

## AGRICULTURE AND NITROGEN; WHAT GOES IN MUST COME OUT

#### Oene Oenema

Wageningen University & Research Center, The Netherlands

WAGENINGENUR

## Outline

## Agriculture and N flows

Pollution swapping in EU-25+
 NH<sub>3</sub> emission abatement measures
 NO<sub>3</sub> leaching abatement measures

# Agricultural Systems

- Crop production systems
  - Arable crops
  - Vegetables & fruits & flowers
  - Greenhouse systems

## Animal production systems

- Grazing systems
- Mixed systems
- Land-less or foot-loose systems (industrial)

# Huge diversity in crop production



## Huge diversity in animal production



# Agriculture and net primary production



#### Current share of Agriculture to global flows

- NH<sub>3</sub> emissions~ 90%
- N<sub>2</sub>O emissions~ 50%
- CH<sub>4</sub> emissions~ 20%

Much related to animal production

- N excretion ~ 1.2 x N fertilizer production
- Pexcretion ~ 1.5 x P fertilizer production
- K excretion ~ 3 x K fertilizer production

# Partitioning of NH<sub>3</sub> sources in Agric.

- Animal housing
- Manure application
- Grazing animals
- NH3-based fertilizers
- Other sources

20-40% 20-30% 10-20% 10-20% 5-10%

## Global N cycle



### Crop yield at harvest and N uptake



#### N uptake in the plant

#### N intake, retention and excretion by animals

## N partitioning



## N in urine

#### N retention

### N in dung

N intake by animals

#### Agriculture & nitrogen: what goes in must come out



## N budgets in Agriculture

In experiments, often N inputs > N outputs + N losses

- Allison (1955)
  - Enigma of the nitrogen balance

- Garrett et all (1993)
  - Unaccounted for N increases with N input in grazing systems

## Nitrogen cycling in crop production



N deposition Biofixation Fertilizer

#### Nitrogen cycling in land-less animal farming



## Nitrogen cycling in mixed systems



#### Nutrient budgets in Agriculture and confusion

- Partial versus complete budgets
- Farm-gate versus soil surface budgets
- Compartment versus system budgets
- System A versus system B
- Static versus dynamic approaches





## N budgets beef & dairy systems, kg/ha/y

Budget item	Beef	Beef	Dairy	Dairy
Total Inputs	23	175	568	240
• Feed			182	80
Fertilizer			330	74
Deposition	15	14	49	49
Biofixation	8	160		8
Other			7	29
Total Outputs	13	60	561	200
• Milk			68	64
Meat	3	23	10	13
NH3 loss	3	10	129	32
Denitrification	2	4	201	42
Leaching	5	23	150	52
Balance	10	115	7	40
O/I efficiency,%	13	13	13	31

## N budgets land-less farms, Mg/farm/yr

Budget item	Pig	Broilers	Layers	
Total Inputs <ul> <li>Feed</li> <li>Animals</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>	20.8 18.8 2.0	21.8 21.5 0.3	36.8 35.0 1.0 0.8	
<ul> <li>Total Outputs</li> <li>Animals</li> <li>Eggs</li> <li>NH<sub>3</sub> loss</li> <li>Manure</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>	24.2 9.4 4.0 10.7	20.7 10.6 3.4 5.8 0.9	35.7 1.9 11.1 4.4 18.1 0.3	
Balance	-3.4	1.1	1.1	
O/I efficiency,%	45	48	35	

# Inputs & Output/Input ratios (O/I)

<ul> <li>Crop production</li> </ul>	<u>l (kg/ha)</u>	0/1
<ul> <li>Arable crops</li> </ul>	10- 300	0.3-0.7
<ul> <li>Vegetables</li> </ul>	100 -1000	0.2-0.6
- Glasshouses	500-2000	0.2-0.6

### Animal production

- Grazing systems
- Mixed systems
- Land-less systems

10 - 100 100-500 10<sup>3</sup>- 10<sup>5</sup> 0.1-0.2 0.1-0.3 0.3-0.6

#### Agricultural N-flows and EU policies



## Regulations hindering farm development

Regulations	Pig farmers, %	Poultry farmers,%
<ul> <li>Zoning restrictions</li> </ul>	44	29
Building permits	17	27
Environmental permits	58	55
Manure policy	26	30
<ul> <li>Production rights</li> </ul>	34	35
Nature conservation pla	ans 10	12
• Animal health & welfare	e 21	38
<ul> <li>Food safety regulations</li> </ul>	5 5	10
• Fiscal legislation Source: Ha	4 rtog et al., 2004	10

## Categorizing of policies & measures

# Abatement of emissions of N species Risks of pollution swapping

## □Control of N input □Synergistic effects possible



## □Spatial zoning

Complex; both, antagonistic and synergistic effects possible

#### Categorizing measures of Nitrates Directive

Spatial zoning of Nitrate vulnerable zones

#### Control of N input via animal manure (+ N fertilizer)

#### □Abatement of emissions of NO<sub>3</sub> leaching



#### Categorizing measures of CLRTAP / NEC / IPPC

Abatement of emissions of NH<sub>3</sub> (and other N species)



□ Control of N input via animal feed

Integrated approach and flexibility of IPPC may include spatial zoning  Modelling tool to assess interactions between environmental policies in EU-25+:
 Activity data: Eurostat and CAPRI
 NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions: following RAINS/GAINS
 Nitrate leaching; newly developed, using Corine land use and JRC soil data

Spatial scales
 Country level
 Nuts 2 level
 Nitrate Vulnerable Zones

#### Ammonia emissions



#### Effects of 'RAINS' measures on NH<sub>3</sub> emissions



#### Effects of 'ND' measures on NH<sub>3</sub> emissions



#### Effects of 'RAINS' measures on NO<sub>3</sub> leaching



Average nitrate leaching in NUTS 2 regions, kg N per ha

#### Mean effect of RAINS and ND measures, %

Measure		NH <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
		EU-25	EU-15	EU-25
Ammonia	Biofiltration	-6	1	0
	Low ammonia application - high	-11	4	8
	Covered storage - high	-4	4	0
	Stable adaptation	-23	8	5
	Low nitrogen feed	-3	-2	-1
	Incineration	-4	-3	-1
	Urea substitution	-8	2	-1
	Package	-49	11	7
Nitrate	Balanced fertilization	-10	-63	-22
	Maximum manure application	0	0	0
	Limit on slopes	-2	-4	-2
	Optimal storage	0	1	0
	Application techniques	0	-10	0
	No winter application	-1	-10	-3
	Winter crops	0	-5	0
	Package	-10	-65	-23



Synergistic effects of abatement measures emerge from N input control

Pollution swapping emerges from abatement of N emissions *without* N input control

Measures of CLRTAP / IPPC increase NO<sub>3</sub> leaching more than ND measures increase NH<sub>3</sub> emissions