for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers seeking to promote more sustainable land use and bioenergy systems. Firstly, policymakers should prioritize the development of integrated land use planning frameworks that balance competing land uses, safeguard ecosystem services, and promote social equity. This requires collaboration across sectors, stakeholder engagement, and evidence-based decision-making processes that account for bioenergy production's environmental and socioeconomic trade-offs. Practitioners involved in bioenergy projects should adopt sustainable land management practices, such as agroforestry, agroecology, and conservation agriculture, to minimize environmental impacts, enhance ecosystem resilience, and maximize socioeconomic benefits. Moreover, they should prioritize community engagement, capacity building, and inclusive development approaches that empower local stakeholders and ensure equitable distribution of benefits. Researchers are vital in advancing knowledge and informing policy and practice in land use dynamics and bioenergy. Future research should focus on methodological advancements, interdisciplinary approaches, and case studies that deepen our understanding of the environmental and socioeconomic interactions associated with bioenergy production. Additionally, there is a need for policy interventions aimed at promoting sustainable bioenergy development, such as carbon pricing mechanisms, land tenure reforms, and certification schemes that incentivize responsible land use practices and promote environmental and socioeconomic sustainability.

Future research in this area should explore innovative approaches for assessing bioenergy production's environmental and socioeconomic impacts, including remote sensing techniques, spatial modeling, and participatory methods that integrate local knowledge and stakeholder perspectives. Moreover, there is a need for longitudinal studies and comparative analyses that track the long-term effects of bioenergy projects on ecosystems, communities, and landscapes, providing valuable insights into the dynamics of land use change and sustainability transitions over time. Furthermore, there is a growing need for policy interventions and governance mechanisms that address the systemic drivers of unsustainable land use practices and promote more equitable and inclusive bioenergy development pathways. This requires collaboration between governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector to develop coherent policy frameworks, regulatory standards, and investment incentives that align environmental conservation, socioeconomic development, and climate resilience objectives.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Abaku, E. A., & Odimarha, A. C. (2024). Sustainable supply chain management in the medical industry: A theoretical and practical examination. *International Medical Science Research Journal, 4*(3), 319-340.

[2] Aturamu, O. A., Thompson, O. A., & Banke, A. O. (2021). Forecasting the effect of climate variability on yam yield in rainforest and Guinea Savannah agro-ecological zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Global Agriculture and Ecology, 11*(4), 1-12.

[3] Azeez, R. A., & Al-Zuhairi, F. K. (2020). Biofuels (Bioethanol, Biodiesel, and Biogas) from Lignocellulosic Biomass: A Review. *Journal of University of Babylon for Engineering Sciences*, 202-215.

[4] Barot, S. (2022). Biomass and bioenergy: resources, conversion and application. *Renewable Energy for Sustainable Growth Assessment*, 243-262.

[5] Bastos Lima, M. G. (2021). Corporate power in the bioeconomy transition: The policies and politics of conservative ecological modernization in Brazil. *Sustainability, 13*(12), 6952.

[6] Baudron, F., Govaerts, B., Verhulst, N., McDonald, A., & Gérard, B. (2021). Sparing or sharing land? Views from agricultural scientists. *Biological Conservation, 259*, 109167.

[7] Bessou, C., Ferchaud, F., Gabrielle, B., & Mary, B. (2011). Biofuels, greenhouse gases and climate change. *Sustainable Agriculture Volume 2*, 365-468.

[8] Cheng, Y., Huang, M., Lawrence, D. M., Calvin, K., Lombardozzi, D. L., Sinha, E., . . . He, X. (2022). Future bioenergy expansion could alter carbon sequestration potential and exacerbate water stress in the United States. *Science Advances, 8*(18), eabm8237.

[9] Cherubin, M. R., Carvalho, J. L. N., Cerri, C. E. P., Nogueira, L. A. H., Souza, G. M., & Cantarella, H. (2021). Land use and management effects on sustainable sugarcane-derived bioenergy. *Land, 10*(1), 72.

[10] Czekała, W. (2022). Biogas as a sustainable and renewable energy source. In *Clean Fuels for Mobility* (pp. 201-214): Springer.

[11] Dale, V. H., Kline, K. L., Wiens, J., & Fargione, J. (2010). *Biofuels: implications for land use and biodiversity*: Ecological Society of America Washington, DC.

[12] de Carvalho Macedo, I., Nassar, A. M., Cowiec, A. L., Seabra, J. E., & Marellid, L. (2015). Greenhouse gas emissions from bioenergy. *Bioenergy & Sustainability: Bridging the Gaps SCOPE, 72*, 582-617.

[13] de Mello, K., Taniwaki, R. H., de Paula, F. R., Valente, R. A., Randhir, T. O., Macedo, D. R., . . . Hughes, R. M. (2020). Multiscale land use impacts on water quality: Assessment, planning, and future perspectives in Brazil. *Journal of Environmental Management, 270*, 110879.

[14] Dhanya, B., Mishra, A., Chandel, A. K., & Verma, M. L. (2020). Development of sustainable approaches for converting the organic waste to bioenergy. *Science of the total environment, 723*, 138109.

[15] Dirisu, J. O., Salawu, E. Y., Ekpe, I. C., Udoye, N. E., Falodun, O. E., Oyedepo, S. O., . . . Kale, S. A. (2024). Promoting the use of bioenergy in developing nations: a CDM route to sustainable development. *Frontiers in Energy Research, 11*, 1184348.

[16] Elsässer, J. P., Hickmann, T., Jinnah, S., Oberthür, S., & Van de Graaf, T. (2022). Institutional interplay in global environmental governance: lessons learned and future research. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 22*(2), 373-391.

[17] Emmanuel, A., Edunjobi, T., & Agnes, C. (2024). Theoretical approaches to AI in supply chain optimization: pathways to efficiency and resilience. *International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive, 6*(01), 092-107.

[18] Eyo-Udo, N. L., Odimarha, A. C., & Kolade, O. O. (2024). Ethical supply chain management: balancing profit, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 6*(4), 1069-1077.

[19] Field, J. L., Richard, T. L., Smithwick, E. A., Cai, H., Laser, M. S., LeBauer, D. S., . . . Sheehan, J. J. (2020). Robust paths to net greenhouse gas mitigation and negative emissions via advanced biofuels. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(36), 21968-21977.

[20] Gavrilescu, M. (2021). Water, soil, and plants interactions in a threatened environment. *Water, 13*(19), 2746.

[21] Gissi, E., Gaglio, M., Aschonitis, V. G., Fano, E., & Reho, M. (2018). Soil-related ecosystem services trade-off analysis for sustainable biodiesel production. *Biomass and Bioenergy, 114*, 83-99.

[22] Gorman, C. E., Torsney, A., Gaughran, A., McKeon, C. M., Farrell, C. A., White, C., . . . Buckley, Y. M. (2023). Reconciling climate action with the need for biodiversity protection, restoration and rehabilitation. *Science of the total environment, 857*, 159316.

[23] Heckwolf, M. J., Peterson, A., Jänes, H., Horne, P., Künne, J., Liversage, K., . . . Kotta, J. (2021). From ecosystems to socio-economic benefits: A systematic review of coastal ecosystem services in the Baltic Sea. *Science of the total environment, 755*, 142565.

[24] Ibe, G., Ezenwa, L., Uwaga, M., & Ngwuli, C. (2018). Assessment of challenges faced by non-timber forest products (NTFPs) dependents' communities in a changing climate: a case of adaptation measures Inohafia LGA, Abia State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Forestry, Wildlife and Environment, 10*(2), 39-48.

[25] Jha, P., & Schmidt, S. (2021). State of biofuel development in sub-Saharan Africa: How far sustainable? *Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, 150*, 111432.

[26] Kabir, Z. (2021). Social, economic, and environmental aspects of bioenergy resources. In *Bioenergy Resources and Technologies* (pp. 349-381): Elsevier.

[27] Kiptoo, D., Waswa, S., & Kagendo, N. M. (2023). Factors Influencing Biofuel Production in Western Kenya. *International Journal of Life Science and Agriculture Research, 2*(7), 181-192.

[28] Lana-Renault, N., Morán-Tejeda, E., de las Heras, M. M., Lorenzo-Lacruz, J., & López-Moreno, N. (2020). Land-use change and impacts. In *Water Resources in the Mediterranean Region* (pp. 257-296): Elsevier.

[29] Liu, X., Kwon, H., Northrup, D., & Wang, M. (2020). Shifting agricultural practices to produce sustainable, low carbon intensity feedstocks for biofuel production. *Environmental Research Letters, 15*(8), 084014.

[30] Loconto, A., Desquilbet, M., Moreau, T., Couvet, D., & Dorin, B. (2020). The land sparing–land sharing controversy: tracing the politics of knowledge. *Land use policy, 96*, 103610.

[31] Longato, D., Gaglio, M., Boschetti, M., & Gissi, E. (2019). Bioenergy and ecosystem services trade-offs and synergies in marginal agricultural lands: A remote-sensing-based assessment method. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 237*, 117672.

[32] McKay, P. A. (2021). *A quality governance framework for sustainable and resilient socio-ecological systems*: Michigan State University.

[33] Montefrio, M. J. F. (2012). Privileged biofuels, marginalized indigenous peoples: The coevolution of biofuels development in the tropics. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 32*(1), 41-55.

[34] Odimarha, A. C., Ayodeji, S. A., & Abaku, E. A. (2024a). Machine Learning's Influence On Supply Chain And Logistics Optimization In The Oil And Gas Sector: A Comprehensive Analysis. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal, 5*(3), 725-740.

[35] Odimarha, A. C., Ayodeji, S. A., & Abaku, E. A. (2024b). The role of technology in supply chain risk management: Innovations and challenges in logistics. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews, 10*(2), 138-145.

[36] Omole, F. O., Olajiga, O. K., & Olatunde, T. M. (2024a). Challenges and successes in rural electrification: A review of global policies and case studies. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal, 5*(3), 1031-1046.

[37] Omole, F. O., Olajiga, O. K., & Olatunde, T. M. (2024b). Hybrid Power Systems In Mining: Review Of Implementations In Canada, USA, And Africa. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal, 5*(3), 1008-1019.

[38] Omole, F. O., Olajiga, O. K., & Olatunde, T. M. (2024c). Sustainable Urban Design: A Review Of Eco-Friendly Building Practices And Community Impact. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal, 5*(3), 1020-1030.

[39] Ostle, N., Levy, P., Evans, C., & Smith, P. (2009). UK land use and soil carbon sequestration. *Land use policy, 26*, S274-S283.

[40] Osuagwu, E. C., Uwaga, A. M., & Inemeawaji, H. P. (2023). Effects of Leachate from Osisioma Open Dumpsite in Aba, Abia State, Nigeria on Surrounding Borehole Water Quality. In *Water Resources Management and Sustainability: Solutions for Arid Regions* (pp. 319-333): Springer.

[41] Partelow, S., Schlüter, A., Armitage, D., Bavinck, M., Carlisle, K., Gruby, R. L., . . . Song, A. M. (2020). Environmental governance theories: a review and application to coastal systems.

[42] Rai, P. K. (2022). Environmental degradation by invasive alien plants in the anthropocene: challenges and prospects for sustainable restoration. *Anthropocene Science, 1*(1), 5-28.

[43] Sakai, P., Afionis, S., Favretto, N., Stringer, L. C., Ward, C., Sakai, M., . . . de Souza, N. M. (2020). Understanding the implications of alternative bioenergy crops to support smallholder farmers in Brazil. *Sustainability, 12*(5), 2146.

[44] Smith, P., Arneth, A., Barnes, D. K., Ichii, K., Marquet, P. A., Popp, A., . . . Strassburg, B. (2022). How do we best synergize climate mitigation actions to co-benefit biodiversity? *Global Change Biology, 28*(8), 2555-2577.

[45] Thompson, O. A., Akintuyi, O. B., Omoniyi, L. O., & Fatoki, O. A. (2022). Analysis of Land Use and Land Cover Change in Oil Palm Producing Agro-Ecological Zones of Nigeria. *Journal of Agroforestry and Environment, 15*(1), 30-41.

[46] Vera, I., Wicke, B., Lamers, P., Cowie, A., Repo, A., Heukels, B., . . . Cherubini, F. (2022). Land use for bioenergy: Synergies and trade-offs between sustainable development goals. *Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, 161*, 112409.

[47] Zhai, H., Lv, C., Liu, W., Yang, C., Fan, D., Wang, Z., & Guan, Q. (2021). Understanding spatio-temporal patterns of land use/land cover change under urbanization in Wuhan, China, 2000–2019. *Remote Sensing, 13*(16), 3331.