GLOBAL RESEARCH ALLIANCE

ON AGRICULTURAL GREENHOUSE GASES

16 / 02 / 2022

Lars Stoumann Jensen, Professor, UCPH

Developing new bio-based fertilisers from organic waste upcycling for optimal use in agriculture - and training a new generation of scientist for the challenge! **Developing new bio-based fertilisers from organic waste upcycling for optimal use in agriculture** - and training a new generation of scientist for the challenge!

Brief bio:

Lars Stoumann Jensen

- Professor of Soil Fertility and Organic Waste Recycling
- Head of the Plant & Soil Section at PLEN, UCPH

Profile

- Long research career focused on soil fertility & CNP cycling, recycling of manures & organic waste, GHG & NH3 emissions, soil C sequestration, dynamic soil-plant-atm modelling, LCA
- Currently involved as partner/PI in a number of EU and national research projects on these topics
- Principal Coordinator of the FertiCycle MSCA training network
- WP4 lead and partner in the **LEX4BIO** EU H2020 project

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

Dept. of Plant & Environmental Sciences (PLEN)





These projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreements No. 860127 and 818309

Background – European challenge: N & P hotspots



Phosphorus balance [kg P/ha/year]

Van Dijk et al. 2016



Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

- In order to protect the atmospheric and aquatic environment, political demand for implementation of environmental regulations / technologies
- Need for redistribution of surplus N & P raw or processed

© Lars Stoumann Jensen Isj@plen.ku.dk

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

Background - N leaching, NH₃ & GHG emissions from EU agriculture



All clearly related to intensity and form of agricultural activity

Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

© Lars Stoumann Jensen lsj@plen.ku.dk



Background – why focus on bio-based fertilisers?

USDA

ORGANIC

- Global population growth, food demand & food security needs
- Planetary boundaries →
 - Global and European N and P overload to the environment
- Scarce resources (**P** and **energy**), protect the environment
- Need for recovery and recycling of excess nutrients from agricultural, industrial and urban waste streams
- Circular economy policies globally (EU, China, etc.) \rightarrow
 - The new **EU Fertiliser Regulation** (in force from mid 2022) will include **bio-based agricultural fertiliser** products
- Organic-agriculture market expansion in affluent countries →
 - increasing demand for eco-labelled, certified, recycled organic fertiliser





Commission

Nitrogen

Phosphoru

Background - N and P recycling potential in the EU

Table 1.EU nutrient recycling potential, total amounts and average amounts per year on agricultural land in
the EU if spread evenly (Eurostat 2016, Leip et al. 2014, Velthof et al. 2015, van Dijk et al. 2016, Sutton et al.
2011, Buckwell & Nadau 2016). For comparison, annual mineral fertilizer use (Eurostat 2016).

	N total Mt	N average kg/ha/a	P total Mt	P average kg/ha/a
Manure	7–9	41-52	1.8	10.5
Biowaste	0.5-0.7	2.9-4.1	0.1	0.6
Slaughterhouse waste	ND	ND	0.3	1.7
Sewage	2.3-3.1	13.3-18.0	0.3	1.7
Mineral fertilizer	10.9	63	1.4	8.1

ND = no data

(Luostarinen et al. 2020. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-380-037-3, SuNaMu final project report)

- Manures dominate
- These are already to a great extent recycled but not optimally
- Other sources are only partly utilised – still significant potential



Technologies to process org. waste into bio-based fertiliser

Processing to improve biobased fertiliser quality:









Fermentation Enzyme Aerobic digestion/Composting

Biological conversion

Anaerobic digestion (AD)



Thermo-chemical conversion

- Liquefaction
- Pyrolysis
- Gasification
- Combustion

Chemical conversion

- Hydrolysis
- Solvent extraction
- Supercritical conversion
- Transesterification
- Refuse derived fuel (RDF)



Physical conversion

- Mechanical extraction
- Briquetting of biomass
- Distillation

 Multiple barriers and challenges for this…



H.S. NUX Thise projects have received funding from the European Unior. . Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

A.S. Nizami et al./Bioresource Technology 241 (2017) 1101-1117

Processing technologies for more advanced nutrient recovery and recycling from manures, urban industrial org. waste streams



- High-tech manure processing technologies already on the market (TRL9)
- But so far only applied in regions with high N/P surplus (Netherlands, Flanders, Catalonia,…) due to high installation & running costs
- Cheaper alternatives (e.g. direct application = surplus) often preferred



Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO) (Buckwell and Nadeu, RISE, 2016)

Processing of organic waste streams produces bio-based products with special challenges

Solid fraction / Composts



Digestates – manure or plant based



Mineral concentrates e.g. $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ from NH_3 stripping

> **Precipitates,** e.g. struvite, Ca-phosphates



Liquid fraction



Traditional and simply processed organic biowaste products often have:

- low nutrient concentrations and high volume
- slow/variable/uncertain nutrient availability
- inappropriate nutrient ratios (N:P:K:S:etc) rel. to plant demand
- higher risk of emissions (NH₃, GHG)
- odour, biosecurity and other nuisances/risks for neighbours

Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

Logistic challenges: Liquid organic fertiliser application



Band application (trailing hoses)



Injected (open/closed slot)



- Not a big technical challenge in countries/regions with advanced manure management
- Huge challenge for other regions and traditional crop farmers





Processing of organic waste streams may produce solid bio-based products with <u>better properties</u>…



⁽photos courtesy of Lærke W Larsen, LEX4BIO)

Standard and more uniform characteristics

- Pelletisation and physical hardness improves spreading
- Higher and more uniform of nutrient concentration
- More defined nutrient availability profile
- Modified nutrient ratios (N:P:K:S) by mixing feedstocks
- More biol. stable
- Lower emissions?



Logistics: Solid / pelletised fertiliser application techniques



- Centrifugal spreaders
- Air/pneumatic
- Solid organics spreader



 For a majority of farmers, BBFs spreadable with these types of technologies will be a preference!



The new EU Fertilising Product Regulation - (EU) 1009/2019

- The new **EU Fertilising Product Regulation** is part of the EU Circular Economy Strategy and linked to both the EU's environmental (Green Deal) and agricultural policy (From Farm to Fork).
- Includes as former regulation mineral/synthetic fertilisers, but now in addition also a range of
 organic materials and waste products that have fertilizer value: animal by-products, compost,
 digestate, plant residues, food waste, etc. Sewage sludge is so far not included.
- Defines **end-of-waste criteria** for when residues / side-streams are no longer waste, but can be used as input materials in fertilizer products
- Includes not just fertilisers, but also **bio-stimulants**, **growth media**, **soil improvers** & **liming agents**
- Ensures **harmonized**, **common EU limit values** for problematic / hazardous substances as well as producer responsibility (REACH), e.g. heavy metal limits, (currently different national regulations)
- Upon approval of a product, it allows **CE marking** so that the fertiliser can be **marketed and traded freely** throughout the EU, rather than approval and certification in each country.
- The new EU fertilizer regulation will be in force from **June/July 2022** but after that it must be implemented in the national laws and executive orders on fertilisers











The new EU Fertilising Product Regulation

Central classifications: CMCs = Component Material Categories:

CMC 1: Virgin material substances and mixtures

CMC 2: Plants, plant parts or plant extracts (*processed plant mat*.) CMC 3: Composts

CMC 4: Fresh crop digestate (*e.g. energy crops*)

CMC 5: Digestate other than fresh crop digestate (*e.g. manure*)

CMC 6: Food industry by-products

CMC 7: Micro-organisms

CMC 8: Agronomic additives

CMC 9: Nutrient polymers

CMC 10: Polymers other than nutrient polymers

CMC 11: Derived products within the meaning of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 *(animal byproducts)*

CMC 12: By-products within the meaning of Directive 2008/98/EC *(waste directive)*CMC13: Precipitated phosphate salts and derivatives (*e.g. struvite*)
CMC14: Thermal oxidation materials and derivatives (*e.g. ash*)
CMC15: Pyrolysis and gasification materials (*e.g biochar*)

Labelling Requirements and *Conformity Assessment Procedures* which varies between different CMCs and different PFCs

covered

New types of inputs

PFCs = Product Function Categories: PFC1. Fertiliser A. Organic fertiliser **Traditional** I. Solid organic fertiliser II. Liquid organic fertiliser mineral B. Organo-mineral fertiliser fertilisers I. Solid organo-mineral fertiliser II. Liquid organo-mineral fertiliser C. Inorganic fertiliser I. Inorganic macronutrient fertiliser (a) Solid inorganic macronutrient fertiliser (i) Straight or (ii) Compound solid inorg. macronutrient fertiliser (b) Liquid inorganic macronutrient fertiliser (i) Straight or (ii) Compound liquid inorg. macronutrient fertiliser II. Inorganic micronutrient fertiliser (a) Straight or (b) Compound inorganic micronutrient fertiliser PFC2. Liming material PFC3. Soil improver A. Organic soil improver B. Inorganic soil improver PFC4. Growing medium "New" PFC5. Inhibitor types of A. Nitrification inhibitor product B. Denitrification inhibitor C. Urease inhibitor functions PFC6. Plant biostimulant covered A. Microbial plant biostimulant B. Non-microbial plant biostimulant PFC7. Fertilising product blend Mixtures of any of the above 14

Bio-based fertilisers may have both positive & negative impacts



15 © Lars Stoumann Jensen <u>Isj@plen.ku.dk</u>

LEX4BIO – Optimising bio-based fertilisers in agriculture Providing a knowledge basis for new policies



Overall bjective: To decrease European dependency on finite and imported, apatitebased phosphorus and energy-intensive mineral nitrogen fertilisers.

Develop an evidence-base for the legislative framework for the optimised production and safe use of bio-based fertilisers (BBF) from nutrient rich side-streams (NRSS)





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 818309 (LEX4BIO).

Specific objectives include:

- Mapping at local, regional and European scale the nutrient availability of NRSS to produce BBFs, assessing their potential and identifying legal barriers and constraints
- Identifying novel BBFs for crop production and determining their effect on soil quality, fertiliser value and crop growth
- Determining the risks related to food safety, human health and environmental losses after application of BBFs and producing guiding principles for safe use of BBFs
- Assessing the integrated ecological impacts over the entire lifecycle of the production and use of BBFs
- Determining the logistic costs, public perceptions and political actions required for optimal use of BBFs

LEX4BIO activities

LEX4BIO work packages:

- WP1: Mapping resources and barriers for BBF
- WP2: BBF and **soil quality**
- WP3: BBF agronomic P efficiency
- WP4: BBF agronomic N efficiency
- WP5: BBF contaminant risk assessment
- WP6: BBF LCA Life Cycle Assessment
- WP7: BBF policy framework & socioeconomics

In WP4 we focus on BBF agronomic N efficiency:

- Compliance methods for characterisation of N BBFs
 - Pot. N mineralisation, pot. ammonia loss
- BBF agronomic N efficiency and fertiliser replacement
 - Field trials across the EU
 - Satellite-based monitoring of BBF effects on crops
- Modelling of environmental N losses from BBF vs. mineral fertiliser

BBF selection

- We have screened the European market for commercially available BBF (in a region or country) in 2020
- In total about 40 N-based & 40 P-based BBFs selected
- Wide coverage of PFC/CMC criteria according to Fertilising Product Regulation
 - N-BBFs mainly CMC 3 CMC 10 compost/digestate/ABP)
 - P-BBFs mainly CMC 10+ (ABP/precipitates/thermal prod.)

				, CMC:		2	uct				
Selected BBFs from our longlist sorted by general PFC and major raw materials PFC:		Compost	Fresh crop digestate	Food industry by-produc ⁺	Animal by-product	Recovered P-Salt	Ash	Biochar / pyrolysis product			
	Organic fertiliser	Solid	5	3	5	9		1	4	27	
		Liquid		1	5	1				7	
	Organo-mineral	Solid	1	1	2	9				13	
	fertiliser	Liquid			1					1	
	Inorganic fertiliser Solid			1		13	5		19		
	morganic rentiliser	Liquid								0	
			6	5	14	19	13	6	4	67	

LEX4BIO N BBF list ABP, dried poultry manure, plant-based, digestate, precipitates, mix, compost

	Raw material	Technology	PFC	СМС	BBF type	
ASL	Product of nutrient-recycle-plant Digestion			4	Mineral precipitate	
AV4	Broiler litter	Drying, granulating and pelletising	1 A-I	10	Poultry manure	
AV8	Broiler litter, blood meal and potassium sulphate Drying, granulating and pelletising			10	Poultry manure	
BA5	75 % BioAgenasol + 25 % wheat gluten	Fermentation and destillation	1 A-I	6/4	Plant based	►LEX4BIO
BA6	Plant based residues (wheat and maize)	Fermentation and destillation	1 A-II	4/6	Plant based	1
BIH	Animal horns	Pelletising (Sphero technology)	1 A-I	10	Animal by-product	
BIL	Broiler litter and seaweed	Drying and pelletising	1 A-I	10	Poultry manure	
BIO	Meat and bone meal, apatite, vinasse, chicken manure and potassium sulphate	Pelletising	1 B-I	10	Animal by-product	
BIP	Different plant watses, e.g. leftovers from sugar production	Liquid	1 A-II	6	Plant based	
BLM	Blood meal			10	Animal by-product	
BO1	Potato cell water	Evaporation	1 A-II	6	Plant based	
BO2	Molasse		1 A-11	6	Plant based	
BO4	Vinasse (sugar production)	and the second second	1 A-II	6	Plant based	
BVC	Municipal organic food waste		1 A-I	3	Compost	
CGR	Wastewater supernatant		1 C-I	13	Mineral precipitate	
ECO	Blood and feather meal		1 B-I	10	Animal by-product	
FEK	Chicken manure		1 A-I	10	Poultry manure	
FEL	Chicken manure		1 A-I	10	Poultry manure	
GRF	Manure and crop digestate	AT SA	1 A-II	5	Digestate	
HDG	75 % slurry, remaining mainly seperative seperation of the second se	CRACK, MARCHAN, MARCHAN,	1 A-II	5	Digestate	
ILF	Gelamin		1 A-II	10	Animal by-product	
MAL	Mixture of malt germ, malt, minera		1 A-I	6	Plant based	
MB2	Meat and bone meal		1 B-I	10	Animal by-product	
M013	Feather meal		1 A-I	10	Animal by-product	
NAD	Liquid manure and vegetables resic		1 B-I	4	Mix animal and plant	
NE4	Sugar, molassses, syrup, Aspergillus	time the second second	1 A-I	6	Plant based	
NE7	Plant-based organic raw material and the second sec		1 B-I	6	Plant based	
OG1	Meat and bone meal		1 B-I	10	Animal by-product	
OG2	Horn meal (pig bristles)		1 A-I	10	Animal by-product	
000	Olive oil production residues		1 A-I	3	Compost	
OPU	Chicken manure		1 B-I	10	Poultry manure	
PAL	Fermented biochar and high-quality day and rock hour	רייוטואוא מוע ופווופוונמנוטור דפורמ דופנמ	1 A-I	4	Plant based	
PCS	Sewage water	P extraction via struvite	1 C-I	12	Mineral precipitate	
PCW	Potato cell water	Evaporation	1 B-II	6	Plant based	
PRI	Animal and/or vegetal origin + mineral granules	Compost into granules, then blending with mineral granules	1 B-I	3/6	Mix animal and plant	
SDG	Agro and food waste + seaweed	Digestion	1 A-II	6	Digestate	
SIF	Animal and vegetal raw materials	Granulating	1 A-I	6/10	Mix animal and plant	
SYS	Ammonium-nitrogen and potassium Digestion using reverse osmosis			6	Mineral precipitate	
TRS	Fish soluble, 78 % proteins, 16 % ash	Enzymatic hydrolysis	1 A-I	10	Animal by-product	
VEC	Residues of the digestion of horse manure	Composting	1 A-I	3	Compost	<u>lsj@plen.ku.dk</u>

Challenges of bio-based vs. mineral fertilisers

How plants take up nutrients





Relevant N-BBF may have

- Higher risk of NH3 loss due to high pH or high carbonate content
- Slower N release / mineralisation

More unpredictable fertiliser value than mineral fertiliser



Develop and validate standard compliance methods for assessing plant N availability and fertiliser value



Potential N-mineralization of BBFs Biological assays

- Aerobic nitrogen mineralization assay
- Cumulative soil respiration

Chemical extractions (mild)

- Hot water extractable N (HW-N)
- Hot KCl extractable N (hKCl-N) Chemical extractions (moderate)
- Hot H_2SO_4 extractable N (H_2SO_4 -N)
- KMnO₄ oxidizable N (POX-N)

Chemical extractions (stable)

Index for residual organic carbon (IROC)

Correlations and predictions of potential N mineralisation



Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)



Potential ammonia volatilisation of BBFs

Aerobic incubation with NH₃ and CO₂ traps

All longlist BBFs (39):

- Surface application
- Pure sand

Surface vs. incorporation (8 BBF):

- Pure sand + sandy soil (DK)
- Surface vs incorporation

Field trial soils (5 BBF):

• 5 field site soils

Moisture, rate and form (3 BBF):

- Different soil moisture
- Different application rate
- Homogenization vs original form
- Correlations and predictions of potential ammonia volatilisation
- = Combined predictions of potential plant N availability © Lars Stoumann Jensen Isi@plen.ku.dk





Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

Potential N-mineralisation – mineral fertiliser vs. BBF

(Conceptual data – LEX4BIO results not finalised yet)



←LEX4BIO →

21 © Lars Stoumann Jensen <u>lsj@plen.ku.dk</u>





Potential ammonia volatilisation – min. fertiliser vs. BBF





Testing actual agronomic N use efficiency & fertiliser value









BA6 PAL FEK MO13 ECO OG2 SDG Reference 1 - 0 kgN/ha Reference 2 - 50 kgN/ha Reference 3 - 100 kgN/ha Reference 4 - 150 kaN/ha



- 5 field trials in a gradient (climate and soil types – FI to ES)
 - + 2 validation sites (ZH, HU)
- 2-y field trials at each site
- Randomized block design (4 reps)
- 10 BBF + 4 min. refs
- Local typical spring/winter crops





Horizon 20.

grant agree



AII-RG (FR)

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN



Applied at 137 kg total-N/ha (recommended opt.)



25 © Lars Stoumann Jensen <u>lsj@plen.ku.dk</u>





Yield response of **BBFs vs. mineral fertilisers**

- Agronomic efficiency of N applied: $AE = \Delta Yield / \Delta N$
- N Fertiliser replace value, $NFRV_{BBF} = AE_{BBF}/Ae_{ref}$
- Most of the BBFs showed a relatively high N fertiliser value (>70%)

36%

109%

73%

references (CAN)

Training a new generation for the BBF challenge?

The FertiCycle network: New bio-based fertilisers from organic waste upcycling

Our vision

- To be able to manage and process organic and nutrient containing waste streams much more intelligently, not just by recycling, but by actually upcycling their content of plant nutrients and organic matter, to create new, more valuable, bio-based fertilisers with higher benefits.
- To base our approach on the cradle-to-cradle concept that all nutrient containing products can be upcycled in a waste-free and circular economy, where their entire lifecycle is considered and dealt with.
- For this we need to train a new generation of bio-based fertiliser experts



⁻⁸⁷³

Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO) **European Training Networks (ETN)** under Marie Sklodowska-Curie Actions in H2020 are an ideal engine for this!

We obtained a grant to initiate the **FertiCycle** network with 15 PhDs

PI: Lars Stoumann Jensen (UCPH, DK)





Recruitment of new bio-based fertiliser experts





Clara Kopp

Florent Lelenda

Kebalo



Jihane El Mahdi

Chrysanthopoulos

Khan Wali

Maja Rydgård



Jared Nyang'au



Hellen Luisa de **Tomas Sitzmann** Castro e Silva



de Santis Sica



Samaya El Hajj Hassan

We started the project 1 Jan 2020…

The COVID-19 pandemic hit us and the globe in March 2020…

In spite of pandemic obstacles we succeeded in recuiting these talented young PhD students from all over the world and relocating them to Europe by the end of 2020!



Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme,



© Lars Stoumann Jensen Isi@plen.ku.dk





Aslihan Ural



Yusra Zireeni

Egor Moshkin





Research + training + dissemination and expected outcomes of FertiCycle





Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

Follow us: <u>www.ferticycle.ku.dk</u> where you can also sign up for our newsletter © Lars Stoumann Jensen si@plen.ku.dk

29



**** * * F

Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO) Follow us: <u>www.ferticycle.ku.dk</u>, newsletter & SoMe



Thank you for your attention ! – I am open to any questions 🙄

Contact: Prof. <u>Lars Stoumann Jensen</u>, University of Copenhagen, Denmark (<u>lsj@plen.ku.dk</u>)





Thise projects have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme , grant agreements No.860127 (FertiCycle) and 818309 (LEX4BIO)

© Lars Stoumann Jensen <u>lsj@plen.ku.dk</u>