

# A multi-model assessment of C cycling and soil C sequestration in grasslands and croplands

Renata Sandor, Fiona Ehrhardt, Bruno Basso, Gianni Bellocchi, Arti Bhatia, Lorenzo Brilli, Massimiliano de Antoni Migliorati, Jordi Doltra, Chris Dorich, Luca Doro, et al.

# ▶ To cite this version:

Renata Sandor, Fiona Ehrhardt, Bruno Basso, Gianni Bellocchi, Arti Bhatia, et al.. A multi-model assessment of C cycling and soil C sequestration in grasslands and croplands. 6th International Symposium on Soil Organic Matter; Harpenden (Royaume Uni), Sep 2017, Harpenden, United Kingdom. pp.2. hal-01644043

# HAL Id: hal-01644043 https://hal.science/hal-01644043v1

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

### O-2c.02

# A multi-model assessment of C cycling and soil C sequestration in grasslands and croplands

Renáta Sándor<sup>1,2</sup>, Fiona Ehrhardt<sup>3</sup>, Bruno Basso<sup>4</sup>, \*Gianni Bellocchi<sup>1</sup>, Arti Bhatia<sup>5</sup>, Lorenzo Brilli<sup>6</sup>, Massimiliano De Antoni Migliorati<sup>7</sup>, Jordi Doltra<sup>8</sup>, Chris Dorich<sup>9</sup>, Luca Doro<sup>10</sup>, Nuala Fitton<sup>11</sup>, Sandro José Giacomini<sup>12</sup>, Peter Grace<sup>7</sup>, Brian Grant<sup>13</sup>, Matthew T. Harrison<sup>14</sup>, Stephanie K. Jones<sup>15</sup>, Miko U.F. Kirschbaum<sup>16</sup>, Katja Klumpp<sup>1</sup>, Patricia Laville<sup>17</sup>, Joël Leonard<sup>18</sup>, Mark Liebig<sup>19</sup>, Mark Lieffering<sup>20</sup>, Raphaël Martin<sup>1</sup>, Russel McAuliffe<sup>21</sup>, Elizabeth Meier<sup>22</sup>, Lutz Merbold<sup>23,24</sup>, Andrew D. Moore<sup>25</sup>, Vasileios Myrgiotis<sup>15</sup>, Paul Newton<sup>20</sup>, Elizabeth Pattey<sup>13</sup>, Sylvie Recous<sup>26</sup>, Susanne Rolinski<sup>27</sup>, Joanna Sharp<sup>28</sup>, Raia Sylvia Massad<sup>17</sup>, Pete Smith<sup>11</sup>, Ward Smith<sup>13</sup>, Val Snow<sup>21</sup>, Lianhai Wu<sup>29</sup>, Wen Zhang<sup>30</sup>, Jean-François Soussana<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>French National Institute for Agricultural Research, Grassland Ecosystem Research Unit, Clermont-Ferrand, France

## Introduction

Agricultural activities can lead to either losses or gains of soil organic carbon (SOC) in croplands and grasslands. Increasing SOC stocks improves soil fertility and is seen as a short- to mid-term solution to mitigate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Emerging ecological and societal challenges (climate change, food security, ecosystem sustainability) require improved knowledge of C pools and fluxes, and greater confidence in the biophysical models to assess C balances and implement effective policies in agriculture.

# Objectives

An inter-comparison and benchmarking modelling exercise aimed at improving estimates of C storage and GHG fluxes in agricultural systems.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Institute for Soil Sciences and Agricultural Chemistry, Budapest, Hungary

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>French National Institute for Agricultural Research, Paris, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>University of Florence, Florence, Italy

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Cantabrian Agricultural Research and Training Centre, Muriedas, Spain

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>University of Sassari, Sassari, Italy

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>Federal University of Santa Maria, Santa Maria, Brazil

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 13}{\rm Agriculture}$  and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture, Burnie, Australia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>Scotland's Rural College, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>Landcare Research, Palmerston North, New Zealand

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>French National Institute for Agricultural Research, Thiverval-Grignon, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>French National Institute for Agricultural Research, Barenton-Bugny, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>USDA Agricultural Research Service, Mandan, ND, United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>AgResearch, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>AgResearch, Palmerston North, New Zealand

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>CSIRO Agriculture and Food, St Lucia, Australia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Zurich, Swaziland

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>CSIRO Agriculture Flagship, Canberra, Australia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>French National Institute for Agricultural Research, Reims, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam, Germany

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research, Lincoln, New Zealand

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, United Kingdom

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

### Materials & methods

Field trials from four continents, established in five temperate pastures and five crop rotations with contrasting pedo-climatic conditions, were selected to assess 24 process-based models (16 for crops, 12 for pastures) against SOC and C-N emission data. Model calibration consisted of five stages, from stage 1 (observed outputs unavailable to modellers) to stage 5 (with all observed outputs). We combined the estimates from the individual models (aggregated on annual basis) by computing median values for each output.

### **Results**

Taking the coefficient of variation (CV) as a degree of the variability of simulations, for all the modelled C fluxes (GPP, gross primary production; RECO, ecosystem respiration; NEE, net ecosystem exchange) CV was reduced with calibration. Moving from stage 1 to 5, CV was reduced from 28.3% to 25.1% for RECO, from 45.7% to 34.6% for GPP and from 461.3% to 72.4% for NEE. The greatest decrease obtained at stage 3 responds to the need of calibrating the models against production and phenology data.

#### Conclusion

The uncertainty envelops of simulated C fluxes (NEE) was reduced with more detailed calibration (improved estimates of GPP and, to a lesser extent, of RECO). We conclude that, to reduce parametric uncertainties in C estimates, production and phenology data are the minimal level requirements for model calibration.

# **Acknowledgments**

This study was coordinated by the Global Research Alliance on agricultural GHGs-Integrative Research Group, supported by the projects CN-MIP, Models4Pastures, MACSUR, COMET-Global and MAGGNET funded by FACCE-JPI multi-partner call on agricultural GHGs.