**Environmental Science** 

# Riccardo Valentini Franco Miglietta Editors

# The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy

An Insight on Managed and Natural Terrestrial Ecosystems



## **Environmental Science and Engineering**

### **Environmental Science**

#### Series editors

Rod Allan, Burlington, Canada Ulrich Förstner, Hamburg, Germany Wim Salomons, Haren, The Netherlands More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/3234

Riccardo Valentini · Franco Miglietta Editors

# The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy

An Insight on Managed and Natural Terrestrial Ecosystems



*Editors* Riccardo Valentini Department for Innovation in Biological, Agro-Food and Forest System (DIBAF) University of Tuscia Viterbo Italy

and

Impacts on Agriculture, Forest and Natural Ecosystem Division (IAFENT) Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Changes (CMCC) Viterbo Italy Franco Miglietta FoxLab Institute of Biometeorology National Research Council of Italy (CNR) and Edmund Mach Foundation San Michele all'Adige Italy

ISSN 1431-6250 Environmental Science and Engineering ISBN 978-3-642-32423-9 ISBN 978-3-642-32424-6 (eBook) DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-32424-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014957323

Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer-Verlag GmbH Berlin Heidelberg is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

## Contents

#### Part I The Overview

1	The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy: A Synthesis Maria Vincenza Chiriacò and Riccardo Valentini	3
2	Carbon, Water and Energy Fluxes of Terrestrial	
	Ecosystems in Italy	11
	Dario Papale, Mirco Migliavacca, Edoardo Cremonese,	
	Alessandro Cescatti, Giorgio Alberti, Manuela Balzarolo,	
	Luca Belelli Marchesini, Eleonora Canfora, Raffaele Casa,	
	Pierpaolo Duce, Osvaldo Facini, Marta Galvagno, Lorenzo Genesio,	
	Damiano Gianelle, Vincenzo Magliulo, Giorgio Matteucci,	
	Leonardo Montagnani, Fabio Petrella, Andrea Pitacco,	
	Guenther Seufert, Donatella Spano, Paolo Stefani,	
	Francesco P. Vaccari and Riccardo Valentini	
3	Biogenic Volatile Organic Compound Emissions	47
	Rita Baraldi, Francesca Rapparini, Osvaldo Facini,	
	Claudia Justina Kemper Pacheco, Giorgio Matteucci,	
	Enzo Brancaleoni and Paolo Ciccioli	
Pa	rt II Forests	
4	The Role of Managed Forest Ecosystem: An Inventory Approach	61
	Anna Barbati and Piermaria Corona	
5	The Role of Managed Forest Ecosystems: A Modeling	
	Based Approach	71
	Angelo Nolè, Alessio Collalti, Marco Borghetti, Marta Chiesi,	
	Gherardo Chirici, Federico Magnani, Serena Marras, Fabio Maselli, Costantino Sirca, Donatella Spano and Riccardo Valentini	

Contents
----------

6	Emissions from Forest Fires: Methods of Estimation and National Results	87
7	Carbon Losses Due to Wood Harvesting and the Role of Wood Products Marco Marchetti, Gherardo Chirici and Bruno Lasserre	103
Par	t III Croplands, Grasslands and Natural Ecosystems	
8	Soil Carbon Stocks and Fluxes Tommaso Chiti, Costantino Sirca, Mirco Rodeghiero, Donatella Spano and Riccardo Valentini	119
9	N <sub>2</sub> O Emission Factors for Italian Crops Simona Castaldi, Giorgio Alberti, Teresa Bertolini, Annachiara Forte, Franco Miglietta, Riccardo Valentini and Angelo Fierro	135
10	Cropland and Grassland Management Emanuele Lugato, Agata Novara, Damiano Gianelle, Loris Vescovo and Alessandro Peressotti	145
Par	t IV Regional Case Studies	
11	<b>The Role of Vineyards in the Carbon Balance Throughout Italy</b> Damiano Gianelle, Luciano Gristina, Andrea Pitacco, Donatella Spano, Tommaso La Mantia, Serena Marras, Franco Meggio, Agata Novara, Costantino Sirca and Matteo Sottocornola	159
12	Afforestation and Reforestation: The Sicilian Case Study Juliane Rühl, Luciano Gristina, Tommaso La Mantia, Agata Novara and Salvatore Pasta	173
13	Afforestation and Reforestation: The Friuli Venezia Giulia Case Study Giorgio Alberti, Gemini Delle Vedove, Silvia Stefanelli and Giuseppe Vanone	185

vi

## Acronyms

AF/R/D	Afforestation/reforestation/deforestation		
AIC	Akaike's information criterion		
ANN	Artificial Neural Network		
BEF	Biomass expansion factor		
BVOC	Biogenic volatile organic compounds		
BWD	Basic wood density		
CAI	Current annual increment		
CC	Combustion completeness		
CE	Combustion efficiency		
CLC	Corine land cover		
CO <sub>2</sub> eq	Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> that would have the same global warming		
	potential (GWP) for a given amount of greenhouse gas		
CRO	Cropland		
CUP	Carbon uptake period		
DBF	Deciduous broadleaf forest		
DBH	Diameter at breast height		
EBF	Evergreen broadleaf forest		
EF	Emission factor		
ENF	Evergreen needleleaf forest		
FE	Fire emissions		
FIE	Fertilizer-induced emission		
FM	Forest management		
GHG	Greenhouse gas		
GIS	Geographic information system		
GPG-LULUCF	Good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and		
	forestry. It refers to IPCC (2003) Penman J., Gytarsky M.,		
	Hiraishi T., Krug, T., Kruger D., Pipatti R., Buendia L., Miwa		
	K., Ngara T., Tanabe K., Wagner F., Good Practice Guidance		
	for Land Use, land-Use Change and Forestry IPCC/IGES,		
	Hayama, Japan		
GPP	Gross primary production		

GRA	Grassland
IAV	Interannual variability
INFC	National inventory of forests and forest carbon pools
IPCC	Intergovernmental panel on climate change
ISCI	Carbon stock inventory
ISTAT	National statistics agency
IUTI	Land use inventory
LAI	Leaf area index
LUC	Land use change
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MBE	Mean bias error
NEE	Net ecosystem exchange
NEP	Net ecosystem production
NPP	Net primary production
Nr	Reactive nitrogen
PAR	Photosynthetically active radiation
PBMs	Process-based models
PFT	Plant functional types
QA/QC	Quality assurance/quality control
RMSE	Root mean square error
SHB	Shrubland
SLA	Specific leaf area
SOA	Secondary organic aerosols
SOC	Soil organic carbon
SOM	Soil organic matter
SVAT	Soil-vegetation-atmosphere transport
TER	Total ecosystem respiration
UNFCCC	United nations framework convention on climate change
VOC	Volatile organic compounds
VPD	Vapor pressure deficit

## Part I The Overview

## Chapter 1 The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy: A Synthesis

Maria Vincenza Chiriacò and Riccardo Valentini

**Abstract** In this chapter a comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gases budget of the Italian terrestrial ecosystems is provided, with particular attention to forest, cropland and grassland ecosystems and some case studies focusing on Italian shrublands and lands naturally or artificially converted to forests. Different methods have been applied and compared, such as regional measurements, use of flux networks and data-driven models within specific sectoral approaches in order to characterize the greenhouse gases budget of terrestrial ecosystems. The results presented respond also to the growing interest of the recent years in the role of the carbon cycle of terrestrial ecosystems and its relevance for national policies on mitigation and adaptation to climate changes.

#### **1.1 Introduction**

This chapter perceives the challenge to address in a comprehensive way the full greenhouse gases budget of the Italian terrestrial ecosystems, with particular attention to forest ecosystems, cropland and grassland ecosystems with some case studies focusing on Italian shrublands and lands naturally or artificially converted to forests.

The wealth of research information presented is mainly referred to the results of a national project, CarboItaly, which involved a number of Italian research institutions and several researchers with the aim to produce data and information useful to characterize different compartments of the greenhouse gases budget of the Italian terrestrial ecosystems, with a special emphasis on forest, croplands, grasslands and natural ecosystems.

M.V. Chiriacò (🖂) · R. Valentini

M.V. Chiriacò · R. Valentini

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

Department for Innovation in Biological, Agro-Food and Forest System (DIBAF), University of Tuscia, Via San C. de Lellis s.n.c., 01100 Viterbo, Italy e-mail: chiriaco@unitus.it

Impacts on Agriculture, Forest and Natural Ecosystem Division (IAFENT), Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Changes (CMCC), Viterbo, Italy

R. Valentini and F. Miglietta (eds.), *The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy*, Environmental Science and Engineering, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-32424-6\_1

The results provided in this book respond to the growing interest of the recent years in the role of the carbon cycle of terrestrial ecosystems and its relevance for national policies on mitigation and adaptation to climate changes.

There is also a growing need on the part of institutions, agencies and policy stakeholders for new data and analysis in relation to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process. In particular, the data presented in this book contribute to build a basis for a full carbon accountability of the land sector.

## **1.2** Methods for the assessments of the greenhouse gases budget

Different methods have been applied and compared, such as regional measurements, use of flux networks and data-driven models within specific sectoral approaches in order to characterize the greenhouse gases budget of terrestrial ecosystems. The Eddy Covariance technique has been applied to a range of Italian sites representative of the main plant functional types (PFT) and of the main Italian macro-regions, to provide data and measures of carbon dioxide, water and energy flow for the whole period of the project. This has made Italy the country with the most dense network of production and eddy covariance Europe. The CarboItaly sites also contributed to the activities in the global network FLUXNET (www.fluxdata.org). Measures of the NEE and its partitioning into the Gross Primary Production (GPP) and ecosystem respiration have been performed with the Eddy Covariance technique in order to analyse the role of the Carbon Uptake Period in the total Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) and define the effect of temperature and precipitation, disturbances and management practices on the interannual variability of NEE, aiming at a better understanding of the role and response of ecosystems to climate change.

The role of the Italian managed forest ecosystems in national greenhouse gases budget has been widely discussed and investigated in this book. Integration of land use and forest inventory approaches as well as modeling based approaches have been applied for the assessment of the national forest Gross and net primary productivity (GPP and NPP) and the carbon, water, and elemental cycles. In forest ecosystems firewood and forest harvesting represent a net carbon loss but the use of wood, carbonneutral renewable resource, for generating energy has also a strong substitution effect as it avoids the use of fossil fuels which are highly CO<sub>2</sub> emitting. The use of wood for construction purposes, substituting traditional materials, tends to increase carbon sequestration and to contribute to climate change mitigation. The great potential of the increasing use of forest wood products for energy, building and furniture purposes in contributing to the reduction of GHG emissions and to a more sustainable development have also been investigated. Another important aspect in the terrestrial carbon budget is represented by the emissions from forest fires. Several experimental and modelling studies have been conducted and presented in this book to improve knowledge of the atmospheric impact of vegetation fires. Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (BVOCs) fluxes have been measured in forest CarboItaly sites and a GISbased model has been developed for predicting BVOCs emissions from the Italian

forest ecosystems in order to estimate the fraction of the Net Ecosystem Production lost as reduced carbon and to assess the impact of BVOCs in the formation of ozone and secondary organic aerosols.

The cropland ecosystems with the organic carbon stock in mineral soils and in permanent woody structure of perennial tree crops also play a key role in the terrestrial carbon budget. In this book an assessment of the total soil organic carbon (SOC) stock in the top 30 cm of mineral soil for the whole Italian territory, according to the different land use types of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) cropland category (arable land, agroforestry, vineyards, olive groves, orchards and rice fields), has been performed as a basis for future land use scenarios and to address mitigation policy at country level.

Also nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions from several Italian croplands along a latitudinal gradient as well as the relationship between N<sub>2</sub>O production and applied N fertilization rate were analyzed and empirically derived from experimental sites in order to assess the effect of climate variability on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for Italian crops and to verify the reliability of internationally applied emission factors for temperate crops.

The effects of climate and management practices on the carbon balance in the soil and in the perennial woody biomass have been particularly investigated for Italian vineyard ecosystems. Moreover, regional case studies have been focused of different managements in cropland and grassland ecosystems and on the consequence on the effect on the soil organic carbon of the abandonment of agricultural land and the natural or artificial afforestation.

#### 1.3 Results

The main results presented in the next chapters have been grouped and further elaborated in order to provide a comprehensive assessment of the whole national greenhouse gases budget of terrestrial ecosystems. The values of Gross Primary Production (GPP) and Net Ecosystems Production (NEP) referred to the total Italian surface as well as the main national emissions of BVOCs and N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> have been assessed and are reported in the Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

Parameter	Unit value (g C m <sup>2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	Total carbon uptake from natural ecosys- tems (Mt C $y^{-1}$ )	Comments
NEE	-227 (25 %: -264; 75 %: -191)	62.3	Median and interquartile range of empirical upscaling using artificial neural network
GPP	849 (25 %: 811; 75 %: 891)	233	<ul> <li>(ANN) trained with eddy covariance data (Luyssaert et al. 2012) (Chap. 2).</li> <li>The national area of natural ecosystems includes forest- land, cropland and grass- land, and has been derived from Corine Land Cover 2006 (CLC 2006)</li> </ul>

 Table 1.1
 Carbon fixed in Italian natural ecosystems

terUnit value (g C $m^2 y^{-1}$ )Total carbon fixed in Italian forestnly aboveground biomass, 2005)135–14511.82–12.70nly below ground biomass, 2005)135–14511.82–12.70nly below ground biomass, 2005)135–14511.82–12.70nly below ground biomass, 2005)40.54353.55–3.81nest tree biomass (below + above ground) in176–18915.37–16.51nest tree biomass (below + above ground) in176–18926.72–40.08eed NPP (all forest carbon pools) total300–45026.72–40.08as mainly planted with Mediterranean pine3680.73oak and evergreen woods3200.23s mainly planted with Mediterranean pine3680.73off or cypreses3.023.02nous fine forests3.17philous forests3.200.23out woods4.023.54nut woods4.023.54nut woods3.613.55nut woods3.613.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.773.55nut woods3.773.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.553.55nut woods3.720.09nut woods3.720.09nut woods3.720.09nut woods3.720.81<	Table 1.2         Total Net Primary Production (NPP) of Italian forest ecosystems	an forest ecosystem	S	
135-145         11.82-12.70           135-145         11.82-12.70           eground) in         176-189         3.55-3.81           eground) in         176-189         15.37-16.51           1317         26.72-40.08         15.37-16.51           intuit         300-450         26.72-40.08           17         6.67         3.02           intuit         300-450         26.72-40.08           317         6.67         3.02           intuit         300-450         26.72-40.08           317         6.67         3.02           intuit         300-450         26.72-40.08           intuit         302         3.02           intuit         302         3.17           intuit         302         3.17           intuit         302         3.17           intuit         302         3.17           intuit         3.17         3.54           intutute         3.57 </td <td>Parameter</td> <td>Unit value (g <math>C m^2 y^{-1}</math>)</td> <td>Total carbon fixed in Italian forest ecosystems (Mt C <math>y^{-1}</math>)</td> <td>Comments</td>	Parameter	Unit value (g $C m^2 y^{-1}$ )	Total carbon fixed in Italian forest ecosystems (Mt C $y^{-1}$ )	Comments
ss, 2005)       40:5435       3:55-3:81         + above ground) in       176-189       15:37-16:51         n pools) total       300-450       26.72-40:08         1317       6.67       26.72-40:08         s       317       6.67         s       420       26.72-40:08         editerranean pine       368       0.73         editerranean pine       368       0.73         ations with non       302       0.73         ations with non       302       0.73         ations with non       302       3.17         d with pine-trees in       407       3.54         d with pine-trees in       407       3.52         woods       372       0.81         s of non native       392       0.01	NPP (only aboveground biomass, 2005)	135-145	11.82–12.70	Inventory approach (Chap. 4) Italian forest area from INFC (2005)
+ above ground) in $176-189$ $15.37-16.51$ n pools) total $300-450$ $26.72-40.08$ $317$ $300-450$ $26.72-40.08$ $317$ $6.67$ $3.02$ editerranean pine $368$ $0.73$ $320$ $0.73$ $3.02$ ations with non $302$ $0.73$ $320$ $0.23$ $3.17$ $320$ $0.23$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $317$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $320$ $3.17$ $321$ $3.54$ $321$ $3.54$ $321$ $3.54$ $321$ $3.52$ $321$ $3.52$ $322$ $0.81$ $322$ $0.81$ $322$ $0.92$ $322$ $0.91$	NPP (only below ground biomass, 2005)	40.5435	3.55-3.81	Based on inventory approach (Chap. 4) and
n pools) total $300-450$ $26.72-40.08$ $317$ $6.67$ $6.67$ $s$ $317$ $6.67$ $c$ $420$ $3.02$ $c$ $3.02$ $3.02$ $c$ $3.02$ $0.73$ $s$ $3.17$ $s$ $3.54$ $s$ $3.54$ $s$ $3.54$ $s$ $3.54$ $s$	NPP forest tree biomass (below + above ground) in 2005	176–189	15.37–16.51	elaborated considering a mean value of the root/shoot ratio (R) of the main Italian for- est types equal to 0.30 (Federici et al. 2008) Italian forest area from INFC (2005)
317         6.67           Is         317         6.67           editerranean pine         368         3.02           ations with non         368         0.73           320         0.23         0.73           ations with non         302         3.17           402         7.98         7.98           467         3.54         3.54           ations with pine-trees in         407         3.52           (Silver fir and red fir         3.52         0.81           woods         372         0.81           soft non native         392         0.09	Simulated NPP (all forest carbon pools) total	300-450	26.72-40.08	Modeling approach (Chap. 5)
Is         420         3.02           editerranean pine         368         0.73           ations with non         320         0.73           ations with non         320         0.23           ations with non         302         3.17           ations with non         302         3.17           dations with non         302         3.54           dations with pine-trees in         407         3.52           dation fine trees in         407         3.52           woods         372         0.81           s of non native         392         0.09	Mediterranean shrub land	317	6.67	The national area of Italian forest types has
editerranean pine     368     0.73       ations with non     320     0.23       ations with non     302     3.17       ations with non     302     3.54       ations with pine-trees in     407     3.52       ation the fit     3.52     3.52       woods     372     0.81       s of non native     392     0.09	• Holm oak and evergreen woods	420	3.02	been derived from Corine Land Cover 2006
320ations with non3023024024024674673814 with pine-trees in (Silver fir and red fir woods407woods372s of non native392	<ul> <li>Woods mainly planted with Mediterranean pine trees and/or cypresses</li> </ul>	368	0.73	
ations with non 302 402 467 467 381 467 381 407 (Silver fir and red fir woods 372 s of non native 392	Hygrophilous forests	320	0.23	
402467467467381a with pine-trees in (Silver fir and red fir woods372woods372s of non native392	<ul> <li>Broad-leaved woods and plantations with non native species</li> </ul>	302	3.17	
467 381 407 372 372 392	<ul> <li>Deciduous mixed oaks woods</li> </ul>	402	7.98	
381 407 372 392	Chestnut woods	467	3.54	
407 372 392	Beech forests	381	3.5	
a 1372 392 a 1392 a 139	• Woods mainly planted with pine-trees in the sub-alpine and alpine areas (Silver fir and red fir woods)	407	3.52	
ers woods and plantations of non native 392	• Black pine and mountain pine woods	372	0.81	
aportes	<ul> <li>Conifers woods and plantations of non native species</li> </ul>	392	0.09	

Parameter	Unit value (g C m <sup>2</sup> )	Total SOC stock in Italian croplands (Mt C)	Comments
SOC stock in the upper 30 cm	-	489 ± 148.2	Data referred to 2007 (Chap. 8)
SOC stock in the upper 30 cm	-	470.5	Projected for 2020, with no mitigation options (Chap. 8)
Arable land and Agroforestry	$4.010 \pm 230$ to $6.980 \pm 2530$	285–497	SOC stock in Italian cropland sub-cate- gories, depending on climate types (Chiti et al. 2010) Data referred to 2000 (Chap. 8)
Vineyards	$3.920 \pm 1.000$ to $8.220 \pm 5.490$	281–590	
Olive groves	$\begin{array}{c} 4.210 \pm 1.330 \\ 5.600 \pm 3.500 \end{array}$	45.5-60.5	
Orchards	$3.810 \pm 990$ to $5.780 \pm 1.640$	240–365	
Rice fields	$6.010 \pm 1.110$ to 23.440 $\pm 8.030$	12.8–19.9	

 Table 1.3
 Soil organic carbon (SOC) stock in Italian cropland ecosystems

Table 1.4 Carbon stock and fluxes measured in local case studies in Italy

Parameter	Total value	Comments	
Annual NEE Vineyards	89–145–814	Measured on sites of Serdiana (CA), Valle dell'Adige (TN) and Negrisia (TV) respectively, in 2009 NEE expressed in g C m <sup>2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> It includes all carbon pools: soil, grass cover, vine canopy and woody biomass (Chap. 11)	
SOC stock permanent irrigated and irrigated arable lands	3.160	SOC Stock expressed in g C m <sup>2</sup> Measured in Sardinia croplands in 2008	
SOC stock vineyard	3.380	(Chap. 8)	
SOC stock olive groves	3.220	_	
Aboveground carbon stock on affor- ested croplands	2530-4.030	SOC stock measured in g C $m^2$ on afforested cropland due to land use change after abandonment in Friuli Venezia Giulia (Chap. 13)	
Belowground carbon stock on affor- ested croplands	660–1.050		
SOC stock on afforested croplands	5.430-7.700	_	
Aboveground NPP on afforested croplands	240–940		
Belowground NPP on afforested croplands	60–240		
Soil carbon sequestration on afforested croplands	40–110		

The total carbon fixed in the Italian natural ecosystems through the process of photosynthesis, expressed as GPP, can be assumed of 233 millions of tons of Carbon (Mt C), of which 62.3 Mt C represents the total Italian net carbon sink, expressed as NEE (Table 1.1).

A considerable amount of national carbon budget of natural ecosystems is represented by the Net Primary Production (NPP) of Italian forests, with a total of 15.37– 16.51 millions of tons of Carbon per year (Mt C y<sup>-1</sup>) fixed in the above and below ground biomass of forest trees and 26.72 ( $\pm$ 5.34)–40.08 ( $\pm$ 8.02) Mt C y<sup>-1</sup>) if considering all carbon pools including litter, dead wood and forest soils (Table 1.2).

Another considerable amount of carbon contained in natural ecosystems is represented by the soil carbon (SOC) stock of Italian croplands. The SOC stock in the upper 30 cm of Italian agricultural soils has been assessed of about 489 ( $\pm$ 148.2) Mt C in 2007 and is projected for 2020 = 470.5 Mt C, with no mitigation options (Table 1.3).

Others values of carbon stock and fluxes are reported in the Table 1.4 related to specific local case studies of the Italian territory.

As reported in Table 1.5, a fraction of the total Net Ecosystem Production (NEP) of the Italian forest ecosystems is lost as reduced carbon and transformed to BVOCs emissions assessed for  $2006 = 41.2 \text{ Gg y}^{-1}$  of Monoterpene emissions and to  $31.7 \text{ Gg y}^{-1}$  of Isoprene emissions. The BVOCs emissions from the Italian forest ecosystems in 2006. The loss of NEP from the Italian forest ecosystems as Biogenic Volatile Organic Compound emissions is estimated of about 3–4 %.

Moreover, another relevant annual loss of NEP of the Italian forest ecosystems is represented by the carbon emissions due to wood removals (Table 1.6).

The two most important non CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases (GHG) exchanged with the atmosphere in Italian agricultural soils are the nitrous oxides (N<sub>2</sub>O) and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>).

Parameters	Total emissions of BVOCs (Gg y <sup>-1</sup> )	Comments
Monoterpene emissions	41.2	of which: $\alpha$ -pinene (9.10 Gg y <sup>-1</sup> ), sabinene (4.34 Gg y <sup>-1</sup> ) and $\beta$ -pinene (3.37 Gg y <sup>-1</sup> ) Limonene, myrcene, <i>trans</i> - and <i>cis</i> -beta ocimene, linalool, 1-8 cineol, camphene, $\beta$ -phellandrene and terpinolene contributed for the rest of the emission (Chap. 3)
Isoprene emissions	31.7	

 Table 1.5
 Total Italian Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (BVOCs) emissions from the Italian forest ecosystems in 2006

rests
l

Parameters	Total emissions (Mt CO <sub>2</sub> )	Comments
Annual carbon loss due to wood removal in Italy	6	Statistical data approach (Chap. 7)
Annual emission of hwp	0.92	Production approach (Chap. 7)

An emission of N<sub>2</sub>O of 1.52 ( $\pm$  0.04) Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq yr<sup>-1</sup> and a slight sink of CH<sub>4</sub> ( $-0.08 \pm 0.001$  Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq yr<sup>-1</sup>) has been assessed for the five main crops which represented 54% of the total harvested land in 2009, excluding rice paddies (Lugato et al., 2010). Applying the emission factor (EF, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg extra N) of 0.8% (derived from the range 0.4 to 0.8% provided by Chapter 9 and 10) to the total amount of fertilizer N consumed in Italy in 2009 (514.480 tons of N) (FAOSTAT 2014) and considering a similar flux strength for the remaining Italian harvested land, the total amount of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent is 1.93 ( $\pm$  0.09) Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq yr<sup>-1</sup> for 2009 while the total sink of CH<sub>4</sub> (excluding rice cultivation) is -0.148 ( $\pm$  0.002) Mt CO<sub>2</sub> eq yr<sup>-1</sup> (Table 1.7).

Table 1.8 shows SOC stock variations related to different management practices, ranging from a carbon sequestration potential of 26–67 g C m<sup>2</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> when

Parameters	Total fluxes of GHG (Mt CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	Comments
N <sub>2</sub> O	1.93 (± 0.09)	Estimated applying an EF of 0.8 % to total N fertilizer
CH4	-0.148 (± 0.002)	consumption in 2009 (Chapter 9 and 10) Sum of -0.08 Mt CO <sub>2</sub> eq from modeling simulation applied to 54 % of national harvested land, and -0.068 Mt CO <sub>2</sub> eq extrapolated applying a similar GHG source strength (tons CO <sub>2</sub> eq/ha) to the remaining harvested land (excluding ricepaddies) (Lugato et al 2010).

Table 1.7Fluxes of  $N_2O$  and  $CH_4$ , expressed as  $CO_2$  equivalents, in soils of Italian croplandsand woodland crops for year 2009 (rice paddies excluded)

Table 1.8	SOC s	tock	variations	related	to	different	management	practices	(the	negative	sign
indicates a	sequest	ration	potential)	1							

Parameters	Total carbon $(g C m^2 y^{-1})$	Comments			
SOC—Average annual carbon loss (with no mitigation options)	20–50	SOC loss in Italian croplands Gardi and Sconosciuto (2007), Janssens et al. (2005), Lugato et al. (2010), Morari et al. (2006) (Chap. 8)			
SOC—Annual carbon loss (with no mitigation options)	16	Calculated as difference between 1990 and 2000 (Chap. 8)			
Permanent set a side or zero tillage	-40	Carbon sequestration potential in soils of mitigation options in Italian crop- lands. Freibauer et al. (2004), Smith et al. (2000a, b) (Chap. 8)			
Perennial crops or deep rooting crops	-60				
Change from conventional to organic farming	-50				
Best management practice: change from cropland to grassland; no-till; farm yard manure	-26 to -67	Field experiments (Morari et al. 2006; Lugato et al. 2006; Triberti et al. 2008; Mazzoncini et al. 2011) (Chap. 10)			
Abandonment of a vineyard	+27 %	SOC stock variation in Sicilian vineyards (Chap. 11)			
Re-planting	-43 % initially				

best management practices like permanent set a side or zero tillage, perennial crops or deep rooting crops, change from conventional to organic farming change and from cropland to grassland, no-till and use of farm yard manure are applied.

#### References

- Chiti T, Papale D, Smith P, Dalmonech D, Matteucci G, Yeluripati J, Rodeghiero M, Valentini R (2010) Predicting changes in soil organic carbon in mediterranean and alpine forests during the Kyoto Protocol commitment periods using the century model. Soil Use Manag 26:475–484. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-2743.2010.00300.x, ISSN: 0266-0032
- CLC (2006) Corine Land Cover 2006 technical guidelines: European environment agency, EEA technical report No 17/2007, p 66
- FAOSTAT (2014) Consumption of fertilizer N in Italy. http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html
- Federici S, Vitullo M, Tulipano S, De Lauretis R, Seufert G (2008) An approach to estimate carbon stocks change in forest carbon pools under the UNFCCC: the Italian case. IForest 1:86–95
- Freibauer A, Rounsevell MDA, Smith P, Verhagen J (2004) Carbon sequestration in the agricultural soils of Europe. Geoderma 122:1–23
- Gardi C, Sconosciuto F (2007) Evaluation of carbon stock variation in Northern Italian soils over the last 70 years. Sustain Sci 2:237–243
- INFC (2005) Inventario nazionale delle foreste e dei serbatoi forestali di carbonio: estensione e composizione dei boschi (http://www.sian.it/inventarioforestale/jsp/dati\_introa.jsp)
- Janssens IA, Freibauer A, Schlamadinger B, Ceulemans R, Ciais P, Dolman AJ, Heimann M, Nabuurs GJ, Smith P, Valentini R, Schulze ED (2005) The carbon budget of terrestrial ecosystems at country-scale-a European case study. Biogeosciences 2:15–26
- Lugato E, Berti A, Giardini L (2006) Soil organic carbon (SOC) dynamics with and without residue incorporation in relation to different nitrogen fertilisation rates. Geoderma 135:315–321. doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2006.01.012
- Lugato E, Zuliani M, Alberti G, Delle Vedove G, Gioli B, Miglietta F, Peressotti A (2010) Application of DNDC biogeochemistry model to estimate greenhouse gas emission from Italian agricultural areas at high spatial resolution. Agr Ecosyst Environ 139:546–556
- Luyssaert S, Abril G, Andres R, Bastviken D, Bellassen V, Bergamaschi P, Bousquet P, Chevallier F, Ciais P, Corazza M, Dechow R, Erb K-H, Etiope G, Fortems-Cheiney A, Grassi G, Hartmann J, Jung M, Lathiere J, Lohila A, Mayorga E, Moosdorf N, Njakou DS, Otto J, Papale D, Peters W, Peylin P, Raymond P, Odenbeck CR, Saarnio S, Schulze E-D, Szopa S, Thompson R, Verkerk PJ, Vuichard N, Wang R, Wattenbach M, Zaehle S (2012) The European land and inland water CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O balance between 2001 and 2005. Biogeosciences 9(8):3357–3380. doi: 10.5194/bg-9-3357-2012, ISSN: 1726-4170
- Mazzoncini M, Bahadur Sapkota T, Barberi P, Antichi D, Risaliti R (2011) Long-term effect of tillage, nitrogen fertilization and cover crops on soil organic carbon and total nitrogen content. Soil Tillage Res 114:165–174. doi:10.1016/j.still.2011.05.001
- Morari F, Lugato E, Berti A, Giardini L (2006) Long term effects of recommended management practices on soil carbon changes and sequestration in north-eastern Italy. Soil Use Manag 22:71–81
- Smith P, Powlson DS, Smith JU, Falloon P, Coleman K (2000a) Meeting Europe's climate change commitments: quantitative estimates of the potential for carbon mitigation by agriculture. Glob Change Biol 6:525–539
- Smith WN, Desjardins RL, Patty E (2000b) The net flux of carbon from agricultural soils in Canada 1970–2010. Glob Change Biol 6:557–568
- Triberti L, Nastri A, Giordani G, Comellini F, Baldoni G, Toderi G (2008) Can mineral and organic fertilization help sequestrate carbon dioxide in cropland? Eur J Agron 29:13–20

## Chapter 2 Carbon, Water and Energy Fluxes of Terrestrial Ecosystems in Italy

Dario Papale, Mirco Migliavacca, Edoardo Cremonese, Alessandro Cescatti, Giorgio Alberti, Manuela Balzarolo, Luca Belelli Marchesini, Eleonora Canfora, Raffaele Casa, Pierpaolo Duce, Osvaldo Facini, Marta Galvagno, Lorenzo Genesio, Damiano Gianelle, Vincenzo Magliulo, Giorgio Matteucci, Leonardo Montagnani, Fabio Petrella, Andrea Pitacco, Guenther Seufert, Donatella Spano, Paolo Stefani, Francesco P. Vaccari and Riccardo Valentini

**Abstract** In this chapter the Eddy Covariance network of Italy is presented, with a short introduction to each of the 29 sites that were active during the CarboItaly project. These sites provided a unique dataset for a better study and understanding of the carbon cycle of terrestrial ecosystems and the links between carbon sink capacity and the main environmental factors. After a number of examples of Eddy Covariance time series where it is possible to see the effect of interannual climate variability and disturbances and managements practices, an analysis of the role of

M. Migliavacca · A. Cescatti · G. Seufert

Joint Research Centre, Institute for Environment and Sustainability, European Commission, Ispra, Italy

E. Cremonese · M. Galvagno ARPA Valle D'Aosta, Aosta, Italy

G. Alberti Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

R. Casa DAFNE, University of Tuscia, Viterbo, Italy

O. Facini IBIMET, CNR, Bologna, Italy

L. Genesio · F.P. Vaccari IBIMET, CNR, Florence, Italy

D. Gianelle Department of Sustainable Agro-Ecosystems and Bioresources, Research and Innovation Centre, Fondazione Edmund Mach, Michele All' Adige, Trento, Italy

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

R. Valentini and F. Miglietta (eds.), *The Greenhouse Gas Balance of Italy*, Environmental Science and Engineering, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-32424-6\_2

D. Papale ( $\boxtimes$ ) · M. Balzarolo · L. Belelli Marchesini · E. Canfora · P. Stefani · R. Valentini Department for Innovation in Biological, Agro-Food and Forest System (DIBAF), University of Tuscia, Viterbo, Italy e-mail: darpap@unitus.it

the Carbon Uptake Period in the total Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) definition and a study of the effect of temperature and precipitation on the interannual variability of NEE are presented in order to show the way these data can contribute to a better understanding of the role and response of ecosystems to climate change.

#### 2.1 Introduction

Monitoring carbon, water and energy fluxes between terrestrial ecosystems and atmosphere is essential for a better understanding of the biological and ecological processes, also in relation to climate variability and climate change, and to assess the carbon balance of the different ecosystems and their ability to sequester  $CO_2$  from the atmosphere.

In order to improve the understanding of the quantities involved in the carbon balance of terrestrial ecosystems, it is important to provide the following definitions: it is defined Gross Primary Production (GPP) of an ecosystem, the total amount of  $CO_2$ that is fixed by the vegetation in photosynthesis. The synthesis of new plant tissues and the maintenance of the plants themselves require energy that is provided by the autotrophic respiration (Ra). The difference between the amount of carbon fixed by photosynthesis and respired by the vegetation is defined Net Primary Production (NPP):

NPP = GPP - Ra

V. Magliulo ISAFOM, CNR, Ercolano, NA, Italy

G. Matteucci ISAFOM, CNR, Rende, CS, Italy

G. Matteucci IBAF, CNR, Monterotondo, RM, Italy

L. Montagnani Forest Services and Agency for the Environment, Autonomous Province of Bolzano, Faculty of Science and Technology, Free University of Bolzano, Bolzano, Italy

F. Petrella Institute for Wood Plant and Environment (IPLA), Environmental Disease and Soil Conservation Unit, Turin, Italy

A. Pitacco DAFNAE, University of Padua, Padua, Italy

D. Spano Department of Science for Nature and Environmental Resources (DIPNET), University of Sassari, via E. de Nicola 9, 07100 Sassari, Italy

P. Duce IBIMET, CNR, Sassari, Italy

D. Spano Impacts on Agriculture, Forest and Natural Ecosystem Division (IAFENT), Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Changes (CMCC), Sassari, Italy The NPP is allocated to the production of biomass (wood, leaves, roots, fruits, seeds etc.) and respired back to the atmosphere mainly due to decomposition by microbial activities. The quantity of carbon lost by respiration for heterotrophic organisms is defined heterotrophic respiration (Rh) and the difference between NPP and Rh is the Net Ecosystem Production

#### NEP = NPP - Rh = GPP - TER

The NEP represents the net ecosystem carbon sink or source due to physiological processes and it is also named Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) when it is quantified using measurements of  $CO_2$  exchanges between ecosystem and atmosphere (while it is called NEP when measured using inventory approaches). The two terms are somehow interchangeable but in general with opposite signs: a flux of carbon from the atmosphere to the ecosystem is positive in NEP and negative in NEE. The sum of the two respiration components (Rh and Ra) represents the total ecosystem respiration (TER).

The NEP is however different from the long term carbon balance of the ecosystem because there can be changes in the carbon stocks due to episodic losses by natural or anthropogenic disturbances and management practices. For this reason the Net Biome Production (NBP) is defined as (Schulze et al. 2000):

 $NEP = NPP - CO_2$  losses due to disturbances

There are different possible approaches and methods to measure the fluxes of energy and greenhouse gases (GHGs) in terrestrial ecosystems, ranging from inventory approaches to chambers measurements and ecosystem scale techniques such as the Eddy Covariance method (Aubinet et al. 2012).

The Eddy Covariance methodology has been developed in the early '90s and has been widely applied at global level. It is based on high frequency (10 Hz) measurements of wind speed, temperature and gas concentration using a three-axis sonic anemometer (which measures the wind speed along the three axis) and a fast response gas analyzer, typically an Infra Red Gas Analyzer (IRGA) for CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O, even if new systems have been recently developed and commercialized to measure high frequency concentrations of other gases such CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>3</sub>.

With the Eddy Covariance technique it is possible to measure the Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) of a GHG of a given surface extended around the monitoring tower (the footprint). The extension and shape of the footprint is function of the wind speed, wind direction and the difference between the measurement and canopy heights and it has generally a radius between few hundred meters and one kilometer around the measurement point. The Eddy Covariance technique is the only method available today to continuously measure the net ecosystem exchanges at ecosystem level and in a not-destructive way.

In addition, for  $CO_2$  NEE measurements, there is the possibility to statistically partition the net carbon fluxes measured into its major components as the gross primary production (GPP) and the ecosystem respiration (Reichstein et al. 2005; Lasslop et al. 2010) allowing a better interpretation of the fluxes in terms of ecosystem processes.

Nowadays, more than 500 sites exist globally, organized in regional networks contributing to the global network FLUXNET (http://fluxnet.ornl.gov/) with the