Predicting methane emissions from pig manure: effects of feeding and manure management

Paria Sefeedpari, André Aarnink, Karin Groenestein ZEA conference, 3-5 May Denmark









Outlines



Why methane emission is important?

- Contribution of (Dutch) livestock farming (70%) to Dutch greenhouse gas emissions
- Contribution of pig farming (~15%)
- Tracks on CH₄ emissions: (in-barn) manure storage (~80%), animal
- Housing systems in the Netherlands: Traditional and Low-emission houses
- Opportunities for lower emissions





Background

- Standards, experiment-based and model-based approaches for determination of CH₄ emissions
- Models and algorithms with different levels of complexity are available.
- A dynamic CH₄ prediction model is needed to enable emission calculations, considering:
 - metabolism of the animals such as composition of the growth;
 - amount of daily volatile solids (VS) and VS characterisation;
 - effect of housing and manure management system;
 - effect of feeding on CH₄ emissions.





Research question and goals

Can modelling be an alternative to measurements at farm-level?

- VS characterisation of the excreted manure;
- Predicting CH₄ emissions from in-barn manure pits in fattening pig farms;
- Validating the model results with experimental data and at two different housing systems (*long-storage and daily removal of manure from in-barn storage*).









Model description

- MESPRO model (Aarnink et al, 1992 & 2018):
- Dynamic model/ daily time resolution/ growth curve (Gompertz function)
- Main inputs:
 - $\,\circ\,$ Start weight and growth rate
 - Total feed and water intake
 - Feed composition (content of water, crude protein, crude fat, crude fibre, remaining carbohydrates, ash, K, P, Ca and digestibility coefficients, lignocellulose components of feed
- Main outputs (among others):
 - Amount of manure
 - Composition of manure
 - Methane emissions







VS characterisation and CH₄ calculations

- Total volatile solids excretion:
- VS in the faeces:
- VS in the urine:
- Non-degradable VS:
- Degradable VS:
- CH₄ production rate (Sommer et al., 2004)

$$VS_{total} = F_{VS} + U_{VS}$$

$$F_{vs} = (1 - DCOM) * OMI$$

$$U_{vs} = {}^{60}/_{28} \times U_N$$

$$VS_{nd} = Lignin + (partially (hemi)cellulose)$$

$$VS_d = VS_{total} - VS_{nd}$$

$$(81 \text{ kJ/mol})$$

$$Elsgaard et al. (2016)$$

$$F_t = (VS_d + 0.01VS_{nd}) e^{\left(lnA - \frac{Ed}{RT}\right)}$$

$$(g \text{ CH}_4/\text{kg VS/h}) (kg/\text{kg VS}) (31.3 \text{ g CH}_4/\text{kgVS/h})$$

$$Petersen et al. (2016)$$

$$(kJ/K/mol) 8$$





Farms description and measurements

Overview of fattening pig farms visited for manure samples in the Netherlands

Farm ID	Floor type	MSS	Ave. manure removal interval	No. of visits	No. of samples			
A-LS	Partly slatted	Long storage underneath slats (LS)	>2 mo	4	12			
B-LS	Partly slatted	Long storage underneath slats (LS)	>2 mo	4	7			
A-SS	Partly slatted	Daily removal manure channel (SS)	1 d	4	6			
B-SS	Partly slatted	Daily removal manure channel (SS)	1 d	4	8			
* LS: long storage; SS: short storage; MSS: Manure storage system								

- In-vitro assay (adopted from Elsgaard et al., 2016)
- CH₄ production rates (g CH₄/kg VS/day) corrected for in-situ temperature
- In-vivo measurements of CH₄ emissions (24-h reference method)







Measured and modeled CH₄ emissions

Results of monitoring pig farms in the Netherlands (SD)

		In-vitro	Model
Average CH ₄ production rate	g CH ₄ kg ⁻¹ VS d ⁻¹	1.4 (0.2)	2.2 (0.2)
Average VS content	g kg ⁻¹ fresh wt	66 (0.01)	80 (0.01)
Average fraction of VS _d	kg kg ⁻¹ VS	-	0.71 (0.02)

Average CH₄ production rate at in-barn storage: Petersen et al., 2016: <u>1.97</u> g CH₄ kg⁻¹ VS d⁻¹

Average degradable VS: Sommer et al., 2004: <u>0.89</u> kg/kg VS in fresh excreta Petersen et al., 2016: <u>0.51</u> kg/kg VS in stored manure





Model predictions of CH_4 emission and height variations

- CH₄ emission during shortand long-term storage as predicted with the height of residual slurry fraction in the storage.
- Lower CH₄ emission in SS vs. LS





LS: long storage; SS: short storage; Solid line: CH₄ emission; Dashed line: height of slurry

11

Model results and validation

Average CH₄ emissions (SD), comparison between modelled and measured values

	Model	in-vitro	in-vivo*	R ²	RMSE
	(kg CH ₄ /animal/year)			(-)	(kg CH ₄ /animal/year)
Long storage	14.3	13.6	26.6	0.84	0.02
(manure)	(5.8)	(6.1)	(9.9)		
Short storage	1.8	1.0	2.9	0.61	0.002
(manure)	(0.74)	(0.52)	(1.2)		
Previous works (manure+animal)		15			

* Total CH₄ emissions (manure +enteric)

Annual CH₄ emissions:

Dutch inventory, 2019: 6.7 kg CH₄ animal.place⁻¹ year⁻¹

Higher in-vivo results can be explained by:

1) methane emissions from the animals;

2) model can not predict the presence of active methanogens in the sedimentary layer;

3) one missing value of the measured data.





Conclusions

- The need for improving estimations of CH₄ emissions from manure at farmscale as affected by manure management and feed;
- Low emission housing system (frequent emptying) caused ~95% reduction in methane emissions from manure;
- The most important effect of frequent manure removal (at daily basis in this study) is the small volume of manure at in-barn storage (in which the methane can be formed). SS houses are equipped with external storage and/or anaerobic digester.





Conclusions

- Results indicated that with additional work, particularly on the methanogenic activity in the manure, the model could be a tool for estimation of CH₄ emissions for inventories;
- It is recommended to estimate InA (Arrhenius parameter) for different manure types, ages and per country;
- The model may be used for farm-level assessments and to investigate mitigation scenarios.





Thank you for your attention

M4Models is a FACCE ERA-GAS project in the Netherlands funded by the NWO and co-funded by the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality.

paria.sefeedpari@wur.nl







To explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life