

CHAPTER 11

N₂O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS, AND CO₂ EMISSIONS FROM LIME AND UREA APPLICATION

Final Draft

7 **Authors**

8 Kristell Hergoualc'h (CIFOR, France), Hiroko Akiyama (Japan), Martial Bernoux (France), Ngonidzashe
9 Chirinda (CGIAR, Zimbabwe), Agustin Del Prado (Spain), Åsa Kasimir (Sweden), Douglas MacDonald
10 (Canada), Stephen Ogle (USA), Kristiina Regina (Finland), Tony van der Weerden (New Zealand)

11

12 **Contributing Authors**

13 Chang Liang (Canada), Alasdair Noble (New Zealand)

Contents

14			
15	11.1	Introduction.....	5
16	11.2	N ₂ O Emissions from Managed Soils.....	5
17	11.2.1	Direct N ₂ O emissions.....	5
18	11.2.2	Indirect N ₂ O emissions	20
19	11.2.3	Completeness, Time series, QA/QC	26
20	11.3	CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	26
21	11.4	CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization.....	27
22		References.....	28
23	Annex 11A.1	References for crop residue data in Table 11.2	36
24	Annex 11A.2	Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF ₁	37
25	Annex 11A.3	Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF _{1FR}	40
26	Annex 11A.4	Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF _{3PRP}	41
27	Annex 11A.5	Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF ₄	43
28	Annex 11A.6	Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF ₅	44
29	Annex 11A.7	Estimation of Default Factor(s) for Frac _{GASF}	45
30	Annex 11A.8	Estimation of Default Factor for Frac _{GASM}	47
31	Annex 11A.9	Estimation of Default Factor for Frac _{LEACH-(H)}	48

Equations

34	Direct N ₂ O emissions from managed soils (Tier 1)	6
35	Equation 11.2 Direct N ₂ O emissions from managed soils (Tier 2).....	7
36	Equation 11.3 N from organic N additions applied to soils (Tier 1).....	12
37	Equation 11.4 N from animal manure applied to soils (Tier 1).....	13
38	Equation 11.5 N in urine and dung deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock (Tier 1)	13
39	Updated Equation 11.6 N from crop residues and forage/pasture renewal (Tier 1).....	14
40	Equation 11.7 Dry-weight correction of reported crop yields.....	15
41	Equation 11.8 N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of loss of soil C through change in land use or	
42	management (Tiers 1 and 2).....	19
43	Equation 11.9 N ₂ O from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soils (Tier 1)	21
44	Equation 11.10 N ₂ O from N leaching/runoff from managed soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs (Tier	
45	1)	23
46	Equation 11.11 N ₂ O from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soils (Tier 2)	23

Final Draft

52

53

Tables

54	Table 11.1 Default emission factors to estimate direct N ₂ O emissions from managed soils	11
55	Table 11.1A Default values for N _{AG(T)} , N _{BG(T)} , R _{AG(T)} , RS _(T) and DRY to be used in Equations 11.6 and 11.7	16
56	Table 11.2 Alternative method and data for estimating above-ground residue (AGR(T))	18
57	Table 11.3 Default emission, volatilisation and leaching factors for indirect soil N ₂ O emissions.....	25
58	Table A2-1 Sample size, mean, and uncertainty range of the EF ₁ disaggregated by length of the experiment	
59	(days) and N application rate (kg N ha ⁻¹ period ⁻¹).....	38
60	Table A2-2 Sample size, mean, and uncertainty range of the EF ₁ disaggregated by climate, fertiliser form and	
61	irrigation practice... ..	39
62	Table A4-1 EF values for cattle and sheep dung and urine, in wet and dry climates.....	42
63	Table A5-1 Results from review papers of N addition experiments in non-agricultural sites	43
64	Table A5-2 Results from review papers of N ₂ O emissions and N deposition conducted at non-agricultural sites	43
65	Table A7-1 Fertiliser consumption in the period 2007-2015 expressed as thousand tonnes nutrients and % of	
66	total fertiliser consumed.....	45
67	Table A7-2 Assumptions on the potential mix of different IFA fertiliser products	45
68	Table A7-3 Emission factors for % NH ₃ -N and NO _x -N (N applied) ⁻¹) from different fertiliser types resulting	
69	from two meta-analysis and number of studies involved.....	46
70	Table A8-1 Emission factors for NH ₃ -N and NO _x -N (N applied ⁻¹) from manure or slurry application and	
71	excreta patches.....	47

72

11.1 INTRODUCTION

No refinement

11.2 N₂O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS

This section presents the methods and equations for estimating total national anthropogenic emissions of N₂O (direct and indirect) from managed soils. The generic equations presented here can also be used for estimating N₂O within specific land-use categories or by condition-specific variables (e.g., N additions to rice paddies) if the country can disaggregate the activity data to that level (i.e., N use activity within a specific land use).

Nitrous oxide is produced naturally in soils through the processes of nitrification and denitrification. Nitrification is the aerobic microbial oxidation of ammonium to nitrate, and denitrification is the anaerobic microbial reduction of nitrate to nitrogen gas (N₂). Nitrous oxide is a gaseous intermediate in the reaction sequence of denitrification and a by-product of nitrification that leaks from microbial cells into the soil and ultimately into the atmosphere. One of the main controlling factors in this reaction is the availability of inorganic N in the soil. This methodology, therefore, estimates N₂O emissions using human-induced net N additions to soils (e.g., synthetic or organic fertilisers, deposited manure, crop residues, sewage sludge), or of mineralisation of N in soil organic matter following drainage/management of organic soils, or cultivation/land-use change on mineral soils (e.g., Forest Land/Grassland/Settlements converted to Cropland).

The emissions of N₂O that result from anthropogenic N inputs or N mineralisation occur through both a direct pathway (i.e., directly from the soils to which the N is added/released), and through two indirect pathways: (i) following volatilisation of NH₃ and NO_x from managed soils and from fossil fuel combustion and biomass burning, and the subsequent redeposition of these gases and their products NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ to soils and waters; and (ii) after leaching and runoff of N, mainly as NO₃⁻, from managed soils. The principal pathways are illustrated in Figure 11.1.

Direct emissions of N₂O from managed soils are estimated separately from indirect emissions, though using a common set of activity data. The Tier 1 methodologies do not take into account different land cover, soil type, climatic conditions or management practices (other than specified below). Neither do they take account of any lag time for direct emissions from crop residue N, and allocate these emissions to the year in which the residues are returned to the soil. These factors are not considered for direct or (where appropriate, indirect) emissions because limited data are available to provide appropriate emission factors. Countries that have data to show that default factors are inappropriate for their country should utilise Tier 2 equations or Tier 3 approaches and include a full explanation for the values used.

11.2.1 Direct N₂O emissions

In most soils, an increase in available N enhances nitrification and denitrification rates which then increase the production of N₂O. Increases in available N can occur through human-induced N additions or change of land-use and/or management practices that mineralise soil organic N.

The following N sources are included in the methodology for estimating direct N₂O emissions from managed soils:

- synthetic N fertilisers (F_{SN});
- organic N applied as fertiliser (e.g., animal manure, compost, sewage sludge, rendering waste, waste water effluent) (F_{ON});
- urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals (F_{PRP});

Final Draft

- N in crop residues (above-ground and below-ground), including from N-fixing crops ¹ and from forages during pasture renewal ² (F_{CR});
- N mineralisation associated with loss of soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management of mineral soils (F_{SOM}); and
- Drainage/management of organic soils (i.e., Histosols) ³ (F_{OS}).

11.2.1.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

The decision tree in Figure 11.2 provides guidance on which tier method to use.

Tier 1

In its most basic form, direct N_2O emissions from managed soils are estimated using Equation 11.1 as follows:

EQUATION 11.1
DIRECT N_2O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS (TIER 1)

$$N_2O_{Direct-N} = N_2O-N_{N\text{ inputs}} + N_2O-N_{OS} + N_2O-N_{PRP}$$

Where:

$$N_2O-N_{N\text{ inputs}} = \left[\left[(F_{SN} + F_{ON} + F_{CR} + F_{SOM}) \cdot EF_1 \right] + \left[(F_{SN} + F_{ON} + F_{CR} + F_{SOM})_{FR} \cdot EF_{1FR} \right] \right]$$

$$N_2O-N_{OS} = \left[\left(F_{OS,CG,Temp} \cdot EF_{2CG,Temp} \right) + \left(F_{OS,CG,Trop} \cdot EF_{2CG,Trop} \right) + \left(F_{OS,F,Temp,NR} \cdot EF_{2F,Temp,NR} \right) + \left(F_{OS,F,Temp,NP} \cdot EF_{2F,Temp,NP} \right) + \left(F_{OS,F,Trop} \cdot EF_{2F,Trop} \right) \right]$$

$$N_2O-N_{PRP} = \left[\left(F_{PRP,CP} \cdot EF_{3PRP,CP} \right) + \left(F_{PRP,SO} \cdot EF_{3PRP,SO} \right) \right]$$

Where:

- $N_2O_{Direct-N}$ = annual direct N_2O -N emissions produced from managed soils, kg N_2O -N yr⁻¹
- $N_2O-N_{N\text{ inputs}}$ = annual direct N_2O -N emissions from N inputs to managed soils, kg N_2O -N yr⁻¹
- N_2O-N_{OS} = annual direct N_2O -N emissions from managed organic soils, kg N_2O -N yr⁻¹
- N_2O-N_{PRP} = annual direct N_2O -N emissions from urine and dung inputs to grazed soils, kg N_2O -N yr⁻¹
- F_{SN} = annual amount of synthetic fertiliser N applied to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

¹ Biological nitrogen fixation has been removed as a direct source of N_2O because of the lack of evidence of significant emissions arising from the fixation process itself (Rochette and Janzen, 2005). These authors concluded that the N_2O emissions induced by the growth of legume crops/forages may be estimated solely as a function of the above-ground and below-ground nitrogen inputs from crop/forage residue (the nitrogen residue from forages is only accounted for during pasture renewal). Conversely, the release of N by mineralisation of soil organic matter as a result of change of land use or management is now included as an additional source. These are significant adjustments to the methodology previously described in the 1996 IPCC Guidelines. Countries may consider a Tier 2 approach for disaggregating low-N concentration crop residues from high-N concentration residues. Current knowledge shows no evidence for such a disaggregation at Tier 1 (Graham et al. 2017).

² The nitrogen residue from perennial forage crops is only accounted for during periodic pasture renewal, i.e. not necessarily on an annual basis as is the case with annual crops.

³ Soils are organic if they satisfy the requirements 1 and 2, or 1 and 3 below (FAO, 1998): 1. Thickness of 10 cm or more. A horizon less than 20 cm thick must have 12 percent or more organic carbon when mixed to a depth of 20 cm; 2. If the soil is never saturated with water for more than a few days, and contains more than 20 percent (by weight) organic carbon (about 35 percent organic matter); 3. If the soil is subject to water saturation episodes and has either: (i) at least 12 percent (by weight) organic carbon (about 20 percent organic matter) if it has no clay; or (ii) at least 18 percent (by weight) organic carbon (about 30 percent organic matter) if it has 60 percent or more clay; or (iii) an intermediate, proportional amount of organic carbon for intermediate amounts of clay (FAO, 1998).

137 F_{ON} = annual amount of animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to
 138 soils (Note: If including sewage sludge, cross-check with Waste Sector to ensure there is no double
 139 counting of N_2O emissions from the N in sewage sludge), kg N yr⁻¹

140 F_{CR} = annual amount of N in crop residues (above-ground and below-ground), including N-fixing crops,
 141 and from forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

142 F_{SOM} = annual amount of N in mineral soils that is mineralised, in association with loss of soil C from soil
 143 organic matter as a result of changes to land use or management, kg N yr⁻¹

144 F_{OS} = annual area of managed/drained organic soils, ha (Note: the subscripts CG, F, Temp, Trop, NR and
 145 NP refer to Cropland and Grassland, Forest Land, Temperate, Tropical, Nutrient Rich, and Nutrient
 146 Poor, respectively)

147 F_{PRP} = annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock, kg
 148 N yr⁻¹ (Note: the subscripts CPP and SO refer to Cattle, Poultry and Pigs, and Sheep and Other animals,
 149 respectively)

150 EF_1 = emission factor for N_2O emissions from N inputs, kg N_2O-N (kg N input)⁻¹ (Table 11.1)

151 EF_{1FR} is the emission factor for N_2O emissions from N inputs to flooded rice, kg N_2O-N (kg N input)⁻¹
 152 (Table 11.1) ⁴

153 EF_2 = emission factor for N_2O emissions from drained/managed organic soils, kg N_2O-N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; (See
 154 guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories:
 155 Wetlands, Chapter 2, Table 2.5 where further disaggregation by climate and land use is available) (Note:
 156 the subscripts CG, F, Temp, Trop, NR and NP refer to Cropland and Grassland, Forest Land, Temperate,
 157 Tropical, Nutrient Rich, and Nutrient Poor, respectively)

158 EF_{3PRP} = emission factor for N_2O emissions from urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock
 159 by grazing animals, kg N_2O-N (kg N input)⁻¹; (Table 11.1) (Note: the subscripts CPP and SO refer to
 160 Cattle, Poultry and Pigs, and Sheep and Other animals, respectively)

161 Conversion of N_2O-N emissions to N_2O emissions for reporting purposes is performed by using the following
 162 equation:

$$N_2O = N_2O-N \bullet 44/28$$

164 Tier 2

165 If more detailed emission factors and corresponding activity data are available to a country than are presented in
 166 Equation 11.1, further disaggregation of the terms in the equation can be undertaken. For example, if emission
 167 factors and activity data are available for the application of synthetic fertilisers and organic N (F_{SN} and F_{ON}) under
 168 different conditions i , Equation 11.1 would be expanded to become ⁵:

EQUATION 11.2
DIRECT N_2O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS (TIER 2)

$$N_2O_{Direct-N} = \sum_i (F_{SN} + F_{ON})_i \bullet EF_{1i} + (F_{CR} + F_{SOM}) \bullet EF_1 + N_2O-N_{OS} + N_2O-N_{PRP}$$

172 Where:

173 EF_{1i} = emission factors developed for N_2O emissions from synthetic fertiliser and organic N application
 174 under conditions i (kg N_2O-N (kg N input)⁻¹); $i = 1, \dots, n$.

175 Equation 11.2 may be modified in a variety of ways to accommodate any combination of N source-, crop type-,
 176 management-, land use-, climate-, soil- or other condition-specific emission factors that a country may be able to
 177 obtain for each of the individual N input variables (F_{SN} , F_{ON} , F_{CR} , F_{SOM} , F_{OS} , F_{PRP}).


⁴ When the total annual quantity of N applied to flooded paddy rice is known, this N input may be multiplied by a lower default emission factor applicable to this crop, EF_{1FR} (Table 11.1) or, where a country-specific emission factor has been determined, by that factor instead.

⁵ It is important to note that Equation 11.2 is just one of many possible modifications to Equation 11.1 when using the Tier 2 method. The eventual form of Equation 11.2 will depend upon the availability of condition-specific emission factors and the ability to which a country can disaggregate its activity data.


Final Draft

Figure 11.1 Schematic diagram illustrating the sources and pathways of N that result in direct and indirect N₂O emissions from soils and waters

Note: Sources of N applied to, or deposited on, soils are represented with arrows on the left-hand side of the graphic. Emission pathways are also shown with arrows including the various pathways of volatilisation of NH₃ and NO_x from agricultural and non-agricultural sources, deposition of these gases and their products NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻, and consequent indirect emissions of N₂O are also illustrated. “Applied Organic N Fertilisers” include animal manure, all compost, sewage sludge, tankage, etc. “Crop Residues” include above- and below-ground residues for all crops (non-N and N fixing) and from perennial forage crops and pastures following renewal. On the lower right-hand side is a cut-away view of a representative sections of managed land; Histosol cultivation is represented here.



192 **Figure 11.2 Decision tree for direct N₂O emissions from managed soils**



Note:

1: N sources include: synthetic N fertiliser, organic N additions, urine and dung deposited during grazing, crop/forage residue, mineralisation of N contained in soil organic matter that accompanies C loss from soils following a change in land use or management and drainage/management of organic soils. Other organic N additions (e.g., compost, sewage sludge, rendering waste) can be included in this calculation if sufficient information is available. The waste input is measured in units of N and added as an additional source sub-term under F_{ON} in Equation 11.1 to be multiplied by EF₁.

2: See Volume 1 Chapter 4, "Methodological Choice and Identification of Key Categories" (noting Section 4.1.2 on limited resources), for discussion of *key categories* and use of decision trees.

3: As a rule of thumb, a sub-category would be significant if it accounts for 25-30% of emissions from the source category.

195 Compilers can develop Tier 2 emission factors specific to mitigation options such as the application of nitrification
196 inhibitors (Akiyama et al. 2010, Ruser & Schulz 2015, Gilsanz et al. 2016). Compilers can also consider an
197 exponential response of N₂O emissions to N application by developing country-specific emission factors (van
198 Groenigen et al. 2010, Shcherbak et al. 2014, Gerber et al. 2016). This method will require activity data on specific
199 fertiliser application rates to individual fields in order to apply rate-specific emission factors that capture the
200 exponential response ⁶. The influence of other environmental conditions, such as freeze-thaw cycles (Wagner-
201 Riddle et al. 2017) can also be addressed with the development of Tier 2 emission factors.

⁶ The Tier 1 method is designed as a simple method for estimating direct N₂O emissions with top-down commodity data on fertiliser production, import/export, or sales data. With these data, it is not possible to know the application rates to individual fields, which is needed for emission factors that are adjusted with application rates. However, variable emission factors can be developed with the Tier 2 method.

Final Draft

Conversion of N₂O–N emissions to N₂O emissions for reporting purposes is performed by using the following equation:

$$\text{N}_2\text{O} = \text{N}_2\text{O-N} \bullet 44/28$$

Tier 3

Tier 3 methods are modelling or measurement approaches. Models are useful because in appropriate forms they can relate the soil and environmental variables responsible for N₂O emissions to the size of those emissions. These relationships may then be used to predict emissions from whole countries or regions for which experimental measurements are impracticable. Models should only be used after validation by representative experimental measurements. Care should also be taken to ensure that the emission estimates developed through the use of models or measurements account for all anthropogenic N₂O emissions⁷. Guidance that provides a sound scientific basis for the development of a Tier 3 Model-based Accounting System is given in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.

According to Equation 11.1, direct emissions of N₂O from managed soils are calculated in the Tier 1 approach on the basis of total N applied to soils as synthetic and organic fertilisers and/or soil N mineralisation. The processes of run-off of N, volatilization of NH₃ and NO_x, emissions of N₂O, and leaching of N, however, do not occur simultaneously but in a sequence, with the peak of run-off and NH₃+NO_x volatilization happening before emissions of N₂O and losses of N through leaching. For example, an application technique affecting the volatilization rate of NH₃+NO_x is likely to change the flow rates of subsequent processes. To illustrate, injecting slurry instead of broadcasting the organic amendment may increase the availability of N for N₂O emissions and/or N-leaching, depending on climatic and soil conditions (Chadwick et al. 2011). It is therefore good practice to carefully assess such 'pollution swapping' effects when implementing a Tier 3 approach and adopting the N-flow principle when estimating direct N₂O emissions. The same applies when estimating indirect N₂O emissions from leaching and runoff (see Section 11.2.2.1). This adoption can be achieved by accounting for the decreased pool of nitrogen that is available for direct N₂O emissions (and nitrogen leaching).

11.2.1.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

Tiers 1 and 2

Three emission factors (EF) are needed to estimate direct N₂O emissions from managed soils. The default values presented here may be used in the Tier 1 equation or in the Tier 2 equation in combination with country-specific emission factors. The first EF (EF₁) refers to the amount of N₂O emitted from the various synthetic and organic N applications to soils, including crop residue and mineralisation of soil organic carbon in mineral soils due to land-use change or management. The second EF (EF₂) refers to the amount of N₂O emitted from an area of drained/managed organic soils, and the third EF (EF_{3PRP}) estimates the amount of N₂O emitted from urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock. Default emission factors for the Tier 1 method are summarised in Table 11.1. For EF₂, see guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Table 2.5.

The default value for EF₁ has been set at 1% of the N applied to soils or released through activities that result in mineralisation of organic matter in mineral soils⁸. Given the growing number of studies highlighting the role of climate and fertiliser type in determining EF₁ (Flechard et al. 2007, Aguilera et al. 2013, Cayuela et al. 2017), alternative emission factors that are disaggregated by climatic zone and fertiliser type are also provided. In wet climates, the default value has been set at 0.6% of organic N inputs and 1.6% of synthetic N inputs. In dry climates, the default value has been set at 0.5% of N inputs for both organic and synthetic N. These alternative factor values for EF₁ can be used by compilers that are able to disaggregate their activity data by climate and/or fertiliser type. There are data to suggest that the emission factor could also be further disaggregated as part of a Tier 2 method. This disaggregation could be based on (1) environmental factors (soil organic C content, soil texture, drainage, soil pH and climate such as temperature and freeze-thaw cycle); and (2) management-related factors (N application rate per fertiliser type; fertiliser type, irrigation and type of crop with differences between legumes, non-leguminous arable crops, and grass) (e.g. Cayuela et al. 2017, Rochette et al. 2018, Wagner-Riddle et al. 2017).

⁷ Natural N₂O emissions on managed land are assumed to be equal to emissions on unmanaged land. These latter emissions are very low. Therefore, nearly all emissions on managed land are considered anthropogenic. Estimates using the IPCC methodology are of the same magnitude as total measured emissions from managed land. Some Tier 3 methods may estimate only part of or aggregate some of the emission sources. Developers of Tier 3 methods should be aware of which components of Equation 11.2 are included in the estimate produced by their country-specific method.

⁸ The value of EF₁ draw on a much larger number of measurements (see Annex 11A.2) than were available for the previous value used for EF₁ in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Bouwman et al. 2002a,b; Novoa & Tejeda 2006; Stehfest & Bouwman 2006).

TABLE 11.1 (UPDATED)					
DEFAULT EMISSION FACTORS TO ESTIMATE DIRECT N ₂ O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS					
Emission factor	Aggregated		Disaggregated		
	Default value	Uncertainty range	Disaggregation ⁴	Default value	Uncertainty range
EF ₁ for N additions from synthetic fertilisers, organic amendments and crop residues, and N mineralised from mineral soil as a result of loss of soil carbon ¹ [kg N ₂ O–N (kg N) ^{–1}]	0.010	0.002 – 0.018	Synthetic fertiliser inputs ⁵ in wet climates	0.016	0.013 – 0.020
			Other N inputs ⁶ in wet climates	0.006	0.001 – 0.011
			All N inputs in dry climates	0.005	–0.001 – 0.012
EF _{IFR} for flooded rice fields ^{2,7} [kg N ₂ O–N (kg N) ^{–1}]	0.004	0.000 – 0.029	Continuous flooding	0.003	0.000 – 0.010
			Single and multiple drainage	0.005	0.000 – 0.016
EF _{3PRP, CPP} for cattle (dairy, non-dairy and buffalo), poultry and pigs ³ [kg N ₂ O–N (kg N) ^{–1}]	0.004	0.002– 0.005	Wet climates	0.005	0.005 – 0.006
			Dry climates	0.002	0.001 – 0.003
EF _{3PRP, SO} for sheep and 'other animals' ³ [kg N ₂ O–N (kg N) ^{–1}]	0.003	0.001 – 0.004	-	-	-
Sources:					
¹ Stehfest & Bouwman 2006; van Lent et al. 2015; Grace et al. 2016; van der Weerden et al. 2016; Albanito et al. 2017; Cayuela et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2017; Rochette et al. 2018.					
² Akiyama et al. 2005; Albanito et al. 2017; Cayuela et al. 2017.					
³ Yamulki et al. 1998; Galbally et al. 2005 ; Liebig et al. 2008; Cai & Akiyama 2016; Cardenas et al. 2016; Di et al. 2016; Hoogendoorn et al. 2016; Hyde et al. 2016; Krol et al. 2016; Li et al. 2016; Luo et al. 2016; Marsden et al. 2016; Misselbrook et al. 2016; Nichols et al. 2016; O'Connor et al. 2016; Owens et al. 2016; Pelster et al. 2016; Ward et al. 2016; Balvert et al. 2017; Byrnes et al. 2017; Forrestal et al. 2017; Marsden et al. 2017; Owens et al. 2017; Thomas et al. 2017a, b; Tully et al. 2017; van der Weerden et al. 2017; Cardoso et al. 2018; Chadwick et al. 2018; Nichols et al. 2018.					
Notes:					
EF ₁ : Uncertainty range of disaggregated EF ₁ based on the 95% confidence interval of fitted values. Uncertainty range of aggregated EF ₁ is based on the 2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile of the dataset (See methods, data and results in Annex 11A.2).					
EF _{IFR} : Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile (See methods and data in Annex 11A.3).					
EF _{3PRP, CPP} and EF _{3PRP, SO} : Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile (See methods and data in Annex 11A.4).					
For EF ₂ , see guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Table 2.5.					
⁴ Disaggregation of EF ₁ and EF _{3PRP, CPP} by climate (based on long-term averages): Wet climates occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration > 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation > 1000 mm. Dry climate occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration < 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation < 1000 mm (cf. Figure 3.A.5.1 in Chapter 3 of Vol. 4 provides a map subdividing wet and dry climates based on these criteria). In wet climates, the EF ₁ is further disaggregated by synthetic fertiliser N inputs and other N inputs.					
⁵ This emission factor should be used for synthetic fertiliser applications, and fertiliser mixtures that include both synthetic and organic forms of N.					
⁶ Other N input refers to organic amendments, animal manures (e.g. slurries, digested manures), N in crop residues and mineralised N from soil organic matter decomposition.					
⁷ Disaggregation of EF _{IFR} : Single and multiple drainage also include alternate wetting and drying. Disaggregated EF _{IFR} for rain-fed and deep-water systems not provided due to lack of data. The EF ₁ should be used for upland rice.					

249

250 Compilers that are able to disaggregate their activity data from all or some of these factors may choose to use
 251 disaggregated emission factors with the Tier 2 approach.

Final Draft

The default value for EF_{3PRP} is 0.4% of the N deposited by all animal types except ‘sheep’ and ‘other’ animals. For these latter species, a default emission factor of 0.3% of the N deposited may be used ⁹. EF_{3PRP} for cattle, pigs and poultry ($EF_{3PRP, CPP}$) is also disaggregated by wet and dry climates with values of 0.5% and 0.2%, respectively. There is no difference in EF_{3PRP} for sheep and other animals ($EF_{3PRP, SO}$) when disaggregated into wet and dry climates, therefore only an aggregated value is provided.

11.2.1.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Tiers 1 and 2

This section describes generic methods for estimating the amount of various N inputs to soils (F_{SN} , F_{ON} , F_{PRP} , F_{CR} , F_{SOM} , F_{OS}) that are needed for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies (Equations 11.1 and 11.2).

Applied synthetic fertiliser (F_{SN})

The term F_{SN} refers to the annual amount of synthetic N fertiliser applied to soils ¹⁰. It is estimated from the total amount of synthetic fertiliser consumed annually. Annual fertiliser consumption data may be collected from official country statistics, often recorded as fertiliser sales and/or as domestic production and imports. If country-specific data are not available, data can be used from the International Fertilizer Association (IFA) (<http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/statistics.asp>) on total fertiliser use by type and by crop, or from the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) (<http://fao.org/faostat/>) on synthetic fertiliser consumption. It may be useful to compare national statistics to international databases such as those of the IFA and FAO. If sufficient data are available, fertiliser use may be disaggregated by fertiliser type, crop type and climatic regime for major crops. These data may be useful in developing revised emission estimates if inventory methods are improved in the future. It should be noted that most data sources (including FAO) might limit reporting to agricultural N uses, although applications may also occur on Forest Land, Settlements, or other lands. This unaccounted N is likely to account for a small proportion of the overall emissions. However, it is recommended that countries seek out this additional information whenever possible.

Applied organic N fertilisers (F_{ON})

The term “applied organic N fertiliser” (F_{ON}) refers to the amount of organic N inputs applied to soils other than by grazing animals and is calculated using Equation 11.3. This includes applied animal manure, sewage sludge applied to soil, compost applied to soils, as well as other organic amendments of regional importance to agriculture (e.g., rendering waste, guano, brewery waste, etc.). Organic N fertiliser (F_{ON}) is calculated using Equation 11.3:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EQUATION 11.3} \\ &\text{N FROM ORGANIC N ADDITIONS APPLIED TO SOILS (TIER 1)} \\ &F_{ON} = F_{AM} + F_{SEW} + F_{COMP} + F_{OOA} \end{aligned}$$

Where:

F_{ON} = total annual amount of organic N fertiliser applied to soils other than by grazing animals, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{AM} = annual amount of animal manure N applied to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{SEW} = annual amount of total sewage N (coordinate with Waste Sector to ensure that sewage N is not double-counted) that is applied to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

⁹ This is an update on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, with over 400 cattle and sheep dung and urine EF_3 values collated from 13 countries (See Annex 11.4). As noted in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, reasons for the lower EF_{3PRP} for sheep include more even urine distribution (smaller and more frequent urinations), and smaller effects on soil compaction during grazing. There are no or very limited data for N_2O emission factors of other animal types, and the emission factor for poultry and swine is assumed to be the same as for cattle. However, a value of 0.3% of the nitrogen deposited may be used for animals classified as ‘other animals’ which includes goats, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, reindeer, and camelids, as these are likely to have nitrogen excretion rates and patterns that are more similar to sheep than to cattle. For disaggregation of EF_3 by dung and urine nitrogen for each livestock group, see Annex 11.4.

¹⁰ For the Tier 1 approach, the amounts of applied mineral nitrogen fertilisers (F_{SN}) and of applied organic nitrogen fertilisers (F_{ON}) are no longer adjusted for the amounts of NH_3 and NO_x volatilisation after application to soil. This is a change from the methodology described in the 1996 IPCC Guidelines. The reason for this change is that field studies that have determined N_2O emission factors for applied N were not adjusted for volatilisation when they were estimated. In other words, these emission factors were determined from: fertiliser-induced N_2O-N emitted / total amount of N applied, and not from: fertiliser-induced N_2O-N emitted / (total amount of N applied – NH_3 and NO_x volatilised). As a result, adjusting the amount of N input for volatilisation before multiplying it with the emission factor would in fact underestimate total N_2O emissions. Countries using Tier 2 or Tier 3 approaches should be aware that correction for NH_3/NO_x volatilisation after mineral or organic N application to soil may be required depending on the emission factor and/or the inventory methodology used.

F_{COMP} = annual amount of total compost N applied to soils (ensure that manure N in compost is not double-counted), kg N yr⁻¹

F_{OOA} = annual amount of other organic amendments used as fertiliser (e.g., rendering waste, guano, brewery waste, etc.), kg N yr⁻¹

The term F_{AM} is determined by adjusting the amount of manure N available ($N_{\text{MMS_Avb}}$; see Equation 10.34 in Chapter 10) for the amount of managed manure used for feed ($\text{Frac}_{\text{FEED}}$), burned for fuel ($\text{Frac}_{\text{FUEL}}$), or used for construction ($\text{Frac}_{\text{CNST}}$) as shown in Equation 11.4. Data for $\text{Frac}_{\text{FUEL}}$, $\text{Frac}_{\text{FEED}}$, $\text{Frac}_{\text{CNST}}$ can be obtained from official statistics or a survey of experts. However, if these data are not available use $N_{\text{MMS_Avb}}$ as F_{AM} without adjusting for $\text{Frac}_{\text{FUEL}}$, $\text{Frac}_{\text{FEED}}$, $\text{Frac}_{\text{CNST}}$.

EQUATION 11.4

N FROM ANIMAL MANURE APPLIED TO SOILS (TIER 1)

$$F_{\text{AM}} = N_{\text{MMS_Avb}} \cdot \left[1 - \left(\text{Frac}_{\text{FEED}} + \text{Frac}_{\text{FUEL}} + \text{Frac}_{\text{CNST}} \right) \right]$$

Where:

F_{AM} = annual amount of animal manure N applied to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

$N_{\text{MMS_Avb}}$ = amount of managed manure N available for soil application, feed, fuel or construction, kg N yr⁻¹ (see Equation 10.34 in Chapter 10)

$\text{Frac}_{\text{FEED}}$ = fraction of managed manure used for feed

$\text{Frac}_{\text{FUEL}}$ = fraction of managed manure used for fuel

$\text{Frac}_{\text{CNST}}$ = fraction of managed manure used for construction

Urine and dung from grazing animals (F_{PRP})

The term F_{PRP} refers to the annual amount of N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils by grazing animals. It is important to note that the N from managed animal manure applied to soils is included in the F_{AM} term of F_{ON} . The term F_{PRP} is estimated using Equation 11.5 from the number of animals in each livestock species/category T ($N_{(T)}$), the annual average amount of N excreted by each livestock species/category T ($\text{Nex}_{(T)}$), and the fraction of this N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils by each livestock species/category T ($\text{MS}_{(T, \text{PRP})}$). The data needed for this equation can be obtained from the livestock chapter (see Chapter 10, Section 10.5).

Equation 11.5 provides an estimate of the amount of N deposited by grazing animals:

EQUATION 11.5

N IN URINE AND DUNG DEPOSITED BY GRAZING ANIMALS ON PASTURE, RANGE AND Paddock (TIER 1)

$$F_{\text{PRP}} = \sum_T \left[\left(N_{(T)} \cdot \text{Nex}_{(T)} \right) \cdot \text{MS}_{(T, \text{PRP})} \right]$$

Where:

F_{PRP} = annual amount of urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range, paddock and by grazing animals, kg N yr⁻¹

$N_{(T)}$ = number of head of livestock species/category T in the country (see Chapter 10, Section 10.2)

$\text{Nex}_{(T)}$ = annual average N excretion per head of species/category T in the country, kg N animal⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (see Chapter 10, Section 10.5)

$\text{MS}_{(T, \text{PRP})}$ = fraction of total annual N excretion for each livestock species/category T that is deposited on pasture, range and paddock¹¹ (see Chapter 10, Section 10.5)

Crop residue N, including N-fixing crops and forage/ pasture renewal, returned to soils (F_{CR})

¹¹ In the livestock section, pasture, range and paddock is referred to as one of the manure management systems denoted as “S”.

Final Draft

The term F_{CR} refers to the amount of N in crop residues (above-ground and below-ground), including N-fixing crops, returned to soils annually¹². It also includes the N from N-fixing and non-N-fixing forages mineralised during forage or pasture renewal¹³. It is estimated from crop yield statistics and default factors for above-/below-ground residue:yield ratios and residue N contents. In addition, the method accounts for the effect of residue burning or other removal of residues (direct emissions of N_2O from residue burning are addressed under Chapter 2, Section 2.4. Because different crop types vary in residue:yield ratios, renewal time and N contents, separate calculations should be performed for major crop types and then N values from all crop types are summed up. At a minimum, it is recommended that crops be segregated into: 1) non-N-fixing grain crops (e.g., maize, rice, wheat, barley); 2) N-fixing grains and pulses (e.g., soybean, dry beans, chickpea, lentils); 3) root and tuber crops (e.g., potato, sweet potato, cassava); 4) N-fixing forage crops (alfalfa, clover); and 5) other forages including perennial grasses and grass/clover pastures. Equation 11.6 provides the equation to estimate N from crop residues and forage/pasture renewal, for a Tier 1 approach. As regards crop residue N, a cross check with the amount of $N_{beddingMS}$ of the Equation 10.34 in "Managed manure N available for application to managed soils, feed, fuel or construction uses" (Volume 4, Chapter 10 Section 10.5.4) and "Field Burning of Agricultural Residues" (3F CRF category - Volume 4, Chapter 5 Section 5.2.4), relative to the amount of agricultural residues that is returned to soils other than the amount of agricultural residues that is removed for other purposes (e.g. bedding) or burnt should be done, in order to eliminate the possibility of double counting.

UPDATED EQUATION 11.6
N FROM CROP RESIDUES AND FORAGE/PASTURE RENEWAL (TIER 1)

$$F_{CR} = \sum_T \left[AGR_{(T)} \cdot N_{AG(T)} \cdot \left(1 - \text{Frac}_{\text{Remove}(T)} - (\text{Frac}_{\text{Burnt}(T)} \cdot C_f) \right) \right] + \left[BGR_{(T)} \cdot N_{BG(T)} \right]$$

$$AGR_{(T)} = Crop_{(T)} \cdot R_{AG(T)} \cdot Area_{(T)} \cdot \text{Frac}_{\text{Renew}(T)}$$

$$BGR_T = Crop_T \cdot \left(1 + R_{AG(T)} \right) \cdot RS_{(T)} \cdot Area_{(T)} \cdot \text{Frac}_{\text{Renew}(T)}$$

Where:

F_{CR} = annual amount of N in crop residues (above and below ground), including N-fixing crops, and from forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils annually, kg N yr⁻¹

$AGR_{(T)}$ = annual total amount of above-ground crop residue for crop T , kg d.m. ha⁻¹. (Use factors in Table 11.1A, or alternatively, the amount can be calculated using the method and data in Table 11.2)

$N_{AG(T)}$ = N content of above-ground residues for crop T , kg N (kg d.m.)⁻¹ (Table 11.1A)

$\text{Frac}_{\text{Remove}(T)}$ = fraction of above-ground residues of crop T removed annually for purposes such as feed, bedding and construction, dimensionless. Survey of experts in country is required to obtain data. If data for $\text{Frac}_{\text{Remove}}$ are not available, assume no removal

¹² The equation to estimate F_{CR} has been modified from the previous *1996 IPCC Guidelines* to account for the contribution of the below-ground nitrogen to the total input of nitrogen from crop residues, which previously was ignored in the estimate of F_{CR} . As a result, F_{CR} now represents a more accurate estimate of the amount of nitrogen input from crop residue, which makes it possible to assess the contribution to residue nitrogen arising from the growth of forage legumes such as alfalfa, where the harvesting of virtually all the above-ground dry matter results in no significant residue except the root system.

¹³ The inclusion of nitrogen from forage or pasture renewal is a change from previous *1996 IPCC Guidelines*.

- 369 $Frac_{Burnt(T)}$ = fraction of annual harvested area of crop T burnt, dimensionless
- 370 C_f = combustion factor (dimensionless) (refer to Chapter 2, Table 2.6)
- 371 $BGR_{(T)}$ = annual total amount of belowground crop residue for crop T , kg d.m. ha⁻¹
- 372 $N_{BG(T)}$ = N content of below-ground residues for crop T , kg N (kg d.m.)⁻¹, (Table 11.1A)
- 373 $Crop_{(T)}$ = harvested annual dry matter yield for crop T , kg d.m. ha⁻¹
- 374 $R_{AG(T)}$ = ratio of above-ground residues dry matter ($AG_{DM(T)}$) to harvested yield for crop T ($Crop_{(T)}$), kg d.m.
- 375 (kg d.m.)⁻¹, (Table 11.1A)
- 376 $Area_{(T)}$ = total annual area harvested of crop T , ha yr⁻¹
- 377 $Frac_{Renew(T)}$ = fraction of total area under crop T that is renewed annually ¹⁴, dimensionless. For countries
- 378 where pastures are renewed on average every X years, $Frac_{Renew} = 1/X$. For annual crops $Frac_{Renew} = 1$
- 379 $RS_{(T)}$ = ratio of below-ground root biomass to above-ground shoot biomass for crop T , kg d.m. (kg d.m.)⁻¹,
- 380 (Table 11.1A)
- 381 T = crop or forage type

383 Data on crop yield statistics (yields and area harvested, by crop) may be obtained from national sources. If such

384 data are not available, FAO publishes data on crop production: (<http://fao.org/faostat/>).

385 Since yield statistics for many crops are reported as field-dry or fresh weight, a correction factor should be applied

386 to estimate dry matter yields ($Crop_{(T)}$) where appropriate (Equation 11.7). The proper correction to be used is

387 dependent on the standards that are applied for yield reporting, which may vary between countries. Alternatively,

388 the default values for dry matter content given in Table 11.1A may be used.

EQUATION 11.7

DRY-WEIGHT CORRECTION OF REPORTED CROP YIELDS

$$Crop_{(T)} = Yield_{Fresh(T)} \bullet DRY$$

392 Where:

- 393 $Crop_{(T)}$ = harvested dry matter yield for crop T , kg d.m. ha⁻¹
- 394 $Yield_{Fresh(T)}$ = harvested fresh yield for crop T , kg fresh weight ha⁻¹
- 395 DRY = dry matter fraction of harvested crop T , kg d.m. (kg fresh weight)⁻¹

396 An improvement on this approach for determining F_{CR} (i.e., Tier 2) would be the use of country-specific data rather

397 than the values provided in Table 11.1A, as well as country-specific values for the fraction of above-ground residue

398 burned.

¹⁴ This term is included in the equation to account for lower N release rates in grasslands that are replanted annually (e.g., van der Weerden *et al.*, 1999; Davies *et al.*, 2001).

Final Draft

408

TABLE 11.1A (NEW GUIDANCE) DEFAULT VALUES FOR $N_{AG(T)}$, $N_{BG(T)}$, $R_{AG(T)}$, $RS_{(T)}$ AND DRY TO BE USED IN EQUATIONS 11.6 AND 11.7					
Crops	N content of above-ground residues ($N_{AG(T)}$) ^a	N content of below-ground residues ($N_{BG(T)}$) ^a	$R_{AG(T)}$ ^b	Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass ($RS_{(T)}$) ^a	Dry matter fraction of harvested product (DRY) ^a
Crops					
Generic value for crops not indicated below ^c	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.009 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.0	0.22	0.85
Generic Grains	0.006 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.009 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.3	0.22 ($\pm 16\%$)	0.88
Winter Wheat	0.006 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.009 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.3	0.23 ($\pm 41\%$)	0.89
Spring Wheat	0.006 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.009 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.3	0.28 ($\pm 26\%$)	0.89
Barley	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.014 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.2	0.22 ($\pm 33\%$)	0.89
Oats	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.3	0.25 ($\pm 120\%$)	0.89
Maize	0.006 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.0	0.22 ($\pm 26\%$)	0.87
Rye	0.005 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.011 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.6	- ^e	0.88
Rice	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	- ^e	1.4	0.16 ($\pm 35\%$)	0.89
Millet	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	- ^e	1.4	- ^e	0.90
Sorghum	0.007 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.006 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	1.4	- ^e	0.89
Beans and Pulses	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	2.1	0.19 ($\pm 45\%$)	0.91
Soybeans	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.008 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	2.1	0.19 ($\pm 45\%$)	0.91
Potatoes and Tubers	0.019 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.014 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.4	0.20 ($\pm 50\%$) ^f	0.22
Peanuts	0.016 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	- ^e	1.0	- ^e	0.94
Grasses and Forages					
Alfalfa	0.027 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.019 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	- ^e	0.40 ($\pm 50\%$) ^g	0.90
Non-legume hay	0.015 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.012 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	- ^e	0.54 ($\pm 50\%$) ^g	0.90
N-fixing forages	0.027 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.022 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.3	0.40 ($\pm 50\%$)	0.90
Non-N-fixing forages	0.015 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.012 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.3	0.54 ($\pm 50\%$)	0.90
Perennial Grasses	0.015 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.012 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.3	0.80 ($\pm 50\%$) ^h	0.90
Grass-Clover Mixtures	0.025 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.016 ($\pm 75\%$) ^d	0.3	0.80 ($\pm 50\%$) ^h	0.90
Sources:					
^a Literature review by Stephen A. Williams, Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University. A list of the original references is given in Annex 11A.1.					
^b 2000 IPCC Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Chapter 4 for $R_{AG(T)}$ except forages, grasses and grass-clover mixes, which are from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 11, and the generic value for all crops, which is the expert opinion of authors.					
Notes:					
^c It is assumed here that grass dominates the system by 2 to 1 over legumes.					
^d No uncertainty is provided in the original study. This uncertainty is expert-based judgment.					
^e No estimate is available. The most appropriate generic value can be used based on expert judgment, in absence of more specific information available to develop a country-specific value.					

^f This is an estimate of non-tuber roots based on the root:shoot values found for other crops. If unmarketable tuber yield is returned to the soil then data are derived from Vangessel & Renner 1990 (see Annex 11A.1) (unmarketable yield = $0.08 * \text{marketable yield} = 0.29 * \text{above-ground biomass}$) suggest that the total residues returned might then be on the order of $0.49 * \text{above-ground biomass}$. Default s.d.

^g This is an estimate of root turnover in perennial systems. Default s.d.

^h Estimate of root turnover to above-ground production based on the assumption that in natural grass systems below-ground biomass is approximately equal to twice (one to three times) the above-ground biomass and that root turnover in these systems averages about 40% (30% to 50%) per year. Default s.d.

409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443

Final Draft

444

TABLE 11.2 (UPDATED) ALTERNATIVE METHOD AND DATA FOR ESTIMATING ABOVE-GROUND RESIDUE ($AGR_{(T)}$)^a					
Crop	Above-ground residue dry matter $AGR_{(T)}$ (kg d.m. ha ⁻¹): $AGR_{(T)} = Crop_{(T)} * Slope_{(T)} + (Intercept_{(T)} * 1000)$				
	Slope	± 2 s.d. as % of mean	Intercept	± 2 s.d. as % of mean	R ² adj.
<i>Major crop types</i>					
Grains	1.09	± 2%	0.88	± 6%	0.65
Beans & pulses ^b	1.13	± 19%	0.85	± 56%	0.28
Tubers ^c	0.10	± 69%	1.06	± 70%	0.18
Root crops, other ^d	1.07	± 19%	1.54	± 41%	0.63
N-fixing forages	0.3	± 50% default	0	-	-
Non-N-fixing forages	0.3	± 50% default	0	-	-
Perennial grasses	0.3	± 50% default	0	-	-
Grass-clover mixtures	0.3	± 50% default	0	-	-
<i>Individual crops</i>					
Maize	1.03	± 3%	0.61	± 19%	0.76
Wheat	1.51	± 3%	0.52	± 17%	0.68
Winter wheat	1.61	± 3%	0.40	± 25%	0.67
Spring wheat	1.29	± 5%	0.75	± 26%	0.76
Rice	0.95	± 19%	2.46	± 41%	0.47
Barley	0.98	± 8%	0.59	± 41%	0.68
Oats	0.91	± 5%	0.89	± 8%	0.45
Millet	1.43	± 18%	0.14	± 308%	0.50
Sorghum	0.88	± 13%	1.33	± 27%	0.36
Rye ^e	1.09	± 50% default	0.88	± 50% default	-
Soybean ^f	0.93	± 31%	1.35	± 49%	0.16
Dry bean ^g	0.36	± 100%	0.68	± 47%	0.15
Potato ^h	0.10	± 69%	1.06	± 70%	0.18
Peanut (w/pod) ⁱ	1.07	± 19%	1.54	± 41%	0.63
Alfalfa	0.29 ^j	± 31%	0	-	-
Non-legume hay	0.18	± 50% default	0	-	-
Sources:					
^a Literature review by Stephen A. Williams, Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University. A list of the original references is given in Annex 11A.1.					
Notes:					
^b The average above-ground residue:grain ratio from all data used was 2.0 and included data for soya bean, dry bean, lentil, cowpea, black gram, and pea.					
^c Average of other crops.					
^d Modelled after peanuts.					
^e No data for rye. Slope and intercept values are those for all grain. Default s.d.					
^f The average above-ground residue:grain ratio from all data used was 1.9.					
^g Ortega, 1988 (see Annex 11A.1). The average above-ground residue:grain ratio from this single source was 1.6. default s.d. for root:AGB.					

^h The mean value for above-ground residue:tuber ratio in the sources used was 0.27 with a standard error of 0.04.

ⁱ The mean value for above-ground residue: pod yield in the sources used was 1.80 with a standard error of 0.10.

^j This is the average above-ground biomass reported as litter or harvest losses. This does not include reported stubble, which averaged 0.165 x Reported Yields. Default s.d.

Mineralised N resulting from loss of soil organic C stocks in mineral soils through land-use change or management practices (F_{SOM})¹⁵

The term F_{SOM} refers to the amount of N mineralised from loss in soil organic C in mineral soils through land-use change or management practices. As explained in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3, land-use change and a variety of management practices can have a significant impact on soil organic C storage. Organic C and N are intimately linked in soil organic matter. Where soil C is lost through oxidation as a result of land-use or management change, this loss will be accompanied by a simultaneous mineralisation of N. Where a loss of soil C occurs, this mineralised N is regarded as an additional source of N available for conversion to N_2O (Smith and Conen, 2004); just as mineral N released from decomposition of crop residues, for example, becomes a source. The same default emission factor (EF_1) is applied to mineralised N from soil organic matter loss as is used for direct emissions resulting from fertiliser and organic N inputs to agricultural land. This is because the ammonium and nitrate resulting from soil organic matter mineralisation is of equal value as a substrate for the microorganisms producing N_2O by nitrification and denitrification, no matter whether the mineral N source is soil organic matter loss from land-use or management change, decomposition of crop residues, synthetic fertilisers or organic amendments. (Note: the opposite process to mineralisation, whereby inorganic N is sequestered into newly formed SOM, is not taken account of in the calculation of the mineralisation N source. This is because of the different dynamics of SOM decomposition and formation, and also because reduced tillage in some circumstances can increase both SOM and N_2O emission.)

For all situations where soil C losses occur (as calculated in Chapter 2, Equation 2.25) the Tier 1 and 2 methods for calculating the release of N by mineralisation are shown below:

Calculation steps for estimating changes in N supply from mineralisation

Step 1: Calculate the average annual loss of soil C ($\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$) for the area, over the inventory period, using Equation 2.25 in Chapter 2. Using the Tier 1 approach, the value for $\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$ will have a single value for all land-uses and management systems. Using Tier 2, the value for $\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$ will be disaggregated by individual land-use and/or management systems.

Step 2: Estimate the N mineralised as a consequence of this loss of soil C (F_{SOM}), using Equation 11.8:

EQUATION 11.8 N MINERALISED IN MINERAL SOILS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SOIL C THROUGH CHANGE IN LAND USE OR MANAGEMENT (TIERS 1 AND 2)

$$F_{SOM} = \sum_{LU} \left[\left(\Delta C_{Mineral, LU} \cdot \frac{1}{R} \right) \cdot 1000 \right]$$

Where:

F_{SOM} = the net annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of loss of soil carbon through change in land use or management, kg N

$\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$ = average annual loss of soil carbon for each land-use type (LU), tonnes C (Note: for Tier 1, $\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$ will have a single value for all land-uses and management systems. Using Tier 2 the value for $\Delta C_{Mineral, LU}$ will be disaggregated by individual land-use and/or management systems.

R = C:N ratio of the soil organic matter. A default value of 15 (uncertainty range from 10 to 30) for the C:N ratio (R) may be used for situations involving land-use change from Forest Land or Grassland to Cropland, in the absence of more specific data for the area. A default value of 10 (range from 8 to 15) may be used for situations involving management changes on Cropland Remaining Cropland. C:N

¹⁵ The inclusion of the term F_{SOM} is a change from the previous 1996 IPCC Guidelines, which did not include the N from mineralisation associated with a loss of soil organic C.

Final Draft

ratio can change over time, land use, or management practice ¹⁶. If countries can document changes in C:N ratio, then different values can be used over the time series, land use, or management practice.

LU = land-use and/or management system type

Step 3: For Tier 1, the value for F_{SOM} is calculated in a single step. For Tier 2, F_{SOM} is calculated by summing across all land-uses and/or management system types (LU).

Countries that are not able to estimate gross changes of mineral soil C will create a bias in the N_2O estimate, and it is *good practice* to acknowledge this limitation in the reporting documentation. It is also *good practice* to use specific data for the C:N ratios for the disaggregated land areas, if these are available, in conjunction with the data for carbon changes.

Area of drained/managed organic soils (F_{OS})

The term F_{OS} refers to the total annual area (ha) of drained/managed organic soils (see footnote 3 for definition). This definition is applicable for both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 methods. For all land uses, the areas should be stratified by climate zone (temperate and tropical). In addition, for temperate Forest Land the areas should be further stratified by soil fertility (nutrient rich and nutrient poor). The area of drained/managed organic soils (F_{OS}) may be collected from official national statistics. Alternatively, total areas of organic soils from each country are available from FAO (<http://fao.org/faostat/>), and expert advice may be used to estimate areas that are drained/managed. For Forest Land, national data will be available at soil survey organisations and from wetland surveys, e.g., for international conventions. In case no stratification by soil fertility is possible, countries may rely on expert judgment.

11.2.1.4 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

No Refinement

11.2.2 Indirect N_2O emissions

In addition to the direct emissions of N_2O from managed soils that occur through a direct pathway (i.e., directly from the soils to which N is applied), emissions of N_2O also take place through two indirect pathways (i.e., 'off-site' N_2O emission from N volatilisation/deposition and N leaching, as illustrated above in Section 11.2).

The first of these pathways is the volatilisation of N as NH_3 and oxides of N (NO_x), and the deposition of these gases and their products NH_4^+ and NO_3^- onto soils and the surface of lakes and other waters. The sources of N as NH_3 and NO_x are not confined to agricultural fertilisers and manures, but also include fossil fuel combustion, biomass burning, and processes in the chemical industry (see Volume 1, Chapter 7, Section 7.3). Thus, these processes cause N_2O emissions in an exactly analogous way to those resulting from deposition of agriculturally derived NH_3 and NO_x , following the application of synthetic and organic N fertilisers and /or urine and dung deposition from grazing animals. The second pathway is the leaching and runoff from land of N from synthetic and organic fertiliser additions, crop residues ¹⁷, mineralisation of N associated with loss of soil C in mineral and drained/managed organic soils through land-use change or management practices, and urine and dung deposition from grazing animals. Some of the inorganic N in or on the soil, mainly in the NO_3^- form, may bypass biological retention mechanisms in the soil/vegetation system by transport in overland water flow (runoff) and/or flow through soil macropores or pipe drains. Where NO_3^- is present in the soil in excess of biological demand, e.g., under cattle urine patches, the excess leaches through the soil profile. The nitrification and denitrification processes described at the beginning of this chapter transform some of the NH_4^+ and NO_3^- to N_2O . This may take place in the groundwater below the land to which the N was applied, or in riparian zones receiving drain or runoff water, or in the ditches, streams, rivers and estuaries (and their sediments) into which the land drainage water eventually flows.

This methodology described in this Chapter addresses the following N sources of indirect N_2O emissions from managed soils arising from agricultural inputs of N:

- synthetic N fertilisers (F_{SN});

¹⁶ Information on C:N ratios in forest and cropped soils may be found in the following references: Aitkenhead-Peterson *et al.*, 2005; Garten *et al.*, 2000; John *et al.*, 2005; Lobe *et al.*, 2001; Snowdon *et al.*, 2005, and other references cited by these authors.

¹⁷ Crop residues should be included as an N input into the leaching and runoff component.

- organic N applied as fertiliser (e.g., applied animal manure¹⁸, compost, sewage sludge, rendering waste, waste water effluent and other organic amendments) (F_{ON});
- urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals (F_{PRP});
- N in crop residues (above- and below-ground), including N-fixing crops and forage/pasture renewal returned to soils (F_{CR})¹⁹; and
- N mineralisation associated with loss of soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management on mineral soils (F_{SOM}).

The generic Tier 1 and Tier 2 methods described below can be used to estimate aggregate total indirect N_2O emissions from agricultural N additions to managed soils for an entire country. If a country is estimating its direct N_2O from managed soils by land-use category, the indirect N_2O emissions can also be estimated by the same disaggregation of land-use categories using the equations presented below with activity data, partitioning fractions, and/or emission factors specific for each land-use category. The methodology for estimating indirect N_2O emissions from combustion-related and industrial sources is described in Volume 1, Chapter 7, Section 7.3.

11.2.2.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

Refer to the decision tree in Figure 11.3 (Indirect N_2O Emissions) for guidance on which Tier method to use.

Tier 1

Volatilisation, $N_2O_{(ATD)}$

The N_2O emissions from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soil are estimated using Equation 11.9:

$$N_2O_{(ATD)}-N = \left[(F_{SN} \bullet \text{Frac}_{GASF}) + ((F_{ON} + F_{PRP}) \bullet \text{Frac}_{GASM}) \right] \bullet EF_4$$

Where:

$N_2O_{(ATD)}-N$ = annual amount of N_2O -N produced from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soils, kg N_2O -N yr^{-1}

F_{SN} = annual amount of synthetic fertiliser N applied to soils, kg N yr^{-1}

Frac_{GASF} = fraction of synthetic fertiliser N that volatilises as NH_3 and NO_x , kg N volatilised (kg of N applied)⁻¹ (Table 11.3)

F_{ON} = annual amount of managed animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to soils, kg N yr^{-1}

F_{PRP} = annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock, kg N yr^{-1}

Frac_{GASM} = fraction of applied organic N fertiliser materials (F_{ON}) and of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals (F_{PRP}) that volatilises as NH_3 and NO_x , kg N volatilised (kg of N applied or deposited)⁻¹ (Table 11.3)

EF_4 = emission factor for N_2O emissions from atmospheric deposition of N on soils and water surfaces, [kg N- N_2O (kg NH_3 -N + NO_x -N volatilised)⁻¹] (Table 11.3)


Conversion of $N_2O_{(ATD)}-N$ emissions to N_2O emissions for reporting purposes is performed by using the following equation:

$$N_2O_{(ATD)} = N_2O_{(ATD)}-N \bullet 44/28$$

¹⁸ Volatilisation and subsequent deposition of nitrogen from the manure in manure management systems is covered in the manure management section of this Volume.

¹⁹ Nitrogen from these components is only included in the leaching/run-off component of indirect N_2O emission.

Final Draft

571 **Figure 11.3** Decision tree for indirect N₂O emissions from managed soils

Note:

1: N sources include: synthetic N fertilizer, organic N additions, urine and dung depositions, crop residue, N mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of soil C on mineral soils as a result of land use change or management practices (crop residue and N mineralization/immobilization is only accounted for in the indirect N₂O emissions from leaching/runoff). Sewage sludge or other organic N additions can be included if sufficient information is available.

2: See Volume 1 Chapter 4, "Methodological Choice and Identification of Key Categories" (noting Section 4.1.2 on limited resources), for discussion of *key categories* and use of decision trees.

3: As a rule of thumb, a sub-source category would be significant if it accounts for 25-30% of emissions from the source category.

579 *Leaching/Runoff, N₂O_(L)*

The N₂O emissions from leaching and runoff in regions where leaching and runoff occurs are estimated using Equation 11.10:

EQUATION 11.10
N₂O FROM N LEACHING/RUNOFF FROM MANAGED SOILS IN REGIONS WHERE LEACHING/RUNOFF OCCURS (TIER 1)

$$N_2O_{(L)}-N = (F_{SN} + F_{ON} + F_{PRP} + F_{CR} + F_{SOM}) \bullet \text{Frac}_{LEACH-(H)} \bullet EF_5$$

Where:

N₂O_(L)-N = annual amount of N₂O-N produced from leaching and runoff of N additions to managed soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N₂O-N yr⁻¹

F_{SN} = annual amount of synthetic fertiliser N applied to soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{ON} = annual amount of managed animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{PRP} = annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N yr⁻¹ (from Equation 11.5)

F_{CR} = amount of N in crop residues (above- and below-ground), including N-fixing crops, and from forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils annually in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{SOM} = annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils associated with loss of soil C from soil organic matter as a result of changes to land use or management in regions where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N yr⁻¹ (from Equation 11.8)

Frac_{LEACH-(H)} = fraction of all N added to/mineralised in managed soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs that is lost through leaching and runoff, kg N (kg of N additions)⁻¹ (Table 11.3)

EF₅ = emission factor for N₂O emissions from N leaching and runoff, kg N₂O-N (kg N leached and runoff)⁻¹ (Table 11.3)

Note: If a country is able to estimate the quantity of N mineralised from organic soils, then include this as an additional input to Equation 11.10.

Conversion of N₂O_(L)-N emissions to N₂O emissions for reporting purposes is performed by using the following equation:

$$N_2O_{(L)} = N_2O_{(L)}-N \bullet 44/28$$

Tier 2

If more detailed emission, volatilisation or leaching factors are available to a country than are presented in Table 11.4, further disaggregation of the terms in the equations can also be undertaken. For example, if specific volatilisation factors are available for the application of synthetic fertilisers (F_{SN}) under different conditions *i*, Equation 11.9 would be expanded to become ²⁰:

EQUATION 11.11
N₂O FROM ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION OF N VOLATILISED FROM MANAGED SOILS (TIER 2)

$$N_2O_{(ATD)}-N = \left\{ \sum_i (F_{SN_i} \bullet \text{Frac}_{GASF_i}) + [(F_{ON} + F_{PRP}) \bullet \text{Frac}_{GASM}] \right\} \bullet EF_4$$

Where:

N₂O_(ATD)-N = annual amount of N₂O-N produced from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soils, kg N₂O-N yr⁻¹

F_{SN_i} = annual amount of synthetic fertiliser N applied to soils under different conditions *i*, kg N yr⁻¹

²⁰ It is important to note that Equation 11.11 is just one of many possible modifications to Equation 11.9, and is also meant to illustrate how Equation 11.10 could be modified, when using the Tier 2 method. The eventual form of Equation 11.11 will depend upon the availability of land use and/or condition-specific partitioning fractions and/or emission factors and the ability to which a country can disaggregate its activity data.

Final Draft

$\text{Frac}_{\text{GASF}_i}$ = fraction of synthetic fertiliser N that volatilises as NH_3 and NO_x under different conditions i , kg N volatilised (kg of N applied)⁻¹

F_{ON} = annual amount of managed animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to soils, kg N yr⁻¹

F_{PRP} = annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock, kg N yr⁻¹

$\text{Frac}_{\text{GASM}}$ = fraction of applied organic N fertiliser materials (F_{ON}) and of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals (F_{PRP}) that volatilises as NH_3 and NO_x , kg N volatilised (kg of N applied or deposited)⁻¹ (Table 11.3)

EF_4 = emission factor for N_2O emissions from atmospheric deposition of N on soils and water surfaces, [kg N– N_2O (kg NH_3 –N + NO_x –N volatilised)⁻¹] (Table 11.3)

Note: If a country is able to estimate the quantity of N mineralised from drainage/management of organic soils then include this as one of the N inputs into the Tier 2 modification of Equation 11.10. Countries can also develop emission factors for $\text{Frac}_{\text{GASF}}$ and $\text{Frac}_{\text{GASM}}$ that are specific for mitigation options such as the application of urease inhibitors.

Conversion of $\text{N}_2\text{O}_{(\text{ATD})}$ –N emissions to $\text{N}_2\text{O}_{(\text{ATD})}$ emissions for reporting purposes is performed by using the following equation:

$$\text{N}_2\text{O}_{(\text{ATD})} = \text{N}_2\text{O}_{(\text{ATD})}\text{--N} \cdot 44/28$$

Tier 3

Tier 3 methods are modelling or measurement approaches. Models are useful as they can relate the variables responsible for the emissions to the size of those emissions. These relationships may then be used to predict emissions from whole countries or regions for which experimental measurements are impracticable. For more information refer to Chapter 2, Section 2.5, where guidance is given that provides a sound scientific basis for the development of a Tier 3 Model-based Accounting System.

According to Equations 11.1, 11.10 and 11.11, direct and indirect emissions of N_2O from managed soils are calculated in the Tier 1 approach on the basis of total N applied to soils as synthetic and organic fertilisers and/or soil N mineralisation. As noted in Section 11.2.1.1, the processes of run-off of N, volatilization of NH_3 and NO_x , emissions of N_2O , and leaching of N, however, do not occur simultaneously but in a sequence, with the peak of run-off and NH_3 + NO_x volatilization happening before emissions of N_2O and losses of N through leaching. Refer to Section 11.2.1.1 for good practice guidance when implementing a Tier 3 approach and adopting the N-flow principle when estimating direct N_2O emissions and indirect N_2O emissions from leaching and runoff.

11.2.2.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION, VOLATILISATION AND LEACHING FACTORS

The method for estimating indirect N_2O emissions includes two emission factors: one associated with volatilised and re-deposited N (EF_4), and the second associated with N lost through leaching/runoff (EF_5). The method also requires values for the fractions of N that are lost through volatilisation ($\text{Frac}_{\text{GASF}}$ and $\text{Frac}_{\text{GASM}}$) or leaching/runoff ($\text{Frac}_{\text{LEACH-(H)}}$). The default values of all these factors are presented in Table 11.3.

Note that in the Tier 1 method, for wet climates or in dry climate regions where irrigation (other than drip irrigation) is used, the default $\text{Frac}_{\text{LEACH-(H)}}$ is 0.24. For dry climates, the default $\text{Frac}_{\text{LEACH-(H)}}$ is zero. The climate threshold for $\text{Frac}_{\text{LEACH-(H)}}$ can be refined at Tier 2 by countries that are able to disaggregate their activity data (see methodological suggestion in Table 11.3).

Country-specific values for EF_4 should be used with great caution because of the special complexity of transboundary atmospheric transport. Although inventory compilers may have specific measurements of N deposition and associated N_2O flux, in many cases the deposited N may not have originated in their country. Similarly, some of the N that volatilises in their country may be transported to and deposited in another country, where different conditions that affect the fraction emitted as N_2O may prevail. For these reasons the value of EF_4 is very difficult to determine, and the method presented in Volume 1, Chapter 7, Section 7.3 attributes all indirect N_2O emissions resulting from inputs to managed soils to the country of origin of the atmospheric NO_x and NH_3 , rather than the country to which the atmospheric N may have been transported.

11.2.2.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

In order to estimate indirect N₂O emissions from the various N additions to managed soils, the parameters F_{SN}, F_{ON}, F_{PRP}, F_{CR}, F_{SOM} need to be estimated.

Applied synthetic fertiliser (F_{SN})

The term F_{SN} refers to the annual amount of synthetic fertiliser N applied to soils. Refer to the activity data section on direct N₂O emissions from managed soils (Section 11.2.1.3) and obtain the value for F_{SN}.

Applied organic N fertilisers (F_{ON})

The term F_{ON} refers to the amount of organic N fertiliser materials intentionally applied to soils. Refer to the activity data section on direct N₂O emissions from managed soils (Section 11.2.1.3) and obtain the value for F_{ON}.

Urine and dung from grazing animals (F_{PRP})

The term F_{PRP} refers to the amount of N deposited on soil by animals grazing on pasture, range and paddock. Refer to the activity data section on direct N₂O emissions from managed soils (Section 11.2.1.3) and obtain the value for F_{PRP}.

Crop residue N, including N from N-fixing crops and forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils (F_{CR})

The term F_{CR} refers to the amount of N in crop residues (above- and below-ground), including N-fixing crops, returned to soils annually. It also includes the N from N-fixing and non-N-fixing forages mineralised during forage/pasture renewal. Refer to the activity data section on direct N₂O emissions from managed soils (Section 11.2.1.3) and obtain the value for F_{CR}.

TABLE 11.3 (UPDATED) DEFAULT EMISSION, VOLATILISATION AND LEACHING FACTORS FOR INDIRECT SOIL N ₂ O EMISSIONS					
Emission factor	Aggregated		Disaggregated		
	Default value	Uncertainty range	Disaggregation	Default value	Uncertainty range
EF ₄ [N volatilisation and re-deposition] ¹ , kg N ₂ O–N (kg NH ₃ –N + NO _x –N volatilised) ^{–1}	0.010	0.002 – 0.018	Wet climate	0.014	0.011 – 0.017
			Dry climate	0.005	0.000 – 0.011
EF ₅ [leaching/runoff] ² , kg N ₂ O–N (kg N leaching/runoff) ^{–1}	0.011	0.000 – 0.020	-	-	-
Frac _{GASF} [Volatilisation from synthetic fertiliser] ³ , (kg NH ₃ –N + NO _x –N) (kg N applied) ^{–1}	0.11	0.02 – 0.33	Urea	0.15	0.03 – 0.43
			Ammonium-based	0.08	0.02 – 0.30
			Nitrate-based	0.01	0.00 – 0.02
			Ammonium-nitrate-based	0.05	0.00 – 0.20
Frac _{GASM} [Volatilisation from all organic N fertilisers applied, and dung and urine deposited by grazing animals] ⁴ , (kg NH ₃ –N + NO _x –N) (kg N applied or deposited) ^{–1}	0.21	0.00 – 0.31	-	-	-
Frac _{LEACH-(H)} [N losses by leaching/runoff in wet climates] ⁵ , kg N (kg N additions or deposition by grazing animals) ^{–1}	0.24	0.01 – 0.73	-	-	-

Final Draft

Sources:

¹ Stehfest & Bouwman 2006; van Lent et al. 2015; Grace et al. 2016; van der Weerden et al. 2016; Albanito et al. 2017; Cayuela et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2017; Rochette et al. 2018.

² Tian et al. 2019.

³ NH₃: Bouwman et al. 2002; Pan et al. 2016. NO_x: Liu et al. 2017.

⁴ NH₃: Bouwman et al. 2002; Cai & Akiyama 2016. NO_x: Liu et al. 2017.

⁵ Reviews: Di & Cameron 2002; Cai & Akiyama 2016. Original papers: Moreno et al. 1996; Diez et al. 1997; Catt et al. 1998; Sogbedji et al. 2000; Asadi et al. 2002; Readman et al. 2002; Ren et al. 2003; Dauden & Quilez 2004; Dauden et al. 2004; Diez et al. 2004; Bakhsh et al. 2005; Basso & Ritchie 2005; Gehl et al. 2005; Fang et al. 2006; Li et al. 2006; Diez-Lopez et al. 2008; Conrad & Fohrer 2009; Zhu et al. 2009; Aronsson & Stenberg 2010; Bakhsh et al. 2010; Salmeron et al. 2010; Yague & Quilez 2010; Claret et al. 2011; Huang et al. 2011; Gallejones et al. 2012; Perego et al. 2012; Sorensen & Rubæk 2012; Tafteh & Sepaskhah 2012; Wang et al. 2012.

Notes:

Disaggregation by climate for EF₄ and Frac_{LEACH-(H)} (based on long-term averages): Wet climates occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration > 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation > 1000 mm. Dry climates occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration < 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation < 1000 mm (cf. Figure 3.A.5.1 in Chapter 3 of Vol. 4).

EF₄: The aggregated EF₄ is the same as the aggregated EF₁ (see Annex 11A.5). The disaggregated EF₄ are the same as the EF₁ disaggregated by wet and dry climates (see Table A2-1 in Annex 11A.2). Uncertainty range of the aggregated EF₄ is based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile of the dataset, uncertainty range of disaggregated EF₄ is based on the 95% confidence interval of fitted values (See methods and data in Annex 11A.2).

EF₅: This emission factor incorporates three components: EF₅ = EF_{5g} + EF_{5r} + EF_{5e}. EF_{5g}: Emission factor for groundwater and surface drainage, including upstream supersaturated with N₂O (N₂O emitted mainly from degassing of groundwater); EF_{5r}: Emission factor for rivers and reservoirs, including downstream (supersaturated N₂O was already degassed and N₂O mainly produced by nitrification/denitrification in situ); EF_{5e}: Emission factor for estuaries. See methods in Annex 11A.6. Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile.

Frac_{GASF}: Calculated by weighting world fertiliser usage with number of observations from review papers (See methods and data in Annex 11A.7). Uncertainty range based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile.

Frac_{GASM}: See methods in Annex 11A.8. Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile.

Frac_{LEACH-(H)}: The Frac_{LEACH-(H)} only applies to wet climates. For dry climate, the default Frac_{LEACH-(H)} is taken as zero. See methods in Annex 11A.9. Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile.

For Tier 2, country specific Frac_{LEACH-(H)} can be estimated for N losses by leaching/runoff for regions where $\Sigma(\text{rain}) - \Sigma(\text{ET}_0) > \text{soil water holding capacity}$, OR where irrigation (except drip irrigation) is used. $\text{ET}_0 = \text{Kpan} * \text{Ep}$, where ET₀: reference evapotranspiration, Kpan: pan evaporation coefficient, Ep: pan evaporation. When Kpan is not available, reference evaporation can be estimated as $\text{ET}_0 = 0.5 * \text{Ep}$ (Explanations of reference and pan evaporation: see Allen et al., 1998). Long-term mean of annual rainfall data should be used for estimating Frac_{LEACH-(H)}. Precipitation and potential evapotranspiration data are available from global datasets, such as the CRU climate dataset (<https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/hrg/>), if country-specific data are not available.

Mineralised N resulting from loss of soil organic C stocks in mineral soils (F_{SOM})

The term F_{SOM} refers to the amount of N mineralised from the loss of soil organic C in mineral soils through land-use change or management practices. Refer to the activity data section on direct N₂O emissions from managed soils (Section 11.2.1.3) and obtain the value for F_{SOM} .

11.2.2.4 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

No Refinement

11.2.3 Completeness, Time series, QA/QC

No refinement

11.3 CO₂ EMISSIONS FROM LIMING

No refinement

11.4 CO₂ EMISSIONS FROM UREA FERTILIZATION

No refinement

Final Draft

References

REFERENCES NEWLY CITED IN THE 2019 REFINEMENT

- Aguilera, E., Lassaletta, L., Sanz-Cobena, A., Garnier, J. & Vallejo, A. (2013) The potential of organic fertilizers and water management to reduce N₂O emissions in Mediterranean climate cropping systems. A review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **164**: 32-52.
- Akiyama, H., Yagi, K. & Yan, X. (2005) Direct N₂O emissions from rice paddy fields: Summary of available data. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **19**(1).
- Akiyama, H., Yan, X. & Yagi, K. (2010) Evaluation of effectiveness of enhanced-efficiency fertilizers as mitigation options for N₂O and NO emissions from agricultural soils: meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology* **16**(6): 1837-1846.
- Albanito, F., Lebender, U., Cornulier, T., Sapkota, T. B., Brentrup, F., Stirling, C. & Hillier, J. (2017) Direct nitrous oxide emissions from tropical and sub-tropical agricultural systems - A review and modelling of emission factors. *Scientific reports* 7:44235 | DOI: 10.1038/srep44235.
- Aronson, E. & Allison, S. (2012) Meta-analysis of environmental impacts on nitrous oxide release in response to N amendment. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 3.
- Aronsson, H. & Stenberg, M. (2010) Leaching of nitrogen from a 3-yr grain crop rotation on a clay soil. *Soil Use and Management* **26**(3): 274-285.
- Asadi, M., Clemente, R., Das Gupta, A., Loof, R. & Hansen, G. (2002) Impacts of fertigation via sprinkler irrigation on nitrate leaching and corn yield in an acid-sulphate soil in Thailand. *Agricultural Water Management* **52**(3): 197-213.
- Bakhsh, A., Kanwar, R. & Baker, J. (2010) N-Application Methods and Precipitation Pattern Effects on Subsurface Drainage Nitrate Losses and Crop Yields. *Water Air and Soil Pollution* **212**(1-4): 65-76.
- Bakhsh, A., Kanwar, R. & Karlen, D. (2005) Effects of liquid swine manure applications on NO₃-N leaching losses to subsurface drainage water from loamy soils in Iowa. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **109**(1-2): 118-128.
- Balvert, S. F., Luo, J. & Schipper, L. A. (2017) Do glucosinolate hydrolysis products reduce nitrous oxide emissions from urine affected soil? *Science of The Total Environment* **603**-604: 370-380.
- Basso, B. & Ritchie, J. (2005) Impact of compost, manure and inorganic fertilizer on nitrate leaching and yield for a 6-year maize-alfalfa rotation in Michigan. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **108**(4): 329-341.
- Bouwman, A. F., Boumans, L. J. M. & Batjes, N. H. (2002) Estimation of global NH₃ volatilization loss from synthetic fertilizers and animal manure applied to arable lands and grasslands. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **16**(2): 8-1.
- Bühlmann, T., Hiltbrunner, E., Korner, C., Rihm, B. & Achermann, B. (2015) Induction of indirect N₂O and NO emissions by atmospheric nitrogen deposition in (semi-)natural ecosystems in Switzerland. *Atmospheric Environment* **103**: 94-101.
- Byrnes, R. C., Nùñez, J., Arenas, L., Rao, I., Trujillo, C., Alvarez, C., Arango, J., Rasche, F. & Chirinda, N. (2017) Biological nitrification inhibition by *Brachiaria* grasses mitigates soil nitrous oxide emissions from bovine urine patches. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **107**: 156-163.
- Cai, Y. & Akiyama, H. (2016) Nitrogen loss factors of nitrogen trace gas emissions and leaching from excreta patches in grassland ecosystems: A summary of available data. *Science of The Total Environment* **572**: 185-195.
- Cardenas, L. M., Misselbrook, T. M., Hodgson, C., Donovan, N., Gilhespy, S., Smith, K. A., Dhanoa, M. S. & Chadwick, D. (2016) Effect of the application of cattle urine with or without the nitrification inhibitor DCD, and dung on greenhouse gas emissions from a UK grassland soil. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **235**: 229-241.
- Cardoso, A. D. S., Alves, B. J. R., Urquiaga, S. & Boddey, R. M. (2018) Effect of volume of urine and mass of faeces on N₂O and CH₄ emissions of dairy-cow excreta in a tropical pasture. *Animal Production Science* **58**(6): 1079-1086.

- 788 Catt, J., Howse, K., Christian, D., Lane, P., Harris, G. & Goss, M. (1998) Strategies to decrease nitrate leaching in
789 the Brimstone Farm Experiment, Oxfordshire, UK, 1988-93: the effect of straw incorporation. *Journal of*
790 *Agricultural Science* **131**: 309-319.
- 791 Cayuela, M. L., Aguilera, E., Sanz-Coben, a. A., Adams, D. C., Abalos, D., Barton, L., Ryals, R., Silver, W. L.,
792 Alfaro, M. A., Pappa, V. A., Smith, P., Garnier, J., Billen, G., Bouwman, L., Bondeau, A. & Lassaletta, L. (2017)
793 Direct nitrous oxide emissions in Mediterranean climate cropping systems: Emission factors based on a meta-
794 analysis of available measurement data. *Agric Ecosyst Environ.* **238**: 25-35.
- 795 Chadwick, D., Sommer, S., Thorman, R., Fanguiero, D., Cardenas, L., Amon, B. & Misselbrook, T. (2011) Manure
796 management: Implications for greenhouse gas emissions. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* **166-167**: 514-531.
- 797 Chadwick, D. R., Cardenas, L. M., Dhanoa, M. S., Donovan, N., Misselbrook, T., Williams, J. R., Thorman, R.
798 E., McGeough, K. L., Watson, C. J., Bell, M., Anthony, S. G. & Rees, R. M. (2018) The contribution of cattle
799 urine and dung to nitrous oxide emissions: Quantification of country specific emission factors and implications
800 for national inventories. *Science of The Total Environment* **635**: 607-617.
- 801 Claret, M., Urrutia, R., Ortega, R., Best, S. & Valderrama, N. (2011) Quantifying nitrate leaching in irrigated
802 wheat with different nitrogen fertilization strategies in an Alfisol. *Chilean Journal of Agricultural Research* **71**(1):
803 148-156.
- 804 Conrad, Y. & Fohrer, N. (2009) Modelling of nitrogen leaching under a complex winter wheat and red clover crop
805 rotation in a drained agricultural field. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth* **34**(8-9): 530-540.
- 806 Dauden, A. & Quilez, D. (2004) Pig slurry versus mineral fertilization on corn yield and nitrate leaching in a
807 Mediterranean irrigated environment. *European Journal of Agronomy* **21**(1): 7-19.
- 808 Dauden, A., Quilez, D. & Vera, M. (2004) Pig slurry application and irrigation effects on nitrate leaching in
809 Mediterranean soil lysimeters. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **33**(6): 2290-2295.
- 810 de Klein, C. A. M., Barton, L., Sherlock, R. R., Li, Z. & Littlejohn, R. P. (2003) Estimating a nitrous oxide emission
811 factor for animal urine from some *New Zealand pastoral soils*. **41**(3): 381-399.
- 812 de Vries, W., Kros, J., Reinds, G. & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2011) Quantifying impacts of nitrogen use in European
813 agriculture on global warming potential. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **3**(5): 291-302.
- 814 Di, H. J., Cameron, K. C., Podolyan, A., Edwards, G. R., de Klein, C. A. M., Dynes, R. & Woods, R. (2016) The
815 potential of using alternative pastures, forage crops and gibberellic acid to mitigate nitrous oxide emissions.
816 *Journal of Soils and Sediments* **16**(9): 2252-2262.
- 817 Diez, J., Hernaiz, P., Munoz, M., de la Torre, A. & Vallejo, A. (2004) Impact of pig slurry on soil properties, water
818 salinization, nitrate leaching and crop yield in a four-year experiment in Central Spain. *Soil Use and Management*
819 **20**(4): 444-450.
- 820 Diez, J., Roman, R., Caballero, R. & Caballero, A. (1997) Nitrate leaching from soils under a maize-wheat-maize
821 sequence, two irrigation schedules and three types of fertilisers. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **65**(3):
822 189-199.
- 823 Diez-Lopez, J., Hernaiz-Algarra, P., Arauzo-Sanchez, M. & Carrasco-Martin, I. (2008) Effect of a nitrification
824 inhibitor (DMPP) on nitrate leaching and maize yield during two growing seasons. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural*
825 *Research* **6**(2): 294-303.
- 826 European Environment Agency. (2016) EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2016. Technical
827 guidance to prepare national emission inventories. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- 828 Fang, Q., Yu, Q., Wang, E., Chen, Y., Zhang, G., Wang, J. & Li, L. (2006) Soil nitrate accumulation, leaching and
829 crop nitrogen use as influenced by fertilization and irrigation in an intensive wheat-maize double cropping system
830 in the North China Plain. *Plant and Soil* **284**(1-2): 335-350.
- 831 Flechard, C. R., Ambus, P., Skiba, U. M., Rees, R. M., Hensen, A., van Amstel, A., Pol-van Dasselaar, A. V.,
832 Soussana, J. F., Jones, M., Clifton-Brown, J., Raschi, A., Horvath, L., Neftel, A., Jocher, M., Ammann, C., Leifeld,
833 J., Fuhrer, J., Calanca, P., Thalman, E., Pilegaard, K., Di Marco, C., Campbell, C., Nemitz, E., Hargreaves, K. J.,
834 Levy, P. E., Ball, B. C., Jones, S. K., van de Bulk, W. C. M., Groot, T., Blom, M., Domingues, R., Kasper, G.,
835 Allard, V., Ceschia, E., Cellier, P., Laville, P., Henault, C., Bizouard, F., Abdalla, M., Williams, M., Baronti, S.,
836 Berretti, F. & Grosz, B. (2007) Effects of climate and management intensity on nitrous oxide emissions in
837 grassland systems across Europe. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* **121**: 135-152.

Final Draft

- 838 Forrester, P. J., Krol, D. J., Lanigan, G. J., Jahangir, M. M. R. & Richards, K. G. (2017) An evaluation of urine
839 patch simulation methods for nitrous oxide emission measurement. *Journal of Agricultural Science* **155**(5): 725-
840 732.
- 841 Galbally, I., Meyer, M., Bentley, S., Weeks, I., Leuning, R., Kelly, K., Phillips, F., Barker-Reid, F., Gates, W.,
842 Baigent, R., Eckard, R. & Grace, P. (2005) A study of environmental and management drivers of non-CO₂
843 greenhouse gas emissions in Australian agro-ecosystems. *Environmental Sciences* **2**(2-3): 133-142.
- 844 Gallejones, P., Castellon, A., del Prado, A., Unamunzaga, O. & Aizpurua, A. (2012) Nitrogen and sulphur
845 fertilization effect on leaching losses, nutrient balance and plant quality in a wheat-rapeseed rotation under a humid
846 Mediterranean climate. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **93**(3): 337-355.
- 847 Gehl, R., Schmidt, J., Stone, L., Schlegel, A. & Clark, G. (2005) In situ measurements of nitrate leaching implicate
848 poor nitrogen and irrigation management on sandy soils. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **34**(6): 2243-2254.
- 849 Gerber, J. S., Carlson, K. M., Makowski, D., Mueller, N. D., Garcia de Cortazar-Atauri, I., Havlík, P., Herrero,
850 M., Launay, M., O'Connell, C. S., Smith, P. & West, P. C. (2016) Spatially explicit estimates of N₂O emissions
851 from croplands suggest climate mitigation opportunities from improved fertilizer management. *Global Change*
852 *Biology* **22**(10): 3383-3394.
- 853 Gilsanz, C., Baez, D., Misselbrook, T. H., Dhanoa, M. S. & Cardenas, L. M. (2016) Development of emission
854 factors and efficiency of two nitrification inhibitors, DCD and DMPP. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **216**: 1-8.
- 855 Grace, P., Shcherbak, I., Macdonald, B., Scheer, C. & Rowlings, D. (2016) Emission factors for estimating
856 fertiliser-induced nitrous oxide emissions from clay soils in Australia's irrigated cotton industry. *Soil Research*
857 **54**(5): 598-603.
- 858 Graham, R., Wortman, S. & Pittelkow, C. (2017) Comparison of Organic and Integrated Nutrient Management
859 Strategies for Reducing Soil N₂O Emissions. *Sustainability* **9**(4): 510.
- 860 Hoogendoorn, C. J., Luo, J., Lloyd-West, C. M., Devantier, B. P., Lindsey, S. B., Sun, S., Pacheco, D., Li, Y.,
861 Theobald, P. W. & Judge, A. (2016) Nitrous oxide emission factors for urine from sheep and cattle fed forage rape
862 (*Brassica napus* L.) or perennial ryegrass/white clover pasture (*Lolium perenne* L./*Trifolium repens*). *Agriculture,*
863 *Ecosystems and Environment* **227**: 11-23.
- 864 Huang, M., Liang, T., Ou-Yang, Z., Wang, L., Zhang, C. & Zhou, C. (2011) Leaching losses of nitrate nitrogen
865 and dissolved organic nitrogen from a yearly two crops system, wheat-maize, under monsoon situations. *Nutrient*
866 *Cycling in Agroecosystems* **91**(1): 77-89.
- 867 Hyde, B. P., Forrester, P. J., Jahangir, M. M. R., Ryan, M., Fanning, A. F., Carton, O. T., Lanigan, G. J. & Richards,
868 K. G. (2016) The interactive effects of fertiliser nitrogen with dung and urine on nitrous oxide emissions in
869 grassland. *Irish Journal of Agricultural and Food Research* **55**(1): 1-9.
- 870 Kelliher, F. M., Cox, N., Van Der Weerden, T. J., De Klein, C. A. M., Luo, J., Cameron, K. C., Di, H. J., Giltrap,
871 D. & Rys, G. (2014) Statistical analysis of nitrous oxide emission factors from pastoral agriculture field trials
872 conducted in New Zealand. *Environmental Pollution* **186**: 63-66.
- 873 Krol, D. J., Carolan, R., Minet, E., McGeough, K. L., Watson, C. J., Forrester, P. J., Lanigan, G. J. & Richards, K.
874 G. (2016) Improving and disaggregating N₂O emission factors for ruminant excreta on temperate pasture soils.
875 *Science of The Total Environment* **568**: 327-338.
- 876 Krol, D. J., Carolan, R., Minet, E., McGeough, K. L., Watson, C. J., Forrester, P. J., Lanigan, G. J. & Richards, K.
877 G. (2016) Improving and disaggregating N₂O emission factors for ruminant excreta on temperate pasture soils.
878 *Science of The Total Environment* **568**: 327-338.
- 879 Li, C., Farahbakhshazad, N., Jaynes, D., Dinnes, D., Salas, W. & McLaughlin, D. (2006) Modeling nitrate leaching
880 with a biogeochemical model modified based on observations in a row-crop field in Iowa. *Ecological Modelling*
881 **196**(1-2): 116-130.
- 882 Li, C., Farahbakhshazad, N., Jaynes, D., Dinnes, D., Salas, W. & McLaughlin, D. (2006) Modeling nitrate leaching
883 with a biogeochemical model modified based on observations in a row-crop field in Iowa. *Ecological Modelling*
884 **196**(1-2): 116-130.
- 885 Li, J., Luo, J., Shi, Y., Li, Y., Ma, Y., Ledgard, S., Wang, L., Houlbrooke, D., Bo, L. & Lindsey, S. (2016) Dung
886 and farm dairy effluent affect urine patch nitrous oxide emissions from a pasture. *Animal Production Science*
887 **56**(3): 337-342.

- 888 Liebig, M. A., Kronberg, S. L. & Gross, J. R. (2008) Effects of normal and altered cattle urine on short-term
889 greenhouse gas flux from mixed-grass prairie in the Northern Great plains. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment*
890 **125**(1-4): 57-64.
- 891 Liu, L. & Greaver, T. (2009) A review of nitrogen enrichment effects on three biogenic GHGs: the CO₂ sink may
892 be largely offset by stimulated N₂O and CH₄ emission. *Ecology Letters* **12**(10): 1103-1117.
- 893 Liu, S., Lin, F., Wu, S., Ji, C., Sun, Y., Jin, Y., Li, S., Li, Z. & Zou, J. (2017) A meta-analysis of fertilizer-induced
894 soil NO and combined NO+N₂O emissions. *Global Change Biology* **23**(6): 2520-2532.
- 895 Luo, J., Ledgard, S., Wise, B. & Lindsey, S. (2016) Effect of dicyandiamide (DCD) on nitrous oxide emissions
896 from cow urine deposited on a pasture soil, as influenced by DCD application method and rate. *Animal Production*
897 *Science* **56**(3): 350-354.
- 898 Marsden, K. A., Jones, D. L. & Chadwick, D. R. (2016) Disentangling the effect of sheep urine patch size and
899 nitrogen loading rate on cumulative N₂O emissions. *Animal Production Science* **56**(3): 265-275.
- 900 Marsden, K. A., Jones, D. L. & Chadwick, D. R. (2017) DMPP is ineffective at mitigating N₂O emissions from
901 sheep urine patches in a UK grassland under summer conditions. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **246**:
902 1-11.
- 903 Misselbrook, T., Fleming, H., Camp, V., Umstatter, C., Duthie, C. A., Nicoll, L. & Waterhouse, T. (2016)
904 Automated monitoring of urination events from grazing cattle. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **230**:
905 191-198.
- 906 Moreno, F., Cayuela, J., Fernandez, J., FernandezBoy, E., Murillo, J. & Cabrera, F. (1996) Water balance and
907 nitrate leaching in an irrigated maize crop in SW Spain. *Agricultural Water Management* **32**(1): 71-83.
- 908 MPI. (2014) Partitioning of animal excreta N into urine and dung and developing the N₂O inventory. In: MPI
909 Technical Paper, p. 26. Wellington, NZ: Ministry for Primary Industries.
- 910 Nichols, K. L., Del Grosso, S. J., Derner, J. D., Follett, R. F., Archibeque, S. L., Delgado, J. A. & Paustian, K. H.
911 (2018) Nitrous oxide and ammonia emissions from cattle excreta on shortgrass steppe. *Journal of Environmental*
912 *Quality* **47**(3): 419-426.
- 913 Nichols, K. L., Del Grosso, S. J., Derner, J. D., Follett, R. F., Archibeque, S. L., Stewart, C. E. & Paustian, K. H.
914 (2016) Nitrous oxide and methane fluxes from cattle excrement on C3 pasture and C4-dominated shortgrass steppe.
915 *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **225**: 104-115.
- 916 O'Connor, P. J., Minogue, D., Lewis, E., Lynch, M. B. & Hennessy, D. (2016) Applying urine collected from non-
917 lactating dairy cows dosed with dicyandiamide to lysimeters and grass plots: Effects on nitrous oxide emissions,
918 nitrate leaching and herbage production. *Journal of Agricultural Science* **154**(4): 674-688.
- 919 Owens, J., Clough, T. J., Laubach, J., Hunt, J. E. & Venterea, R. T. (2017) Nitrous oxide fluxes and soil oxygen
920 dynamics of soil treated with cow urine. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **81**(2): 289-298.
- 921 Owens, J., Clough, T. J., Laubach, J., Hunt, J. E., Venterea, R. T. & Phillips, R. L. (2016) Nitrous oxide fluxes,
922 soil oxygen, and denitrification potential of urine- and non-urine-treated soil under different irrigation frequencies.
923 *Journal of Environmental Quality* **45**(4): 1169-1177.
- 924 Pan, B., Lam, S. K., Mosier, A., Luo, Y. & Chen, D. (2016) Ammonia volatilization from synthetic fertilizers and
925 its mitigation strategies: A global synthesis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **232**(Supplement C): 283-
926 289.
- 927 Pelster, D. E., Gisore, B., Koske, J. K., Goopy, J., Korir, D., Rufino, M. C. & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2016) Methane
928 and nitrous oxide emissions from cattle excreta on an East African grassland. *Journal of Environmental Quality*
929 **45**(5): 1531-1539.
- 930 Perego, A., Basile, A., Bonfante, A., De Mascellis, R., Terribile, F., Brenna, S. & Acutis, M. (2012) Nitrate
931 leaching under maize cropping systems in Po Valley (Italy). *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **147**: 57-65.
- 932 Readman, R., Beckwith, C. & Kettlewell, P. (2002) Effects of spray application of urea fertilizer at stem extension
933 on winter wheat: N recovery and nitrate leaching. *Journal of Agricultural Science* **139**: 11-25.
- 934 Ren, L., Ma, J. & Zhang, R. (2003) Estimating nitrate leaching with a transfer function model incorporating net
935 mineralization and uptake of nitrogen. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **32**(4): 1455-1463.

Final Draft

- 936 Rochette, P., Liang, B. C., Pelster, D., Bergeron, O., Lemke, R., Kroebel, R., MacDonald, D., Yan, W. &
937 Flemming, C. (2018) Soil nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural soils in Canada: exploring relationships with
938 soil, crop and climatic variables. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **254**: 69-81.
- 939 Ruser, R. & Schulz, R. (2015) The Effect of Nitrification Inhibitors on the Nitrous Oxide (N₂O) Release from
940 Agricultural Soils-A Review. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* **178**: 171-188.
- 941 Salmeron, M., Caverro, J., Quilez, D. & Isla, R. (2010) Winter Cover Crops Affect Monoculture Maize Yield and
942 Nitrogen Leaching under Irrigated Mediterranean Conditions. *Agronomy Journal* **102**(6): 1700-1709.
- 943 Shcherbak, I., Millar, N. & Robertson, G. P. (2014) A global meta-analysis of the nonlinear response of soil nitrous
944 oxide (N₂O) emissions to fertilizer nitrogen. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **111**: 9199-9204.
- 945 Sogbedji, J., van Es, H., Yang, C., Geohring, L. & Magdoff, F. (2000) Nitrate leaching and nitrogen budget as
946 affected by maize nitrogen rate and soil type. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **29**(6): 1813-1820.
- 947 Sorensen, P. & Rubaek, G. (2012) Leaching of nitrate and phosphorus after autumn and spring application of
948 separated solid animal manures to winter wheat. *Soil Use and Management* **28**(1): 1-11.
- 949 Stehfest, E. & Bouwman, L. (2006) N₂O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural
950 vegetation: summarizing available measurement data and modeling of global annual emissions. *Nutrient Cycling*
951 *in Agroecosystems* **74**: 207-228.
- 952 Tafteh, A. & Sepaskhah, A. (2012) Yield and nitrogen leaching in maize field under different nitrogen rates and
953 partial root drying irrigation. *International Journal of Plant Production* **6**(1): 93-113.
- 954 Thomas, B. W., Gao, X., Beck, R. & Hao, X. (2017) Are distinct nitrous oxide emission factors required for cattle
955 urine and dung deposited on pasture in western Canada? *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **24**(33):
956 26142-26147.
- 957 Thomas, B. W., Stoeckli, J. L., Beck, R., Liu, K., Koenig, K. M., Beres, B. L., Hao, X. & Gao, X. (2017) Nitrapyrin
958 reduced nitrous oxide emissions from beef cattle urine patches on a semiarid tame pasture. *Soil Science Society of*
959 *America Journal* **81**(6): 1537-1547.
- 960 Tian, L., Cai, Y. & Akiyama, H. (2019) A review of indirect N₂O emission factors from agricultural nitrogen
961 leaching and runoff to update of the default IPCC values. *Environmental Pollution* **245**: 300-306.
- 962 Tully, K. L., Abwanda, S., Thiong'o, M., Mutuo, P. M. & Rosenstock, T. S. (2017) Nitrous oxide and methane
963 fluxes from urine and dung deposited on Kenyan pastures. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **46**(4): 921-929.
- 964 van der Gon, H. & Bleeker, A. (2005) Indirect N₂O emission due to atmospheric N deposition for the Netherlands.
965 *Atmospheric Environment* **39**(32): 5827-5838.
- 966 van der Weerden, T., Cox, N., Luo, J., Di, H. J., Podolyan, A., Phillips, R., Saggar, S., De Klein, C., Ettema, P. &
967 Rys, G. (2016) Refining the New Zealand nitrous oxide emission factor for urea fertiliser and farm dairy effluent.
- 968 van der Weerden, T. J., Manderson, A., Kelliher, F. M. & de Klein, C. A. M. (2014) Spatial and temporal nitrous
969 oxide emissions from dairy cattle urine deposited onto grazed pastures across New Zealand based on soil water
970 balance modelling. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **189**: 92-100.
- 971 van der Weerden, T. J., Styles, T. M., Rutherford, A. J., de Klein, C. A. M. & Dynes, R. (2017) Nitrous oxide
972 emissions from cattle urine deposited onto soil supporting a winter forage kale crop. *New Zealand Journal of*
973 *Agricultural Research* **60**(2): 119-130.
- 974 van der Weerden, T. J., Styles, T. M., Rutherford, A. J., de Klein, C. A. M. & Dynes, R. (2017) Nitrous oxide
975 emissions from cattle urine deposited onto soil supporting a winter forage kale crop. *New Zealand Journal of*
976 *Agricultural Research* **60**(2): 119-130.
- 977 van Groenigen, J. W., Velthof, G. L., Oenema, O., Van Groenigen, K. J. & Van Kessel, C. (2010) Towards an
978 agronomic assessment of N₂O emissions: A case study for arable crops. *Eur J Soil Sci* **61** 903-913.
- 979 van Lent, J., Hergoualc'h, K. & Verchot, L. V. (2015) Soil N₂O and NO emissions from land use and land-use
980 change in the tropics and subtropics: a meta-analysis. *Biogeosciences* **12**: 7299-7313.
- 981 Wagner-Riddle, C., Congreves, K. A., Abalos, D., Berg, A. A., Brown, S. E., Ambadan, J. T., Gao, X. & Tenuta,
982 M. (2017) Globally important nitrous oxide emissions from croplands induced by freeze-thaw cycles. *Nat Geosci*
983 **10**: 279-286.

- Wang, T., Zhu, B. & Kuang, F. (2012) Reducing interflow nitrogen loss from hillslope cropland in a purple soil hilly region in southwestern China. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **93**(3): 285-295.
- Ward, G. N., Kelly, K. B. & Hollier, J. W. (2018) Greenhouse gas emissions from dung, urine and dairy pond sludge applied to pasture. 1. Nitrous oxide emissions. *Animal Production Science* **58**(6): 1087-1093.
- Yague, M. & Quilez, D. (2010) Response of Maize Yield, Nitrate Leaching, and Soil Nitrogen to Pig Slurry Combined with Mineral Nitrogen. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **39**(2): 686-696.
- Yamulki, S., Jarvis, S. C. & Owen, P. (1998) Nitrous oxide emissions from excreta applied in a simulated grazing pattern. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **30**(4): 491-500.
- Zhu, B., Wang, T., Kuang, F., Luo, Z., Tang, J. & Xu, T. (2009) Measurements of Nitrate Leaching from a Hillslope Cropland in the Central Sichuan Basin, China. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **73**(4): 1419-1426.

REFERENCES COPIED FROM THE 2006 GUIDELINES

- Aitkenhead-Peterson, J.A., Alexander, J.E. and Clair, T.A. (2005). Dissolved organic carbon and dissolved organic nitrogen export from forested watersheds in Nova Scotia: Identifying controlling factors. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, **19**, GB4016, doi:10.1029/2004GB002438.
- Akiyama, H., Yagi, K. and Yan, X. (2005). Direct N₂O emission from rice paddy fields: Summary of available data. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*, **19**(1), art. no. GB1005.
- Alm, J., Saarnio, S., Nykanen, H., Silvola, J. and Martikainen, P.J. (1999). Winter CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O fluxes on some natural and drained boreal peatlands. *Biogeochem.* **44**, 163-186.
- Bouwman, A.F. (1996). Direct emissions of nitrous oxide from agricultural soils. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.*, **46**, 53-70.
- Bouwman, A.F., Boumans, L.J.M. and Batjes, N.H. (2002a). Emissions of N₂O and NO from fertilised fields: Summary of available measurement data. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*, **16**(4), art. no. 1058.
- Bouwman, A.F., Boumans, L.J.M. and Batjes, N.H. (2002b). Modeling global annual N₂O and NO emissions from fertilised fields. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*, **16**(4), art. no. 1080.
- Brumme, R., Borken, W. and Finke, S. (1999). Hierarchical control on nitrous oxide emission in forest ecosystems. *Global Biochem. Cycles* **13**, 1137-1148.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Gasche, R., Breuer, L. And Papen, H. (1997). Fluxes of NO and N₂O from temperate forest soils: impact of forest type, N deposition and of liming on the NO and N₂O emissions. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.* **48**, 79-90.
- Clough, T., Bertram, J.E., Sherlock, R.R., Leonard, R.L. and Nowicki, B.L. (2006). Comparison of measured and EF5-r-derived N₂O fluxes from a spring-fed river. *Glob. Change Biol.* **12**, 477-488.
- Corre, M.D., Pennock, D.J., van Kessel, C., and Elliott, D.K. (1999). Estimation of annual nitrous oxide emissions from a transitional grassland-forest region in Saskatchewan, Canada. *Biogeochem.* **44**, 29-49.
- Davies, M.G., Smith, K.A. and Vinten, A.J.A. (2001). The mineralisation and fate of N following ploughing of grass and grass-clover swards. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, **33**, 423-434.
- de Klein, C.A.M. (2004). Review of the N₂O emission factor for excreta deposited by grazing animals (EF_{3PRP}). Paper prepared as part of the 2006 Revised Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Inventories of IPCC.
- Denier van der Gon, H. and Bleeker, A. (2005). Indirect N₂O emission due to atmospheric N deposition for the Netherlands. *Atmos. Environ.* **39**, 5827-5838.
- Dong, L.F., Nedwell, D.B., Colbeck, I. and Finch, J. (2004). Nitrous oxide emission from some English and Welsh rivers and estuaries. *Water Air Soil Pollution: Focus* **4**, 127-134.
- FAO (1998). World Reference Base for Soil Resources. World Soil Resources Reports 84. FAO, Rome. 88pp. (ISBN 92-5-104141-5).
- Garten, C.T., Cooper, L.W., Post, W.M. and Hanson, P.J. (2000). Climate controls on forest soil C isotope ratios in the southern Appalachian mountains. *Ecology*, **81**, 1108-1119.
- Hiscock, K.M., Bateman, A.S., Fukada, T. and Dennis, P.F. (2002). The concentration and distribution of groundwater N₂O in the Chalk aquifer of eastern England. In: Van Ham, J., Baede, A.P.M., Guicherit, R. and

Final Draft

- 1033 Williams-Jacobse, J.G.F.M. (eds.), Proc. 3rd Internat. Symp. Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases, Maastricht, The
1034 Netherlands, 185-190.
- 1035 Hiscock, K.M., Bateman, A.S., Muhlerr, I.H., Fukada, T. and Dennis, P.F. (2003). Indirect emissions of nitrous
1036 oxide from regional aquifers in the United Kingdom. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **37**, 3507-3512.
- 1037 IPCC (1997). Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Inventories. Houghton J.T., Meira Filho
1038 L.G., Lim B., Tréanton K., Mamaty I., Bonduki Y., Griggs D.J. Callander B.A. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on
1039 Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/OECD/IEA, Paris, France.
- 1040 IPCC (2000). Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.
1041 Penman J., Kruger D., Galbally I., Hiraishi T., Nyenzi B., Emmanuel S., Buendia L., Hoppaus R., Martinsen T.,
1042 Meijer J., Miwa K., Tanabe K. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),
1043 IPCC/OECD/IEA/IGES, Hayama, Japan.
- 1044 IPCC (2003). Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. Penman J., Gytarsky M.,
1045 Hiraishi T., Krug, T., Kruger D., Pipatti R., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T., Tanabe K., Wagner F.
1046 (Eds).Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/IGES, Hayama, Japan.
- 1047 John, B., Yamashita, T., Ludwig, B. and Flessa, H. (2005). Storage of organic carbon in aggregate and density
1048 fractions of silty soils under different types of land use. *Geoderma*, **128**, 63-79.
- 1049 Klemetsson, L., Kasimir Klemetsson, A., Escala, M. and Kulmala, A. (1999). Inventory of N₂O emission from
1050 farmed European peatlands. In: Freibauer, A. and Kaltschmitt, M. (eds.), Approaches to Greenhouse Gas
1051 Inventories of Biogenic Sources in Agriculture, Proc. Workshop at Lökeberg, Sweden, 9-10 July 1998, pp. 79-91.
- 1052 Klemetsson, L., Weslien, P., Arnold, K., Agren, G., Nilsson, M. and Hanell, B. (2002). Greenhouse gas
1053 emissions from drained forests in Sweden. In: Olsson M. (ed.) Land-use strategies for reckoning net greenhouse
1054 gas emissions. Mistra Programme: Progress report 1999 – 2002. Swedish Univ. Agric. Sciences, Uppsala: pp. 44-
1055 67.
- 1056 Lobe, I., Amelung, W. and Du Preez, C.C. (2001). Losses of carbon and nitrogen with prolonged arable cropping
1057 from sandy soils of the South African Highveld. *European Journal of Soil Science*, **52**, 93-101.
- 1058 Laine, J., Silvola, J., Tolonen, K., Alm, J., Nykanen, H., Vasander, H., Sallantausta, T., Savolainen, I., Sinisalo, J.,
1059 and Martikainen, P.J. (1996). Effect of water-level drawdown on global climatic warming – northern peatlands.
1060 *Ambio* **25**, 179-184.
- 1061 Martikainen, P.J., Nykanen, H., Alm, J., and Silvola, J. (1995). Change in fluxes of carbon dioxide, methane and
1062 nitrous oxide due to forest drainage of mire sites of different trophy. *Plant Soil* **169**, 571-577.
- 1063 Minkinen, K., Korhonen, K., Savolainen, I. and Laine, J. (2002). Carbon balance and radiative forcing of Finnish
1064 peatlands 1900-2100: the impact of forestry drainage. *Glob. Change Biol.* **8**, 785-799.
- 1065 Novoa, R. and Tejeda, H.R. (2006) Evaluation of the N₂O emissions from N in plant residues as affected by
1066 environmental and management factors. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.* **1-3**, 29-46.
- 1067 Reay, D.S., Smith, K.A. and Edwards A.C. (2004). Nitrous oxide in agricultural drainage waters following field
1068 fertilisation. *Water Air Soil Pollution: Focus*, **4**, 437-451.
- 1069 Reay, D., Smith, K.A., Edwards, A.C., Hiscock, K.M., Dong, L.F. and Nedwell, D. (2005). Indirect nitrous oxide
1070 emissions: revised emission factors. *Environ. Sciences*, **2**, 153-158.
- 1071 Regina, K., Nykänen, H., Silvola, J. and Martikainen, P.J. (1996). Nitrous oxide production in boreal peatlands of
1072 different hydrology and nutrient status. In: Northern peatlands in global climatic change. Proc. Internat. Workshop,
1073 Academy of Finland, Hyytiälä: pp. 158-166.
- 1074 Robertson, G.P. and Grace, P.R. (2004). Greenhouse gas fluxes in tropical and temperate agriculture: the need for
1075 a full-cost accounting of global warming potentials. *Environ. Develop. Sustain.* **6**, 51-63.
- 1076 Rochette, P. and Janzen, H.H. (2005). Towards a revised coefficient for estimating N₂O emissions from legumes.
1077 *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.*, **73**, 171-179.
- 1078 Snowdon, P., Ryan, P. and Raison, J. (2005). Review of C:N ratios in vegetation, litter and soil under Australian
1079 native forests and plantations. *National Carbon Accounting System Technical Report No. 45*, Australian
1080 Greenhouse Office, Canberra.
- 1081 Sawamoto, T., Nakajima, Y., Kasuya, M., Tsuruta, H. and Yagi, K. (2005). Evaluation of emission factors for
1082 indirect N₂O emission due to nitrogen leaching in agro-ecosystems. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **32**(3),
1083 doi:10.1029/2004GL021625.

- 1084 Smith, K.A. and Conen, F. (2004). Impacts of land management on fluxes of trace greenhouse gases. *Soil Use*
1085 *Manage.*, **20**, 255-263.
- 1086 Stehfest, E. and Bouwman, L. (2006). N₂O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural
1087 vegetation: summarizing available measurement data and modeling of global annual emissions. *Nutr. Cycl.*
1088 *Agroecosyst.* **74**, 207-228.
- 1089 van der Weerden, T.J., Sherlock, R.R., Williams, P.H. and Cameron, K.C. (1999). Nitrous oxide emissions and
1090 methane oxidation by soil following cultivation of two different leguminous pastures. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, **30**, 52-
1091 60.
- 1092 West, T.O. and McBride, A.C. (2005). The contribution of agricultural lime to carbon dioxide emission in the
1093 United States: dissolution, transport, and net emissions. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **108**, 145-154.
- 1094

Final Draft

1095 **Annex 11A.1** **References for crop residue data in Table 11.2**

1096 *No Refinement*

Annex 11A.2 Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF₁

Material and methods

We extracted all studies from the databases by Stehfest & Bouwman (2006), van Lent et al. (2015), Grace et al. (2016), van der Weerden et al. (2016), Albanito et al. (2017), Cayuela et al. (2017), Liu et al. (2017), and Rochette et al. (2018) and excluded studies which:

- Were non-peer-reviewed publications,
- Were conducted in the laboratory and greenhouse, and modelling studies (only field studies were selected),
- Were conducted in flooded rice fields (emissions from N inputs in flooded rice are estimated using the EF_{1FR}),
- Related to grazed soils where urine and/or dung were applied (emissions from urine/dung inputs in grazed soils are estimated using the EF_{3PRP}),
- Related to enhanced synthetic or organic fertiliser either treated with inhibitors or coated, and
- Were conducted on drained organic soils.

We further selected the cases from the source databases for which an emission factor had been or could be computed using a control site as:

$$EF_{1i} = \frac{N_2O_{Ti} - N_2O_{Ci}}{N_i}$$

Where N_2O_{Ti} is the N₂O flux during the experimental period due to the application of inputs N_i and other unquantified sources of N; and N_2O_{Ci} is the N₂O flux during the experimental period at a control site due to other sources of N than N_i.

Climate (Temperate/Boreal Wet, Temperate/Boreal, Dry Tropical Wet, Tropical Dry) was assigned to most cases. Temperate, boreal and tropical zones correspond to those defined in Chapter 3 of Vol. 4 in the 2006 IPCC guidelines. Wet climates occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration > 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation > 1000 mm. Dry climates occur in temperate and boreal zones where the ratio of annual precipitation: potential evapotranspiration < 1, and tropical zones where annual precipitation < 1000 mm. Climates were also grouped at a lower level of disaggregation by distinguishing dry climates from wet climates. Fertiliser was categorised as synthetic, organic or a mix of synthetic and organic forms. At a less disaggregated level, fertiliser comprised two groups: organic and synthetic plus mixed forms of fertiliser.

The linear mixed-effect model approach was selected for developing the disaggregated emission factors to account for lack of independence among data from individual sites compared to data from different sites. A location identification was assigned to all individual cases from experimental sites. Cases either with an identical coordinate or being from a same reference with a same soil type and a same land use were considered a unique location. The models included location identification as a random-effect, and climate, fertiliser or their interaction as fixed-effects. Influence of the length of the experiment, of the N application rate as well as influence of irrigation in dry climates was evaluated by considering these 3 variables as fixed-effects. The length of the experiment (days) was categorized into 5 classes as: ≤ 120, (120; 180], (180; 240], (240; 300], and > 300. The N application rate (kg N ha⁻¹ period⁻¹) was categorized following the 6 classes: (0; 100], (100; 200], (200; 300], (300; 500], (500; 700], and > 700. Irrigation was categorized as yes or no.

Means for the fixed-effects were compared using the LSD Fisher test. The confidence interval of fitted values by the models was considered for uncertainty quantification of disaggregated EF₁. Given the unbalance of the dataset between climates and fertiliser forms (76% in wet climate, 80% with synthetic plus mixed fertiliser form), the aggregated EF₁ could not be analysed by linear mixed-effect modelling. Instead the estimate was computed as the average of the EF₁ disaggregated by precipitation regime (wet, dry) and fertiliser form for wet climate (S + M, O) with a bootstrapping method (each applied 1000 times). The low and high uncertainty values of the aggregated EF₁ were assigned the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of the dataset generated by bootstrapping because of the non-normal distribution of residuals.

Final Draft

Results

The dataset was dominated by cases from Europe (34%) and North America (28%). Cases from Asia represented 19% of all cases while Africa, Central-South America, and Oceania formed an equal share of 6–7% of the dataset.

The linear mixed-effect model analysis indicated no clear trend of decrease or increase of the EF_1 according to the length of the experimental period or the N application rate (Table A2-1). Therefore, these criteria were not considered further in the analysis.

TABLE A2-1 SAMPLE SIZE, MEAN, AND UNCERTAINTY RANGE OF THE EF_1 DISAGGREGATED BY LENGTH OF THE EXPERIMENT (DAYS) AND N APPLICATION RATE ($KG\ N\ HA^{-1}\ PERIOD^{-1}$). A, B, C LETTERS INDICATE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS WITHIN A DISAGGREGATION LEVEL BASED ON LSD FISHER TEST				
Disaggregation by length of experiment	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
≤ 120	335	0.012	0.008 – 0.015	B
(120, 180]	188	0.020	0.016 – 0.024	C
(180, 240]	84	0.009	0.003 – 0.014	B
(240, 300]	40	-0.002	-0.010 – 0.007	A
> 300	205	0.013	0.008 – 0.017	B
Disaggregation by N application rate	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
(0, 100]	255	0.015	0.011 – 0.018	A
(100, 200]	377	0.011	0.007 – 0.014	A
(200, 300]	135	0.014	0.004 – 0.025	A
(300, 500]	63	0.010	0.004 – 0.015	A
(500, 700]	15	0.008	-0.002 – 0.018	A
> 700	11	0.013	0.009 – 0.017	A

The analysis yielded no significant difference in EF_1 between the four climates as disaggregated by temperature and rainfall (Table A2-2). Disaggregation by rainfall pointed towards an EF_1 significantly higher in wet climate than in dry climate. In dry climate, irrigation led to a higher EF_1 than when irrigation was not practiced. Irrigation was practiced in most (63%) cases from dry climates, explaining the similarity between the EF_1 for dry climates and the EF_1 for irrigated fields in dry climates. Lower EF_1 for non-irrigated fields in dry climates may be used at Tier 2 level by compilers that have the corresponding activity data.

Comparison between the three fertiliser forms (S: Synthetic, O: Organic, M: Mixed S+O) suggested that synthetic and mixes of synthetic and organic forms could be grouped into a single category, while the EF_1 for organic fertiliser forms was significantly lower than the EF_1 for synthetic fertilisers. The EF_1 obtained from the interaction of climate disaggregated by rainfall and fertiliser with two levels of disaggregation (O and S + M) were similar in dry climates. In wet climates, the EF_1 of the S + M form was significantly higher than the EF_1 for the organic form.

Based on these results, the EF_1 was disaggregated by climate and fertiliser with no distinction between fertiliser form in dry climates ($EF_{1\ Dry} = 0.5\%$), but with a distinction between organic fertiliser ($EF_{1\ Wet\ O} = 0.6\%$) and synthetic plus mixed fertiliser ($EF_{1\ Wet\ S + M} = 1.6\%$) in wet climates. The aggregated EF_1 computed from these disaggregated values amounted to 1.0% with an uncertainty range of 0.2 – 1.8%.

TABLE A2-2 SAMPLE SIZE, MEAN, AND UNCERTAINTY RANGE OF THE EF₁ DISAGGREGATED BY CLIMATE, FERTILISER FORM AND IRRIGATION PRACTICE. A, B LETTERS INDICATE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS WITHIN A DISAGGREGATION LEVEL BASED ON LSD FISHER TEST				
Disaggregation by climate (temperature, rainfall)	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
Temperate/boreal wet	526	0.013	0.007 – 0.019	A B
Temperate/boreal dry	121	0.007	-0.002 – 0.015	A B
Tropical wet	122	0.014	0.011 – 0.018	B
Tropical dry	86	0.004	-0.004 – 0.013	A
Disaggregation by rainfall	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
Wet	648	0.014	0.011 – 0.017	B
Dry	207	0.005	0.000 – 0.011	A
Disaggregation by irrigation in dry climate	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
Irrigation	94	0.004	0.003 – 0.006	B
No irrigation	56	0.001	-0.001 – 0.003	A
Disaggregation by fertiliser form (S: Synthetic, O: Organic, M: Mixed S+O)	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
S	607	0.013	0.007 – 0.019	B
M	49	0.014	0.011 – 0.017	A B
O	163	0.007	0.003 – 0.011	A
Disaggregation by climate (rainfall) and fertiliser form (S + M: Synthetic and Mixed S+O, O: Organic)	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
Wet S + M	509	0.016	0.013 – 0.019	B
Wet O	110	0.006	0.001 – 0.011	A
Dry S + M	147	0.005	-0.003 – 0.013	A
Dry O	53	0.005	-0.003 – 0.013	A
Disaggregation by climate (rainfall) and fertiliser form (S + M: Synthetic and Mixed S+O, O: Organic) in wet climate	n	Mean	Uncertainty range	Significance
Wet S + M	509	0.016	0.013 – 0.019	B
Wet O	110	0.006	0.001 – 0.011	A
Dry	200	0.005	-0.001 – 0.011	A

Final Draft

Annex 11A.3 Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF_{1FR}

We extracted all studies with paddy rice field experiments that had a zero-N control from the databases by Akiyama et al. (2005), Albanito et al. (2017) and Cayuela et al. (2017). We excluded studies which:

- Were non-peer-reviewed publications,
- Were conducted in the laboratory and greenhouses, and modelling studies (only field studies were selected),
- Were conducted in upland rice fields,
- Were less than 70 days in duration,
- Related to grazed soils where urine and/or dung was applied, and
- Related to manure or fertilizer treated with inhibitors.

The database contained 70 EF_{1FR} values and the arithmetic mean was 0.4%. Water management strongly affects N₂O emission from paddy rice fields (Akiyama et al. 2005). Therefore, aggregated and disaggregated values by water management were calculated based on arithmetic means and confidence intervals were constructed to include 95% of the distribution of measured emissions. Arithmetic mean of ‘continuous flooding’ (0.3%, n = 44) was lower than ‘with single and multiple drainage’ (0.5%, n = 26). Only ‘continuous flooding and ‘with single and multiple drainage’ were considered for disaggregation of water management, because the number of available data were not adequate to evaluate other drivers. For example, other factors such as climate were not considered due to limited number of data.

Annex 11A.4 Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF_{3PRP}

We combined the dataset recently collated by Cai & Akiyama (2016) with 27 additional studies to derive EF_{3PRP} factors (Yamulki et al. 1998; Galbally et al. 2005; Liebig et al. 2008; Cardenas et al. 2016; Di et al. 2016; Hoogendoorn et al. 2016; Hyde et al. 2016; Krol et al. 2016; Li et al. 2016; Luo et al. 2016; Marsden et al. 2016; Misselbrook et al. 2016; Nichols et al. 2016; O'Connor et al. 2016; Owens et al. 2016; Pelster et al. 2016; Ward et al. 2016; Balvert et al. 2017; Byrnes et al. 2017; Forrestal et al. 2017; Marsden et al. 2017; Owens et al. 2017; Thomas et al. 2017a, b; Tully et al. 2017; van der Weerden et al. 2017; Cardoso et al. 2018; Chadwick et al. 2018; Nichols et al. 2018). We excluded studies which:

- Were non-peer-reviewed publications,
- Were conducted in the laboratory and greenhouses, and modelling studies (only field studies were selected),
- Were conducted in flooded rice fields,
- Included fertiliser (manure or synthetic) additions,
- Were less than 30 days in duration, and
- Related to excreta treated with inhibitors.

The updated dataset contained 461 EF_{3PRP} values, with urine dominating the data, representing 326 (= 71%) of the values. Data were collated from studies where excreta was deposited onto either pasture or forage crops such as brassicas or fodder beets. Nitrogen sources were dung, real urine and artificial urine. Artificial urine represented a substantial number of data values (72).

Research has shown that increasing soil water content generally results in greater N₂O production and emission from urine patches (de Klein et al. 2003, van der Weerden et al. 2014). Therefore, EF_{3PRP} data has been disaggregated by climate (dry and wet) for compilers with suitable activity data to allow disaggregation of livestock classes by climate. The division between wet and dry in the tropics is based on 1000 mm of precipitation (greater than 1000 mm equating with wet/moist climate), and the division in the temperate region is based on mean annual precipitation:potential evapotranspiration ratio of 1 (greater than 1 equating with a wet/moist climate). There are currently insufficient observations in the dataset to allow further climate disaggregation. Aggregated values are also provided for compilers that are not able to disaggregate PRP N inputs by climate. A bootstrap approach was used to estimate all disaggregated and aggregated values and corresponding 2.5th and 97.5th percentile ranges directly from the available data.

To determine whether there were significant differences in excreta EF₃ values between different categories (e.g. cattle vs. sheep), the data were analysed using a linear model. Excreta type (dung vs. urine vs. artificial urine), livestock type (cattle vs. sheep), land use (pastoral vs. forage crop) and climate (wet vs. dry) were added as fixed effects. There were very few data obtained from the same site, therefore site was not included in the model as a random effect. Due to its non-normal distribution, however, data was log transformed using a log (x + a) approach, (where a = 0.25%). An a term was added due to the presence of several negative values.

Results showed a significant difference between real urine and artificial urine EF_{3PRP} values (P = 0.05). However, the analysis of data from two of the studies that included both real urine and artificial urine at similar N loads (de Klein et al. 2003; Chadwick et al. 2018) showed urine type (real vs artificial) had no significant effect on EF_{3PRP} (P = 0.88, n = 16). On this basis, all artificial urine data were included, adding considerably more observations to the dataset (i.e., 63 additional observations).

Excreta type and animal type were highly significant (both P < 0.001), while there was a significant interaction between climate and animal type (P = 0.04). EF_{3PRP} values for cattle and sheep dung and urine, in wet and dry climates are shown in Table A4-1

Final Draft

1234

TABLE A4-1 EF VALUES FOR CATTLE AND SHEEP DUNG AND URINE, IN WET AND DRY CLIMATES					
Livestock type	Excreta type	Climate			
		Wet		Dry	
		mean	2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile, n ^A	mean	2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile, n ^A
Cattle	Urine	0.0078	0.0066 – 0.0089, 279	0.0032	0.0015 – 0.0049, 11
	Dung	0.0013	0.0010 – 0.0017, 107	0.0007	0.0004 – 0.0010, 6
Sheep	Urine	0.0039	0.0019 – 0.0058, 35	0.0031 ^B	0.0016 – 0.0046, 13 ^B
	Dung	0.0004	-0.0001 – 0.0009, 21	0.0021 ^C	-0.0005 – 0.0047, 7 ^C
<p>^A The 2.5th to 97.5th percentile range reflect the 95% confidence interval for the mean.</p> <p>^B There were only two data for sheep urine dry, with a mean value of 0.0027. Because this mean value was similar to the cattle urine dry mean of 0.0032, data from both livestock types were pooled to allow a more robust mean and confidence interval for sheep urine under dry conditions.</p> <p>^C The dataset contained a single data value for sheep dung in dry climates (0.0105); this single value was greater than all the data for cattle dung in dry climates. To derive an approximation for a mean value and confidence interval for sheep dung in dry climates, this single sheep dung value was combined with cattle dung data from dry climates.</p>					

1235

1236 Disaggregated excreta EF_{3PRP} values for cattle in wet and dry climates and sheep in wet and dry climates (Table
 1237 11.1) were calculated from the urine and dung EF_{3PRP} values reported in Table A4.1, assuming a urine:dung ratio
 1238 of 0.66:0.34 (Kelliher et al. 2014). However, compilers may wish to improve their inventories with a Tier 2 method
 1239 if activity data can be partitioned into dung and urine to produce a country-specific urine:dung ratio. This
 1240 methodology will require data on N content of different forages and feeds and the amount of feed consumed by
 1241 livestock (MPI, 2014).

Annex 11A.5 Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF₄

In order to develop EF₄ values, review papers on indirect N₂O emission from N deposition were collected from the published literature. We found two types of review papers, as described below.

(1) Review papers on N addition experiments conducted in non-agricultural sites

In these experiments chemical N was applied to non-agricultural and non-wetland soil to simulate N deposition. Soil N₂O emissions were measured in a zero-N control site and in a N treated site. One key advantage of this type of study is that N₂O emissions from the zero-N control (N₂O from N mineralization, plant litter and N deposition) could be removed by subtracting the associated emissions from the treatment plots. The EF was computed as:

$$EF (\%) = (N_2O_{N \text{ treatment}} - N_2O_{\text{control}}) / N \text{ input} \times 100$$

However, the disadvantage is that N application rates are often higher than actual N deposition rates. Regardless, the estimated EF values from these studies were the same order of magnitude to the EF₁ values estimated for this report (Table A5-1), at least given that most of experiments relevant for estimating new EF₄ factors were conducted in temperate wet climate zones.

TABLE A5-1 RESULTS FROM REVIEW PAPERS OF N ADDITION EXPERIMENTS IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SITES				
References	n	Mean EF (%)	SD	Note
Aronson & Allison (2012)	93	1.9	3.1	Data with measurement period of less than 90 days were excluded.
Liu & Greaver (2009)	42	0.87	0.25	—

(2) Review papers on N₂O emission and N deposition conducted in non-agricultural sites

In these experiments N₂O emission and N deposition were measured concurrently in non-agricultural and non-wetland sites, and the EF was calculated as follows:

$$EF (\%) = N_2O / N \text{ deposition} \times 100$$

The advantage of this type of study is that actual N deposition rates were measured at these sites. However, the disadvantage is that EF do not exclude N₂O from a zero-N control (N₂O from N mineralization), and therefore the influence of N deposition could not be isolated from other sources of N₂O emissions. In general, the EF values of these studies were higher than those from N addition experiments in non-agricultural sites (Table A5-2), probably because the resulting EFs did not exclude N₂O from N mineralization and plant litter as well as other sources of N inputs. This could cause double counting because the other sources of N are already addressed in other calculations for direct and indirect N₂O emissions.

TABLE A5-2 RESULTS FROM REVIEW PAPERS OF N ₂ O EMISSIONS AND N DEPOSITION CONDUCTED AT NON-AGRICULTURAL SITES				
References	n	Mean EF (%)	SD	Note
Bühlman et al. (2015)	57	7.0	8.7	Mean was calculated from Table S1
van der Gon & Bleeker (2005)	21	3.8	4.1	Weighted mean was calculated from Table 3
de Vries et al. (2011)	67	7.3	7.5	Estimated data were excluded

Therefore, considering that N addition experiments conducted in non-agricultural sites reported similar EF values as EF₁ results from our analysis, we decided to use the same emission factors as EF₁ for EF₄. Disaggregation is only considered for climate type due to the absence of dependence of EF₄ upon the form (organic or synthetic) of original N input that volatilised. The EF₄ was disaggregated by wet and dry climates, as indicated in Table A2-2 of Annex 11A.2.

Final Draft

Annex 11A.6 Estimation of Default Emission Factor(s) for EF₅

We collected peer-reviewed papers on EF₅ for in situ field studies (Tian et al. 2019). The final dataset contained 254 data observations (EF_{5g}: n = 101, EF_{5r}: n = 91, EF_{5e}: n = 23).

The EF_{5g}, EF_{5r} and EF_{5e} are defined as:

EF_{5g}: groundwater (soil solution and lysimeter leaching water were not included), spring, surface drainage, and upstream emissions (upstream supersaturated with N₂O, N₂O emitted mainly from degassing of groundwater)

EF_{5r}: rivers, reservoirs (including lake and pond), and downstream emissions (supersaturated N₂O was already degassed and N₂O mainly produced by nitrification/denitrification in situ).

EF_{5e}: estuary emissions (only including inner estuaries or lower reaches of river that are close to the river mouth, while outer estuaries and coastal seawater are excluded)

We found a lack of consistency in dividing EF_{5g} and EF_{5r} for streams based on the literature, at least in some studies. Here, we categorized data into EF_{5g} based on upstream supersaturated with N₂O where N₂O is emitted mainly from degassing of groundwater, and EF_{5r} based on downstream, supersaturated N₂O that was already degassed and N₂O mainly produced by nitrification/denitrification in situ.

Note that the N sources in most rivers include both agricultural (mainly arable farming and grazing grassland) and urban sewage. However, we found it was difficult to separate the different N sources based on the limited information in the publications. Therefore, our dataset on EF_{5r} includes non-agricultural N source.

Most estuaries are impacted by urban waste water and aquaculture in addition to agriculture. However, all available data were included because of their limited number.

Arithmetic mean emission factors were calculated as follows; EF_{5g}: 0.0060 kg N₂O–N/kg NO₃–N in the water, EF_{5r}: 0.0026 kg N₂O–N/kg NO₃–N in the water and EF_{5e}: 0.0026 kg N₂O–N/kg NO₃–N in the water.

EF₅ was calculated as follows:

$$EF_5 = EF_{5g} + EF_{5r} + EF_{5e}$$

Uncertainty range is based on the 2.5th to 97.5th percentile.

Annex 11A.7 Estimation of Default Factor(s) for Frac_{GASF}

The Tier 1 aggregated default $\text{NH}_3 + \text{NO}_x$ EF for emissions from synthetic fertiliser has been derived as the arithmetic mean of default EF values for the different types of individual N fertilisers. Individual fertiliser types were weighted according to their use in the period 2007-2015 as reported by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) (Table A7-1), based on world fertiliser usage. For countries that require inventories for air pollutant emissions, there is a continuous update of NH_3 and NO EF values through the EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook (European Environment Agency, 2016).

TABLE A7-1 FERTILISER CONSUMPTION IN THE PERIOD 2007-2015 EXPRESSED AS THOUSAND TONNES NUTRIENTS AND % OF TOTAL FERTILISER CONSUMED (SOURCE: IFA: HTTP://IFADATA.FERTILIZER.ORG/)		
Fertiliser product	2007-2015	%
Ammonia (direct application)	35823	4%
AS	27931	3%
Urea	442550	50%
AN	53676	6%
CAN	29624	3%
Nitrogen solutions	46870	5%
Other N straight	45722	5%
AP	55692	6%
Other NP (N)	17911	2%
N K compound (N)	2372	0.3%
N P K compound (N)	127227	14%
Where Ammonia (direct application) = anhydrous ammonia, AS= ammonium sulphate, AN=Ammonium nitrate, CAN= calcium ammonium nitrate and AP= ammonium phosphate		

For disaggregation, we divided all fertiliser usage into 4 types of fertiliser categories based on their basic chemical composition: urea, ammonium-based (ammonia-direct application, AS, and AP), nitrate-based (N K compound-N) and ammonium-nitrate-based (AN, CAN, Nitrogen solutions, Other N straight, Other NP-N and N P K compound-N). For weighting purposes, assumptions on chemical compositions had to be considered for different fertiliser types reported by IFA for compound fertilisers and for those fertilisers that had not been tested in our experimental datasets. We assumed that emissions from these fertiliser types were those obtained from the mean value of a mix of different straight fertilisers for different IFA fertiliser products, in the absence of clear statistics on their composition and based on qualitative assessments (Table A7-2).

TABLE A7-2 ASSUMPTIONS ON THE POTENTIAL MIX OF DIFFERENT IFA FERTILISER PRODUCTS	
Fertiliser product	Fertiliser Mix
Nitrogen solutions	Urea (50%), AN (25%), CAN (25%)
Other N straight	AN (50%), CAN (50%)
Other NP (N)	AN (50%), CAN (50%)
AP	MAP (50%), DAP (50%)
N K compound (N)	Sodium Nitrate
N P K compound (N)	AN (50%), CAN (50%)
Where AN = Ammonium nitrate, CAN = calcium ammonium nitrate AS = ammonium sulphate, AP = ammonium phosphate, MAP = monoammonium phosphate and DAP = diammonium phosphate.	

Final Draft

For NH₃, we used the datasets of peer-reviewed studies from the Bouwman et al. (2002) meta-analysis and the recently published dataset collated by Pan et al. (2016). A total number of 273 studies were used, and included most of the common fertiliser types. Although data were primarily obtained from studies comparing NH₃ emissions from different fertiliser types, we also included emissions data from other studies that were conducted for other purposes (e.g., assessing effect of urease inhibitors, application rate, and amendments) by using the EF values from the control treatments.

For NO_x, we used the dataset of peer-reviewed studies collated by Liu et al. (2017). For the Tier1 EF, we used the data from 54 studies (171 field measurements) comprising information on NO emissions by aggregating data from all types of fertiliser. Furthermore, to develop the disaggregated NO_x EFs, we estimated values that were specific to different fertiliser types.

Median EF values for each fertiliser type for both NH₃ and NO_x are shown in Table A7-3.

TABLE A7-3 EMISSION FACTORS FOR % NH₃-N AND NO_x-N (N APPLIED)⁻¹ FROM DIFFERENT FERTILISER TYPES RESULTING FROM TWO META-ANALYSIS AND NUMBER OF STUDIES INVOLVED						
	% lost as N				number of studies	
Fertiliser	Total	NH ₃ -N	NO _x -N		Total	NO _x -N
urea	15.3%	14.2%	1.1%		209	22
AS	10.2%	9.5%	0.7%		41	4
AN	6.0%	3.0%	2.9%		34	11
CAN	3.2%	1.6%	1.6%		7	1
DAP	9.8%	9.1%	0.7%		11	3
MAP	6.0%	5.3%	0.7%		3	1
Sodium Nitrate	1.2%	0.2%	1.0%		4	3
AA	3%	2.9%	0.1%		2	1
Where AS = ammonium sulphate, AN = Ammonium nitrate, CAN = calcium ammonium nitrate, DAP = diammonium phosphate, MAP = monoammonium phosphate and AA = anhydrous ammonia.						

EF values for NH₃ emissions were compared with those obtained using the method to predict NH₃ emissions in the current EMEP/EEA guidelines (EMEP/EEA, 2016) and were comparable to the range calculated by Hutchins (*pers. commun.*).

Annex 11A.8 Estimation of Default Factor for Frac_{GASM}

Review papers on NH₃ and NO were collected to derive the fraction of N that is volatilised. Field measurement data with manure or slurry application and excreta patches were extracted from the published literature (see below). Field measurement data with chemical N application were excluded from this analysis, as well as studies with a focus on mitigation technologies, such as nitrification inhibitors or urease inhibitors.

For NH₃, the arithmetic mean was calculated from Bouwman et al. (2002) and Cai & Akiyama (2016). For NO, the mean and uncertainty range were calculated from Cai & Akiyama (2016) and Liu et al (2017). The difference between mean EF for cattle and sheep excreta were negligible, thus livestock type was not considered. The default Frac_{GASM} was derived as the sum of the arithmetic mean of NH₃ EF and NO_x EF. The uncertainty range was based on 2.5th and 97.5th percentile.

TABLE A8-1 EMISSION FACTORS FOR NH ₃ -N AND NO _x -N (N APPLIED ⁻¹) FROM MANURE OR SLURRY APPLICATION AND EXCRETA PATCHES				
	n	Mean	Range (2.5 th to 97.5 th percentile)	Source of data
NO _x	40	0.015	0 – 0.149	Liu et al. (2017)
NH ₃	172	0.197	0 – 0.295	Bouwman et al. (2002), Cai & Akiyama (2016)
NO _x + NH ₃	212	0.212	0 – 0.312	References listed above

Final Draft

Annex 11A.9 Estimation of Default Factor for Frac_{LEACH}-(H)

We collected review papers (Di & Cameron 2002; Cai & Akiyama 2016) and original papers on N leaching for this analysis (Moreno et al. 1996; Diez et al. 1997; Catt et al. 1998; Sogbedji et al. 2000; Asadi et al. 2002; Readman et al. 2002; Ren et al. 2003; Dauden & Quilez 2004; Dauden et al. 2004; Diez et al. 2004; Bakhsh et al. 2005; Basso & Ritchie 2005; Gehl et al. 2005; Fang et al. 2006; Li et al. 2006; Diez-Lopez et al. 2008; Conrad & Fohrer 2009; Zhu et al. 2009; Aronsson & Stenberg 2010; Bakhsh et al. 2010; Salmeron et al. 2010; Yague & Quilez 2010; Claret et al. 2011; Huang et al. 2011; Gallejones et al. 2012; Perego et al. 2012; Sorensen & Rubaek 2012; Taftah & Sepaskhah 2012; Wang et al. 2012). Only peer-reviewed studies that used lysimeters and in-situ field measurements were included. Studies conducted in the laboratory were excluded, along with studies that used mitigation technologies such as nitrification inhibitor. The final dataset contained 355 data observations from which the arithmetic mean and uncertainty range for a 95% confidence interval were calculated.