



## National Agricultural Manure Management Program

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Manure Management

#### The National Agricultural Manure Management Program

The quantification of emissions and mitigations from manure management in Australia has been limited. In recognition of the similarities between some manure systems across the intensive livestock industries (feedlot beef, pork, poultry and dairy), and with acknowledgement of research synergies that can improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of research in this area, the intensive livestock industries developed a joint application to the “Filling the Research Gap” (FtRG) program administered by the Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry. The FtRG program is part of the Carbon Farming Futures package within the overall Clean Energy Initiative. From this application, funding was provided for the National Agricultural Manure Management Program (NAMMP).

The projects funded under NAMMP are discussed in complementary fact sheets. These research projects address the following research priorities under the FtRG program: (1) the reduction of nitrous oxide emissions, (2) the reduction of methane emissions, (3) increasing soil carbon and (4) improving modelling capacity. These projects will include the quantification of emission sources within the context of developing mitigation strategies and Carbon farming Initiative (CFI) methodologies.

#### Manure Management Systems and Emission Sources

Manure management begins with animal nutrition, which determines the mass and characteristics of manure excreted. In particular, the mass of organic material (volatile solids or VS) and nitrogen (N) represents the substrate from which emissions arise. Quantification and mitigation of manure emissions typically begins here.

Most manure management systems have three (or more) stages after excretion. Quantification of manure emissions generally requires the mass flow of manure (specifically VS and N) to be followed throughout the whole system.

Manure emissions are regulated by physical and biological processes. The amount of time that manure is held in each stage can have a significant influence on the total emissions.

The largest emission source tends to be from manure that remains in the ‘post excretion management’ stage for a reasonable period of time or moves to the storage or treatment stage.






## National Agricultural Manure Management Program

In some cases this can be as large as 60 to 80 per cent of emissions on a site. This offers a significant opportunity for mitigation.

Mitigation of manure emissions can be targeted at any or all of the stages throughout the system. However, because manure management systems represent a series of interlinked processes, mitigation research needs to consider the impacts of changes on later stages.

A generalised manure management process is explained by the following flow diagram:






## National Agricultural Manure Management Program

### Manure Management Emissions


The agricultural sector made up 15.5% (84.7 Mt) of the total net emissions (545.8 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent) of Australia in 2009 (DCCEE 2009). Agriculture is also the main source of nitrous oxide (19.5 Mt – equivalent to 74.5% of total) and methane (65.3 Mt – equivalent to 57.9% of total) in Australia. The main sources of agricultural GHGs from the intensive livestock industry are enteric methane and manure management emissions.

Figure 1 shows that manure management is currently estimated to be 4% of agricultural emissions. On this basis, little research effort has been directed to manure management. Despite this small contribution from manure emissions, some mitigation options in this area are attractive for research investment. For intensive livestock production, such as grain-fed beef cattle, piggeries, dairy and poultry, manure emissions are a significant source of on-farm GHG. These industries combined account for 84% of manure management emissions. There is every expectation that significant reductions to manure emissions could be made through design and management changes driven by sound research and development. Figure 2 shows the relative contribution to manure emissions by industry in 2005.

**Figure 1 – Components of all Agricultural Emissions, NGGI 2009**



**Figure 2 – Manure Management Emissions by Livestock Class, NGGI 2005**







## National Agricultural Manure Management Program

### Industry Specific Emission Sources

#### **Pig Production**

Emissions from manure management during pig production differ between manure treatment systems. Particularly, differences exist between liquid effluent systems and deep litter systems. For liquid systems, close to 80% of agricultural emissions arise from the effluent ponds (based on the DCCEE methodology), with the vast majority of this being methane. Appreciable losses of ammonia also arise from effluent treatment, with smaller volumes of nitrous oxide thought to occur from land application of effluent and solids following treatment.

When applying the DCCEE methodology, deep litter emissions are dominated by nitrous oxide from the pig shed, with smaller amounts of methane and ammonia (leading to indirect nitrous oxide emissions). Solid storage and application emissions are also relevant for deep litter systems.

#### **Chicken Meat and Egg Production**

Studies show (which were based on modelled systems rather than measurements), the most important emission sources for the chicken meat industry to be:

- nitrous oxide and ammonia from chicken meat grow-out sheds; and
- nitrous oxide from land application of chicken meat litter.

For the egg industry, the most important emission sources were found to be:

- nitrous oxide from land application; and
- shed emissions (methane, ammonia, nitrous oxide).

#### **Dairy**

In 2005 the emissions from the Australian Dairy Industry were equivalent to

- 7266 kt CO<sub>2</sub>-e from enteric fermentation,
- 815 kt CO<sub>2</sub>-e due to N loss after excretion to the soil,
- 574 kt CO<sub>2</sub>-e from manure management systems
- 100 kt CO<sub>2</sub>-e from the direct application of effluent to the soil.

During the manure management of dairy waste, there are significant amounts of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O gases emitted. In 2005, this was equal to 26.8 kt of CH<sub>4</sub> and 34.3 t of N<sub>2</sub>O. These emissions are equivalent to 17% of all Australian livestock emissions from manure management. It was found that >90% of GHG emissions from manure management originated from storing untreated dairy effluent and the subsequent CH<sub>4</sub> emissions that arise due to anaerobic conditions. Emissions of nitrous oxide from dairy feed pads may also be significant, though less research has been focused on this area.



## National Agricultural Manure Management Program

### **Feedlot Beef**

While there remains a lack of fundamental research to quantify emission sources from feedlot systems, there is a reasonable expectation that nitrogen emissions (collectively) represent the largest emission source.

Feed pad emissions represent the largest contributor to overall manure management at a feedlot. Less emissions arise from the manure after pen removal such as in storage ponds and land application.

### **References**

- Manure Management Research Consortium Development Proposal, NAMMP Consortium, 2012.
- Wiedemann, S, McGahan, E, Grist, S & Grant, T, 2010a, 'Life cycle assessment of two Australian pork supply chains', Paper submitted to the 7<sup>th</sup> International conference on LCA in the Agri-food Sector, Bari, Italy, 22-24 September
- Wiedemann, SG, McGahan, EJ & Watts, PJ, 2010b, A scoping life cycle assessment of the Australian lot feeding sector, Meat and Livestock Australia, Ltd, Project number B.FLT.0360, Sydney, NSW.
- Wiedemann et al. 2011 – “*Environmental Assessment of Chicken Meat Production using Life Cycle Assessment*”

Disclaimer: The opinions, advice and information contained in this publication have not been provided at the request of any person but are offered by Australian Pork Limited (APL) solely for informational purposes. While APL has no reason to believe that the information contained in this publication is inaccurate, APL is unable to guarantee the accuracy of the information and, subject to any terms implied by law which cannot be excluded, accepts no responsibility for loss suffered as a result of any party's reliance on the accuracy or currency of the content of this publication. The information contained in this publication should not be relied upon for any purpose, including as a substitute for professional advice. Nothing within the publication constitutes an express or implied warranty, or representation, with respect to the accuracy or currency of the publication, any future matter or as to the value of or demand for any good.