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3.1 INTRODUCTION

The Fifth Assessment Report of IPCC (2013) disclosed that the global mean temperature increased by 0.85°C from 1880 to 2012. Specifically, the last three decades have been warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850. Global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions due to human activities have grown rapidly by 54% between 1990 and 2011 (IPCC 2013). Rapidly increasing anthropogenic GHG emissions are making a significant contribution to global climate change.

As a primary food producer, GHG emissions from agriculture contribute by 13% to the global GHG emissions and are likely to increase in the coming decades (Smith and Gregory 2013). Fifty-six percent of the global anthropogenic non-CO$_2$ emissions was derived from agriculture (U.S. EPA 2012). In addition, food production and consumption accounted for almost one-fifth of total anthropogenic GHG emissions globally (Smith et al. 2014). However, indirect emissions in the process of crop production relevant to the manufacture of agricultural chemicals and farm mechanical operations also made a significant contribution to global GHG emissions.

Livestock production is already known to contribute to GHG emissions. As reported by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), GHG emissions induced by livestock production were estimated to be 7516 million metric tons per year of CO$_2$ equivalents (CO$_2$-eq.), accounting for 18% of annual worldwide GHG emissions. Livestock production emitted 103 million tons of methane in 2004 through enteric fermentation and manure management, equivalent to 2369 million tons of CO$_2$-eq. In China, a large livestock producer, GHG emissions from animal enteric fermentation and manure management have been estimated at 445 Tg CO$_2$-eq., accounting for 45.7% of the nation’s total agricultural emissions in 2005 (NDRC 2012). However, the life cycle and supply chain of domesticated animals raised for food have been vastly underestimated as a source of GHGs and in fact account for at least half of all human-caused GHGs. The above-mentioned would easily qualify livestock for a hard look indeed in the search for ways to address climate change.

The population explosion and subsequently the growing demand for resources intensify the food and energy crises and also attract increasing attentions (Steinfeld et al. 2006; FAO 2009; Godfray et al. 2010). The production of crop and livestock has been operated with maximum resource input available to reach a maximum production, though the total cropland area has been decreasing and GHGs have been emitted increasingly since the end of twentieth century (Huang 2013).

Concerns about GHG emissions reduction to mitigate climate change and food security have recently inspired the assessment of the carbon footprint (CF) for various activities and products (Hertwich and Peters, 2009). CF, defined as a measure of the total amount of carbon dioxide emissions that is directly and indirectly caused by an activity or is emitted over the life cycles of a product, is analyzed to measure the climate change impact of products and activities in terms of the amount of GHGs emitted in a whole life cycle.

Growing interest in GHG mitigation in agriculture has provided a strong enticement to assess the CF of different agricultural production. Calculation of CF in agriculture identifies the contributions of agricultural production to climate change and the components of emission sources. Meanwhile, determining a CF of a certain agricultural product is useful for identifying how low-carbon economy could be implemented to abate climate change. In this chapter, a methodology is introduced to clarify how to calculate CF of crop and livestock production according to the CF definition and life-cycle assessment method. Then an assessment approach is supplied to evaluate the CFs under different scenarios and detect climate change mitigation strategies.
3.2 GHG EMISSION SOURCES

3.2.1 SYSTEM BOUNDARIES

The system boundary for CF calculation is the farm gate of agricultural production. For crop production, the system boundary is the land boundary of studied cropland. However, the system boundary for livestock production is the farm gate of studied livestock such as dairy, sheep, pig, and so on. All agricultural inputs are traced back to production and raw material extraction and all major GHG emissions (CH\textsubscript{4}, N\textsubscript{2}O, and fossil CO\textsubscript{2}) associated with inputs and farm management are accounted for.

3.2.2 GHG EMISSION SOURCES IN CROP PRODUCTION

CF of crop production was generally assessed by taking into account all the GHG emissions caused by or associated with material used, and farm machine operated and irrigation and drainage power exhausted for crop production in a crop life cycle (Lal et al. 2004; Hillier et al. 2009; Cheng et al. 2011). During the full life-cycle analysis of crop production, the total carbon emissions were estimated both of the direct and indirect emissions within the farm gate from crop sowing to grain harvest under a single cropping system. Hence, identifying GHG emission sources during agricultural production is the first step to conduct a CF research.

3.2.2.1 Direct Emission

3.2.2.1.1 Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Soil

Nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) could absorb terrestrial thermal radiation and thus contributes to global warming of the atmosphere. On a mass basis, N\textsubscript{2}O is approximately 265 times more potent than CO\textsubscript{2} in a 100-year time horizon (IPCC 2013). N\textsubscript{2}O could be generated in the processes of nitrification and denitrification in soil. In most soils, an increase in available N could enhance the nitrification and denitrification rates which then increase the production of N\textsubscript{2}O. Available N could be supplied through human-induced N additions or change of management practices. Approximately, 58% of global N\textsubscript{2}O emissions were from agriculture in 2005 (Smith et al. 2007). Therefore, N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from soil could be identified as a source of CF in crop production.

3.2.2.1.2 Methane Emissions from Flooded Rice Paddy

Atmospheric concentration of methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) has increased by 1.5 times compared with preindustrial times, accounting for 18% of the global warming potential (GWP), which ranks CH\textsubscript{4} as having the second highest radiative forcing of the long-lived GHGs. Rice paddies, which are characterized by relatively high organic carbon levels and prolonged anaerobic conditions during rice growth, are one of the major anthropogenic sources of CH\textsubscript{4} accounting for almost 20% of agricultural CH\textsubscript{4} emission. Carbon input and anaerobic condition are the important factors to generate CH\textsubscript{4}. Soil type, temperature, and rice cultivar could also affect CH\textsubscript{4} emissions. The two main pathways for CH\textsubscript{4} emissions from soil to the atmosphere are transfer through rice plants and ebullition in the water. CH\textsubscript{4} emission from flooded rice paddy is one of the important emission sources when we calculate CF in rice production.

3.2.2.1.3 Organic Carbon Stock Changes in Soil

According to IPCC (2007), the net flux of CO\textsubscript{2} in agriculture is estimated to be approximately balanced though large annual CO\textsubscript{2} exchanges occurring between the atmosphere and agricultural lands. Soil carbon sequestration, with an estimated 89% contribution to the technical potential, is one of the most important pathways to achieve GHG mitigation potential. Although CO\textsubscript{2} emits much from soil each year, carbon input could not be ignored in the calculation of CF. In general, organic carbon stock change in soil is a thoughtful way to reflect the net CO\textsubscript{2} flux in cropland. Actually,
carbon stock change could not be measured in 1 year and there is also not an appropriate method to accurately calculate SOC stock change in 1 year. However, we usually assess CF for carbon production in a given year. Given these, SOC stock change is not taken into account CF calculation in this methodology.

3.2.2.1 CO₂ Emissions from Machine Operation
Farm machinery is used for spraying and tillage, harvesting, strapping, and transportation in the process of crop production. Energy, such as gasoline and diesel oil, is necessary for operating farm machinery. In this process, there is an amount of CO₂ emitted by energy consumed. CO₂ emission from machine operation should be taken into account CF calculation.

3.2.2.2 Indirect Emission
3.2.2.2.1 GHG Emissions from Manufacturing of Agricultural Inputs
Inputs of fertilizer, pesticide, herbicides, and plastic film are necessary to supply nutrient, protect plant health, and prevent water loss for crop production. However, there is a huge CO₂ emission when these agricultural materials are produced in the factories. These emissions occur outside the farm gate but are induced by crop production. Given these, the indirect emissions from manufacturing of agricultural materials should be thought over when assessing CF for crop production.

3.2.2.2.2 GHG Emissions by Irrigation
In most agricultural regions of the world, irrigation is necessary for water sully in plant growth except for rainfed cropland. Energy use for irrigation is also one of the main GHG emission sources in farming process. The main components of energy use associated with irrigation are related to processes which apply water to field by lifting, conveying or pressurizing it, and these processes could be powered by diesel or electricity (Wang et al. 2012). The emissions of GHG reasonably occur when diesel is used and electricity is generated.

3.2.3 GHG Emission Sources in Livestock Production
CF of livestock and poultry production could be generally assessed by taking into account all the GHG emissions caused by or associated with material used, farm management, and power exhausted for livestock and poultry production.

3.2.3.1 Direct Emissions
3.2.3.1.1 Manure Treatment
Both CH₄ and N₂O emissions occur from livestock manure management systems. Manure management account for 7% of total non-CO₂ emissions in agriculture (Smith et al. 2007). CH₄ could be emitted when confined manure management operations are conducted. However, N₂O emissions vary significantly between different manure treatment types and can also result in indirect emissions due to other forms of nitrogen loss from the system.

3.2.3.1.2 Enteric Fermentation
According to the FAO, 37% of human-induced methane comes from livestock production. Ruminant animals have a rumen which could produce CH₄ when microbial fermentation takes place. Cattle are an important CH₄ source in many countries due to their large population and high CH₄ emission rate by their ruminant digestive system. So emissions of CH₄ from enteric fermentation should be taken into account when CF of ruminant livestock production is estimated.

3.2.3.1.3 Farm Management
Machinery operation is needed especially in aggregated farm management. Machinery operation could exhaust energy such as gasoline and diesel oil which induce CO₂ emissions.
3.2.3.2 Indirect Emission

3.2.3.2.1 CO₂ Emissions from Manufacturing of Agricultural Inputs
Agricultural input includes forage, pesticides, detergents, medicines, and so on. GHG emissions occur by production and transport of these inputs. Specifically, the GHG emissions from forage input include crop cultivation, forage production, and forage transportation.

3.2.3.2.2 CO₂ Emissions from Electricity Use
Electricity is also used in livestock farms, and CO₂ emissions occur when electricity is generated. This is an indirect emission source in livestock production.

3.3 CARBON FOOTPRINT CALCULATION METHODS

3.3.1 Crop Production
CF of crop production could be estimated by summarizing all the GHG emissions that is directly and indirectly caused by or associated with material used, farm management, and power exhausted over the life stages of crop production.

3.3.1.1 Direct Emissions

3.3.1.1.1 Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Soil
The direct N₂O emissions (\(E_{N_{2}O}\) kg CE ha⁻¹) induced by fertilizer N input could be estimated using the following equation:

\[
E_{N_{2}O} = N \times EF_{N_{2}O} \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265
\]  

(3.1)

where \(N\) represents the amount of chemical fertilizer-N application (kg N), \(EF_{N_{2}O}\) is the emission factor of N₂O emission induced by N fertilizer application (kg N₂O–N kg⁻¹ N fertilizer), 44/28 is the molecular weight of N₂ in relation to N₂O, 298 is the net GWP of N₂O in a 100-year horizon, and 12/44 is the molecular weight of CO₂ in relation to CE. According to IPCC (2006), \(EF_{N_{2}O}\) is estimated as 0.01 for dry cropland and 0.003 for rice paddy.

3.3.1.1.2 Methane Emissions from Flooded Rice Paddy
Seasonal CH₄ emissions from rice paddies should be estimated for rice CF calculation. Direct CH₄ emissions are estimated using the IPCC’s methodology (IPCC 2006) with the equation:

\[
E_{CH_{4}} = EF_{d} \times t \times A \times 28
\]  

(3.2)

\[
EF_{d} = EF_{c} \cdot SF_{w} \cdot SF_{p} \cdot SF_{o} \cdot SF_{s,r}
\]  

(3.3)

\[
SF_{o} = \left(1 + \sum_{i} ROAi \cdot CFOAi\right)^{0.59}
\]  

(3.4)

where \(E_{CH_{4}}\) represents the GHG emissions (kg CO₂-eq.) from CH₄ emitted from rice paddy in a single season, \(EF_{d}\) is a daily emission factor (kg CH₄/ha/day), \(t\) is rice growing period (days), \(A\) is area of rice paddy (ha), and 28 is the relative molecular warming forcing of CH₄ in a 100-year horizon (IPCC 2013), \(EF_{c}\) is the emission factor for continuously flooded fields without organic amendments, \(SF_{o}\) represents scaling factor to account for the differences in water regime during the rice
The growing period, $SF_p$, represents scaling factor to account for the differences in water regime in the preseason before the rice growing season, $SF_o$, represents scaling factor should vary for both type and amount of organic amendment applied (Equation 3.4), $SF_s$, represents scaling factor for soil type, rice cultivar, and so on, if these factors are available. $ROA_i$ is the application rate of organic amendment $i$, in dry weight for straw and fresh weight for others (kg/ha), and $CFOA_i$ is the conversion factor for organic amendment $i$.

### 3.3.1.1.3 CO$_2$ Emissions from Machine Operation

CO$_2$ emissions from machine operation could be calculated according to the amount of fuel, net caloric value of a given fuel and emission factor of this fuel, as shown in Equation 3.5:

$$EM = \sum_i (EF_i \cdot W_i \cdot NCV_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

where $E_M$ is the CO$_2$ emissions from machine operation (kg CO$_2$-eq.), $W_i$ is the amount of fuel $i$ consumed (t or L), $NCV_i$ represents net caloric value for fuel $i$ (GJ/kg or L), $EF_i$ represents emission factor for fuel $i$ (kg CO$_2$-eq./GJ).

### 3.3.1.2 Indirect Emissions

#### 3.3.1.2.1 GHG Emissions from Manufacturing of Agricultural Inputs

GHG emissions induced by manufacturing of individual materials used for crop production, protection and management including fertilizer, pesticides, and plastic film, which are calculated using Equation 3.6:

$$E_{AI} = \sum AI \times EF_{AI}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

where $E_M$ is GHG emissions from manufacture of individual materials such as fertilizer, pesticide, agricultural film, and so on (kg CO$_2$-eq.), $AI$ denotes the amount of a kind of agricultural inputs in kg ha$^{-1}$, and $EF$ is the emission factor of manufacturing a unit of the input material (kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$).

#### 3.3.1.2.2 GHG Emissions by Irrigation

The energy use for irrigation, which would be one of the main GHG emission sources in farm operations, is also calculated. The main components of energy use associated with irrigation are related to pumping water to field, being generally powered either by diesel or by electricity (Wang et al. 2012). In general, GHG emissions induced by irrigation ($E_{IRRRI}$, kg CE ha$^{-1}$) could be calculated using the approach developed by Wang et al. (2012):

$$E_{IRRRI} = IR_{ij} \times EF_j$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

where $IR_{ij}$ represents the amounts of water irrigated for crop $i$ in region $j$ in m$^3$ and $EF_j$ is the emission factor of irrigation for region $j$ in kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$.

### 3.3.1.3 CF Assessment

Overall, the total CF of grain crop in a single cropping season in terms of land used ($CF_A$, kg CO$_2$-eq./ha) was assessed by summarizing all of the individual GHG emissions mentioned above:

$$CF_A = \frac{E_{N2O} + E_{CH4} + E_M + E_{AI} + E_{IRRRI}}{A}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

where $A$ is the total area of studied field (ha).
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With the estimated \( CF_A \), \( CF \) in terms of grain production (\( CF_Y \), kg \( \text{CO}_2 \)-eq./kg grain produced) (GHG intensity in other words) was evaluated using Equation 3.9:

\[
CF_Y = \frac{CF_A}{Y} \tag{3.9}
\]

where \( Y \) denotes grain yield of a given crop (kg/ha).

### 3.3.2 Livestock Production

CF of livestock production was generally assessed by taking into account all the GHG emissions caused by or associated with material used, farm management, and energy exhausted for livestock production. A life-cycle assessment (LCA) and input–output analysis was used to describe the total GHG emissions by livestock production. CF calculated was expressed in carbon dioxide equivalent (\( \text{CO}_2 \)-eq.) per unit livestock production.

#### 3.3.2.1 Direct Emission

#### 3.3.2.1.1 \( \text{CH}_4 \) Emissions from Enteric Fermentation

\( \text{CH}_4 \) is produced in herbivores as a by-product of enteric fermentation, a digestive process by which carbohydrates are broken down by microorganisms into simple molecules for absorption into the bloodstream (IPCC 2006). The \( \text{CH}_4 \) emissions from enteric fermentation are estimated using Equation 3.10:

\[
E_{\text{EF}} = H \times EF_{\text{EF}} \times 28 \tag{3.10}
\]

where \( E_{\text{EF}} \) is the \( \text{CH}_4 \) emissions from enteric fermentation (kg \( \text{CO}_2 \)-eq.), \( H \) denotes the number of ruminant head, \( EF_{\text{EF}} \) is the emission factors for enteric fermentation (kg \( \text{CH}_4 \)/head/a), and 28 is the net GWP of \( \text{CH}_4 \) in a 100-year horizon.

#### 3.3.2.1.2 \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) and \( \text{CH}_4 \) Emissions by Manure Treatment

Livestock production can result in both \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) emissions from livestock manure management systems, which are significant GHG sources in the agricultural sector. \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) emissions during manure treatment (\( E_M \), kg \( \text{CO}_2 \)-eq.) are estimated using Equations 3.11 through 3.13:

\[
E_M = H \times EF_{\text{CH}_4} \times 28 + (N_{\text{O}_{D(mm)}} + N_{\text{O}_{G(mm)}}) \times 265 \tag{3.11}
\]

\[
N_{\text{O}_{D(mm)}} = \left[ \sum_S \left[ \sum_T (N_T \times N_{\text{ex}(T)} \times MS_{(T,S)}) \right] \times EF_3(S) \right] \times \frac{44}{28} \tag{3.12}
\]

\[
N_{\text{O}_{G(mm)}} = \left[ \sum_S \left[ \sum_T (N_T \times N_{\text{ex}(T)} \times MS_{(T,S)}) \times \left( \frac{\text{FracGasMS}}{100} \right)_{(T,S)} \right] \times EF_4 \right] \times \frac{44}{28} \tag{3.13}
\]

where \( H \) denotes the number of head (head), \( EF_{\text{CH}_4} \) is the \( \text{CH}_4 \) emission factor (kg \( \text{CH}_4 \)/head/a), \( N_{\text{O}_{D(mm)}} \) the direct emissions of nitrous oxide under manure management system (kg \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \)/a), \( N_{\text{O}_{G(mm)}} \) the indirect nitrous oxide emissions of manure management system (kg \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \)/a), the direct and indirect \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) emission from manure treatment are calculated using the second method.
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recommended by IPCC (2006), 298 is the net GWP of N₂O in a 100-year horizon, \( N_{(T)} \) is the number of head of livestock species/category \( T \) in the given region, \( N_{ex_{(T)}} \) is the annual average \( N \) excretion per head of species/category \( T \) in the country (kg N/animal/year), \( MS_{(T,S)} \) is the fraction of total annual nitrogen excretion for each livestock species/category \( T \) that is managed in manure management system \( S \) in the given region (dimensionless), \( EF_{3(S)} \) is the emission factor for direct N₂O emissions from manure management system \( S \) in the country (kg N₂O-N/kg N) in manure management system, \( T \) is species/category of livestock, \( EF_4 \) is the emission factor for N₂O emissions from atmospheric deposition of nitrogen on soils and water surfaces, kg N₂O-N (kg NH₃–N + NOₓ–N volatilized)⁻¹, default value is 0.01 kg N₂O-N (kg NH₃–N + NOₓ–N volatilized)⁻¹, 44/28 is conversion of (N₂O–N) emissions to N₂O (mm) emissions.

3.3.2.1.3 Energy Use in Farm Management
The GHG emissions from energy use induced by farm management (\( CF_M \), kg CO₂-eq.) include fuel and electricity consumed in the process of farm management. These emissions could be calculated by Equations 3.14 and 3.15:

\[
E_F = \sum_i (EF_i \cdot W_i \cdot NCV_i) \tag{3.14}
\]

\[
E_E = E \times EF_E \tag{3.15}
\]

where \( E_F \) is CO₂ emissions from fuel use (kg CO₂-eq.), \( W_i \) is the amount of fuel \( i \) consumed (t or L), \( NCV_i \) represents net caloric value for fuel \( i \) (GJ/kg or L), \( EF_i \) represents emission factor for fuel \( i \) (kg CO₂-eq./GJ). \( E \) is the amount of electricity used in the life-cycle analysis of livestock production (kw h) and \( EF_E \) represents emission factor for electricity generation (kg CO₂-eq./kw h).

3.3.2.2 Indirect Emissions
3.3.2.2.1 GHG Emissions from Manufacture of Forage
According to the field survey conducted by previous study, the types of forage include mixed forage, self-made forage, concentrates, and green forage. The GHG emissions from manufacture of forage include crop cultivation, forage processing, and forage transportation. In general, these emissions could be estimated using the following equation:

\[
E_{Forge} = F_C \times EF_C + F_P \times EF_P + E_T \tag{3.16}
\]

where \( E_{Forge} \) is the GHG emissions by forge input, \( F_C \) is the amount of crop production used for forge manufacture (kg), \( EF_C \) represents the emission factor for a given crop production (kg CO₂-eq./kg production); \( F_P \) means the amount of forage used in livestock production (kg), \( EF_P \) denotes emission factor in forage processing (kg CO₂-eq./kg forge produced). \( E_T \) is the GHG emissions by forage transportation calculated by multiplying amount of fuel consumption by emission factor of fuel.

3.3.2.3 Assessment of CF of Livestock Production
Overall, total CF of livestock production could be assessed by summarizing all of individual GHG emissions mentioned above:

\[
CF = E_{EF} + E_M + E_F + E_E + E_{Forge} \tag{3.17}
\]
With the estimated CF, CF in terms of livestock and poultry production (\( CF_p \), kg CO\(_2\)-eq./kg production) (GHG intensity in other words) was calculated using Equation 3.18:

\[
CF_p = \frac{CF}{\rho}
\]

(3.18)

where \( \rho \) denotes the production of a given livestock (kg).

### 3.4 DATA SOURCES

#### 3.4.1 EMISSION FACTORS

##### 3.4.1.1 Crop Production

Assessment of CF in crop production considers various emission factors including direct N\(_2\)O emission by N input, CH\(_4\) emission from rice paddy, CO\(_2\) emission by fuel combustion, carbon dioxide respired by an adult, manufacture of agricultural inputs, and energy use in irrigation.

1. **Emission factors of direct N\(_2\)O emission by N input**

   Direct N\(_2\)O emission factors have been developed by IPCC (2006) and some studies over the world. Some emission factors developed are listed in Table 3.1. However, the region-specific emission factors should be used in CF assessment in these regions if available.

2. **Emission factors of direct CH\(_4\) emission from rice paddy**

   All the emission and scaling factors that relate to calculate CH\(_4\) emissions from rice paddy are listed in Tables 3.2 through 3.5 according to IPCC methodology (IPCC 2006). Region-specific emission factors should be used in CF assessment in these regions if available.

### TABLE 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Factor of N Fertilizer-Induced N(_2)O Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( EF_{N_2O} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) F: flood; D: drainage; IF: intermittent flood; M: moist but nonwaterlogged by intermittent irrigation.

\(^b\) P: annual precipitation, m.

### TABLE 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Default CH(_4) Baseline Emission Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( EF_c )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) It was assumed that no flooding occurred for less than 180 days prior to rice cultivation, and that the fields were continuously flooded without organic amendments during rice cultivation.
### TABLE 3.3
Default CH$_4$ Emission Scaling Factors for Water Regimes during the Rice Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Regime</th>
<th>Scaling Factor ($SF_w$)</th>
<th>Aggregated Case</th>
<th>Disaggregated Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upland$^a$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated$^b$</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermittently flooded—single aeration</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfed and deep water$^c$</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought prone</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep water (more than 50 cm for a significant period of time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^a$ Fields are never flooded for a significant period of time.

$^b$ Fields are flooded for a significant period of time and water regime is fully controlled.
- **Continuously flooded**: Fields have standing water throughout the rice growing season and may only dry out for harvest (end-season drainage).
- **Intermittently flooded**: Fields have at least one aeration period of more than 3 days during the cropping season.
  - **Single aeration**: Fields have a single aeration during the cropping season at any growth stage (except for end-season drainage).
  - **Multiple aeration**: Fields have more than one aeration period during the cropping season (except for end-season drainage).

$^c$ Fields are flooded for a significant period of time and water regime depends solely on precipitation.

### TABLE 3.4
Default CH$_4$ Emission Scaling Factors for Water Regimes before the Cultivation Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Regime Prior to Rice Cultivation</th>
<th>Scaling Factor ($SF_p$)</th>
<th>Aggregated Case</th>
<th>Disaggregated Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non flooded preseason &lt;180 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non flooded preseason &gt;180 days</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded preseason (&gt;30 days)$^a$</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^a$ Short preseason flooding periods of less than 30 days are not considered in selection of $SF_p$.

### TABLE 3.5
Default Conversion Factor for Different Types of Organic Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organic Amendment</th>
<th>Conversion Factor (CFOA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straw incorporated shortly (&lt;30 days) before cultivation$^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straw incorporated long (&gt;30 days) before cultivation$^a$</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm yard manure</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green manure</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^a$ Straw application means that straw is incorporated into the soil; it does not include case that straw just placed on the soil surface nor that straw was burnt on the field.
3. Emission factors of fuel combustion
Net caloric values and emission factors for main kinds of fuel are shown in Tables 3.6 and 3.7 according to IPCC (2006).

4. Carbon dioxide respired by an adult
Carbon dioxide respired by an adult is 0.9 kg CO$_2$-eq. day$^{-1}$ person$^{-1}$ (Yang 1996).

5. Emission factors of manufacture of agricultural inputs
Emission factors of manufacture of agricultural inputs vary largely among different regions and techniques of production. However, there are limited studies focused on development emission factors of these. Herewith, this chapter lists some emission factors by previous studies (Table 3.8). Specific emission factor development is an essential research field in future.

6. Emission factor of irrigation
Emission factors of irrigation have been developed by researches for some regions (Table 3.9). For example, emission factors of irrigation in each province of China have been developed, and the details of this calculator were also presented in the study of Wang et al. (2012). However, region-specific emission factors for irrigation should be developed in further studies for the precise of CF calculation.

### 3.4.1.2 Livestock Production

1. CH$_4$ emission factor of enteric fermentation
The amount of CH$_4$ that is released depends on the type of digestive tract, age, and weight of the animal, and the quality and quantity of the feed consumed (IPCC 2006). The emission factor could be found in Tables 3.10a and 3.10b according to IPCC (2006).
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**TABLE 3.6**

Default Net Calorific Values (NCVs) of Main Kinds of Fuel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Net Calorific Value (TJ/Gg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$NCV_i$</td>
<td>Motor gasoline</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviation gasoline</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jet gasoline</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas/diesel oil</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biogasoline</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiesels</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE 3.7**

Default CO$_2$ Emission Factors for Main Kinds of Fuel Combustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Default CO$_2$ Emission Factor (kg CO$_2$/TJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EF_i$</td>
<td>Motor gasoline</td>
<td>69,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviation gasoline</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jet gasoline</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas/diesel oil</td>
<td>74,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biogasoline</td>
<td>70,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiesels</td>
<td>70,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.8
Emission Factors for Manufacturing Fertilizer, Pesticide, and Plastic Film

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Emission Factor</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EF_{AI}$</td>
<td>N fertilizer</td>
<td>6.38 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$ N</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Lu et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N fertilizer</td>
<td>10.85 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$ N</td>
<td>Scotland, UK</td>
<td>Hillier et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N fertilizer</td>
<td>4.95 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$ N</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P fertilizer</td>
<td>0.73 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$ P$_2$O$_5$</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K fertilizer</td>
<td>0.55 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$ K$_2$O</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmyard manure</td>
<td>0.55 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Scotland, UK</td>
<td>Hillier et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>17.05 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>1.32 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Scotland, UK</td>
<td>Hillier et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbicides</td>
<td>26.22 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbicides</td>
<td>23.1 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Scotland, UK</td>
<td>Hillier et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fungicide/nematicide</td>
<td>11.59 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Scotland, UK</td>
<td>Hillier et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>18.99 kg CO$_2$-eq. kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cheng et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.9
Emission Factors for Irrigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Emission Factor</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EF_i$</td>
<td>91.67 kg CO$_2$-eq. ha$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Punjab, India</td>
<td>Dubey and Lal (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.49 kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>Hebei province, China</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30 kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>Inner Mongolia, China</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>Liaoning province, China</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50 kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>Gansu province, China</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40 kg CO$_2$-eq. m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>Hunan province, China</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.10a
Emission Factors for Enteric Fermentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Developed Countries (kg CH$_4$ head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Developing Countries (kg CH$_4$ head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Liveweight (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EF_{EF}$</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46 (developed countries); 45 kg (developing countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camels</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mules and Asses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpacas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Emission factors of manure management

The main factors affecting CH$_4$ emissions are manure production and the portion of the manure that decomposes anaerobically. Direct N$_2$O emissions occur via combined nitrification and denitrification of nitrogen contained in the manure. The CH$_4$ emission factors could be found in Annex 10A.2 in Chapter 10 of IPCC (2006), whereas the N$_2$O emission factors could be obtained in Tables 10.19 and 10.20 in Chapter 10 of IPCC (2006).

3. Emission factors of fuel and electricity consumed

Net caloric values and emission factors for main kinds of fuel are shown in Tables 3.6 and 3.7 according to IPCC (2006). Emission factor of electricity generation is shown in Table 3.11. However, region-specific emission factors should be used when CFs of livestock production are calculated in these region if available.

4. Carbon dioxide respired by an adult

Carbon dioxide respired by an adult is 0.9 kg CO$_2$-eq. day$^{-1}$ person$^{-1}$ (Yang 1996).

5. Emission factors of manufacture of forage

According to the description above, GHG emissions from manufacture of forage include crop cultivation, forage processing, and forage transportation. Emissions from transportation could be calculated by the emission factors supplied in Tables 3.6 and 3.7. Emission factors of crop cultivation actually are the CF of crop production used in forage production, which could be estimated by the approach supplied by this chapter or just obtained from

---

**TABLE 3.10b**

Enteric Fermentation Emission Factors for Cattle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cattle Category</th>
<th>Emission Factors  (kg CH$_4$/head/year)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Average milk production of 8400 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Includes beef cows, bulls, calves, growing steers/heifers, and feedlot cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Average milk production of 6000 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Includes bulls, calves, and growing steers/heifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Average milk production of 2550 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Includes beef cows, bulls, and young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Average milk production of 2200 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Includes beef cows, bulls, and young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Average milk production of 800 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Includes beef cows, bulls, and young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Average milk production of 1650 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Includes multi-purpose cows, bulls, and young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average milk production of 475 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Includes multi-purpose cows, bulls, and young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Average milk production of 900 kg head$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Includes cows, bulls, and young. Young comprise a large portion of the population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

previous studies. There are limited studies focused on the development of emission factors by forge processing, which should be conducted in future studies.

3.4.2 Activity Data

3.4.2.1 Statistical Data

There are national or regional statistical yearbooks in the government of each country and region. Annually, being one of the most important sections, agriculture production data should be involved in these yearbooks. Therefore, input data for CF calculation could be collected from various yearbooks that reported agricultural production statistical data. The input data requested by CF calculation of crop production include crop yields, cultivated area, as well as the amounts of various agricultural inputs including fertilizer, pesticide, agricultural plastic film, irrigated water, diesel use during crop production. However, the input data, including scale of livestock production, yield of livestock, manure treatment method, and amounts of manure, as well as the amount of individual agricultural inputs consisting of forge, fuel, and electricity, should be collected for livestock production CF calculation. The input data requested is listed in Tables 3.12 and 3.13 for crop and livestock production, respectively.

3.4.2.2 Field Survey Data

Field survey data are also an important source for CF study. Data collection could be performed by face-to-face interview with farmers during crop and livestock harvest each year. Data describing material and energy inputs for crop and livestock production in a single crop production cycle or a whole year should be recorded to create a database. During the survey, a number of farms should be randomly selected for the field questionnaire survey according to local scare. The data for a single cropping season inquired with the interview include: (a) locations of farms and contacts of farmers; (b) amounts of fertilizers (N, P, K) and pesticides used; (c) machinery operation for spraying, tillage,

TABLE 3.11
Emission Factors for Electricity Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Emission Factors (kg CO₂-equ./kW h)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EF_E$</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>CER (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North China</td>
<td>1.0302</td>
<td>The NDRC climate division (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast China</td>
<td>1.1120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East China</td>
<td>0.8100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle China</td>
<td>0.9779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest China</td>
<td>0.9720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South China</td>
<td>0.9223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.12
Data Request for CF Calculation in Crop Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Cultivated Area (ha)</th>
<th>Yield (kg N/ha)</th>
<th>Fertilizer (kg N/ha)</th>
<th>K Fertilizer (kg K₂O/ha)</th>
<th>Other (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Fuel (L or kg/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 3.13
Data Request for CF Calculation in Livestock Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scale (Heads)</th>
<th>Yield (kg/year)</th>
<th>Forge (kg/head)</th>
<th>Electricity (kW h)</th>
<th>Fuel (L or kg)</th>
<th>Manure Treatment Method</th>
<th>Manure (kg/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.14
Data Surveyed for CF Calculation in Crop Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cultivated Area (ha)</th>
<th>Yield (kg)</th>
<th>N Fertilizer (kg N)</th>
<th>P Fertilizer (kg P₂O₅)</th>
<th>K Fertilizer (kg K₂O)</th>
<th>Other Fertilizer (kg)</th>
<th>Pesticide (kg)</th>
<th>Film (kg)</th>
<th>Irrigation (m³)</th>
<th>Fuel (L or kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.15
Data Surveyed for CF Calculation in Livestock Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scale (Heads)</th>
<th>Yield (kg/year)</th>
<th>Forge (kg/year)</th>
<th>Electricity (kW h/year)</th>
<th>Fuel (L or kg/year)</th>
<th>Manure Treatment Method</th>
<th>Manure (kg/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

harvesting, and transportation as well as for irrigation; (d) cropping system and water regime management for rice paddy; and (e) farm size and the total grain produced. Data obtained for CF calculation of livestock production include: (a) location of a farm and the contacts of farmers; (b) scale of a farm, (c) amounts of forage, fuel, and electricity; (d) manure treatment method and amounts of manure, (e) annual yield of livestock production. The requested data for the field survey of crop and livestock production are listed in Tables 3.14 and 3.15, respectively.

3.5 CASE STUDIES

3.5.1 CF OF MAIN GRAIN CROP PRODUCTION IN SHANDONG PROVINCE, CHINA

3.5.1.1 Scope and Objective

Wheat and corn are the major grain crops, accounting for almost 64% of total arable land area in China (FAOSTAT 2014). Shandong Province is one of the most important grain crop producers in China. The yields of wheat and maize in Shandong province accounted for 18 and 10% of total wheat and maize, respectively, in China. In order to meet the food demand by the increasing population, production of these crops has been achieved with maximum available input of resources to reach a maximum yield. In addition, these two grain crops could have significant contributions to agricultural
GHG emissions. Given that determining the CF of crop production is useful for identifying how low-carbon economy could be implemented to abate climate change, this case study was aimed to quantify the CFs of the two grain crops in Shandong province. Special attention has been given to the contribution of individual inputs to total CF in crop production. In addition, sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess the sensitivity of the total CF to different factors considered in this study.

### 3.5.1.2 Data Source

Input data for CF calculation includes crop grain yields, the amounts of various agricultural inputs including fertilizer, pesticide, agricultural plastic film, irrigated water, and diesel in 2012. The original data were available from “Compilation of the national agricultural costs and returns” and “Yearbook of China water resources.” The data collected for CF calculation was shown in Table 3.16.

### 3.5.1.3 CF Calculation

The “farm gate” (up to harvest) was considered as the boundary of this study. Therefore, the direct emissions from soil N$_2$O and CH$_4$ emissions, machine operation, and indirect emissions from manufacturing of agricultural inputs and irrigation in wheat and maize production were considered for CF calculation up to the “farm gate” (up to harvest).

#### 3.5.1.3.1 Direct Emissions

**Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Soil**

For maize field,

$$E_{N_2O} = N \times EF_{N_2O} \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265 = 170.69 \times 0.0186 \times 0.75 \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265 = 991.57 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)}$$

For wheat field,

$$E_{N_2O} = 197.55 \times 0.0186 \times 0.75 \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265 = 1147.6 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)}$$

**Methane Emissions from Flooded Rice Paddy**

There is no CH$_4$ emission in maize and wheat field, therefore, $E_{CH_4} = 0$.

**CO$_2$ Emissions from Machine Operation**

For maize field,

$$E_M = \sum_i (EF_i \cdot W_i \cdot NCV_i) = 74,100 \times 131.40 \times 43 \times 10^{-6} = 418.68 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)}$$

For wheat field,

$$E_M = 74,100 \times 207 \times 43 \times 10^{-6} = 659.56 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)}$$

### Table 3.16

Original Data for CF Calculation of Grain Crop Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>N Fertilizer (kg/ha)</th>
<th>P Fertilizer (kg/ha)</th>
<th>K Fertilizer (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Film (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Pesticide (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Diesel (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Irrigation (m$^3$/ha)</th>
<th>Yield (kg/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>170.69</td>
<td>86.41</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>131.40</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>7515.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>197.55</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>207.00</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>6546.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.1.3.2 Indirect Emissions

3.5.1.3.2.1 GHG Emissions from Manufacturing of Agricultural Inputs

For maize production,

\[ E_{AI} = \sum AI \cdot EF_{AI} = 170.69 \times 6.38 + 86.41 \times 0.73 + 48.75 \times 0.55 + 9.39 \times 17.05 \]
\[ = 1338.99 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

For wheat production,

\[ E_{AI} = 197.55 \times 6.38 + 115.5 \times 0.73 + 60.45 \times 0.55 + 7.81 \times 17.05 = 1511.09 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

3.5.1.3.2.2 GHG Emissions by Irrigation

For maize production,

\[ E_{IRRI} = IR_j \times EF_j = 945 \times 0.26 = 245.7 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

For wheat production,

\[ E_{IRRI} = IR_j \times EF_j = 2400 \times 0.26 = 624 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

3.5.1.3.3 CF Assessment

For maize production,

\[ CF_A = \frac{E_{N_2O} + E_{CH_4} + E_M + E_{Labor} + E_{AI} + E_{IRRI}}{A} = \frac{991.57 + 0 + 418.68 + 1338.99 + 245.7}{1} = 2994.94 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

\[ CF_Y = \frac{CF_A}{Y} = \frac{2994.94}{7515.75} = 0.40 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./kg yield)} \]

For wheat production,

\[ CF_A = \frac{1147.6 + 0 + 659.56 + 1511.09 + 624}{1} = 3942.25 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./ha)} \]

\[ CF_Y = \frac{3942.25}{6546.75} = 0.60 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./kg yield)} \]

3.5.1.4 Results

The CFs of maize and wheat production were calculated based on the CF methodology provided by this chapter. As shown in Figure 3.1, wheat production had the higher CFs being 3942.25 kg CO\(_2\)-eq./ha and 0.6 kg CO\(_2\)-eq./kg yield than maize production with the CFs of 2994.94 kg CO\(_2\)-eq./ha and 0.4 kg CO\(_2\)-eq./kg yield.

Proportions of different inputs in CF were calculated to assess the contribution of each emission source to total CF (Figure 3.2). Both for maize and wheat production, most of the CF (70 and 61%, respectively) was derived from N fertilizer application including N\(_2\)O emissions from soil and GHG emissions from manufacturing of N fertilizer. Machine operation turned to be the second biggest
contributor by 14% in maize production. However, machine operation and irrigation made the similar contribution (17 and 16%, respectively) to total CF in wheat production, which is different from maize production with a contribution of only 8% in irrigation.

3.5.1.5 Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity of the total CF to different inputs and grain yield, including fertilizer, irrigation, pesticide, machine operation, and grain yield, was evaluated in this study. As shown in Table 3.17, the calculated CF responded differently to changes in the different parameters, which were increased and decreased by 10% in our evaluation. The most sensitive parameter was grain yield (9.09 and −9.09% for 10% decrement and increment, respectively) and N fertilizer input (6.95 and −6.95% for 10% decrement and increment in maize production, and 6.11 and −6.11% for 10% decrement and increment in wheat production, respectively) for both maize and wheat production. The sensitivity of K fertilizer had a much smaller influence on CF in our evaluation. Sensitivity analysis gave us a suggestion that the reliability of data sources of these inputs is a key factor to obtain the accurate CF results. These also indicated that the increase in grain production and N fertilizer use efficiency could be a strategy to reduce CF in grain crop production.
3.5.1.6 Conclusions

The production of wheat and maize in Shandong province of China shows CFs of 0.6 and 0.4 kg CO$_2$-eq./kg grain, respectively, mainly due to N fertilizer inputs and machine operation. This chapter highlights opportunities for GHG mitigation by improving N fertilizer use efficiency and increasing grain yield in crop production of Shandong province of China.

### 3.5.2 CF of Milk Production Based on a Site Survey in Sichuan Province, China

#### 3.5.2.1 Scope and Objective

China’s livestock production ranks first in the world, and GHG emissions from animal enteric fermentation and manure management have been estimated at 445 Tg CO$_2$-eq., accounting for 45.7% of the nation’s total agricultural emissions in 2005 (NDRC 2012). Thus, livestock production in China could play a key role in global climate change. To identify the contributions of livestock production to climate change and the key mitigation options, quantifying and assessing the CF in China’s livestock and poultry production is urgently required. According to statistical data, Sichuan province is one of the largest livestock producer in China with the output of pork, poultry, eggs, and milk being 4.964, 0.93, 1.464, and 0.7118 million tons, respectively, which could emit much GHG to atmosphere. Therefore, Sichuan province was chosen to assess the CF of milk production in this case study. The main purposes of the study are to quantify the CFs of the milk production and to identify the contributions of individual GHG sources to total CF.

#### 3.5.2.2 Data Source

This study involved a field survey of Hongya county, Sichuan province (103.37°E, 29.91°N) that is one of the major livestock production regions in China (Hu et al. 2010). Data collection was performed by face-to-face interviews with farmers. The obtained data included: (I) number of livestock head, (II) amounts of forage, fuel, and electricity, (III) manure treatment method and amounts of manure, and (IV) annual yield of livestock production (Table 3.18).

#### 3.5.2.3 CF Calculation

The “farm gate” (up to harvest) was considered as the boundary of this study. Therefore, the direct emissions from enteric fermentation, manure treatment and machine operation, and indirect emissions from manufacturing of forage in milk production were considered for CF calculation up to the “farm gate” (up to harvest).

### TABLE 3.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>−10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N fertilizer</td>
<td>−6.95</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P fertilizer</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K fertilizer</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide</td>
<td>−0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>−0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine operation</td>
<td>−1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>−9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2.3.1 Direct Emission

3.5.2.3.1.1 CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation  In this calculation, enteric fermentation factors could be obtained from a previous study in China as shown in Table 3.19. Hence, CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation could be calculated as follow:

\[ E_{EF} = H \times EF_{EF} \times 28 = 280 \times 86.2 \times 28 + 12 \times 12 \times 28 = 696,371 \text{ (kg CO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

3.5.2.3.1.2 N₂O and CH₄ Emissions by Manure Treatment  All the manure in this farm was directly applied into soil for forge cultivation. Therefore, this emission was 0 kg CO₂-equivalent for this farm. The N₂O emissions by manure input are calculated in forge cultivation part.

3.5.2.3.1.3 Energy Use in Farm Management

\[ E_F = \sum_i (EF_i \cdot W_i \cdot NCV_i) = 44.3 \times 69,300 \times 321.66 \times 10^{-6} = 987.49 \text{ (kg CO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

\[ E_E = E \times EF_E = 23,061 \times 0.9223 = 21,269.16 \text{ (kg CO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

3.5.2.3.2 Indirect Emissions

3.5.2.3.2.1 GHG Emissions from Manufacture of Forage  As shown in Table 3.17, the forage used in this farm includes hay, concentrated forage, and green forage. The emission factors of concentrated forage and green forage production are 0.57 and 0.98 kg CO₂-equivalent/kg forage, respectively. However, hay was produced by itself. The GHG emissions in the process of hay production include N₂O emissions by manure input and irrigation, which could be calculated according to CF methodology for crop production supplied by this chapter.

\[ E_{N_{2}O} = N \times E F_{N_{2}O} \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265 = (24,841 \times 0.062) \times 0.02 \times \frac{44}{28} \times 265 = 12,827.18 \text{ (kg CO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

\[ E_E = E \times EF_E = 125 \times 0.9223 = 115.29 \text{ (kg CO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

---

**TABLE 3.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Emission Factor (kg CH₄/head/a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult cow</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bred cattle (&gt;1 year)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calf (&lt;1 year)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology for Carbon Footprint Calculation in Crop and Livestock Production

Total GHG emissions by hay production are:

\[ E_{\text{Forge-hay}} = 12,827 + 115.29 = 12,942.29 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq.}) \]

GHG emissions by all the forage input are also calculated:

\[ E_{\text{Forge}} = F_C \times EF_C + F_P \times EF_P + E_T = (688,920 \times 0.57 + 425,492 \times 0.98 + 12,942.29) + 0 + 80.416 \times 69,300 \times 321.66 \times 10^{-6} = 824,401.4 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq.}) \]

3.5.2.3.3 Assessment of CF of Milk Production

\[ \text{CF} = E_{\text{EF}} + E_M + E_E + E_{\text{ter}} + E_{\text{Forage}} = 696,371 + 0 + 987.49 + 21,269.16 + 814,401.4 = 1,533,029.05 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq.)} \]

CF of milk production in terms of production is calculated below:

\[ CF_P = \frac{CF}{P} = \frac{1,533,029.05}{1,588,440} = 0.97 \text{ (kgCO}_2\text{-eq./kg milk produced}) \]

3.5.2.4 Results

According to this calculation, the CF of milk production in this farm is 0.97 kg CO\textsubscript{2}-eq./kg milk produced. Proportions of GHG emissions by different inputs in CF were calculated to assess the contribution of each emission source to the total CF (Figure 3.3). For milk production, forage input contributed the most GHG emission in the total CF (53%), and the contributions of enteric fermentation were 45%. Emissions in the process of farm management made a contribution as small as 2%.

3.5.2.5 Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity of the total CF to different inputs and milk yield was further evaluated in this study, including CH\textsubscript{4} emissions from enteric fermentation, energy use in farm management, GHG

FIGURE 3.3 Contributions of agricultural inputs to total CF of milk production.
emissions from manufacture of forage and milk yield, respectively. As shown in Table 3.20, the calculated CF responded differently to changes in the different parameters. The most sensitive parameters were milk yield (9.09 and −9.09% for 10% decrement and increment, respectively), GHG emissions from manufacture of forage (−5.34 and 5.34% for 10% decrement and increment, respectively), and CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation (−4.51 and 4.51% for 10% decrement and increment, respectively). The sensitivity of energy use in farm management had a much smaller influence on CF in our evaluation. Sensitivity analysis gave us a suggestion that the reliability of data sources of these inputs is a key factor to obtain the accurate CF results. These also indicated that the increase of milk production and forage use efficiency and decrease of CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation could be a strategy to reduce CF in milk production.

3.5.2.6 Conclusions

This case study quantified the CF of milk production in Sichuan province of China using data from a questionnaire survey. GHG emissions from enteric fermentation and forage use contributed significantly to the total CF.

3.5.3 Limitations and Recommendations

As a basic assessment of CF of crop and livestock production, there would be still an issue of uncertainty. As an estimation for regional CF of crop production, the direct N₂O emission from N fertilizer use was estimated using default value by IPCC (2006). In addition, emissions of potassium and phosphorus from fertilizers and from use of pesticides were estimated using those reported by Dubey and Lal (2009). Other factors such as CO₂ emission from N fertilizer and plastic film manufacturing, as well as irrigation energy consumption were estimated from synthesizing data available from Chinese literature though limited. The selection of emission factors may cause some uncertainties in the CF calculation. Hence, the development of region-specific emission factors is one of key assignments for further studies. There could be some uncertainties induced by data collection, especially by field survey. In the second case study, we chose a farm in Sichuan province as a sample to calculate the CF of milk production. However, there may be some biases or errors for the data obtained from field survey due to the survey approaches and the knowledge of farmers. Therefore, the reasonable approach of field survey such as the design of survey forms and the selection of farm samples is very important for further studies, and increasing the number of samples may lower the uncertainties of the estimates.

We have not considered the impact of soil carbon balance on farm gate emissions in the first case study, because there were limited data concerned on soil carbon balance in a given crop production in Shandong province. The soil forms a large C pool, and there is thus scope for large amounts of C to be gained or lost from soils as a consequence of farming practice. For example, Lal (2004) reported management of repeated disturbance has turned many arable soils into C sources. But, some studies showed that the C sequestration in soil had not changed in conventional till, while reducing tillage or no till would lead to C sequestration in the soil (Smith et al. 2008). Soil carbon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>−10%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation</td>
<td>−4.51</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy use in farm management</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG emissions from manufacture of forage</td>
<td>−5.34</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>−9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.20: Sensitivity Analysis of Various Agricultural Inputs and Milk Yield to Total CF in Milk Production (in %)
balance should be taken into account when CFs are estimated under different agricultural management related to carbon balance in further studies.
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