

1
2
3
4 1
5
6 2 **Development of Crop.LCA, an adaptable screening life cycle**
7
8
9 3 **assessment tool for agricultural systems: a Canadian scenario**
10
11
12 **assessment**
13 4
14
15 5

16
17
18 6 Pietro Goglio^a, Ward N. Smith^b, Devon E. Worth^b, Brian B. Grant^b, Raymond L. Desjardins^b,
19
20 Wen Chen^b, Mario Tenuta^c, Brian G. McConkey^d, Adrian Williams^a, Paul Burgess^a
21 7
22
23 8

24
25 9 ^a*School of Water, Energy and Environment, Cranfield University, College Road, BEDFORD,*
26
27 10 *MK43 0AL, UK;* ^b*Ottawa Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food*
28
29 11 *Canada, K.W. Neatby Building, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6;* ^c*Canada Research Chair in*
30
31 12 *Applied Soil Ecology, Department of Soil Science, University of Manitoba, 309 Ellis Building, 13*
32
33 13 *Freedman Crescent Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2;* ^d*Swift Current Research Station,*
34
35 14 *Swift Current, Saskatchewan, Canada S0E 1A0*
36
37
38
39
40 15

41
42
43 16 ***Corresponding author:**

44 17 Pietro Goglio, PhD

45 18 *School of Water, Energy and Environment, Cranfield University, Bedford, MK4 30AL, UK*
46
47

48 19 Phone: 0044 (0) 1234 750111 ext. 3221

49
50
51 20 Fax: +44 (0)1234 752971

52
53
54
55 21 E-mail: pietro.goglio@cranfield.ac.uk, pietro.goglio@gmail.com
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 22 **Abstract**

5
6 23 There is an increasing demand for sustainable agricultural production as part of the transition
7
8 24 towards a globally sustainable economy. To quantify impacts of agricultural systems on the
9
10 25 environment, life cycle assessment (LCA) is ideal because of its holistic approach. Many tools
11
12 26 have been developed to conduct LCAs in agriculture, but they are not publicly available, not
13
14 27 open-source, and have a limited scope. Here, a new adaptable open-source tool (Crop.LCA) for
15
16 28 carrying out LCA of cropping systems is presented and tested in an evaluation study with a
17
18 29 scenario assessment of 4 cropping systems using an agroecosystem model (DNDC) to predict
19
20 30 soil GHG emissions. The functional units used are hectares (ha) of land and gigajoules (GJ) of
21
22 31 harvested energy output, and 4 impact categories were evaluated: cumulative energy demand
23
24 32 (CED), 100-year global warming potential (GWP), eutrophication and acidification potential.
25
26 33 DNDC was used to simulate 28 years of cropping system dynamics, and the results were used as
27
28 34 input in Crop.LCA. Data were aggregated for each 4-year rotation and statistically analysed.
29
30 35 Introduction of legumes into the cropping system reduced CED by 6%, GWP by 23%, and
31
32 36 acidification by 19% per ha. These results highlight the ability of Crop.LCA to capture cropping
33
34 37 system characteristics in LCA, and the tool constitutes a step forward in increasing the accuracy
35
36 38 of LCA of cropping systems as required for bio-economy system assessments. Furthermore, the
37
38 39 tool is open-source, highly transparent and has the necessary flexibility to assess agricultural
39
40 40 systems.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 51 **Keywords:** LCA, cropping systems, tool, scenario assessment, agriculture, open-source
58
59 52

1. Introduction

Agriculture is responsible for feeding a growing world population, while concerns about environmental impacts rise. Worldwide, there is a need to develop bio-based economies or “bio-economies” with reduced fossil fuel use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Philp, 2015; World Bank, 2015). These bio-economies need to be sustainably managed to reduce environmental impacts, while increasing productivity and profitability (Huisings et al., 2015; Pülzl et al., 2014). It is therefore important to quantify the impacts and synergies of agricultural systems on ecosystem services and the environment (Bosch et al., 2015; Goglio et al., 2014). The variability in pedo-climate conditions, management practices, cultivars, etc. is considerable and affects the environmental impacts of cropping systems (Nemecek et al., 2014).

With its holistic approach, life cycle assessment (LCA) has been used in many research studies to evaluate environmental impacts in agricultural production systems (Biswas et al., 2008; Nemecek et al., 2015). A variety of impact categories have been included in agricultural LCA: global warming potential (GWP), acidification potential (AP), eutrophication potential (EP), cumulative energy demand (CED), toxicity potential, and impacts on biodiversity (Goglio et al., 2012; Huijbregts et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2009; Nemecek et al., 2015).

In cropping systems, it has been observed that the impact of a crop is significantly affected by the previous crop in the cropping system (Hokazono and Hayashi, 2015; Knudsen et al., 2014; Nemecek et al., 2015). Some research has proposed Cereal Unit allocation to fully assess cropping systems, which is based on an agriculture-specific biophysical unit developed for the purpose of agricultural statistics (Brankatschk and Finkbeiner, 2014), and a methodology based on rotation allocation (Brankatschk and Finkbeiner, 2015). Other research studies proposed a dual approach by considering either each crop separately or the cropping system as a whole (Knudsen et al., 2014). Instead, Nemecek et al. (2015) considered the interval for each crop combination as starting after the harvest of the preceding crop and ending with the harvest of the main crop, together with assessing the cropping system as a whole.

Main LCA tools include SimaPro, GABI and OpenLCA which is an open source software under the Mozilla Public License (MPL 2.0) agreement. All these LCA tools were developed for

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

84 general purposes including the agricultural sector. However they were not specifically designed
85 to assess agricultural systems, and they do not readily consider effects of crop management on
86 soil emissions (Ciroth, 2007; GABI, 2016; SimaPro 8.3, 2016). Thus, researchers and the private
87 sector have developed several tools for agricultural LCA (BASF, 2015; Nemecek et al., 2015;
88 Tuomisto et al., 2015). For instance, SALCA (Swiss Agricultural Life Cycle Assessment) was
89 developed by Agroscope to assess agricultural systems mainly in Central Europe (Nemecek et
90 al., 2015). AgBalance is another tool developed to carry out LCA of agricultural systems.
91 However, the user cannot access or modify the code of either tool. In addition AgBalance,
92 which was conceived for the sustainability assessment of agriculture, must be purchased by the
93 user (BASF, 2015; Nemecek et al., 2010; Teuscher et al., 2014). In contrast, other tools, such as
94 the European Union (EU) Carbon Calculator and ULICEES, were developed to compute carbon
95 (C) footprints (Tuomisto et al., 2015; Vergé et al., 2012), while the FEAT model also included
96 energy consumption (Camargo et al., 2013). Porta et al. (2008) developed eVerdEE, a simplified
97 tool for environmental product declarations in the agricultural sector. Similarly, the Cranfield
98 LCA tool was developed to assess agricultural systems under United Kingdom (UK) conditions
99 using Microsoft® Excel (Williams et al., 2010), while the LCAD tool was specifically designed
100 to assess anaerobic digestion systems (Styles et al., 2014, 2015). LCAcommons is both a set of
101 tools and life cycle inventories (LCI) developed for different production processes, including
102 agricultural products, by several United States (US) governmental institutions (USDA, 2015).
103 The existing LCA tools developed to assess agriculture are either simple tools, not publicly
104 available, not modular or not open-source, which is considered advantageous for the LCA
105 community (Ciroth, 2007). In this study, a new adaptable open-source tool (Crop.LCA) to carry
106 out screening LCA of cropping systems is i) presented, ii) tested in an evaluation study
107 consisting of a scenario assessment of 4 cropping systems using an agroecosystem model to
108 predict soil emissions (i.e., CO₂, N₂O, CH₄ and NH₃ volatilisation), and iii) used to compute the
109 contribution of each process to overall 100-year horizon GWP.

2. Crop.LCA tool

2.1. General characteristics

The Crop.LCA tool was designed in 2015-2016 to perform screening LCA of cropping systems using local data according to ISO standards (ISO, 2006a, 2006b, 2013). Crop.LCA allows users to carry out site-specific assessment, as defined by Potting and Hauschild (2006), of the environmental impacts of cropping systems. It is open-source, community-based, and adaptable to a wide range of crops and types of crop management after collecting site specific data. Crop.LCA is at the same time a LCA software, it integrates models for nitrate leaching, soil P loss and soil erosion and allows to use model estimates or observations for GHG emissions to be accounted for in the life cycle assessment of cropping systems. The tool was developed by the authors, synthesising and integrating recent advances in agricultural LCA methodology with the aim of being flexible and specifically tailored for the assessment of agricultural systems. To serve as an adaptable software tool, Crop.LCA includes its source code, which users can modify. Figure 1 illustrates the framework of the tool, which can be used to rapidly perform screening LCA of cropping systems using 1 ha of land as the functional unit. Considering the recommendations given by Hayashi (2013) for food sustainable consumption and production and in agreement with Goglio et al. (2014) and Nemecek et al. (2011a), other functional units (kg of harvested product, GJ of harvested energy output, unit of economic value from agricultural production) can be computed from the value per ha generated by the tool for each impact category. The harvested energy output is the energy output of the grain yield and the amount of straw/residues harvested from the field. The current version of Crop.LCA computes the LCI of energy consumption and of key chemicals: fossil CO₂, biogenic CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, CO, NH₃, NO₂, SO₂, non-methane volatile organic compounds, particulate matter, SF₆, nitrate leaching, PO₄⁻³, and phosphorus (P) emissions. Active ingredients for pesticides were considered only for the impact categories included in the tool, while heavy metals were excluded. The Crop.LCA tool uses the LCI to estimate CED according to Huijbregts et al. (2010), 100-year horizon GWP according to the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (Myhre et al., 2013), AP and EP according to the CML method (CML, 2015). The current version of Crop.LCA does not include any water-related impacts except EP. The tool also computes contributions to GWP of different processes (e.g., soil emissions of CO₂; CH₄ and

1
2
3
4 140 N₂O; machinery use, production and repair; fertiliser production and transport). If the results of
5
6 141 soil CO₂ emissions are negative, it means that soil C sequestration occurred.
7
8

9 142 **2.2. System boundary**

10 143 The system boundary considered by Crop.LCA includes the agricultural phase, along with soil
11 144 GHG emissions, NH₃ volatilisation, NO₃⁻ leaching and all upstream processes, including
12 145 machinery production, transport, maintenance and repairs, fertiliser, pesticide and seed
13 146 production and transport (Fig. 2). The downstream limit is the transport of the agricultural
14 147 products (e.g. grain, hay or silage) to the farm centre (i.e., location of the main farm facilities,
15 148 including barns, silage pits and machinery storage facilities) (Fig. 2). Drying, silage pit filling,
16 149 and hay storage are excluded. In agreement with previous research and ISO standards, all
17 150 upstream processes from raw material extraction up to the regional storehouse (i.e. a building of
18 151 the local suppliers of agricultural inputs) are included (Audsley et al., 1997; Brentrup et al.,
19 152 2004; ISO, 2006a, 2006b, 2013). Transport processes from raw material extraction to the farm
20 153 centre were included within the system boundary.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 154 **2.3. Data sources and treatment for the life cycle inventory**

32 155 Field data are used as inputs to Crop.LCA. All upstream processes used emission factors derived
33 156 from available literature. For instance, data for the production of fuel, electricity, steel, and
34 157 rubber in Crop.LCA were derived from GHGenius ((S&T)2, 2014). GHGenius is a tool
35 158 developed to account for environmental impacts of different vehicles in Canadian and US
36 159 conditions with a cradle-to-wheel approach ((S&T)2, 2014). The data currently available in
37 160 Crop.LCA for both background and foreground processes are relevant to North American
38 161 conditions; however, data from other sources can be integrated in Crop.LCA by changing the
39 162 corresponding input files available on the bitbucket platform
40 163 (<https://bitbucket.org/croplcateam/crop.lca>), following the user manual and by collecting site-
41 164 specific data for background processes. Data for seed, fertiliser and pesticide production were
42 165 taken from other data sources (Bhatty et al., 1979; Boehmel et al., 2008; Brentrup et al., 2004;
43 166 Ceccon et al., 2002; Gasol et al., 2012; Goglio et al., 2012; Haciseferoğulları et al., 2003;
44 167 (S&T)2, 2014). Urea and ammonia production data were derived from several data sources
45 168 associated with North American conditions (Brentrup et al., 2004; Sheehan et al., 1998; (S&T)2,
46 169 2014). Data for inputs used during cultivation were treated as described below.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.3.1. Machinery use, and machinery production, maintenance, and repairs

The machinery use LCI includes field operations, transport of machinery from the farm centre to the field, farm transport, and production and transport of the fuel necessary for both field operations and farm transport. Field operations are accounted for on the basis of field working capacity and the power needed to carry out the specific field operation (Dyer et al., 2010; Dyer and Desjardins, 2003). For farm transport with heavy-duty diesel trucks and light-duty petrol trucks, specific emissions and fuel consumption data from GHGenius were used ((S&T)², 2014). For all agricultural diesel machinery, oil consumption was estimated on the basis of the ASABE standard D 497.7 (ASABE, 2011; Goglio et al., 2014). In all transport processes, the return journey of the machinery is included, in accordance with Gasol et al. (2012) and Goglio et al. (2012, 2014).

Machinery production impacts were estimated based on weight, working capacity, and total lifetime of the machine (ASABE, 2011; Audsley et al., 1997; Brentrup et al., 2004). Tractor production was computed using GHGenius ((S&T)², 2014). Production impacts for machinery other than tractors were subdivided into material extraction impacts and those related to machinery manufacture, in accordance with Audsley et al. (1997) and Goglio et al. (2014). For manufacturing, electricity was the only energy source considered and the energy mix used was based on the location of the machinery factory (Audsley et al., 1997). This information was gathered by carrying out a survey of machinery manufacturers and suppliers in Canada, in agreement with Audsley et al., (1997) and Goglio et al. (2014).

Impacts of maintenance and repairs for machinery are included on the basis of the overall energy used during machinery manufacturing and the production of raw materials for machinery, in accordance with Audsley et al. (1997). In our accounting process, the overall energy is split among energy sources (e.g., electricity, diesel) to estimate total or cumulative energy consumption and emissions from maintenance and repair of machinery, and production of materials used during maintenance and repairs.

2.3.2. Fertiliser, seed and pesticide production

Crop.LCA computes the LCI related to fertiliser use on the basis of the actual amount of fertiliser applied to fields. In the case of multiple fertilisers, the contribution of each component is considered in the production process. For instance, if a fertiliser is composed of urea and ammonium phosphate, the production of each is included. Seed production is computed on the basis of the number of seeds (maize, *Zea mays* L.) or the weight of seeds used during seeding. Pesticide production is accounted for on the basis of the amount of pesticide applied to fields, the type of pesticide or active ingredient, and its concentration. During pesticide transport, the quantity of the total formulation is used in calculations.

2.3.3. Nitrate leaching, soil P loss, ammonia volatilisation and soil GHG emissions

Nitrate leaching is estimated for Crop.LCA by the SQCB (Sustainability Quick Check for Biofuels) model (Faist Emmenegger et al., 2009; Nemecek et al., 2014). Crop.LCA integrates the USLE (Universal Soil Loss Equation) to predict soil erosion according to Faist Emmenegger et al. (2009) and Nemecek et al. (2014). Soil P loss is estimated from soil erosion and the amount of P applied by integrating the SALCA-P model into Crop.LCA (Nemecek et al., 2010, 2014; Teuscher et al., 2014). Ammonia volatilisation and soil GHG emissions (i.e., CO₂, CH₄ emissions, N₂O) are read as inputs and included in computation of the LCI. In particular, Crop.LCA sums up GWP from all sources including CO₂ from soil C changes and computes soil CO₂ emissions in agreement with currently available LCA methods (Goglio et al., 2015). Crop.LCA predicts indirect N₂O emissions from nitrate leaching and ammonia emissions using the IPCC Tier 1 method (De Klein et al., 2006).

2.4. Program design and availability

Crop.LCA was coded in the open-source program R (R Development Core Team, 2005) as a modular tool with separate functions for different processes (e.g., field cultivation, production and transport of fertiliser, nitrate leaching, soil GHG emissions, soil P loss). This allows the inclusion or exclusion of specific processes by disabling or enabling the functions in the source code. The open-source code and user manual are publicly available (<https://bitbucket.org/croplcateam/crop.lca>). The R code can be readily modified, and the input

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

files can be edited in a spreadsheet following the user manual. All input files are in comma separated value (.csv) format. For background processes, Crop.LCA uses data from literature and other databases (e.g., GHGenius)(S&T)2, 2014). Other modules in Crop.LCA have also been designed to compute GWP, EP, and AP.

3. Evaluation study

3.1. Case study scenario assessment

A case study was used to validate Crop.LCA, based on a scenario assessment of 4 cropping systems studied in a field experiment described by Glenn et al. (2010, 2011, 2012) and Maas et al. (2013), located at the Glenlea Research Station (49.64°N, 97.16°W; 235 m a.s.l.), on the Red River plain (<2% slope) near Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Mean soil organic C content (0–0.2 m) at the beginning of the study was approximately 3.2%. Particle size distribution was 60% clay, 35% silt, and 5% sand. The impact categories and system boundary considered in the LCA are the same as those in Crop.LCA. The functional units used are ha of land and GJ of gross energy output.

The conventional (CONV) cropping system (Table 1) has a crop management system similar to that of the annual cropping system described by Glenn et al. (2010, 2011, 2012). The CONV, no-tillage (NT), and residue (RES) systems include the same crop sequence with no cover crops (maize-spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)-canola (*Brassica napus* L.)-spring barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.)), while in the legume (L) system, faba bean (*Vicia faba* var. *minor* L.) replaces maize (Table 1). In the RES system, straw and maize stover are left in the field, unlike in the other systems (Table 1). Full details can be found in the supplementary material.

For the scenario assessment, a Canadian version (DNDC v.CAN) (Grant et al., 2016; Kröbel et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2013) of the DNDC (Denitrification and Decomposition) model (Li et al., 1992, 1994) was run using 28 years (1985–2012) of climate data (i.e., daily max. and min. temperature, precipitation, global solar radiation, humidity and wind speed). DNDC estimates of GHG emissions, grain yields, crop residues, and nitrate and ammonia losses were used as inputs for the Crop.LCA tool. Yearly data (1st Jan –31st Dec) for each impact category were aggregated

1
2
3
4 257 to compute a mean impact for each 4-year rotation (e.g., 1985–1988, 1989–1992) of the cropping
5
6 258 systems to have 7 sample elements for statistical analysis. Yearly data were used, as all of the
7
8 259 crops have a similar life cycle (~150-day growth, spring sown with fall harvest). Only 2% of the
9
10 260 harvested area of crops in the study region is sown in autumn (CANSIM, 2016). However,
11
12 261 Crop.LCA can compute impacts for different timeframes when necessary (e.g. harvest of the
13
14 262 previous crop to harvest of the given crop). The impacts for spring wheat were also calculated
15
16 263 separately, since it is a major crop in the region (CANSIM, 2016). The harvested energy output
17
18 264 (GJ) is computed from yields and the upper heating value (or gross energy) of the harvested
19
20 265 biomass.

21 266 **3.2. DNDC model and simulations**

23 267 DNDC was originally developed to estimate N₂O emissions (Li et al., 1992), but it has been
24
25 268 expanded to simulate soil C and nitrogen (N) dynamics and CO₂ emissions (Li et al., 1994). The
26
27 269 model has been developed and tested for many soils, climates, and cropping systems. Several
28
29 270 regional versions are available on the Global Research Alliance Modelling Platform
30
31 271 (<http://gramp.org.uk/models/family/2>). DNDC (DNDCv.CAN) was first run for 10 years to
32
33 272 stabilise C and N pools before estimating soil GHG emissions for each system. The climate data,
34
35 273 crop, and soil inputs for the simulations were obtained from Uzoma et al. (2015), who found
36
37 274 DNDC reasonably simulated soil temperature, soil water content, soil N, and N₂O emissions for
38
39 275 annual cropping.

41 276 **3.3. Statistical analyses**

42 277 Statistical analyses were conducted with R to investigate whether i) the CED, GWP, AP, and EP
43
44 278 of the cropping systems and ii) the GWP of wheat, for both functional units (ha and GJ), were
45
46 279 statistically different. A Friedman test was first performed, followed by pair-wise non-parametric
47
48 280 comparisons, considering each 4-year rotation separately for the entire cropping system
49
50 281 assessment and each year of wheat cultivation separately (Siegel and Castellan, 1988). There
51
52 282 were thus 7 sample elements (i.e., 4-year rotation average) available for the statistical analyses,
53
54 283 while one value for each 4-year rotation was used to assess impacts of wheat cultivation.
55
56 284 Crop.LCA was also used to perform contribution analysis of soil emissions.

3.4. Results

The L cropping system had the lowest mean GWP per ha ($3740 \text{ kg CO}_2\text{eq ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$, Fig. 3a), 23% less than that in the CONV system. In contrast, wheat in the RES system had the lowest mean GWP per ha ($1670 \text{ kg CO}_2\text{eq ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$, Fig. 3c), with high variability due to the interaction of climate, soil and crop management. Per GJ, GWP for wheat in the RES system also had high variability (Fig. 3d). Considering the entire cropping systems, the NT and CONV systems had the lowest mean GWP per GJ (34 and $38 \text{ kg CO}_2 \text{ eq GJ}^{-1}\text{y}^{-1}$, respectively) (Fig. 3b). Statistical tests confirmed that these differences in GWP were significant for both functional units at $p < 0.05$, except for GWP per GJ of wheat (Fig. 3d). GWP was strongly affected by soil C dynamics, which influenced soil CO_2 emissions (-230% of GWP, on average; range = -9.8% to -391% depending upon the cropping system assessed); the negative sign indicates a reduction in GWP due to CO_2 absorption of the crop from the atmosphere and the consequent increase in soil C from retained residues. The contribution of direct N_2O emissions to GWP averaged 171% among the systems while the mean contribution of the indirect N_2O emissions to GWP was smaller (12%).

The CONV system had the highest mean CED per ha ($19.2 \text{ GJ ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$) (Fig. 4a), while the L system had the lowest (19% less than that in CONV). The NT system had the lowest mean CED per GJ of energy output ($0.153 \text{ GJ GJ}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$), 2.4% less than that in the CONV system (Fig. 4b). These differences among cropping systems were statistically significant for both functional units at $p < 0.05$. There was little difference in EP per ha among the 4 cropping systems (Fig 4c). The L system had the lowest mean EP ($19.1 \text{ kg of PO}_4^{-3}\text{eq ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$), 4.5% less than that in the CONV system. For EP per GJ, the NT system had the lowest EP ($0.157 \text{ kg of PO}_4^{-3}\text{eq GJ}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$, Fig. 4d), 3.5% less than that in the CONV system. The RES system had the highest mean AP per ha ($32.3 \text{ kg SO}_2\text{eq ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$, Fig. 4e), 13.4% higher than that in the CONV system, while the L system had 18.8% less AP than the CONV system. In line with AP per ha, mean AP per GJ was highest in the RES system ($0.565 \text{ kg SO}_2\text{eq GJ}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$, Fig. 4f), 68.0% higher than that in the CONV system, while the NT system had the lowest AP ($0.199 \text{ kg of SO}_2\text{eq GJ}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$), 14.3% less than that in the CONV system. Differences in AP and EP were statistically significant for both functional units at $p < 0.05$.

315 4. Discussion

316 4.1. Scenario assessment

317 The scenario assessment demonstrated the ability of Crop.LCA to capture characteristics of these
318 different cropping-system scenarios. Introduction of legumes into the cropping system reduced
319 most of the impacts considered. In particular, the cropping system with legumes decreased CED
320 by at least 3.9%, GWP by 23.0%, and AP by 19% per ha.

321
322 Values of CED per ha ($13\text{-}19 \text{ GJ ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$) were close to the range of values reported by Pelletier
323 et al. (2008) for organic and conventional wheat, maize, and canola ($1.9\text{-}17 \text{ GJ ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$) on the
324 basis of average Canadian conditions for cultivation and using statistical data. CED per GJ (0.15-
325 0.32 GJ GJ^{-1}) agreed with results obtained by Goglio et al. (2014) ($0.25\text{-}0.39 \text{ GJ GJ}^{-1}$) using
326 SimaPro and DNDC model results for two locations in western Canada with climate and soil
327 similar to those of the present study.

328
329 The GWP obtained with Crop.LCA are similar to those of other LCAs of cropping systems using
330 emission factors and models to estimate soil GHG emissions and reactive N species, but other
331 research often disregard soil C dynamics (Bacenetti et al., 2014; Börjesson and Tufvesson, 2011;
332 Brentrup et al., 2004; Goglio et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2009; Nemecek et al., 2011b, 2011a).
333 Several C footprint studies have been conducted under similar conditions (Dyer et al., 2010;
334 Dyer and Desjardins, 2003; Shrestha et al., 2013, 2014). Most Crop.LCA estimates of GWP are
335 higher than the C footprints reported from these studies due to soil GHG accounting methods (in
336 particular for soil N_2O and soil CO_2 emissions) and system boundaries (inclusion of soil borne
337 emissions) which differ from those in the present study. The contribution analysis revealed the
338 importance of soil emissions to total GWP. For the cropping systems assessed here, the
339 contribution of soil C change to the GWP was -230%, while direct N_2O emissions contributed
340 171% of the GWP on average. In Crop.LCA soil emissions can be accounted for by including
341 them as inputs (i.e. from different sources: measurements, models, emission factors). This is an
342 interesting feature of the tool, considering the high level contribution of soil emissions in the
343 overall GWP of cropping system (Garrigues et al., 2012; Goglio et al., 2014). These results are
344 larger than those of Zaher et al. (2013), who reported up to a 70% contribution of direct N_2O

1
2
3
4 345 emissions to overall GWP in a cropping system containing wheat and barley in eastern
5
6 346 Washington, US.
7

8 347
9
10 348 The EP results per ha (19-21 kg PO₄³⁻eq ha⁻¹) are in line with those of other LCA studies for
11
12 349 similar crops (e.g., wheat and maize) (17-58 kg PO₄³⁻eq ha⁻¹) (Bacchetti et al., 2015; Goglio et
13
14 350 al., 2012) under different soil and climate conditions. The EP for the entire cropping system was
15
16 351 at least 24% larger than those obtained for maize cultivation at several locations in the US maize
17
18 352 belt (Kim et al., 2009) using the DAYCENT model, most likely due to different methods used to
19
20 353 estimate nitrate leaching.
21

22 354
23 355 The AP results per ha lie within the range of those reported by Kim et al. (2009) for US maize
24
25 356 production using DAYCENT (22-53 kg SO₂eq ha⁻¹ y⁻¹). However, AP per ha in the current study
26
27 357 was at least 5.4 times as large as the AP reported by Goglio et al. (2012), who performed an LCA
28
29 358 of cropping systems, including maize and wheat, in Mediterranean conditions. In contrast, AP
30
31 359 per ha was >55% lower than the AP reported by Bacchetti et al. (2015) for maize cultivation in
32
33 360 northern Italy. The results obtained in this study demonstrate the strong influence that crop
34
35 361 selection can have on the overall performance of cropping systems (Camargo et al., 2013; Gan et
36
37 362 al., 2011; MacWilliam et al., 2014; Nemecek et al., 2015), highlighting the importance of
38
39 363 designing sustainable cropping systems within the context of a bio-economy.
40

41 364 42 365 **4.2. Comparison with other LCA tools**

43 366 Open-source LCA tools are highly sought within the LCA community (Ciroth, 2007) because
44
45 367 they increase transparency, which hastens development. Having full access to the source code,
46
47 368 the LCA user can modify functions as required, which was previously suggested as advantageous
48
49 369 for the openLCA tool (Ciroth, 2007). The availability of the source code gives more flexibility,
50
51 370 which is necessary to account for variability, which is common in agricultural systems
52
53 371 (Börjesson and Tufvesson, 2011). Among the tools assessed, only Crop.LCA and the FEAT
54
55 372 model are open-source (Table 2). However, the FEAT model is not modular, does not allow a
56
57 373 multi-approach assessment, where a single crop and a cropping system are assessed at the same
58
59 374 time and does not incorporate multiple methods to account for soil emissions (Camargo et al.,
60
61 375 2013).
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 376
5
6 377 Crop.LCA was developed with a modular framework, which makes it easy to use from a
7
8 378 programming standpoint, as with SALCA and the EU Carbon Calculator (Nemecek et al., 2010,
9
10 379 2015; Teuscher et al., 2014; Tuomisto et al., 2015) (Table 2). The modular framework also
11
12 380 allows exclusion or inclusion of specific processes (e.g., machinery production, fertiliser
13
14 381 application) by enabling and disabling the corresponding functions in the source code. Crop.LCA
15
16 382 can therefore be rapidly adapted to different goals and scopes of agricultural LCA (Teuscher et
17
18 383 al., 2014). The Crop.LCA tool can assess entire cropping systems over several years as a single
19
20 384 entity, or individual crops, which is considered important (Brankatschk and Finkbeiner, 2015;
21
22 385 Knudsen et al., 2014; Nemecek et al., 2015). In contrast with Crop.LCA, SALCA does not
23
24 386 account for more than one input method to account for soil emissions and is not adaptable, while
25
26 387 the EU Carbon Calculator considers only GWP, excludes other impact categories and does not
27
28 388 allow multiple methods to be used for soil emissions (Table 2) (Tuomisto et al., 2015).
29
30 389
31
32 390 Crop.LCA is publicly available online, can be run in R with few commands, and uses .csv files.
33
34 391 The user-friendly framework is similar to that of the SALCA and LCAD tools, the FEAT model
35
36 392 and the EU Carbon Calculator, which are Excel-based macros. It is also similar to the eVerDEE
37
38 393 tool, which includes a graphical user interface (Table 2) (Camargo et al., 2013; Nemecek et al.,
39
40 394 2010; Porta et al., 2008; Styles et al., 2014, 2015; Teuscher et al., 2014; Tuomisto et al., 2015).
41
42 395
43
44 396 Unlike some previous tools developed for LCA or C footprint assessment, Crop.LCA includes
45
46 397 other impact categories besides GWP, such as EP and AP (Camargo et al., 2013; Dyer and
47
48 398 Desjardins, 2003; Tuomisto et al., 2015; Vergé et al., 2012) (Table 2). Furthermore, it was
49
50 399 developed in compliance with ISO standards (ISO, 2006a, 2006b, 2013), focuses on crop
51
52 400 management and applies characterization factors from the IPCC 5th Assessment Report (Myhre
53
54 401 et al., 2013).
55
56 402
57
58 403 Crop.LCA is a comprehensive tool which can characterise field operations, depending on the
59
60 404 type of machinery used, its weight and power. It shares these features with SALCA, but uses a
61
62 405 more complex approach than eVerDEE (Nemecek et al., 2010; Porta et al., 2008; Teuscher et al.,
63
64 406 2014). Crop.LCA has the potential to be adapted by the user to carry out LCA of a wide range of
65

1
2
3
4 407 crops, including catch crops, cover crops, and other temperate and tropical crops. For this reason,
5
6 408 it can be used to assess bio-economic systems involving many products and production pathways
7
8 409 (Philp, 2015). The current version of Crop.LCA cannot represent as many crops as several other
9
10 410 tools (BASF, 2015; Camargo et al., 2013; Nemecek et al., 2010; Porta et al., 2008; Styles et al.,
11
12 411 2014, 2015; Teuscher et al., 2014) (Table 2); however, they contain other limitations when
13
14 412 compared with Crop.LCA. For instance, SALCA currently focuses on Swiss and central
15
16 413 European systems. Other models can be used worldwide, such as AgBalance, eVerdEE, the
17
18 414 FEAT model, and LCAD (BASF, 2015; Camargo et al., 2013; Porta et al., 2008; Styles et al.,
19
20 415 2014, 2015). Crop.LCA can also be integrated to carry out either spatialised or regional LCA.
21
22 416

23 417 One limitation of Crop.LCA is that it is based mostly on North American conditions (Table 2). In
24
25 418 addition like some other tools (USDA, 2015; Vergé et al., 2012), life cycle inventory analysis of
26
27 419 the background processes was not part of the original development objectives of Crop.LCA.
28
29 420 Thus, input data files for unit processes for background processes (e.g., the production of
30
31 421 fertilizers, pesticides, seeds), occurring outside North American conditions, are currently not
32
33 422 available and need to be prepared by the LCA practitioner using other software and databases
34
35 423 (e.g., SimaPro, (SimaPro 8.3, 2016)) to conduct site-specific assessments. However, being open-
36
37 424 source, users can select geographically specific input files (e.g. soils and impact factors) or use
38
39 425 empirical data. Furthermore, users can develop the code to include other impacts, processes, data
40
41 426 sources or features. Many calculation libraries are available in R, which offers the adaptability
42
43 427 needed for assessing new bio-economic systems and current systems in new ways.
44
45 428

46 47 429 **4. Conclusion**

48
49 430 Crop.LCA can capture the interactions of soil, climate and crop management for a variety of
50
51 431 cropping systems. The main strength of Crop.LCA is that it is transparent and open-source;
52
53 432 therefore, the code can be modified by the LCA practitioner as needed. The availability of the
54
55 433 source code provides more flexibility, which is necessary to account for variability in agricultural
56
57 434 systems. Crop.LCA can also be used for site-specific assessments, increasing the accuracy of
58
59 435 bio-economic assessments. The tool has the advantage of accounting for several substances,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

436 allowing for the assessment of individual crops or cropping systems over several years. Further
437 developments should include the introduction of new substances and impact categories.

438
439 In the scenario assessment, Crop.LCA captured variability among cropping-system scenarios. It
440 highlighted the environmental benefits of introducing legumes in rotation. It also demonstrated
441 that inclusion of soil C change significantly reduced the GWP of cropping systems; thus, it
442 should be included in the assessment of bio-economic systems. Further developments are
443 necessary to better estimate impacts of crop-management choices in the assessment of bio-
444 economic systems, integrating scientific evidence provided by agricultural and bioenergy
445 research in LCA methodology.

5. Acknowledgements

447 The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. Constantine A. Campbell and Andrea De Angeli for
448 their interesting scientific discussions and Don O'Connor for his valuable insight and support.
449 Funds from the Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Program of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
450 (AGGP-AAFC) were provided to MT for gathering and analysing the Manitoba site data. The
451 authors acknowledge AAFC and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of
452 Canada for funding PG's Visiting Fellowship.

6. References

- 453
454 ASABE, 2011. ASAE D497.7 MAR 2011 Agricultural Machinery Management Data. American
455 Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers, St. Joseph, Michigan.
- 456 Audsley, E., Alber, S., Clift, R., Cowell, S., Crettaz, P., Gaillard, G., Hausheer, J., Jolliett, O.,
457 Kleijn, R., Mortensen, B., Pearce, D., Roger, E., Teulon, H., Weidema, B., van Zeijts, H.,
458 1997. Harmonisation of environmental life cycle assessment for agriculture. Final
459 Report. Concerted action AIR3-CT94-2028. Silsoe Research Institute; Brussels:
460 European Commission DG VI Agriculture, Silsoe.
- 461 Bacenetti, J., Fusi, A., Negri, M., Guidetti, R., Fiala, M., 2014. Environmental assessment of two
462 different crop systems in terms of biomethane potential production. *Sci. Tot. Environ.*
463 466–467, 1066–1077. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.07.109
- 464 Bacenetti, J., Fusi, A., Negri, M., Fiala, M., 2015. Impact of cropping system and soil tillage on
465 environmental performance of cereal silage productions. *J. Clean Prod.* 86, 49–59. doi:
466 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.052

- 1
2
3
4 467 BASF, 2015. AgBalance - Measuring Sustainability in Agriculture. BASF Crop Protection.
5 468 BASF Badische Anilin- und Soda-Fabrik, Ludwigshafen, Germany. Available at: URL
6 469 <http://www.agro.basf.com/agr/AP->
7 470 [Internet/en/content/sustainability/measuring_sustainability/agbalance/index](http://www.agro.basf.com/agr/AP-Internet/en/content/sustainability/measuring_sustainability/agbalance/index). (Accessed:
8 471 28.07.2015)
9
10
11 472 Bhattya, R.S., Rosnagel, B.G., Christison, G.I., 1979. Energy and protein digestibilities of hulled
12 473 and hullless barley determined by swine-feeding. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 59, 585–588. doi:
13 474 10.4141/cjas79-073
14
15
16 475 Biswas, W.K., Barton, L., Carter, D., 2008. Global warming potential of wheat production in
17 476 Western Australia: a life cycle assessment. *Water and Env. J.* 22, 206–216. doi:
18 477 10.1111/j.1747-6593.2008.00127.x
19
20
21 478 Boehmel, C., Lewandowski, I., Claupein, W., 2008. Comparing annual and perennial energy
22 479 cropping systems with different management intensities. *Agr. Syst.* 96, 224–236. doi:
23 480 10.1016/j.agsy.2007.08.004
24
25
26 481 Börjesson, P., Tufvesson, L.M., 2011. Agricultural crop-based biofuels – resource efficiency and
27 482 environmental performance including direct land use changes. *J. Clean Prod.* 19, 108–
28 483 120. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2010.01.001
29
30
31 484 Bosch, R., Van de Pol, M., Philp, J., 2015. Define biomass sustainability. *Nat.* 523, 526–527.
32
33 485 Brankatschk, G., Finkbeiner, M., 2014. Application of the Cereal Unit in a new allocation
34 486 procedure for agricultural life cycle assessments. *J. Clean Prod.* 73, 72–79. doi:
35 487 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.02.005
36
37 488 Brankatschk, G., Finkbeiner, M., 2015. Modeling crop rotation in agricultural LCAs —
38 489 Challenges and potential solutions. *Agr. Syst.* 138, 66–76. doi:
39 490 10.1016/j.agsy.2015.05.008
40
41
42 491 Brentrup, F., Küsters, J., Lammel, J., Barraclough, P., Kuhlmann, H., 2004. Environmental
43 492 impact assessment of agricultural production systems using the life cycle assessment
44 493 (LCA) methodology II. The application to N fertilizer use in winter wheat production
45 494 systems. *Eur. J. Agr.* 20, 265–279. doi: 10.1016/S1161-0301(03)00039-X
46
47
48 495 Camargo, G.G.T., Ryan, M.R., Richard, T.L., 2013. Energy use and greenhouse gas emissions
49 496 from crop production using the Farm Energy Analysis Tool. *BioSci* 63, 263–273. doi:
50 497 10.1525/bio.2013.63.4.6
51
52
53 498 CANSIM, S.C., 2016. CANSIM Table 001-0010. Estimated areas, yield, production and average
54 499 farm price of principal field crops, in metric units, annual.
55 500 <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=0010010&&pattern>
56 501 [=&stByVal=1&p1=1&p2=31&tabMode=dataTable&csid=/](http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=0010010&&pattern) (accessed 14.03.2016).
57
58
59 502 Ceccon, P., Coiutti, C., Giovanardi, R., 2002. Energy Balance of Four Farming Systems in
60 503 North-Eastern Italy. *Ital. J. Agron.* 6, 73–83.
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 504 Ciroth, A., 2007. ICT for environment in life cycle applications openLCA — A new open source
5 505 software for life cycle assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 12, 209–210. doi:
6 506 10.1065/lca2007.06.337
7
8
9 507 CML, 2015. CML-IA Characterisation Factors - Software and data - CML. Universiteit Leiden,
10 508 Leiden. Available at: URL <http://cml.leiden.edu/software/data-cmlia.html>. (Accessed:
11 509 20.07.2015)
12
13
14 510 De Klein, C., Novoa, R.S.A., Ogle, S., Smith, K.A., Rochette, P., Wirth, T.C., McConkey, B.G.,
15 511 Mosier, A., Rypdal, K., Walsh, M., Williams, S.A., 2006. Chapter 11: N₂O Emissions
16 512 from Managed Soils, and CO₂ Emissions from Lime and Urea Application, in: Gytarsky
17 513 M, Hiraishi T, Irving W, Krug T, Penman J (Eds.), *IPCC Guidelines for National
18 514 Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. IPCC International Panel on Climate Change, Geneva, p.
19 515 11.1-11.54.
20
21
22 516 Dyer, J.A., Desjardins, R.L., 2003. Simulated Farm Fieldwork, Energy Consumption and Related
23 517 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Canada. *Biosyst. Eng.* 85, 503–513. doi: 10.1016/S1537-
24 518 5110(03)00072-2
25
26
27 519 Dyer, J.A., Vergé, X.P.C., Desjardins, R.L., Worth, D.E., McConkey, B.G., 2010. The impact of
28 520 increased biodiesel production on the greenhouse gas emissions from field crops in
29 521 Canada. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* 14, 73–82. doi: 10.1016/j.esd.2010.03.001
30
31
32 522 Faist Emmenegger, M., Reinhard, J., Zah, R., Ziep, T., Weichbrodt, R., Wohlgemuth, V., Berlin,
33 523 F., Roches, A., Freiermuth Knuchel, R.F., Gaillard, G., 2009. *Sustainability Quick Check
34 524 for Biofuels*. Agroscope Reckenholz-Tänikon, Dübendorf.
35
36 525 GABI, 2016. GABI Envision software 2.5 Gabi, Leinfelden-EchterdingenGermany.
37
38
39 526 Gan, Y., Liang, C., Hamel, C., Cutforth, H., Wang, H., 2011. Strategies for reducing the carbon
40 527 footprint of field crops for semiarid areas. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 31, 643–656.
41 528 doi: 10.1007/s13593-011-0011-7
42
43 529 Garrigues, E., Corson, M.S., Angers, D.A., van der Werf, H.M.G., Walter, C., 2012. Soil quality
44 530 in Life Cycle Assessment: Towards development of an indicator. *Ecological Indicators*
45 531 18, 434–442. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.014
46
47
48 532 Gasol, C.M., Salvia, J., Serra, J., Antón, A., Sevigne, E., Rieradevall, J., Gabarrell, X., 2012. A
49 533 life cycle assessment of biodiesel production from winter rape grown in Southern Europe.
50 534 *Biomass Bioenerg.* 40, 71–81. doi: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.02.003
51
52
53 535 Glenn, A.J., Amiro, B.D., Tenuta, M., Stewart, S.E., Wagner-Riddle, C., 2010. Carbon dioxide
54 536 exchange in a northern Prairie cropping system over three years. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*
55 537 150, 908–918. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.02.010
56
57
58 538 Glenn, A.J., Amiro, B.D., Tenuta, M., Wagner-Riddle, C., Drewitt, G., Warland, J., 2011.
59 539 Contribution of crop residue carbon to soil respiration at a northern Prairie site using

1
2
3
4 540 stable isotope flux measurements. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* 151, 1045–1054. doi:
5 541 10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.03.008
6
7
8 542 Glenn, A.J., Tenuta, M., Amiro, B.D., Maas, S.E., Wagner-Riddle, C., 2012. Nitrous oxide
9 543 emissions from an annual crop rotation on poorly drained soil on the Canadian Prairies.
10 544 *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* 166–167, 41–49. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.06.015
11
12 545 Goglio, P., Bonari, E., Mazzoncini, M., 2012. LCA of cropping systems with different external
13 546 input levels for energetic purposes. *Biomass Bioenerg.* 42, 33–42. doi:
14 547 10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.03.021
15
16
17 548 Goglio, P., Grant, B.B., Smith, W.N., Desjardins, R.L., Worth, D.E., Zentner, R., Malhi, S.S.,
18 549 2014. Impact of management strategies on the global warming potential at the cropping
19 550 system level. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 490, 921–933. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.05.070
20
21
22 551 Goglio, P., Smith, W.N., Grant, B.B., Desjardins, R.L., McConkey, B.G., Campbell, C.A.,
23 552 Nemecek, T., 2015. Accounting for soil carbon changes in agricultural life cycle
24 553 assessment (LCA): a review. *J. Clean Prod.* 104, 23–39. doi:
25 554 10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.040
26
27
28 555 Grant, B., Smith, W., Campbell, C., Desjardins, R., Lemke, R., Kroebel, R., McConkey, B.,
29 556 Smith, E., Lafond, G., 2016. Comparison of DayCent and DNDC models: Case studies
30 557 using data from long-term experiments on the Canadian prairies, in: Del Grosso S, Parton
31 558 B, Lajpat A (Eds.), *Advances in Modeling Agricultural Systems: Trans-Disciplinary*
32 559 *Research, Synthesize, Modeling, and Applications.*, ASA-SSSA-CSSA Book Series.
33 560 Madison.
34
35
36 561 Haciseferoğulları, H., Gezer, İ., Bahtiyarçay, Y., Mengeş, H.O., 2003. Determination of some
37 562 chemical and physical properties of Sakız faba bean (*Vicia faba* L. Var. major). *J. Food*
38 563 *Eng.* 60, 475–479. doi: 10.1016/S0260-8774(03)00075-X
39
40
41 564 Hayashi, K., 2013. Practical recommendations for supporting agricultural decisions through life
42 565 cycle assessment based on two alternative views of crop production: the example of
43 566 organic conversion. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 18, 331–339. doi: 10.1007/s11367-012-
44 567 0493-9
45
46
47 568 Hokazono, S., Hayashi, K., 2015. Life cycle assessment of organic paddy rotation systems using
48 569 land- and product-based indicators: a case study in Japan. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 20,
49 570 1061–1075. doi: 10.1007/s11367-015-0906-7
50
51
52 571 Huijbregts, M.A.J., Hellweg, S., Frischknecht, R., Hendriks, H.W.M., Hungerbühler, K.,
53 572 Hendriks, A.J., 2010. Cumulative Energy Demand As Predictor for the Environmental
54 573 Burden of Commodity Production. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44, 2189–2196. doi:
55 574 10.1021/es902870s
56
57
58 575 Huisingh, D., Zhang, Z., Moore, J.C., Qiao, Q., Li, Q., 2015. Recent advances in carbon
59 576 emissions reduction: policies, technologies, monitoring, assessment and modeling.

1
2
3
4 577 Journal of Cleaner Production, Carbon Emissions Reduction: Policies, Technologies,
5 578 Monitoring, Assessment and Modeling 103, 1–12. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.098
6
7
8 579 ISO, 2006a. SS-EN ISO 14040 Environmental Management- Life Cycle Assessment, Principles
9 580 and Framework. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.
10
11 581 ISO, 2006b. SS-EN ISO 14044 Environmental Management – Life Cycle Assessment –
12 582 Requirements and Guidelines. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.
13
14
15 583 ISO, 2013. TS-EN ISO 14067 Greenhouse Gases -Carbon Footprint of Products- Requirements
16 584 and Guidelines for Quantification and Communication. International Organization for
17 585 Standardization, Geneva.
18
19
20 586 Kim, S., Dale, B.E., Jenkins, R., 2009. Life cycle assessment of corn grain and corn stover in the
21 587 United States. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 14, 160–174. doi: 10.1007/s11367-008-0054-4
22
23 588 Knudsen, M.T., Meyer-Aurich, A., Olesen, J.E., Chirinda, N., Hermansen, J.E., 2014. Carbon
24 589 footprints of crops from organic and conventional arable crop rotations - Using a life
25 590 cycle assessment approach. *J. Clean Prod.* 64, 609–618. doi:
26 591 10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.009
27
28
29 592 Kröbel, R., Smith, W., Grant, B., Desjardins, R., Campbell, C., Tremblay, N., Li, C., Zentner, R.,
30 593 McConkey, B., 2011. Development and evaluation of a new Canadian spring wheat sub-
31 594 model for DNDC. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 91, 503–520. doi: 10.4141/cjss2010-059
32
33
34 595 Li, C., Frohling, S., Frohling, T.A., 1992. A model of nitrous oxide evolution from soil driven by
35 596 rainfall events: 1. Model structure and sensitivity. *J. Geophys. Res.* 97, 9759–9776. doi:
36 597 10.1029/92JD00509
37
38
39 598 Li, C., Frohling, S., Harriss, R., 1994. Modeling carbon biogeochemistry in agricultural soils.
40 599 *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 8, 237–254. doi: 10.1029/94GB00767
41
42 600 Maas, S.E., Glenn, A.J., Tenuta, M., Amiro, B.D., 2013. Net CO₂ and N₂O exchange during
43 601 perennial forage establishment in an annual crop rotation in the Red River Valley,
44 602 Manitoba. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 93, 639–652. doi: 10.4141/cjss2013-025
45
46
47 603 MacWilliam, S., Wismer, M., Kulshreshtha, S., 2014. Life cycle and economic assessment of
48 604 Western Canadian pulse systems: The inclusion of pulses in crop rotations. *Agric. Syst.*
49 605 123, 43–53. doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2013.08.009
50
51 606 Myhre, G., Shindell, D., Bréon, F.-M., Collins, W., Fluglestvedt, J., Huang, J., Koch, D.,
52 607 Lamarque, J.-F., Lee, D., Mendoza, D., Nakajima, T., Robock, A., Stephens, G.,
53 608 Takemura, T., Zhang, H., 2013. Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing, in:
54 609 Stocker, T.F., Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y.
55 610 Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (Eds.), *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis.*
56 611 *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
57 612 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
58 613 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., pp. 659–740.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 614 Nemecek, T., Freiermuth Knuchel, R., Alig, M., Gaillard, G., 2010. The advantages of generic
5 615 LCA tools for agriculture: examples SALCAcrop and SALCAfarm. Presented at the 7 th
6 616 International Conference on Life Cycle Assessment in Agri-Food sector, Bari.
7
8
9 617 Nemecek, T., Dubois, D., Huguenin-Elie, O., Gaillard, G., 2011a. Life cycle assessment of Swiss
10 618 farming systems: I. Integrated and organic farming. *Agr. Syst.* 104, 217–232. doi:
11 619 10.1016/j.agsy.2010.10.002
12
13
14 620 Nemecek, T., Huguenin-Elie, O., Dubois, D., Gaillard, G., Schaller, B., Chervet, A., 2011b. Life
15 621 cycle assessment of Swiss farming systems: II. Extensive and intensive production. *Agr.*
16 622 *Syst.* 104, 233–245. doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2010.07.007
17
18 623 Nemecek, T., Bengoa, X., Lansche, J., Mouron, P., Rossi, V., Humbert, S., 2014.
19 624 Methodological Guidelines for the Life Cycle Inventory of Agricultural Products.
20 625 Version 2.0. World Food LCA Database (WFLDB). Quantis and Agroscope, Lausanne
21 626 and Zurich, Switzerland.
22
23
24 627 Nemecek, T., Hayer, F., Bonnin, E., Carrouée, B., Schneider, A., Vivier, C., 2015. Designing
25 628 eco-efficient crop rotations using life cycle assessment of crop combinations. *Eur. J.*
26 629 *Agron.* 65, 40–51. doi: 10.1016/j.eja.2015.01.005
27
28
29 630 Pelletier, N., Arsenault, N., Tyedmers, P., 2008. Scenario Modeling Potential Eco-Efficiency
30 631 Gains from a Transition to Organic Agriculture: Life Cycle Perspectives on Canadian
31 632 Canola, Corn, Soy, and Wheat Production. *Environ. Manag.* 42, 989–1001. doi:
32 633 10.1007/s00267-008-9155-x
33
34
35 634 Philp, J., 2015. Balancing the bioeconomy: supporting biofuels and bio-based materials in public
36 635 policy. *Energy Environ. Sci.* 8, 3063–3068. doi: 10.1039/C5EE01864A
37
38 636 Porta, P., Buttol, P., Naldesi, L., Masoni, P., Zamagni, A., 2008. A simplified LCA tool for
39 637 Environmental Product Declarations in the agricultural sector. Presented at the 6th
40 638 International Conference on LCA in the Agri-Food sector, Zurich, pp. 318–324.
41
42
43 639 Potting, J., Hauschild, M.Z., 2006. Spatial differentiation in life cycle impact assessment: A
44 640 decade of method development to increase the environmental realism of LCIA. *Int. J.*
45 641 *Life Cycle Assess.* 11, 11–13. doi: 10.1065/lca2006.04.005
46
47
48 642 Pülzl, H., Kleinschmit, D., Arts, B., 2014. Bioeconomy – an emerging meta-discourse affecting
49 643 forest discourses? *Scand. J. Forest Res.* 29, 386–393. doi:
50 644 10.1080/02827581.2014.920044
51
52
53 645 R Development Core Team, 2005. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
54 646 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
55
56 647 Sheehan, J., Camobreco, V., Duffield, J., Graboski, M., Shapouri, H., 1998. Life Cycle Inventory
57 648 of Biodiesel and Petroleum Diesel for Use in an Urban Bus (No. NREL/SR-580-24089).
58 649 U.S. Department of Energy’s Office of Fuels Development; U.S. Department of
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 650 Agriculture's Office of Energy; National Renewable Energy Laboratory; Midwest
5 651 Research Institute, US.
6
7
8 652 Shrestha, B.M., McConkey, B.G., Smith, W.N., Desjardins, R.L., Campbell, C.A., Grant, B.B.,
9 653 Miller, P.R., 2013. Effects of crop rotation, crop type and tillage on soil organic carbon in
10 654 a semiarid climate. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 93, 137–146. doi: 10.4141/cjss2012-078
11
12 655 Shrestha, B.M., Desjardins, R.L., McConkey, B.G., Worth, D.E., Dyer, J.A., Cerkowniak, D.D.,
13 656 2014. Change in carbon footprint of canola production in the Canadian Prairies from
14 657 1986 to 2006. *Renew. Energy* 63, 634–641.
15
16
17 658 Siegel, S., Castellan, N., 1988. *Nonparametric statistics for behavioral sciences*, McGraw-Hill.
18 659 ed. New York.
19
20
21 660 SimaPro 8.3, 2016. Simapro 8.3. PRé Consultants: Life Cycle consultancy and software
22 661 solutions, Amersfoort, Netherlands.
23
24 662 Smith, W.N., Grant, B.B., Desjardins, R.L., Kroebel, R., Li, C., Qian, B., Worth, D.E.,
25 663 McConkey, B.G., Drury, C.F., 2013. Assessing the effects of climate change on crop
26 664 production and GHG emissions in Canada. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 179, 139–150. doi:
27 665 10.1016/j.agee.2013.08.015
28
29
30 666 (S&T)2, 2014. GHGenius, Model Version 4.03a. (S&T)2 Consultants Inc. for Natural Resources
31 667 Canada, Delta, British Columbia, Canada. <http://www.ghgenius.ca/> (Accessed
32 668 25.06.2014).
33
34
35 669 Styles, D., Gibbons, J., Williams, A.P., Stichnothe, H., Chadwick, D.R., Healey, J.R., 2014.
36 670 Cattle feed or bioenergy? Consequential life cycle assessment of biogas feedstock options
37 671 on dairy farms. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 1034–1049. doi: 10.1111/gcbb.12189
38
39
40 672 Styles, D., Gibbons, J., Williams, A.P., Dauber, J., Stichnothe, H., Urban, B., Chadwick, D.R.,
41 673 Jones, D.L., 2015. Consequential life cycle assessment of biogas, biofuel and biomass
42 674 energy options within an arable crop rotation. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 1305–1320. doi:
43 675 10.1111/gcbb.12246
44
45
46 676 Teuscher, R., Lansche, J., Nemecek, T., Gaillard, G., 2014. Optimizing the LCA data processing
47 677 for food products in the context of Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment: challenges and
48 678 opportunities. Presented at the 9th Conference on Life Cycle Assessment in the Agri-
49 679 Food Sector, San Francisco.
50
51
52 680 Tuomisto, H.L., De Camillis, C., Leip, A., Nisini, L., Pelletier, N., Hastrup, P., 2015.
53 681 Development and testing of a European Union-wide farm-level carbon calculator. *Integr.*
54 682 *Environ. Assess. Manag.* 11, 404–416. doi: 10.1002/ieam.1629
55
56 683 USDA, 2015. LCA Digital Commons Project. United States Department of Agriculture.
57 684 Available at: URL <http://www.lcacommons.gov/?q=about>. (Accessed: 29.07.2015).
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

685 Uzoma, K.C., Smith, W., Grant, B., Desjardins, R.L., Gao, X., Hanis, K., Tenuta, M., Goglio, P.,
686 Li, C., 2015. Assessing the effects of agricultural management on nitrous oxide emissions
687 using flux measurements and the DNDC model. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 206, 71–83.
688 doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2015.03.014

689 Vergé, X.P.C., Dyer, J.A., Worth, D.E., Smith, W.N., Desjardins, R.L., McConkey, B.G., 2012.
690 A Greenhouse Gas and Soil Carbon Model for Estimating the Carbon Footprint of
691 Livestock Production in Canada. *Anim.* 2, 437–454. doi: 10.3390/ani2030437

692 Williams, A.G., Audsley, E., Sandars, D.L., 2010. Environmental burdens of producing bread
693 wheat, oilseed rape and potatoes in England and Wales using simulation and system
694 modelling. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 15, 855–868. doi: 10.1007/s11367-010-0212-3

695 World Bank, 2015. Population growth (annual %) | Data | Table.
696 <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.GROW>. (Accessed at: 11.11.2015).

697 Zaher, U., Stöckle, C., Painter, K., Higgins, S., 2013. Life cycle assessment of the potential
698 carbon credit from no- and reduced-tillage winter wheat-based cropping systems in
699 Eastern Washington State. *Agric. Syst.* 122, 73–78. doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2013.08.004

Figure captions

Figure 1 Conceptual framework of the Crop.LCA tool (NPKS: fertiliser; LCA.ini(), name of the initialisation function to start Crop.LCA in the R environment; CED: Cumulative Energy Demand; GWP: global warming potential with a 100 year horizon; AP: acidification potential; EP: eutrophication potential)

Figure 2 Main processes considered within the system boundary for the production system analyzed by the Crop.LCA tool (RM: Raw materials; O: oil; F: fuel; LO: lubricating oil; M: machinery; Fert: fertilizer; Pest: pesticide; H: herbicide; S: seed).

Figure 3 Boxplot of global warming potential with a 100 year horizon (GWP) for the cropping systems (a, b) and for wheat cultivation (c, d) according to the functional units considered (ha of land and GJ of energy output) (Bold line: median, Dashed line: mean, box: 25% and 75% quantiles, ○: maximum values, ◆: minimum values) (CONV: conventional; NT: no-tillage; L: legume; RES: residue)

Figure 4 Boxplot of (a,b) cumulative energy demand (CED), (c,d) eutrophication potential (EP,) and (e, f) acidification potential (AP) for the cropping systems with the functional units considered (ha of land and GJ of energy output) (Bold line: median, Dashed line: mean, box: 25% and 75% quantiles, ○: maximum values, ◆: minimum values) (CONV: conventional; NT: no-tillage; L: legume; RES: residue)

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3







Figure 4









Table 1 Summary of characteristics of cropping systems considered in the scenario assessment (Note: Fertiliser cells in the Crop.LCA input file contain the amount of fertiliser applied and its nutrient concentration; further details are given in the Supplementary Material. Bold text indicates differences among systems)

| Cropping System | CONV | NT | L | RES |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Name in the supplementary material | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Crop sequence ^a | Maize-spring wheat-canola-spring barley | maize-spring wheat-canola-spring barley | Faba bean-spring wheat-canola-spring barley | maize-spring wheat-canola-spring barley |
| Tillage | Harrowing and disk harrowing | No tillage | Harrowing and disk harrowing | Harrowing and disk harrowing |
| Fertiliser ^b | | | | |
| Year 1 | 180 kg ha ⁻¹ NPKS 112 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 180 kg ha ⁻¹ NPKS 112 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 0 kg ha⁻¹ NPKS 0 kg ha⁻¹ Urea | 180 kg ha ⁻¹ NPKS 112 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea |
| Year 2 | 213 kg ha ⁻¹ NP | 213 kg ha ⁻¹ NP | 106 kg ha⁻¹ NP | 213 kg ha ⁻¹ NP |
| Year 3 | 317 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 317 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 317 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 317 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea |
| Year 4 | 212 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 212 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 212 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea | 212 kg ha ⁻¹ Urea |
| Pesticide treatment number per year | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| Residue management | Straw and stover collected | Straw & stover collected | Straw and stover collected | Straw and stover left on the field |

^a maize (*Zea mays* L.), spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), canola (*Brassica napus* L.), spring barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.), and faba bean (*Vicia Faba* var. *minor* L.)

^bNutrient content: NPKS 35-25-10-10, NP 43-10, Urea 46

Table 2 Comparison of several characteristics of the LCA tools

| Tool | AgBalance | Cranfield LCA tool | Crop.LCA | EU Carbon calculator | eVerdEE | FEAT model | LCAcommons | LCAD | SALCA | ULICEES |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Impact category assessed | Several | Several | Several | GWP | Several | Several | Several | Several | Several | GWP |
| Modular | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Adaptable ^a | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Copyright issues | Available after purchase | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Not available | Authors mentioned and agreement signed | By citing authors |
| Crop assessed | Several | Several | Several | Several | Several | Several | Several | bioenergy crops | Several | Several |
| Geographical area | W ^b | UK | W ^b , currently focused on North America | Europe | W ^b | W ^b | North America | W ^b | Mostly focused on Europe | Mostly focused on North America |
| Availability | Available after purchase | Online | Online | Online | Online | Online | Online | Not available | On written request | On request |
| Code available | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Multiapproach for cropping systems ^c | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Does the tool allow for more than one input method for soil-borne emissions? ^d | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| References | BASF 2015 | Williams et al., 2010 | Current publication | Tuomisto et al., 2015 | Porta et al., 2008 | Camargo et al., 2013 | USDA 2015 | Styles et al., 2014, 2015 | Nemecek et al. 2010; Teuscher et al., 2014 | Vergé et al., 2012 |

^aadaptable: Yes: the code of the tool and the data sources are available to the user for possible modifications which can be easily carried out, No: the code of the tool and the data sources are not available to the user for possible modifications which cannot be easily carried out.

^bW: Worldwide

^cmulti-approach: Yes: individual crops and entire cropping systems can be considered at the same time; No: individual crops and entire cropping systems cannot be considered at the same time

^dinput method, in this context, refers to the methodology used to compute and estimate soil borne emissions

Development of Crop.LCA, an adaptable screening life cycle assessment tool for agricultural systems: a Canadian scenario assessment

Goglio, Pietro

2017-06-22

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

Pietro Goglio, Ward N. Smith, Devon E. Worth, et al., Development of Crop.LCA, an adaptable screening life cycle assessment tool for agricultural systems: A Canadian scenario assessment, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 172, 20 January 2018, pp. 3770-3780

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.175>

Downloaded from CERES Research Repository, Cranfield University