

Interactive comment on “N₂O release from agro-biofuel production negates global warming reduction by replacing fossil fuels” by P. J. Crutzen et al.

E. Smeets

edward.smeets@mnp.nl

Received and published: 14 September 2007

A.F. Bouwman lex.bouwman@mnp.nl **E. Stehfest** elke.stehfest@mnp.nl

Crutzen, Mosier, Smith and Winiwarter claim that the nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from energy crop production have been underestimated in existing studies of the greenhouse gas (GHG) balances of biofuels. We agree that N₂O emissions are an important and often neglected issue in the debate on biofuels. However, there are several aspects of the calculations presented by Crutzen *et al.* that may cause a substantial overestimation of their N₂O emissions from energy crops, particularly the N₂O emission factor.

The N₂O emission factor

The N₂O emission factor of 3.3-4.6% proposed by Crutzen *et al.* is the total worldwide emission of N₂O from agriculture divided by the total global anthropogenic input of "new" fixed N in the agricultural production system. Thus, Crutzen *et al.* include the N input in livestock production systems and the associated N₂O emissions. Energy crop production and livestock production may be related, for example through the use of distiller's grain and oil cakes as animal feed. We argue that the emissions associated with the use of these by-products from production of ethanol from starch crops and biodiesel produced from oil crops should not be allocated to energy crop production, but to the production of animal products where they substitute conventional animal feed.

We argue that the inclusion of the animal production system is not correct and propose the use of a 2.7% crop specific emission factor that is defined as the total worldwide emission of N₂O from crop production divided by the total worldwide N input into the crop production system. The 2.7% crop specific emission factor is calculated as follows. The global N₂O emission from agriculture is 6.7 Tg N₂O-N/y according to Stehfest and Bouwman (2006) and MNP (2006). Crop production contributes 3.4 Tg N₂O-N/y and emissions from grassland used for livestock production add 2.7 Tg N₂O-N/y. This leaves 0.5 Tg N₂O-N/y from N leached from fertilized fields, which we allocate completely to crop production. We recognize that this causes an overestimation, since part of the leaching occurs in grassland. The total N₂O emission from crop production is thus 4.0 Tg N₂O-N/y.

We use data on N inputs in agriculture (81 Tg N in the year 2000) from FAO (2007) of which 97% (78 Tg N/y) is applied to cropland (FAO/IFA/IFDC, 2003). In contrast, Crutzen *et al.* use an estimate of 100 Tg N from Galloway *et al.* (2004). However, this 100 Tg N is the total N₂-fixation by the Haber-Bosch process, of which 86 Tg N is used for the production of fertilizers and 14 Tg N is '*dispersed to the environment during processing or used in the manufacture of synthetic fibres, refrigerants, explosives,*

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

plastics, rocket fuels, nitroparaffins, etc.’ (Galloway *et al.*, 2004). In our opinion, the 14 Tg N/y should be excluded from the calculations of the emission factor, because it is not an N input in the agricultural system.

The global N input from biological N₂-fixation (BNF) on agricultural areas is 38 Tg N/y of which 22 Tg N/y is fixed by leguminous crops such as pulses. We recognize that estimates for global N₂-fixation by leguminous food crops are fraught with potential errors. Atmospheric deposition adds another 35 Tg N/y, of which 16 Tg N/y is deposited on cropland. Furthermore, the application of manure in cropland amounts to 33 Tg N/y. The cropland-specific N₂O emission factor is thus 2.7% ($4.0/[78+22+16+33]$). Hence, by considering the global crop production system exclusively and using figures that are roughly the same as used by Crutzen *et al.*, the emission factor for N₂O that is attributed to energy crop production is reduced by 0.6–1.9% compared to Crutzen *et al.*

N₂O release versus CO₂ saved in biofuels

We also re-calculated the values for the equilibrium mass ratio of N to dry matter in gN/kg (r_{Ne}) and compared these values with the actual mass ratio of N to dry matter in gN/kg (r_{Na}) to determine the N₂O release versus CO₂ saved in biofuels (following the same approach as used by Crutzen and his team). For cases where $r_{Ne} < r_{Na}$, the actual N input required to compensate for the N removed from the field via the harvested matter leads to N₂O emissions that exceed the CO₂ saved in the biofuels. We calculate the following r_{Ne} values: $r_{Ne} = 42$ g N/kg dry matter for diesel produced from rapeseed, $r_{Ne} = 19$ g N/kg dry matter for ethanol from corn and $r_{Ne} = 15$ g N/kg dry matter for ethanol from sugar cane.

We see that $r_{Ne} > r_{Na}$ for biofuels produced from rapeseed, corn and sugar cane ($r_{Na} = 39$ g N/kg dry matter for rapeseed, $r_{Na} = 15$ g N/kg dry matter for maize, $r_{Na} = 7.3$ g N/kg dry matter for sugar cane). The same is true for ethanol produced from barley or oat ($r_{Na} = 19$ g N/kg dry matter), assuming the conversion efficiency of corn to ethanol. Only for wheat the r_{Ne} is lower than r_{Na} ($r_{Na} = 22$ g N/kg dry matter). Hence,

we conclude that the CO₂ savings from biofuel use are larger than the N₂O emissions from energy crop production, except for ethanol made from wheat, and that the values assumed by Crutzen *et al* lead to a significant underestimation of the CO₂ savings.

Discussion

The above simple global estimates ignore the variability of emissions caused by differences in crop type and the associated management system, and soil and climate conditions and the impact of the choice of the type of reference land use (i.e., the land use replaced by energy crops). Furthermore, we (and Crutzen *et al.*) ignored other (non-N₂O) emissions during the production of the energy crop and the conversion to fuel (as also proposed by Crutzen *et al.*), as well as changes in soil organic matter in areas converted to energy crop production. These issues need to be analysed in a full life cycle analysis with spatially explicit calculations of N₂O emissions to account for differences in environmental conditions, to provide a firm basis for drawing conclusions about the GHG emission reductions from the substitution of fossil fuels by biofuels. In addition, no attention has been paid to the (substantial) uncertainties related to the data used to calculate the N₂O emission factor and which are particularly large for the N input from biological nitrogen fixation and for the emissions of N₂O.

References

IFA/IFDC/IPI/PPI/FAO (2003). Fertilizer use by crop. Fifth edition. Rome, Italy, International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA), International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC), International Potash Institute (IPI), Phosphate and Potash Institute (PPI), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

FAO (2007). FAOSTAT Statistical database. Accessible online at <http://faostat.fao.org/site/291/default.aspx>. Rome, Italy, Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO).

Galloway, J. N., F. J. Dentener, *et al.* (2004). "Nitrogen cycles: Past, present, and

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

future." *Biogeochemistry* 70: 153-226.

IPCC (2006). 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Volume 4 Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use IGES, Japan.

MNP (2006). Integrated modelling of global environmental change. An overview of IM-AGE 2.4. Bilthoven, the Netherlands, Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (MNP in Dutch).

Stehfest, E. and A. F. Bouwman (2006). "N₂O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural vegetation: summarizing available measurement data and modeling of global annual emissions." *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 74(3): 207-228.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 7, 11191, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper