

BURLEIGH DODDS SERIES IN AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE

Assessing the environmental impact of agriculture

Edited by Professor Bo P. Weidema, Aalborg University, Denmark



Contents

Series list	x
Introduction	xv

Part 1 Life cycle assessment

1	Life cycle assessment methodology for agriculture: some considerations for best practices	3
	<i>Seyyed Hassan Pishgar-Komleh, Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation, Poland and Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Czech Republic; Paria Sefeedpari, Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation, Poland; Nathan Pelletier, University of British Columbia, Canada; and Miguel Brandão, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden</i>	
	1 Introduction	3
	2 Identifying a functional unit	5
	3 Unit processes as the building blocks of LCI	8
	4 Categories of environmental pressures and impacts	16
	5 Conclusion and future trends	29
	6 Abbreviations	31
	7 Where to look for further information	32
	8 References	33
2	Key challenges in modelling of agricultural activities and their environmental impact	49
	<i>Evelyne A. Groen, Wageningen University, The Netherlands</i>	
	1 Introduction	49
	2 Addressing key challenges	51
	3 Case studies	67
	4 Conclusion	71
	5 Future trends	72
	6 Where to look for further information	75
	7 References	76

3	The use of farm-level models to assess the environmental impact of livestock production	85
	<i>Alasdair Sykes, Cairistiona Topp and Robert Rees, Scotland's Rural College (SRUC), UK</i>	
	1 The role of modelling in agricultural greenhouse gas mitigation	85
	2 Methodologies for accounting for agricultural emissions	94
	3 Farm-level greenhouse gas tools	98
	4 Developing farm-level modelling approaches	107
	5 Conclusion	110
	6 Acknowledgements	111
	7 Where to look for further information	111
	8 References	111
4	Assessing the environmental impact of ruminant production systems	121
	<i>Taro Takahashi, Rothamsted Research and University of Bristol, UK; Graham A. McAuliffe, Rothamsted Research, UK; and Michael R. F. Lee, Rothamsted Research and University of Bristol, UK</i>	
	1 Introduction	121
	2 LCA applied to ruminant production systems	122
	3 Case study: materials and methods	131
	4 Case study: results and discussion	133
	5 Conclusion	134
	6 Acknowledgements	135
	7 Where to look for further information	135
	8 References	135
5	Using life cycle assessment to compare intensive versus extensive agricultural systems	139
	<i>Matthias Meier, Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Switzerland</i>	
	1 Introduction	139
	2 Validity of LCA studies comparing intensive and extensive agricultural systems	141
	3 Assessing validity at the inventory level: reactive nitrogen emission modeling	142
	4 Assessing validity at the inventory level: heavy metal emissions in different farming systems	144
	5 References	147

Part 2 Modelling particular impacts

6	Modelling impacts of agriculture on freshwater <i>Stephan Pfister, ETH Zurich, Switzerland; and Sandra Payen, CIRAD, France and AgResearch, New Zealand</i>	153
	1 Introduction	153
	2 Modelling impacts of water consumption: water scarcity footprints	157
	3 Modelling impacts on water quality	162
	4 Modelling salinization impacts	162
	5 Soil quality and land-use implications	163
	6 Accounting for geographical and temporal variation	163
	7 Case studies	164
	8 Summary	167
	9 Future trends	168
	10 Acknowledgements	170
	11 Where to look for further information	170
	12 References	170
7	Modelling the environmental impacts of pesticides in agriculture <i>Peter Fantke, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark</i>	177
	1 Introduction	177
	2 Applying pesticides and quantifying emissions	180
	3 Ecotoxicity impacts of pesticides	187
	4 Human toxicity impacts of pesticides	193
	5 Addressing spatiotemporal variability	199
	6 Substituting pesticides to optimize agricultural pesticide use	203
	7 Case study	204
	8 Future trends and conclusion	210
	9 Acknowledgements	216
	10 Where to look for further information	216
	11 References	218
8	Assessing socio-economic impacts of agriculture <i>Bo P. Weidema, Aalborg University, Denmark</i>	229
	1 Introduction	229
	2 Cost-benefit analysis and assessment in agriculture	230
	3 Social impact assessment	232
	4 Sustainable livelihoods and the concept of capitals	234
	5 Applications of the capitals concept, critique, and a way beyond	237
	6 Valuation of impacts	240
	7 The product life cycle perspective	244

8	Socio-economic impacts of agricultural development	248
9	Inequality	248
10	Land tenure, ownership, rents, and taxation	249
11	Food prices and price instability	250
12	Certification and fair-trade schemes	250
13	Where to look for further information	251
14	References	252
Part 3 Improvement options		
9	Improvement options for agricultural crop production for food, feed and bioenergy <i>Benoît Gabrielle, AgroParisTech and Université Paris-Saclay, France; and Pietro Goglio, Wageningen University, The Netherlands and Cranfield University, UK</i>	261
1	Introduction: the case for improving the performance of crop production systems	261
2	Methodological background	262
3	Improvement options	267
4	Summary	278
5	Future trends in research	279
6	Where to look for further information	280
7	References	281
10	Improving the environmental performance of horticultural production: fruits and vegetables <i>Cornelius Adewale and David Granatstein, Washington State University, USA</i>	287
1	Introduction	287
2	Key findings from LCA of horticultural crops	288
3	Unique challenges of LCA for horticultural crops	303
4	Case study: OFoot Project, Washington State, USA	305
5	Future trends and conclusion	307
6	Where to look for further information	308
7	References	308
11	Improving the environmental performance of pig and poultry production <i>Ben Putman, Martin Christie and Greg Thoma, University of Arkansas, USA</i>	313
1	Introduction	313
2	Improvement options	314

3 Case studies	322
4 Future trends	323
5 Conclusion	325
6 Where to look for further information	325
7 References	326
12 The environmental impact of valorising agricultural by-products <i>Jerke de Vries and Rik Eweg, Van Hall Larenstein University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands</i>	335
1 Introduction	335
2 Main treatment pathways for valorising agricultural by-products	338
3 Availability and collectability of by-products	339
4 Environmental impact of valorising by-products	343
5 Future opportunities and perspectives	348
6 Summary and conclusion	352
7 Where to look for further information	354
8 References	354
Index	361

Introduction

In spite of its decreasing share of global economic output, agriculture is still responsible for a large part of overall physical output, both to the rest of the economy and to the environment. For example, it has been estimated that agriculture and land use are responsible globally for around 24% of the greenhouse gas emissions fuelling climate change. A prerequisite to improving the sustainability of agriculture are reliable methods to identify and quantify types of environmental impact. These can then be used to identify priorities, set targets for improvement and monitor progress. This book provides a review of current research on the use of life cycle assessment (LCA) and other modelling techniques to measure and model the environmental impact and improve the sustainability of agriculture. The book is divided in three parts. Chapters in Part 1 review key issues in using LCA and modelling applied to farming systems. Part 2 provides more detail on the modelling of three particular impacts, namely freshwater, pesticides and social impacts. Part 3 looks in more detail on options for reducing the environmental impact and improving the performance of both crop and livestock farming.

Part 1 Life cycle assessment

Life cycle assessment (LCA) is increasingly applied to agricultural systems. However, in spite of the standardisation of this assessment technique through the ISO 14040 series, there are still many different interpretations of the requirements laid down by the standards, resulting in a plethora of ways in which LCA is applied in practice. In turn, this results in the generation of sometimes conflicting results. Chapter 1 provides a review of the most important issues in agricultural LCA and demonstrates how to deal with challenges such as system boundary delimitations, defining the functional unit, handling co-production and choice of impact assessment methods.

Chapter 2 provides a broader view on modelling of agricultural activities and their environmental impacts. The focus of the chapter is on model quality as dependent on the quality of data and the accuracy of modelling decisions to support mitigation strategies or management changes towards environmental friendlier agricultural products. Applying uncertainty and sensitivity analysis can reduce uncertainty in model outputs and direct data collection efforts towards the most important variables, thereby contributing to overall model quality. The chapter includes two detailed case studies that show the benefits of including uncertainty propagation and sensitivity analysis in model assessment. The chapter ends by describing future trends in modelling, especially in facilitating the reuse of models.

Chapter 3 describes a range of farm-level greenhouse gas modelling tools, and critically assesses their ability to function as a tool for farm-level benchmarking and mitigation assessment. The authors conclude that the majority of farm-level tools do not effectively account for their methodological choices and that the disparity in interpretation and adaptation leads to considerable differences in output. The chapter considers the challenges, limitations and opportunities offered by further development of different modelling approaches.

Chapter 4 provides a review of recent LCAs on ruminant production systems and considers the particular challenges in modelling, especially in pasture-based ruminant production systems with their high degree of variation in physical, chemical and biological processes. A case study demonstrates how uncertainty surrounding climate impacts of ruminant systems can potentially be reduced through on-farm measurements of greenhouse gas fluxes, but that not all measurements carry the same degree of value.

Chapter 5 examines the use of LCA for comparisons of intensive and extensive agricultural systems. Most often LCAs of agricultural systems compare conventional agriculture as an intensive farming system with certified organic agriculture as an extensive farming system, even though production intensity in terms of yields and inputs may vary over a wide range in both production systems. Nevertheless, comparative LCA studies on organic and conventional farming are well suited to discuss advantages and limitations of using LCA to assess the environmental sustainability of farming systems of different production intensities. The chapter assesses the validity of the modelling of reactive nitrogen and heavy metal emissions in different farming systems.

Part 2 Modelling particular impacts

Chapter 6 looks at modelling the impacts of agriculture on freshwater consumption, water quality and salinization. 80-90% of human freshwater consumption is accounted for by agriculture, mainly due to the high volumes of irrigation water for crop production. Additionally, agricultural activities affect hydrological cycles through land use changes and soil modifications, and through pollution of water bodies with fertilizers and pesticides. The chapter addresses data availability and databases, the issues of high geographical and temporal variability, and current gaps in modelling. Notable gaps are found in hydrological data and models for groundwater as well as in the assessment of impacts on ecosystems.

Chapter 7 reviews how pesticides are currently addressed in impact assessment. A real-life scenario study of four selected pesticides applied to potatoes illustrates and provides guidance on the quantification of emissions, exposure and toxicity. The chapter discusses the relevance of spatiotemporal

variability in modelling emissions and the toxicity and ecotoxicity impacts of pesticides, and how substitution scenarios can be used to identify more sustainable pesticides.

Chapter 8 looks at the wider economic and social impacts of agriculture. Economic assessments remain the dominating form of socio-economic assessment in agriculture, but its practical implementation often suffer from severe limitations. The chapter describes how much of the early criticism has slowly been adopted and integrated in the form of significant improvements in the consistency and completeness of economic assessment techniques. Nevertheless, a better integration with the qualitative understandings developed in the social impact assessment community is still largely missing, notably with respect to power, politics and institutions, and viewing human and social capabilities as direct contributors to wellbeing, i.e. beyond being just economic factors of production. The chapter suggests that these limitations can be overcome by combining existing models. The unique importance of agriculture in sustainable development is highlighted through a discussion of how the benefits of increases in agricultural productivity are distributed, as illustrated by the role of inequality, land tenure, and food pricing. Most of these issues can only be effectively addressed by well-functioning public institutions. The final section of the chapter discusses to what extent certification and fair-trade schemes might address these issues in the absence of public governance.

Part 3 Improvement options

Part 3 looks assesses the available options for mitigating environmental impacts within agricultural crop production (Chapter 9), horticulture (Chapter 10), and pork and poultry production (Chapter 11). A final chapter looks at the options for valorising by-products. In general, the four chapters point out the large variation between local contexts, crops, and types of impacts. Nevertheless, some general conclusions can be drawn. The authors of Chapter 9 highlight the promising results from research on agro-ecology and other quantitative evidence on designing highly efficient production systems. Chapter 10 examines key findings from LCA of horticultural crops and production systems and finds a relatively low environmental impact compared to other food types. For fruit crops, the largest impacts occur at the farm level, most often related to machinery use, pesticides and fertilizers.

Currently, pork and chicken account for nearly three quarters of global meat consumption. With increasing concern for the environmental impacts associated with human activity, and due to the magnitude of the pork and poultry sectors, there is mounting pressure to meet the growing demand for these animal-based proteins with fewer resources and lower emissions. Chapter 11 points out that the emission intensity of pork and poultry operations

is largely determined by the feed conversion ratio and manure handling. The authors outline improvement options and provide case studies for making pig and poultry production more sustainable. In their outlook for the future, they highlight the role of data science, data-driven decision-making and automation in order to continue improving efficiency in agriculture.

Chapter 12 provides an overview of opportunities to reduce the environmental impact of valorising agricultural by-products, i.e. crop residues, industrial by-products, and animal manure. The authors estimate the available by-products and the maximum and realistic greenhouse gas reduction potentials in North Western Europe, assessing the relative importance of availability and collectability, as well as broader issues such as land use changes, soil carbon sequestration and pollution swapping.

To the reader

The chapters of this book can be read individually. As editor, I have sought to ensure consistency in the use of terms and methodological recommendations. It is my hope that this book can serve as a standard reference for the agricultural science and LCA research community and that it will support further research to improve measuring and modelling the environmental impact of agriculture.

Part 1

Life cycle assessment

Chapter 1

Life cycle assessment methodology for agriculture: some considerations for best practices

Seyyed Hassan Pishgar-Komleh, Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation, Poland and Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Czech Republic; Paria Sefeedpari, Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation, Poland; Nathan Pelletier, University of British Columbia, Canada; and Miguel Brandão, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Identifying a functional unit
- 3 Unit processes as the building blocks of LCI
- 4 Categories of environmental pressures and impacts
- 5 Conclusion and future trends
- 6 Abbreviations
- 7 Where to look for further information
- 8 References

1 Introduction

Along with the increased demand by a growing and wealthier human population for healthy and nutritious food, growing awareness and concerns in today's society over the environmental impacts associated with agricultural systems have shifted focus to sustainable consumption and production (Mazur-Wierzbicka, 2015). As a result, agriculture has been the subject of considerable public debate and scrutiny (Jansen and Vellema, 2004).

Life cycle assessment (LCA) is an approach formalized in the 14040 and 14044 standards of the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) (ISO, 2006a,b). These standards provide a methodological framework for quantitatively evaluating the environmental impacts and as a further step, the trade-offs among the corresponding LCA results, economic and social impacts can be considered for sustainability assessment (Lee and Inaba, 2004). While focus on socio-economic objectives, such as employment effects and contribution to gross domestic product (GDP), historically took predominance over environmental concerns (FAO, 2006), the latter are swiftly catching

up by drawing the interest of policy makers and expressed preferences of consumers. One of the limitations of typical LCA studies is the exclusion of social and economic aspects of product systems, which may favour a decision that otherwise would not be favoured. A sustainability assessment study that excludes these impacts is incomplete. However, incorporating life cycle costing (LCC) and social impacts has proven challenging, as pointed out by Dreyer et al. (2006), who noted that 'recommendations based on LCA fail to address possible trade-offs between environmental protection and both social and economic concerns in the product life cycle'. In an attempt to overcome this issue, a wide range of studies have been conducted on life cycle social assessment (LCSA) and LCC (Klöpffer and Renner, 2008; Finkbeiner et al., 2010). Although including a social assessment into agricultural LCA studies is still in its infancy, literature exists on some case studies and applications. In this regard, agriculture and agro-food systems are the first sectors in which social LCA has been applied - for example, tomatoes and citrus fruits from Italy, milk and eggs from Canada, bananas from Cameroon, roses from Ecuador and the Netherlands, and oysters from Denmark (Petti et al., 2018; Pelletier, 2018; Revéret et al., 2015; De Luca et al., 2015; Franze and Ciroth, 2011; Wangel, 2014; Feschet et al., 2013).

In order to manage the social performance of a production system, it is required to ensure that a wide variety of sustainability concerns are met, including labour issues, human health, resource availability, animal welfare, biodiversity, and food security, in addition to the quantification of the impacts of emissions to air, soil, and water. In this context, LCA can be an important tool for measuring, benchmarking and, in turn, improving the social performance of the agri-food sector. This is relevant, in particular, when seeking to understand and make comparisons between traditional subsistence and industry and farming, organic and conventional production systems, or animal-based and animal-free diets.

The concept of social responsibility has been defined as 'the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development, working with employees, their families, the local community and society at large to improve their quality of life' (Holme and Watts, 2000). In ISO 26000 (ISO, 2010), this concept has been defined more comprehensively as: 'responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behaviour that (1) contributes to sustainable development, including health and the welfare of society; (2) takes into account the expectations of stakeholders; (3) is in compliance with applicable law and consistent with international norms of behaviour; and (4) is integrated throughout the organisation and practised in its relationships'. Responsibility allocation is an issue on which there is no general agreement and the literature shows different viewpoints (Mankiw and Taylor, 2006; Ferng,

2003; Lenzen et al., 2007; Rodrigues et al., 2006). Based on the literature, allocation of responsibility can be done according to criteria representing either *producer responsibility*, *consumer responsibility*, or *income responsibility* (Weidema et al., 2018). Although these three types of responsibility are discussed in the context of global regulation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, they can be generally applied to all environmental impacts of the product life cycle. According to the first alternative, the producer bears the main responsibility for the environmental impact of a goods item or a service (we use the term *product* to denote both goods and services) throughout the entire life cycle. This allocation method ignores the important role of the final consumers as the main drivers for environmental impacts and that outsources the environmental impacts to countries with fewer commitments (Pedersen and de Haan, 2006; Weidema et al., 2018). The second alternative ascribes all environmental impacts related to production and consumption of a product to the consumers. This encourages the consumers to purchase products with the least environmental impacts. The last alternative - income responsibility - allocates all of the environmental impacts in the value chain to the activities that receive income from the value chain (Weidema et al., 2018). Since LCA studies are performed in the context of life cycle management and social responsibility, the relationship between LCA models and social responsibility needs to be investigated. Accordingly, Weidema et al. (2018) identified three social responsibility paradigms, namely *value chain responsibility*, *supply chain responsibility*, and *consequential responsibility* for social assessments.

In summary, the current commitments to continuous improvements over time in social responsibility and environmental performance are major challenges for policy makers, producers, and consumers, who rely on scientifically robust tools with which to quantify sustainability impacts and meet self-imposed targets. The LCA can play a key role in supporting the transition to socially and environmentally responsible systems to obtain the systematic and scientifically robust sustainability results that it can produce.

2 Identifying a functional unit

The functional unit (FU) is a key element in LCA and must be defined clearly. ISO (2006a) states that 'LCA is a relative approach, which is structured around a FU. This FU defines what is being studied. All subsequent analyses are then relative to that FU, as all inputs and outputs in the life cycle inventory (LCI) and consequently the life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) profile are related to the FU'. In other words, an FU for the product of an agricultural system ought to represent a quantifiable value associated with the function of the agricultural production system under study (Caffrey and Veal, 2013a). Defining the appropriate FU is dependent on the system being analysed, the goal of the

study, and the system boundary of the LCA and is generally chosen to reflect the way the product is traded (Harris and Narayanaswamy, 2009); in case of comparing different alternatives, an equivalent basis of the alternatives can be considered (e.g. energy content in biofuels and gasoline or diesel as a transport fuel). Weidema et al. (2004) provided some useful recommendations on key issues in LCA in the form of a guideline. Based on this guideline, the FU needs to be, as far as possible, related to the function of the product rather than to the quantity of the product. For example, for agricultural tillage machinery 'the tillage area (with specific depth) per hour' can be selected rather than choosing 'the mass of tillage machine'. Failing to define an appropriate FU makes it impossible to compare different LCA results (Caffrey and Veal, 2013b) (e.g. comparing organic and conventional systems). Depending on the type of study and product, different product attributes can form the basis for defining the proper FU in the modelling of agricultural systems.

2.1 Mass

The majority of agricultural studies use a mass-based FU. In this category, the environmental impacts of a product are related to 1 kg or tonne of a product, regardless of the quality and commercial value of the product (Cerutti et al., 2013; Pishgar-Komleh et al., 2017a). For simplicity, the mass-based FU is widely used in LCA of agricultural products. Studies on animal production tend to use mass-based FUs for milk, butter, yogurt, cheese, ice cream and whey products (e.g. 1 kg of raw milk) (Basset-Mens et al., 2009). Examples of agricultural LCAs that adopt mass-based FU are (Basset-Mens et al., 2009; Haas et al., 2001; Mollenhorst et al., 2006; Fantin et al., 2017; Anton et al., 2005; Hayashi, 2005; Nienhuis and de Vreede, 1996; Pishgar-Komleh et al., 2013).

2.2 Energy

In studies that deal with bioenergy and biofuel production, an energy-based (or a proportional function, such as distance driven) FU can be used, for example, 1 MJ, since the function of the system is to deliver energy. Studies that have employed an energy-based FU in the LCA of agricultural crops include Hanegraaf and Biewinga (1998), Heller et al. (2003), Monti et al. (2009) and Fazio and Monti (2011).

2.3 Other functional units

In some studies, alternative FUs are relevant (Cerutti et al., 2013). Since land use *per se* is not seen directly as a production function, land-based FUs are not commonly used in LCA. However, this FU can be correctly applied when

the goal of the study is, for example, related to supporting the minimization of environmental impacts associated with cultivating a certain area (Mouron et al., 2006a,b). When comparing different land-management options (e.g. food, fuel, feed, fibre timber, or carbon sequestration), given that the functions of the different land uses are different, it is necessary to balance each alternative so that they can be compared. The FU (e.g. 1 ha) would thus reflect no net production (Brandão, 2012). The land-based FU has been used to compare low input-low output systems with high input-high output systems (Cerutti et al., 2013), although the outputs across alternatives must be equal to enable comparability. In addition, this FU has been used to compare crop-rotation systems including fallow land (Karlsson and Sund, 2016). Defining the appropriate FU for comparing and contrasting farming systems, such as organic and conventional systems, is very important. Applying different FUs may reverse the ranking of the options being compared (e.g. organic and conventional product systems seen from a mass- or land-area-based FU). Intuitively, it is widely believed that organic farming is an environmentally superior alternative to conventional farming; however, this viewpoint is often challenged by the insights gained from LCA studies, where results are normalised by the quantity of product. Tuomisto et al. (2012) found that organic systems may decrease nitrate leaching, while increasing land requirements and soil erosion. Nemecek et al. (2011) showed organic farming has better environmental outcomes at the farm scale (per ha), but not per unit of output (per kg product). Several LCAs have used land-based FUs in the modelling of agricultural and animal products (Haas et al., 2001; Nemecek et al., 2001; Huguenin-Elie and Nemecek, 2004; Basset-Mens and van der Werf, 2005; Hayashi, 2005; Mouron et al., 2006a; Xiao et al., 2019; Pirlo and Lolli, 2019); however, results must be interpreted with caution because the comparability between alternative systems, which requires that systems to produce an equivalent amount of all products, is not always ensured.

In other studies, value-based or economic-based FUs have been adopted, which can be useful because they integrate product quantity and quality in a single index (Mouron et al., 2006b; Cerutti et al., 2013). The disadvantage of this FU is that it does not enable comparison across countries and years. It is strongly influenced by the economic context in which the farm is located and can change significantly from one year to another (Cerutti et al., 2013).

Despite the need to adapt FUs to the product properties and purpose of the study, the majority of LCA studies on agricultural products use the above FUs. For example, in studies on animal products, FUs have been defined as:

- 1 kg or tonne of energy corrected milk (ECM) leaving the farm-gate over a specific period of time (Cederberg and Stadig, 2003; Cederberg and Mattsson, 2000; Cederberg and Flysjö, 2004; Casey and Holden, 2005);

- 1 kg or tonne of fat and protein corrected milk (FPCM) (Pirlo and Lolli, 2019; Gerber et al., 2011; Thomassen et al., 2008b, 2009; Basset-Mens et al., 2009).
- 1 litre or tonne of milk produced and sold per year per herd size (Hospido et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2006; Eide, 2002);
- number of products (such as 1,000 eggs produced) (Williams et al., 2006);
- 1 kg of bone-free meat leaving the farm-gate (Basset-Mens et al., 2009; Cederberg and Darelius, 2002; Cederberg and Stadig, 2003).
- 1 kg or tonne of live or dead animal carcass, such as pig, chicken, and beef leaving the farm-gate (Basset-Mens et al., 2009; Haas et al., 2000; Eriksson et al., 2005; Basset-Mens and van der Werf, 2005; Williams et al., 2006; Casey and Holden, 2006; Katajajuuri, 2007; Pishgar-Komleh et al., 2017b).
- 1 kg or tonne of animal protein, such as pork, chicken, or beef protein (Zhu and van Ierland, 2004).

3 Unit processes as the building blocks of LCI

3.1 Collecting data on inputs and outputs: completeness vs. precision

A 'unit process' is one or more grouped operations in a production system that can be defined and separated from others. According to ISO (2006a,b), unit processes are the smallest elements in the LCI of product systems for which input and output data are quantified. With high data resolution (i.e. geographical, technological, and temporal), it can refer to an activity such as transportation, planting, harvesting, tillage, cleaning, and separation; if less resolved data are available, it can refer to a collection of activities that aggregate into a higher-level process, like crop production, post-harvest and so on. The outputs of a unit process are main products, by-products, emissions, and wastes, while inputs refer to resources, such as raw materials and energy, intermediate products, or other products (e.g. fertilizers or pesticides).

Like any assessment tool, data are a driving force behind LCA (Curran, 2015). Data acquisition is one of the most complex issues facing LCA practitioners (Klöpffer and Grahl, 2014). Large numbers of interlinked processes need to be considered to complete the LCI. Raw material inputs, energy use, ratio of main product to co-products, production rates, and environmental releases must all be quantified for each process in the production system (Curran, 2015). LCI data can be classified into two categories: foreground and background. Foreground data are typically those unique to the product system being modelled and are collected directly from sources including on-site measurements, interviews, questionnaires or surveys, and online or offline data collection tools. Background data represent common industrial processes

that may be shared across multiple product systems and typically come from databases, open literature, and statistics. Once raw data are collected, data modelling approaches are applied to transform raw data into unit process datasets. Unit process datasets are the basis of every LCI database.

Depending on the LCI data collection method, LCA can be classified into three types: process-based, input-output (IO) based, and hybrid LCA (Heijungs and Suh, 2002). To select the most appropriate method for a given study, important factors such as boundary completeness and precision should be considered carefully with respect to the goals of the study (Lenzen and Crawford, 2009).

In process-based LCA, all the resources and emissions over the entire life cycle (or specific life cycle stages) of a product are considered. This allows calculating the complete environmental impact of a product. However, finding physical data for all inputs and outputs of a background process can be challenging, which can lead to the underestimation of impacts (Curran, 2015; Mattila, 2018; Crawford et al., 2018). It is challenging, if not impossible, to have a complete LCI with process data.

To overcome this problem, IO-based LCA can be applied. The IO-based LCA relies on sectoral-exchange information in a given year for a country's entire economy. This approach uses an IO table containing the annual transactions between all the sectors of the economy, along with data for sector-specific resource inputs and emissions (Curran, 2015; Mattila, 2018). Some of the limitations of this approach include price variability, sector aggregation, and the lack of input-specific data (Teh et al., 2018). The IO-based LCA requires detailed sector-level data regarding resource inputs and emissions. These are often available for certain kinds of emissions that have particular policy relevance – for example, GHG emissions – but will often be unavailable for many standard impact categories in LCA. Since the IO-based models use aggregated sectoral data, product-level LCIs will be less accurate (Huijbregts et al., 2001a). For instance, different agricultural systems (notorious for high variability among products and regions), such as organic and conventional farming systems, belong to the same sector, and thus the results of environmental impact assessments for products from these sectors will be similar, which is not valid (Curran, 2015). This concern applies to all agricultural commodities, which are considered equal in terms of resource use and emissions, when IO LCA results are calculated. Numerous LCA studies of agricultural products used process-based models (Cellura et al., 2012; Pelletier et al., 2010; Stoessel et al., 2012; Lardon et al., 2009) while few studies used IO-based models (Yan et al., 2013; Joshi, 1999).

In order to have both the completeness of the IO-based LCA and the precision of process-based LCA, a hybrid LCA approach can be applied (Suh and Huppes, 2005; Curran, 2015; Yang et al., 2017; Pomponi and Lenzen,

Index

- AB models. *see* Agent-based (AB) models
 - Absolute global warming potential (AGWP) 97
 - Acidification 19–21, 264, 276, 291, 321, 338
 - ADEME. *see* French Environmental Protection Agency (ADEME)
 - Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment (APFSAFE) 234
 - AEP. *see* Aquatic ecotoxicity potential (AEP)
 - Agent-based (AB) models 246
 - AGPs. *see* Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGPs)
 - AgRE Calc. *see* Agricultural Resource Efficiency Calculator (AgRE Calc)
 - Agricultural activities modelling
 - case studies
 - combined uncertainty and sensitivity plot 69–71
 - correlation effect on output variance 67–69
 - challenges
 - data collection and uncertainty 54–56
 - model characteristics 51–53
 - uncertainty and sensitivity analysis 56–66
 - environmental impacts modelling 49–50
 - future trends 72–75
 - Agricultural by-products valorisation 353
 - availability and use 339–340, 348–349
 - collection 340, 343, 348–349
 - economic viability 351–352
 - environmental assessment and reduction potential 349–350
 - environmental trade-offs and pollution swapping 350–351
 - LULUC and soil carbon sequestration 348
 - manure 347
 - overview 335–338
 - primary residue 343
 - secondary residue 343, 347
 - treatment pathways 338–339
- Agricultural crop production
 - improvement 279–280
 - cropping systems and management scenarios 265–266
 - environmental performance measurement 262–265
 - generic types of management options 266
 - incremental approaches and efficiency 267–269, 271–274
 - overview 261–262
 - single practices to full-blown systems approach 274–276, 278
 - Agricultural labour-productivity 249
 - Agricultural LCAs 11–12
 - Agricultural Resource Efficiency Calculator (AgRE Calc) 98–99
 - Agro-ecology 275, 278
 - AGWP. *see* Absolute global warming potential (AGWP)
 - Albedo 155
 - ALCA. *see* Attributional life cycle assessment (ALCA)
 - Allocation 13–16
 - Anaerobic digestion 321, 349
 - Analytical uncertainty propagation 61
 - Anthropocentric valuation 240
 - Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGPs) 316–317
 - APFSAFE. *see* Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment (APFSAFE)
 - APSIM model 73
 - AquaCrop model 159, 160
 - Aquastat 159

- Aquatic ecosystems 191
 Aquatic ecotoxicity potential (AEP) 269
 Aquatic eutrophication 22
 'Areas of protection' concept 238
 Attributional life cycle assessment (ALCA) 10, 11, 12, 30, 89
 Available Water Remaining (AWaRe) 160, 161, 164

 Behavioural economics 241
 Bio-based materials 307, 336
 Bio-cascading 336
 Biodiversity loss 261
 Biofuel production 343
 Biofuel sustainability 267
 Biophysical allocation 30
 Biophysical model 50
 Bio-refinery 336, 339
 Blue water 156
 Brightway 75, 169
 Brundtland commission 234

 CALM tool 100-101
 CalTOX model 193, 203
 Capabilities, concept of 234, 237
 'Capitals and capabilities' framework 238
 Carbon Calculator for New Zealand Agriculture and Horticulture 102-103
 Carbon cycle 264
 Carbon dioxide emissions 91, 337
 Carbon footprint analysis 305-306
 Carbon sequestration 99, 100, 268, 343, 348, 351, 352, 353
 Carbon sinks 92, 124, 128, 304
 Causal physical allocation 14
 CCaLC Carbon Footprinting Tool 103-104
 CFF. *see* Climate Friendly Food (CFF) Farm Carbon Calculator
 Chain-analysis models 50
 CLCA. *see* Consequential life cycle assessment (CLCA)
 Climate change 18-19, 24-25, 261, 264, 268
 Climate Friendly Food (CFF) Carbon Calculator 99-100
 CMLCA 74
 CML method 22
 'Competitive Commercial Agriculture for Africa' 248
 Conference of European Statisticians Recommendations on Measuring Sustainable Development 237
 Consequential LCA 89
 Consequential life cycle assessment (CLCA) 10-11, 12, 13, 30
 Conservation tillage (CT) 268
 Consumer responsibility 5
 Cool Farm Tool 101-102
 CPLANv0 tool 100
 Cradle to farmgate analysis 123-128, 131
 Crop by-products in pig and poultry rations 317
 Cropping system 262, 265-266, 273-274, 279
 Crop rotation 295
 CropWat model 159
 CT. *see* Conservation tillage (CT)
 Cultural capital 235

 DALY. *see* Disability-Adjusted Life-Year (DALY)
 Data-driven decision-making 324
 DAYCENT 102
 DDT. *see* Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane
 Decision-making algorithms 325
 Decision support systems 324
 Deliberative valuation 242-243
 Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) 198
 Direct economic cost 231
 Direct land use change (dLUC) 27
 Disability-Adjusted Life-Year (DALY) 244
 Disease and weed management 271, 272
 Disease-resistant cultivar 291
 Distance-to-target weighting 243
 dLUC. *see* Direct land use change (dLUC)
 Dose-response curve thresholds 243
 Drip irrigation 166
 Due diligence 233
 Dynamic forest (simulation) models 50
 dynamiCROP model 197-198, 202-203

 EC-JRC. *see* European Commission's Joint Research Centre (EC-JRC)
 Eco-efficiency 263
 Ecoinvent database 158, 184
 Ecoinvent emission factor inventory 102
 Economic allocation 14-15
 Economic analysis 234
 Economic-based functional unit. *see* Value-based functional unit
 Ecosystem quality, affected by water use 161
 Ecotoxicity 271, 272
 Education, benefits of 238

- EIA. *see* Environmental impact assessment (EIA)
- Ekins, Paul 235
- Emission metrics, used in greenhouse gas reporting 97-98
- Empirical models 88
- Endowment effect 241
- Endpoint categories 17
- Energy allocation 14
- Energy-based functional unit 6
- Environmental efficiency vs. sustainability 308
- Environmental impact assessment (EIA) 232
- Environmental pressures and impacts and categories 16-29
- Epistemic uncertainty 55-56
- EU Impact Assessment system 233
- EU Nitrates Directive 94
- EU Pesticide Database 178
- European Commission 244
- European Commission's Joint Research Centre (EC-JRC) 18, 21, 28
- EUTREND model 22, 24
- Eutrophication 21-24, 263, 264, 269, 274, 276, 294, 302, 321, 338
- Factor fixing 66
- 'Factor of consumption' 238
- Factor prioritizing 66
- 'Fair trade' labels 251
- FAO. *see* Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)
- FAOSTAT. *see* Food and Agricultural Organization Corporate Statistical Database (FAOSTAT)
- FAO/UNESCO Soil Map of the World 205
- FAPRI partial equilibrium model 27
- FarmBeats system 324
- Farm Carbon Assessment Tool (FCAT) 101
- Farming Enterprise Greenhouse Gas Calculator 103
- Farm-level models 85
 - accounting methodologies for agricultural emissions 94-98
 - developing
 - model sensitivity, flexibility, and data input burden challenges 107-108
 - non-greenhouse gas environmental impacts modelling in farming systems 109-110
 - spatially specific environmental data in farm-level footprints 108-109
 - greenhouse gas tools 98
 - profiles of 98-104
 - reviewed farm-level tools
 - summary 104-106
 - modelling role in agricultural greenhouse gas mitigation
 - of agricultural emissions 88-90
 - environmental impacts 93-94
 - greenhouse gas emissions and environmental footprint of agriculture 90-93
 - rationale 85-88
- FCAT. *see* Farm Carbon Assessment Tool (FCAT)
- FCR. *see* Feed conversion ratio (FCR)
- Feed additives 315, 316
- Feed conversion ratio (FCR) 314
- Feed processing technologies 316
- Feed production 313-314, 315
- Feed-use efficiency 315
- Fertilizer management 271
- FFD. *see* Fossil fuel depletion (FFD)
- Financial capital 235, 236-237
- 'Five Capitals' model 235
- Flood Control Act (1936) 231
- Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) 237
- Food and Agricultural Organization Corporate Statistical Database (FAOSTAT) 181
- Forum for the Future 235
- Fossil energy 269, 298
- Fossil fuel depletion (FFD) 343, 351
- Four-Capital Model of Wealth Creation* 235
- French Environmental Protection Agency (ADEME) 211
- Freshwater, modelling agriculture impacts
 - on 153-156
 - case studies
 - of mandarin in Morocco 165-166
 - of New Zealand milk 164-165
 - Water conservation and increased irrigation efficiency 166
 - geographical and temporal variation
 - accounting 163-164
 - research future trends
 - impact assessment 168-169
 - inventory 169
 - technical solutions 169-170
 - salinization impacts modelling 162-163
 - soil quality and land-use
 - implications 163

- water consumption impacts
 - modelling 157
 - inventory modelling 157-162
 - water quality impacts modelling 162
- Freshwater efficiency, optimizing 167
- Functional unit 5-8, 263
- Function-oriented approaches 51-52

- General Equilibrium (GE) models 245
- Genetic selection 317
- GHG. *see* Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- Github 75
- Global consumer goods trade 250-251
- 'Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Indicators' 211
- Global sensitivity analysis 56, 62-66
- Global temperature potential (GTP) 19
- Global warming potential (GWP) 18-19, 97, 123, 268, 275, 288, 290, 293-294, 302, 304
- Glycerol 347
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions 261, 263, 264, 268, 269, 271, 273, 275, 276, 305, 313, 314, 321, 337, 343, 347, 350, 351, 352, 353
- Greenhouse infrastructure 297, 302
- Greenhouse production
 - strawberry 293, 301, 302
 - tomato 292-293, 297, 302
- Green water 156
- Grey water 162
- GTAP-BIO model 28
- GTAP Model 28
- GTP. *see* Global temperature potential (GTP)
- GWP. *see* Global warming potential (GWP)

- Health economics 230
- Heavy metal emissions, in farming
 - systems 144-146
- Horticultural crops and LCA 308
 - challenges 303-305
 - findings 288, 301-303
 - energy use 298, 300
 - farm-to-farm variability 296-298
 - greenhouse production 302
 - location effects 292-294
 - production system
 - comparisons 289-292
 - protected cultivation systems 302
 - self-assessment programmes 301
 - supply chain stage hot spots 294-296
 - water use efficiency 300-301
 - yield effect 296
- Organic Farming Footprints (OFoot) Project 305-307
 - overview 287-288
- Hotspot analysis 57
- Human capital 235, 238
- Hybrid-based LCA 9-10
- Hybrid modelling 245-246

- IEA Bioenergy consortium 339
- IFC social performance standards 232
- IIRC. *see* International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC)
- iLUC. *see* Indirect land use change (iLUC)
- Impact Assessment Guidelines 244
- Impact assessment process 233
- Impact2002 model 188, 193
- Income responsibility 5
- Indirect economic cost 231
- Indirect land use change (iLUC) 27, 28, 338
- Input-output analysis 230, 231
- Input-output-based LCA 9
- 'Input-output' (IO) models 245-246
- Integrated management 347
- Intellectual capital 235
- Intensive vs. extensive agricultural
 - systems 139-141
 - LCA studies validity 141-142
 - overview 139-141
 - validity assessment at inventory level
 - heavy metal emissions 144-146
 - reactive nitrogen emission modeling 142-144
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 18, 88, 89, 94-96
- International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) 235
- IO models. *see* 'Input-output' (IO) models
- IPCC. *see* Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
- Irrigation 273, 295, 298, 300-301, 324
- ISO 26000 guidance standard 232
- ISO 14040-standards 245

- Köppen-Geiger climate classification 205
- Kyoto Protocol 88

- LANCA 163
- Land-based functional unit 6-7
- Land transformation. *see* Land use change (LUC)

- Land use and land use changes (LULUC) 337, 338, 348, 351, 353
- Land use change (LUC) 25, 27
- Land use impacts on climate change, ecosystem services, and biodiversity 24-29
- LCA. *see* Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
- LCC. *see* Life cycle costing (LCC)
- LCSA. *see* Life cycle social assessment (LCSA)
- LEAP. *see* Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership (LEAP)
- Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) 230, 245-246, 262-263, 264-265, 266, 278, 313, 338
- methodology 3-29
- studies validity 141-142
- system models 315
- see also* Horticultural crops and LCA; *and specific entries*
- Life cycle costing (LCC) 4, 5
- Life-cycle fossil energy 263
- Life Cycle Initiative 211
- Life cycle inventory (LCI) 5
- Life cycle social assessment (LCSA) 4
- Litter 319-320
- Livestock and manure management, emissions from 95
- Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership (LEAP) 320
- Local sensitivity analysis 56, 57-59
- LPJmL model 52
- LUC. *see* Land use change (LUC)
- LULUC. *see* Land use and land use changes (LULUC)
- Machine learning 325
- Managed soils, emissions from 95-96
- Manure and composts 291
- Manure management 314
- Marginal abatement costs 243
- Marginal valuation 243
- Mass allocation 14
- Mass-based functional unit 6
- Mechanistic model 50
- Metabolic 'biophysical' allocation 15-16
- Midpoint categories 17
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 27
- Modern monopsony situation 249
- Monetary valuation 240
- MONICA model 52
- Monte Carlo simulation 56, 59, 60, 61, 98
- Muntons PLC carbon calculator 104
- National Inventory Report 100, 101
- Natural resources, depletion of 162
- Natural variability 55, 56
- Nitrate leaching 274, 275
- Nitrogen cycle 264
- Nitrous oxide emission 91, 314, 321, 337, 350
- Non-anthropocentric valuation scheme 240
- Non-renewable resource depletion 271
- North Wyke Farm Platform National Capability 131
- NUE. *see* Nutrient use efficiency (NUE)
- Nutrient balance concept 304
- Nutrient density concept 304
- Nutrient use efficiency (NUE) 271
- OFoot Project. *see* Organic Farming Footprints (OFoot) Project
- OLCA-Pest. *see* Operationalizing Life Cycle Assessment of Pesticides (OLCA-Pest)
- OpenFoodTox database, EFSA 192
- openLCA Nexus 74
- Open-source projects 75
- Operationalizing Life Cycle Assessment of Pesticides (OLCA-Pest) 211
- Optimization models 50
- Organic Farming Footprints (OFoot) Project 305-307
- Organic fertilizer 271
- Packaging material 295
- Paris Agreement 85, 168, 268
- Paris Conference of the Parties (2015) 261
- Parkins, Sara 235
- Perennial crop, life cycle assessment of 165-166, 304
- Pesticide application programmes 272
- Pesticides 177-180, 180-183
- application data 183-184
- case study 204-210
- ecotoxicity impacts of 187-188, 191-193
- framework for characterizing 188-190
- emissions, quantifying 184-185
- future trends 210-215
- global ecological burden from 192-193

- human toxicity impacts of 193,
 - framework for characterizing 193-195
 - global human disease burden from pesticide exposure 198-199
 - occupational exposure 196
 - residential and non-residential bystander exposure 196-197
 - residue exposure in food crops 197-198
- interface between emission quantification and impact assessment for 185, 187
- spatial variability aspects of 199-201
- substituting, to optimize agricultural pesticide use 203-204
- temporal variability aspects 201-203
- PestLCI 185
- PestLCI 2.0 205
- Phosphorus cycle 264
- Physical capital 235
- Phytase 316
- Pig and poultry production 324-325
 - case studies 322-323
 - improvement options 314
 - animal performance 317-319
 - feed rations 315-317
 - LCA system models 315
 - manure and waste management 319-322
 - overview 313-314
- Pollution swapping 337, 350-351
- Porritt, Jonathon 235
- Poultry Calculator 324
- PPEC model 324
- Precipitation 156
- Primary residues 339, 340, 343, 350
- Principal component analysis 296
- Process-based LCA 9
- Process-based models 88
- Producer responsibility 5
- Proteases 316

- Quality-Adjusted person-Life-Year (QALY) 244
- Quantitative and qualitative techniques 233, 238

- Reactive nitrogen emission modeling 142-144
- ReCiPe 2008 22, 24
- ReCiPe 2016 22

- Region-oriented approaches 52
- Renewable energy sources 300
- REPA. *see* Resource and Environmental Profile Analysis (REPA)
- Residue management 273
- Resource and Environmental Profile Analysis (REPA) 245
- Responsibility allocation 4-5
- Ruminant production systems 121-122
 - case study
 - materials and methods 131-132
 - results and discussion 133-134
 - LCA applied to 122-131
- Run-off 156

- SAM. *see* Social Accounting Matrix (SAM)
- Secondary residues 339, 340, 343, 347, 350
- Simulation models 50
- 'Six Capitals' model 235
- Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) 246
- Social capital 235
- Social network capital 236, 237
- Social network relations 235
- Social responsibility 4
- Socio-economic impacts of agriculture
 - assessment 232-234
 - capitals concept
 - applications 237-238
 - sustainable livelihoods and 234-237
 - certification and fair-trade schemes 250-251
 - cost-benefit analysis 230-231
 - development 248
 - food prices and price instability 250
 - inequality 248-249
 - land tenure, rents, and taxation 249-250
 - overview 229-230
 - product life cycle perspective 244-246, 248
 - valuation 240-244
- Sociology 232, 234
- Soil carbon storage 268
- Soil C-N pool 144
- Soil management practices 268
- Soil organic matter (SOM) 336, 340
- Solicitation process 242, 244
- Solid separation 321
- SOM. *see* Soil organic matter (SOM)
- Spatio-temporal resolution and water scarcity footprinting 164-165
- Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants 198

- Sustainable capital development 236
- 'Sustainable livelihoods security'
concept 234, 237
- Sustainable Rural Livelihoods
framework 235
- Swine manure 320, 321
- Synthetic amino acids (AA) 315-316
- Target organisms, additional 192
- Taylor series 61
- Terrestrial ecosystems 191
- Terrestrial eutrophication 21-22
- Toxicity 24
- Transpiration 156
- UAVs. *see* Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)
- Uncertainty propagation/analysis 56, 59-62
- UNEP. *see* United Nations Environment
Programme (UNEP)
- UNEP/SETAC. *see* United Nation
Environmental Program/Society
of Environmental Toxicology and
Chemistry Life Cycle Initiative
(UNEP/SETAC)
- UNEP/SETAC Working Group on Impact
Assessment 238
- United Nation Environmental Program/
Society of Environmental Toxicology
and Chemistry Life Cycle Initiative
(UNEP/SETAC) 160, 162
- United Nations Environment Programme
(UNEP) 19
- Unit processes, as LCI building
blocks 10-11, 13-16
- avoiding allocation via system
expansion 12-13
- data collection 8-10
- ensuring balanced systems 11-12
- Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) 324
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 231
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticide Programs 178
- USES-LCA model 188, 193, 203
- USEtox 2.1 205
- USEtox model 24, 188, 193, 198, 200, 203
- Utility-weights 241
- Value-based functional unit 7
- Vertical farming 307
- Washington State University 305
- Water availability 156
- Water body 156
- Water consumption 156, 167-168
- Water productivity 156
- Water resources, optimizing effective use
of 167
- Water scarcity 156, 168
- Water scarcity footprint 156, 157, 160-162,
164-165
- Water stress 156, 351
- Water use 156
efficiency 300-301
impact modelling framework 154
- Water withdrawal 156, 264
- Weed and disease management 275
- World Commission on Environment and
Development 234