



HAL
open science

Greenhouse gases emissions assessment of viticulture technical itineraries: method and results

Emilie Adoir, Sophie Penavayre, Hervé Quérol

► **To cite this version:**

Emilie Adoir, Sophie Penavayre, Hervé Quérol. Greenhouse gases emissions assessment of viticulture technical itineraries: method and results. CNRS LETG. 2020. hal-04210612

HAL Id: hal-04210612

<https://hal.science/hal-04210612v1>

Submitted on 19 Sep 2023

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.



ADVICLIM



Life project ADVICLIM

Action B2

Greenhouse gases emissions assessment of viticulture technical itineraries: method and results



ECOCLIMASOL
CLIMATE RISK MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS



Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Table of contents..... | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 2 |
| 1. Methodology synthesis | 3 |
| 1.1. Outlines of the study | 3 |
| 1.1.1. Approach, perimeter and functional unit..... | 3 |
| 1.1.2. Results scale | 5 |
| 1.2. Life cycle inventories | 7 |
| 1.2.1. General methodology of a life cycle inventory | 7 |
| 1.2.2. GHG flows taken into account in this study | 8 |
| 1.2.2.1. Direct emissions | 10 |
| 1.2.2.2. Indirects emissions | 13 |
| 1.3. Impact assessment | 18 |
| 2. Results and discussion..... | 19 |
| 2.1. Saint-Emilion pilot site..... | 19 |
| 2.1.1. Plots description | 19 |
| 2.1.2. GHG emissions results | 22 |
| 2.1.2.1. Analysis of a case study : the plot Saint-Emilion - 9 | 22 |
| 2.1.2.2. Comparison between the 15 sampled plots of Saint-Emilion | 24 |
| 2.2. Cotnari pilot site | 26 |
| 2.2.1. Plots description | 26 |
| 2.2.2. GHG emissions results | 26 |
| 2.3. Val de Loire pilot site | 30 |
| 2.3.1. Plots description | 30 |
| 2.3.2. GHG emissions results | 30 |
| 2.4. Plumpton pilot site | 35 |
| 2.4.1. Plots description | 35 |
| 2.4.2. GHG emissions results | 35 |
| 2.5. Gesenheim pilot site..... | 38 |
| 2.5.1. Plots description | 38 |
| 2.5.2. GHG emissions results | 38 |
| Conclusion | 42 |
| Appendix 1: Loading rates references..... | 43 |
| Appendix 2: Data sets for pesticide active ingredients | 44 |
| | 1 |

Introduction

The aim of Adviclim action B2 is to assess the carbon footprints of technical itineraries for the five project pilot sites. The objectives of doing this assessment were to :

1. identify the main processes responsible for greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions and to characterize some interventions frequently producing high GHG emissions for each pilot site ;
2. identify the proportion of indirect emissions against the proportion of direct emissions from the plot, on which the vine-growers can make modifications ;
3. compare GHG emissions of observed practices against the practices modelled in scenarios with SEVE model (action B1) ;
4. ultimately integrate new constraints in the multi-agents model for systematically reducing GHG emissions when the model proposes new scenarios of adaptation of practices to global warming;
5. extrapolate, if possible, the emissions produced by sampled plots to the pilot site scale according to plots representativity.

The application of the assessment method described in a previous methodological report (Demarez et al, 2016) on twenty-seven sampled plots over the five Adviclim pilot sites led to the results presented in the report. They give answers to the two first objectives noted above. The third objective of assessing adaptation scenarios has not been tackled in this report, as the scenarios were not mature enough at the end of the project or were not relevant regarding GHG emissions assessment. But the methodology for assessing them would have been exactly the same.

1. Methodology synthesis

This first part is the summary of the previous previous methodological report (Demarez et al, 2016) which was very detailed.

1.1. Outlines of the study

1.1.1. APPROACH, PERIMETER AND FUNCTIONAL UNIT

The approach to calculate the carbon footprint of a viticultural activity is a life cycle approach. It takes into account all the life cycle steps of a product in the GHG flows inventory, from resources extraction and energy production for inputs manufacturing to their end of life (cf Figure 1). This approach implies to define the studied object, system, perimeter and the functional unit of the study, in accordance with its objectives.

Studied object: a plot planted with vine.

Studied system: The studied system gathers all the elements involved in the activities of the studied object (tools, inputs, equipments, staff).

Boundaries of the study: The boundaries of the study include all the *direct emissions* produced by the activities linked to the technical itinerary (use of tools, functioning of equipments, transport between the farm and the plot), and all the *indirect emissions* produced by manufacturing, transporting and dealing with the end of life of the elements of the studied system. Those two types of emissions are drawn on the Figure 1. The boundaries include only the production of grape and its transport back to the farm. The transformation into wine, the conditioning and distribution of wine are out of the scope of this study.

Functional unit: GHG emissions are calculated for 1 ha of planted vine and 1 year.




Figure 1 : Life cycle of the cultivation of a plot planted with vine (Demarez et al, 2016)

1.1.2. RESULTS SCALE

The scale for presenting GHG emissions budgets was set at an intermediate level of detail. The budgets for each sub-operation are indeed grouped by vineyard operations, 10 in total (cf Table 1). This way of aggregation helps to meet the first aim of the study (cf Introduction).

Tools and inputs are used and spread during interventions. Tools and diesel can be used for all vineyard operations. Other inputs (pesticides, fertilizers) are only linked to the three vineyard operations “Application of fertilizers and manures”, “Pest and disease management” and “Soil maintenance”.

Equipments are permanently installed. They can be linked to four vineyard operations:

- Pest and disease management (Sexual confusion diffusers),
- Plot management and maintenance (Drainage),
- Treillis management and maintenance (Trellising),
- Vine maintenance (Irrigation).

The transport of tools and employees between the farm and the plot, as well as transport of tools, inputs and equipments from the manufacturer to the farm are linked to the vineyard operation “Transport”.

Then, for each vineyard operation, the distinction is made between:

- The direct emissions: this includes CO₂ emissions (all operations) and N₂O emissions (« Application of fertilizers and manures » only), respectively linked to carbon and nitrogen cycles and directly emitted on the plot.
- The indirect emissions: this includes the GHG emissions produced during the extraction of raw materials, the manufacturing of system elements (tools, inputs, equipments) and the transport of system elements from the manufacturer to the farm.

This distinction helps to meet the second aim of the study (cf Introduction).

| Vineyard operation | Vineyard sub-operation | Category of sub-operation |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| 1 - Application of fertilizers and manures | Fertilizers application | Intervention |
| | Foliar fertilization | Intervention |
| 2 - Canopy management | Debudding | Intervention |
| | Chemical thinning out | Intervention |
| | Non chemical thinning out | Intervention |
| | Non thermal leaf removal | Intervention |
| | Thermal leaf removal | Intervention |
| | Chemical berries removal | Intervention |
| | Non chemical berries removal | Intervention |
| | Chemical vine shooting | Intervention |
| | Non chemical vine shooting | Intervention |
| | Trimming | Intervention |
| | Regulation of growth treatment | Intervention |
| 3 - Harvest | Harvest | Intervention |
| 4 - Pest and disease management | Sexual confusion diffusers | Equipment |
| | Soil disinfection - Vines devitalization | Intervention |
| | Observation of pests | Intervention |
| | Fungicide treatment | Intervention |
| | Insecticide treatment | Intervention |
| | Defense stimulators treatment | Intervention |
| 5 - Plot management and maintenance | Stones grinding | Intervention |
| | Drainage | Equipment |
| | Equipement - other | Equipment |
| | Edge management - Sowing | Intervention |
| | Edge management - Mowing | Intervention |
| | Intervention - other | Intervention |
| 6 - Soil maintenance | Inter-row soil management - Deep loosening | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Chemical weeding | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Mechanical weeding | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Thermal weeding | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Mowing | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Mulching | Intervention |
| | Inter-row soil management - Sowing | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Hilling | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Ridges ploughing | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Chemical weeding | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Mechanical weeding | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Thermal weeding | Intervention |
| | Intervine soil management - Mowing | Intervention |
| | 7 - Trellis management and maintenance | Trellising management |
| Trellising | | Equipment |
| Lifting | | Intervention |
| 8 - Vine maintenance | Watering | Intervention |
| | Vines replacement | Intervention |
| | Irrigation | Equipment |
| | Antifrost system | Equipment |
| 9 - Winter pruning | Canes and vine shoots shredding | Intervention |
| | Canes and vine shoots burning | Intervention |
| | Canes and vine shoots export | Intervention |
| | Pre-pruning | Intervention |
| | Pruning | Intervention |
| | Canes pulling | Intervention |
| 10 - Transport | Transport between the farm and plot | Transport |
| | Transport of tools and inputs | Transport |

Table 1 : Description of the 10 vineyard operations

1.2. Life cycle inventories

1.2.1. GENERAL METHODOLOGY OF A LIFE CYCLE INVENTORY

A life cycle inventory (LCI) is an inventory of all the flows coming from natural resources (water, atmospheric gas, mining resources,...), and emitted to natural compartments (water, air, soil), when making a product or providing a service. Considering the amount of data needed to estimate these elementary flows according to a life cycle approach, a LCI consists in using **existing data sets**, which are elementary life cycle inventory for many inputs, tools, equipments or energy, available in dedicated databases such as Ecoinvent or Agribalyse®. They are used for indirect emissions assessment.

It can happen that some datasets are not available. The building of a **proxy** is then needed (*intermediate LCI between existing data sets and the product or service LCI*), by aggregation of data sets of the constituents of an input, a tool, an equipment or by aggregation of sources of energy included in an energy mix.

Here are the steps to carry out a LCI :

→ Case n°1 : if the data set of the system element exist (*ex : vineyard tractor*) :

a. Identify the closest data set from the inventoried element

Ex : the data set « Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U » from the database Agribalyse®, corresponding to the emissions linked to the manufacturing of a tractor of which the lifetime is under 7500 h, is the most appropriate data set for a vineyard tractor.

b. Calculate the weighting factor of the data set to adapt the studied element and the functional unit

Ex : the data set « Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U » gives the emissions for the manufacturing of 1 kg of 7500 h lifetime tractor. So this data set needs to be multiplied by the mass of the studied vineyard tractor, and to be weighted by the use time during one year and one hectare to fit the functional unit of this study.

→ Case n°2 : if the data set of the studied element does not exist (*ex : pesticide commercial product*):

a. Identify the closest data set from the constituents of the inventoried element.

Ex : « Cyclic N-compound {GLO} market for | Alloc Rec, S » (in kg) for the active ingredient Tetraconazole of the commercial product Greman.

b. Calculate the weighting factor of the data set of each constituent of the inventoried element.

Ex : 0,1 kg of « Cyclic N-compound {GLO} market for | Alloc Rec, S » for 1 L of Greman.

c. Create a proxy of the inventoried element and collect the weighting factor corresponding to the functional unit of this proxy

Ex : 0,23 L of Greman spread on the plot for the growing year 2015-2016.

For the study presented in this report, the creation of proxy has been carried out only for pesticide commercial products and for the trellising equipment.

After this sequence of data sets search and proxys creation, all the inventoried data sets and the weighting factors relating to them are entered in the SimaPro® tool, which aggregates those data at the defined assessment scale.

For the study presented in this report, the thinnest assessment scale is the vineyard operation and the split between direct and indirect emissions for each vineyard operation (cf Table 1).

1.2.2. GHG FLOWS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THIS STUDY

The methodological report on the estimation of GHG emissions (Demarez et al, 2016), inventories all the theoretical system elements producing direct and indirect emissions. This exhaustive inventory is presented in the Table 2.

The methodology initially designed has been partially applied for the plots of Saint-Emilion, due to the lack of LCI in LCA data sets. Hence the color code of the column “Direct emissions” and “Indirect emissions” of Table 2 :

- Darker orange : emissions taken into account in the study
- Lighter orange: emissions linked to some elements of the studied plots, but not taken into account. Two reasons for that: either data sets don't exist for those elements and are difficult to model, either the collected data to weight the data sets were not complete at the moment of calculating the results.
- Green: emissions not taken into account because no elements producing those emissions inventoried for the studied plots.

The emissions taken into account are only fossil carbon emissions: the biogenic carbon budget is excluded (carbon sequestration in grapes, leaves, vine shoots and vine roots, and possible carbon releasing).

In the following paragraphs (1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2), the formulas for calculating data sets weights are written with a color code:

- Green: reference value
- Orange: data collected for the studied plot.

| Elements and processes to take into account for estimating GHG emissions in a viticultural system | | | Direct emissions | | Indirect emissions | Corresponding vineyard operation(s) (cf Table 1) |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| linked to equipments | Simple equipments | Antifrost equipments consuming energy (electricity, oil or gas) | Manufacturing of the equipment | | X | 8 – Vine maintenance |
| | | | Equipment functioning | Oil or gas combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Energy extraction/production | |
| | | Antifrost equipments by water spraying | Manufacturing of the equipment | | X | |
| | | | Equipment functioning | | Sprayed water production | |
| | Compound equipments | Trellising | Manufacturing of the equipment | | X | 7 – Treillis management and maintenance |
| | | | Equipment functioning | | X | |
| Irrigation | Manufacturing of the equipment | | X | Irrigation water production | 8 – Vine maintenance | |
| | Equipment functioning | | | | | |
| linked to tools | Motorized pulling tools and towed tools | | Tool manufacturing | | X | All vineyard operations except 10 – Transports |
| | Motorized non pulling tools | | Tool functioning | Diesel combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Diesel extraction/production | |
| | Tools | | Tool manufacturing | | X | |
| | Tools | | Tool functioning | Diesel combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Diesel extraction/production | |
| linked to inputs | Pesticide | | Input manufacturing | | X | 4 – Pest and disease management |
| | Fertilizers and enrichments | | Input diluting | | Dilution water production | |
| | Fertilizers and enrichments | | Input manufacturing | | X | 1 – Application of fertilizers and manures |
| | Fertilizers and enrichments | | Input spreading | N ₂ O emissions at the field | | |
| linked to transport | Transport from the farm to the plot | of motorized pulling tools and towed tools | Tool manufacturing | | X | 10 - Transport |
| | | | Transport of tools on roads | Diesel combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Diesel extraction/production | |
| | | of spraying tool for tank refilling during a treatment | Tool manufacturing | | X | |
| | | | Transport of tools on roads | Diesel combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Diesel extraction/production | |
| | of employees | | Transport of employees by vehicle | Diesel combustion (CO ₂ emissions) | Vehicule manufacturing and diesel extraction/production | |
| | Transport from the manufacturer to the retailer | of tools/inputs/equipments | | | X | |
| | Transport from the retailer to the farm | | | | X | |
| Transport from the farm to the sorting centre | | | | X | | |

Table 2 : Processes taken into account for the preliminary results (bolded boxes), and correspondance between system elements and vineyard operations

(Legend for « direct emissions » and « indirect emissions » columns :

- bolded darker orange boxes = emissions taken into account ;
- lighter orange = emissions from system elements but not taken into account ;
- green = emissions not taken into account because elements not in the case study system)

1.2.2.1. Direct emissions

a. Direct emissions linked to tools uses

Available data sets

| Direct emissions | Data set | Unit |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| Tool diesel combustion | « Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U » | kg |

Calculation method

| Direct emissions | Calculation method |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Tool diesel combustion | $\begin{aligned} & \text{Consumption for each intervention (kg)} \\ & = \\ & \text{Diesel motor specific consumption (kg/hp/h}^1\text{)} \\ & \times \text{motor rated power (hp)} \times \text{loading rate (\%)} \\ & \times \text{intervention duration (h)} \end{aligned}$ |

The reference values in green are:

- Diesel motor specific consumption : 0.1865 kg/hp/h
- Loading rate: see Appendix 1.

If two tools are towed during a single intervention, the loading rate used in the formula is the average of the loading rate of the two tools. Half of this intervention fuel consumption is allocated to the vineyard operation linked to each tool.

¹ kg/hp/h = kg per horsepower per hour.

Example of datasets and quantities for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9:

| | | |
|---|---------|----|
| Application of fertilisers and manures | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 0,000 | kg |
| Canopy management | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 38,408 | kg |
| Harvest | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 72,680 | kg |
| Pest and disease management | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 72,015 | kg |
| Plot management and maintenance | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 0,000 | kg |
| Soil maintenance | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 131,566 | kg |
| Trellis management and maintenance | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 48,749 | kg |
| Vine maintenance | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 0,000 | kg |
| Winter pruning | | |
| Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 0,000 | kg |

Table 3 : Inventories of direct emissions linked to tools use

b. Direct emissions linked to transport

« Direct emissions linked to transport » means emissions linked to fuel consumption from motorized tools on road and from cars transporting people on the return journeys between the farm and the plot.

Available datasets

| Direct emissions | Datasets | Unit |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Transport of motorized tools on road | Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | kg |
| Transport of people | Transport, passenger car, petrol, fleet average/ Direct/ RER U | person.km |

Calculation method

| Direct emissions | Calculation method | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|----|----|------------------|----|------|
| Transport of motorized tools on road | <p>Consumption for each intervention (kg) = average tractor speed on road (km/h) * average consumption on road (L/h) * 2 * distance plot-farm (km)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Motorized tool category</th> <th>Average speed km/h</th> <th>Average consumption on road (L/h)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tractor</td> <td>30</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Straddle tractor</td> <td>20</td> <td>13.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Motorized tool category | Average speed km/h | Average consumption on road (L/h) | Tractor | 30 | 10 | Straddle tractor | 20 | 13.5 |
| Motorized tool category | Average speed km/h | Average consumption on road (L/h) | | | | | | | | |
| Tractor | 30 | 10 | | | | | | | | |
| Straddle tractor | 20 | 13.5 | | | | | | | | |
| Transport of people | <p><u>For each intervention with a motorized tool :</u> Number of transported people.distance (person.km) = (number of people mobilised for the intervention – 1) * 2 * distance plot-farm * number of worked days for the intervention</p> <p><u>For each intervention without motorized tool :</u> Number of transported people.distance (persone.km) = (number of people mobilised for the intervention) * 2 * distance plot-farm * number of worked days for the intervention</p> | | | | | | | | | |

Example of datasets and quantities for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9 :

| Transport | Diesel combustion, in tractor/ U | 27,756 | kg |
|-----------|--|--------|-----------|
| | Transport, passenger car, petrol, fleet average/ Direct/ RER U | 67,33 | person.km |

Table 4 : Inventory of direct emissions linked to transport

c. Direct emissions linked to input spreading (only fertilizers)

Only 9 plots over the 15 of Saint-Emilion applied fertilizers in 2016. As the fertilizer spreading is thought at a pluriannual scale, no calculation using the emission model N₂O, NH₃, NO₃⁻, NO were done in this study.

d. Direct emissions linked to equipment activity (irrigation/antifrost) (fuel consumption)

Fuel or gas combustion has not been modeled for now because the case-study does not use irrigation or antifrost systems.

1.2.2.2. Indirects emissions

a. Indirect emissions linked to the use of tools

This part takes into account indirect emissions linked to:

- Fuel consumption : extraction, refining, transportation.
- Tools production.

Datasets available

| Indirect emissions | Datasets | | Unit |
|---|-------------------------------|--|------|
| Use of a tool (motorized tool towed or mounted) | Diesel, at regional storage/S | | kg |
| | Towed tool | General machinery, with tires, LT <2'500h, production/ U | |
| | | General machinery, with tires, LT >5'000h, production/ U | |
| | | General machinery, with tires, LT 2'500-5'000h, production/ U | |
| | Mounted tool | General machinery, without tires, LT 8000h, production/ U | |
| | Harvesting machine | Harvester/Machine with engine, LT <5'000h, production/ U | |
| | | Harvester/Machine with engine, LT >10'000h, production/ U | |
| | | Harvester/Machine with engine, LT 5'000 to 10'000h, production/ U | |
| | Tractor | Tractor, LT 10'000h, production/ U | |
| | | Tractor, LT 12'000h, production/ U | |
| Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U | | | |

Datasets in bold are the most used tools for vine-growing.

Calculation method

For the amount of fuel consumed, the calculation and the result are identical to those of direct emissions.

| Indirect emissions | Calculation method |
|---|---|
| Use of a tool (motorized tool towed or mounted) | $\text{Tool quantity (kg/ha/an)} = \frac{\text{Tool mass (kg)} \times \left(\frac{\text{Duration of use (h/an)}}{\text{Lifetime (h)}} \right)}{\text{Worked area of the plot (ha)}}$ |

The lifetime of a tool is the accumulation of the duration of use during all the life of the tool.

While the quantity linked to each tool has been requested, the low response rate regarding tools mass and lifetime led to the use of baseline data from Agribalyse®.

Example of datasets and quantities for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9:

Canopy management

| | | |
|---|--------|----|
| Diesel, at regional storage/S | 38,408 | kg |
| General machinery, without tires, LT 8000h, production/ U | 1,722 | kg |
| Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U | 2,750 | kg |

Harvest

| | | |
|--|--------|----|
| Diesel, at regional storage/S | 72,680 | kg |
| Harvester/Machine with engine, LT <5'000h, production/ U | 5,743 | kg |

Pest and disease management

| | | |
|---|--------|----|
| Diesel, at regional storage/S | 72,015 | kg |
| General machinery, without tires, LT 8000h, production/ U | 3,960 | kg |
| Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U | 4,125 | kg |

Soil maintenance

| | | |
|---|---------|----|
| Diesel, at regional storage/S | 131,566 | kg |
| General machinery, without tires, LT 8000h, production/ U | 6,079 | kg |
| Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U | 6,876 | kg |

Trellis management and maintenance

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|----|
| Diesel, at regional storage/S | 48,749 | kg |
| Tractor, LT 7'500h, production/ U | 1,650 | kg |

b. Indirect emissions linked to inputs

The only inputs studied here are pesticides because they are the only one inventoried for the plot.

Datasets available

Cf. Appendix 2

The data collected and that makes sense for winegrowers is the commercial product. It is necessary to build a proxy for each product from the available datasets.

The table below presents the aggregations realized to create the proxy for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9.

| Product type | Name of the pesticide | Functional unit proxy | Active substance | Active substance concentration (source : ephy.anses.fr) | Unit c° | Available datasets |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|---|--|
| Fungicide | Amarok | 1 L | Cymoxanil | 40 | g/L | [sulfonyl]urea-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER |
| | | | Folpet | 334 | g/L | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Atemi | 1 kg | Cyproconazole | 100 | g/kg | Cyclic N-compound {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Chaoline | 1 kg | Fosetyl | 471 | g/kg | Fosetyl-Al {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | | | Metiram | 289 | g/kg | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Escadril | 1 L | Cymoxanil | 40 | g/L | [sulfonyl]urea-compound {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | | | Folpet | 334 | g/L | folpet, at regional storage/kg/rer |
| | Greman | 1 L | Tetraconazole | 100 | g/L | Cyclic N-compound {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Indar EW | 1 L | Fenbuconazole | 50 | g/L | Cyclic N-compound {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Kocide 35 DF | 1 kg | Copper hydroxide | 350 | g/kg | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | kumulus | 1 kg | Sulphur | 800 | g/kg | Secondary sulphur, at refinery/kg/RER |
| | Nordox 75 WG | 1 kg | Copper oxide | 350 | g/kg | Copper oxide, at plant/kg/RER |
| | Privest | 1 kg | Ametoctradin | 120 | g/kg | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | | | Metiram | 440 | g/kg | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| | Rhodax | 1 kg | Fosetyl | 440 | g/kg | Fosetyl-Al {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S |
| Mancozeb | | | 260 | g/kg | Pesticide, unspecified {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S | |
| Sulfojet | 1 kg | Sulphur | 800 | g/kg | Secondary sulphur, at refinery/kg/RER | |

Calculation method

| Indirect emissions | Calculation method |
|----------------------|---|
| Pesticides spreading | $\text{Product } j \text{ quantity spread (kg/ha/an)} = \sum_i^n \text{Dose spread during intervention } i$ |

Proxys and quantities for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9 :

| Pest and disease management | | |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|
| Amarok | 1,8 | L/ha |
| Atemi | 0,07 | kg/ha |
| Chaoline | 3,68 | kg/ha |
| Escadril | 2,3 | L/ha |
| Greman | 0,23 | L/ha |
| Indar | 0,75 | L/ha |
| Kocide | 2,96 | kg/ha |
| kumulus | 5 | kg/ha |
| Nordox | 0,15 | kg/ha |
| Privest | 2,4 | kg/ha |
| Rhodax | 2,69 | kg/ha |
| Steward | 0,13 | kg/ha |
| Sulfojet | 7 | kg/ha |
| Soil maintenance | | |
| Heliosol | 0,2 | L/ha |
| Round up | 3 | L/ha |
| Viaglif | 3 | L/ha |

c. Indirect emissions linked to equipments

Two type of equipments are studied :

Simple equipments (ex : system for pesticide treatment) : only data regarding the equipment lifetime.

Compound equipments (ex : trellising) : data regarding the number and the mass of the « material units » that compose the equipment, and the equipment lifetime.

Available datasets

It does not exist datasets for vine-growing equipments neither for material units from compound equipments.

For simple equipments, proxys from materials and quantities that compose the equipments should be created. But these data have not been collected. Equipments are not modelised in this study.

For compound equipments, a test was realised for the equipment of trellising used on the plot Saint-Emilion - 9. Proxys for each material are created in order to be used again for other plots. Thus, the functional unit of each proxy is chosen depending on data that are non-specific from farms or regions (mass, area and lifetime of each material unit).

| Material unit | Material | Datasets for production and end of life of the material unit | Dataset unit | Functional unit of the proxy « material unit » | Calculation quantity of dataset | Quantity of dataset for 1 functional unit |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--|----------------|--|---|---|
| Pole (Ø 8 cm, H 2m) | Wood | Sawnwood, softwood, dried (u=20%), planed {RoW} market for Alloc Rec, S | m ³ | 1 pole | $\frac{\text{Cylindrical volume (m}^3\text{)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,0005 |
| Wire (Ø 2.5 mm) | Cast iron | Steel, low-alloyed {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S | kg | 1 kg of wire | $\frac{\text{Mass (kg)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,0333 |
| | | Wire drawing, steel {RoW} processing Alloc Rec, S | kg | | $\frac{\text{Mass (kg)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,0333 |
| | | Zinc coat, coils {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S | m ² | | $\frac{\text{Cylinder surface (m}^2\text{)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,0066 |
| Anchoring (Ø 3 cm, H 50 cm) | Cast iron | Steel, low-alloyed {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S | kg | 1 anchoring | $\frac{\text{Mass (kg)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,071 |
| | | Wire drawing, steel {RoW} processing Alloc Rec, S | kg | | $\frac{\text{Mass (kg)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,071 |
| | | Zinc coat, coils {GLO} market for Alloc Rec, S | m ² | | $\frac{\text{Surface cylindre (m}^2\text{)}}{\text{Lifetime (year)}}$ | 0,0012 |

Trellising material unit dimensions are reference data from « Le coût des fournitures en viticulture et œnologie 2014 » (IFV/APCA). Datasets of materials and treatment process for this type of equipments are described in the annex 2 of the methodological report.

Proxys and quantities for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9 :

| Proxys material units for classical trellising (1.2.1) | Calculation proxy quantity | Proxy quantity | Units |
|--|--|----------------|-----------------|
| Pole | $\frac{\text{Number of pole on the plot}}{\text{Plot area (ha)}}$ | 1287 | pole/ha/yr |
| Wire | $\frac{\text{Wire mass on the plot (kg)}}{\text{Plot area (ha)}}$ | 792 | kg/ha/yr |
| Anchoring | $\frac{\text{Number of anchoring on the plot}}{\text{Plot area (ha)}}$ | 99 | anchoring/ha/yr |

1.3. Impact assessment

The Global Warming Potential (GWP) is a weighting factor that aims to aggregate the effect of all the substances contributing of global warming into one value. The unit of this indicator is “CO₂ equivalent”, as, by definition, the CO₂ greenhouse effect has been set up to 1, and the greenhouse effect of other gases relatively to the CO₂. The GWP 100 years calculates the radiative forcing over a time horizon of 100 years, in order to take into account the different residence times of the substances in the atmosphere.

$$\text{Conversion of gases quantities (in eq. CO}_2\text{)} \\ = \\ \text{Gas quantity} \times \text{GWP to 100 years weighting factor of the gas to convert}$$

Different GWP values exist according to different assessment methods. The Table 3 summarizes the GWP of the main GHG emitted by viticulture (CO₂ and N₂O), for three main European and international methods.

| | IMPACT | Europe RECEIPE | IPCC 2013 100 years | Unit |
|-----------------------|--------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| CO₂ | 1 | 1 | 1 | kg CO ₂ eq/kg |
| N₂O | 156 | 298 | 265 | kg CO ₂ eq/kg |

Table 3 : GWP values for CO₂ and N₂O and several assessment methods

The **IPCC 2013 GWP 100 years** has been selected for the Adviclim project, to be consistent with the French database Agribalyse®. This method, built by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), provides characterization factors for the largest number of greenhouse gases.

2. Results and discussion

2.1. Saint-Emilion pilot site

2.1.1. PLOTS DESCRIPTION

For Saint-Emilion, GHG emissions calculations were processed on fifteen plots for the cultural year 2015-2016. Some characteristics of the technical itineraries, useful to interpret the results, are presented in Table 4.

All the sampled plots are planted with Merlot, and equipped with the same classic wooden trellising. None of the plots are equipped with irrigation system or antifrost system.

However, the plots show a good variability in terms of:

- quantity of manual work,
- motor power of motorized tools,
- inter-rows plant cover surface.

The vines of a majority of plots are grown in a conventional way, two plots are under integrated viticulture, one under organic and one under biodynamic viticulture.

The numbers of intervention days for each vineyard operation are summarized in the Table 5. The two most frequent vineyard operations are the Pest and disease management, and the Soil maintenance. They show some variability also, due in some extent to the type of viticulture (conventional/integrated/organic/biodynamic) for the Pest and disease management mainly. But even among the conventional plots, the number of intervention days are quite variable for those two vineyard operations.

The work output (the time to execute an intervention on 1 ha) is roughly the same between all the plots. There are some differences for inter-rows mowing and weeding work output, due to the differences in inter-rows plant cover surface of the plots (half or all the inter-rows mowed).

| Plot code | Type of viticulture practised on the vineyard | Manual harvest | Harvesting machine used for pesticide spraying | Mean motor power of motorized tools, excepting harvesting machine (hp) | Planting distance between 2 rows (m) | Planting density (stocks/ha) | Inter-rows plant cover surface | Inter-rows plant cover duration |
|-----------------|---|----------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Plot 102 | Integrated | No | Yes | 70-78 | 1,5 | 5800 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 83 | Integrated | Yes | No | 55-90 | 1,5 | 6500 | Alternative | Permanent |
| Plot 232 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 45-70 | 1,3 | 6500 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 242 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 45-70 | 1,3 | 6500 | Bare soil | - |
| Plot 14 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 55-90 | 1,4 | 5900 | Alternative | Permanent |
| Plot 106 | Conventionnal | No | No | 55-65 | 1,5 | 5500 | Alternative | Permanent |
| Plot 15 | Conventionnal | No | Yes | 48-65 | 1,4 | 6000 | Alternative | Permanent |
| Plot 78 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 60 | 1,25 | 5700 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 9 | Conventionnal | No | No | 55-65 | 1,4 | 6500 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 32 | Conventionnal | No | No | 60-75 | 1,2 | 5820 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 1 | Biodynamic | Yes | No | 65-75 | 1,5 | 5500 | Bare soil | - |
| Plot 70 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 50 | 1,4 | 6400 | Alternative | Temporary (spring and summer) |
| Plot 90 | Conventionnal | Yes | No | 44-80 | 1,5 | 6000 | Entire surface | Permanent |
| Plot 55 | Conventionnal | No | Yes | 60-125 | 1,1 | 6000 | Alternative | Permanent |
| Plot 552 | Organic | No | Yes | 60-125 | 1,1 | 6000 | Alternative | Permanent |

Table 4 : Some agronomic characteristics of the sampled plots (Saint-Emilion)

| Plot code | 1 - Application of fertilizers and manures | 2 – Canopy management | 3 – Harvest | 4 – Pest and disease management | 6 – Soil maintenance | 7 – Trellis management and maintenance | 8 - Vine maintenance | 9 – Winter pruning |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| Plot 102 | | 7 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 1 | | 1 |
| Plot 83 | | 4 | | 11 | 11 | | | |
| Plot 232 | 2 | 3 | | 12 | 12 | | 1 | 1 |
| Plot 242 | 2 | 3 | | 12 | 11 | | 1 | 1 |
| Plot 14 | | 5 | | 12 | 9 | | | 1 |
| Plot 106 | | 6 | 1 | 11 | 11 | | | 1 |
| Plot 15 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 10 | | | 1 |
| Plot 78 | 2 | 5 | | 10 | 8 | | | 2 |
| Plot 9 | | 3 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 1 | | |
| Plot 32 | | 4 | | 17 | 4 | | | 1 |
| Plot 1 | 12 | | | 26 | 10 | | | 1 |
| Plot 70 | 2,5 | 4 | | 10,5 | 9 | | | |
| Plot 90 | 0,5 | 7 | | 13,5 | 8 | | 2 | |
| Plot 55 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 10 | | | 1 |
| Plot 552 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 16 | | | 1 |

Table 5 : Number of intervention days for each vineyard operation and each plot for the year 2015-2016 (Saint-Emilion)

2.1.2. GHG EMISSIONS RESULTS

2.1.2.1. Analysis of a case study : the plot Saint-Emilion - 9

The Figure 2 illustrates the GHG emissions assessment results for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9, regarding the observed technical itinerary of the plot for the growing year 2015-2016. Those results are presented in details in Table 6.

GHG emissions due to viticulture on this plot are mainly direct emissions (61 % of total emissions).

However, the split between direct and indirect emissions is different according to vineyard operations: the direct emissions represent 78 % of the emissions linked to harvest, while they represent only 45 % of the emissions linked to trellis management and maintenance. Some vineyard operations (for ex, n°4 and n°7) involve indeed inputs or equipments that do not produce themselves any GHG emissions directly in the field when installed or applied (for example, trellising or pesticides), but of which the manufacturing produces significant indirect emissions. Only the use of tools to manage or apply it produces direct emissions that balances the indirect ones.

The most emitting vineyard operations, excepting trellis management and maintenance, are the soil maintenance (24 % of the total emissions) and the pest and disease management (23 %). The numerous motorized pulling tools use days for those two operations explain this result (cf Table 5). The mechanical harvest, executed in only one day, represent also a significant part of the total emissions (14 %). On the contrary, the pruning doesn't show any GHG emissions, as it is manual interventions, and the employees' transportation is allocated to the vineyard operation "Transport".

To finish with, the result of indirect emissions for the trellising equipment (13 % of the total emissions) shows the importance to take into account this kind of equipment, even after having smoothed the manufacturing emissions over the quite high lifetime (between 20 and 40 years for the material units of the trellising equipment).




Figure 2 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Saint-Emilion - 9

| Vineyard operation | Direct emissions | | Indirect emissions | | Total of emissions for the vineyard operation | |
|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | GHG emissions (kg CO2 eq/ha) | % of total emissions of the vineyard operation | GHG emissions (kg CO2 eq/ha) | % of total emissions of the vineyard operation | GHG emissions (kg CO2 eq/ha) | % of total emissions at plot scale |
| 1 - Application of fertilizers and manures | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 2 - Canopy management | 61 | 73% | 23 | 27% | 83 | 6% |
| 3 - Harvest | 153 | 78% | 43 | 22% | 196 | 14% |
| 4 - Pest and disease management | 170 | 50% | 168 | 50% | 339 | 23% |
| 5 - Plot management and maintenance | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 6 - Soil maintenance | 241 | 68% | 112 | 32% | 353 | 24% |
| 7 - Trellis management and maintenance | 154 | 45% | 191 | 55% | 345 | 24% |
| 8 - Vine maintenance | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 9 - Winter pruning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 10 - Transport | 104 | 81% | 24 | 19% | 129 | 9% |
| Total of emissions at plot scale | 883 | 61% | 561 | 39% | | |

Table 6 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Saint-Emilion- 9

2.1.2.2. Comparison between the 15 sampled plots of Saint-Emilion

The variability of technical itineraries appears also after the application of GHG emissions assessment method, on the Figure 3 for the distinction between direct and indirect emissions, and on the Figure 4 for the distinction between vineyard operations.

The total GHG balances per plot varies from single (1180 kg eq CO₂/ha/year for the plot 90) to triple (3000 kg eq CO₂/ha/year for the plot 552), with a mean of 1860 kg eq CO₂/ha/year.

The main conclusions drawn above on the case study (plot 9) are also valid for all the fifteen plots:

- GHG emissions due to viticulture are mainly direct emissions (between 57 and 77% of the total emissions of the plot) ;
- The most emitting vineyard operations are the Soil maintenance (between 23% and 53% of the total emissions of each plot) and the Pest and disease management (between 10% and 38% of the total emissions of each plot) ;
- The harvest can be a significant part of the total emissions when not manual (between 7% and 14% of the total emissions of each plot).

According to the technical itineraries, the Application of fertilizers and manures, and the Canopy management, can also constitute a significant part of the total emissions.

The variability of those results can be explained by the number of intervention days per vineyard operation, but also by the motor power of the motorized tools.

For example, the plots 55 and 552 have the same motor power for the tractor used for Pest and disease management (150 hp), but the plot 55 have less intervention days than the plot 552 for this vineyard operation (respectively 11 and 16 days), hence the difference of 400 kg eq CO₂/ha/year between the two plots.

Then the plots 55 and 106 have the same number of intervention days for Pest and disease management, but the motor power of the motorized tool used for spraying pesticides is from single to double (150 for the plot 55, 65 for the plot 106, as the harvesting machine is used on the plot 55 for this intervention), hence the difference of 600 kg eq CO₂/ha/year.




Figure 3 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the 15 plots of Saint-Emilion (direct and indirect emissions)




Figure 4 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the 15 plots of Saint-Emilion and each viticultural operation

2.2. Cotnari pilot site

2.2.1. PLOTS DESCRIPTION

For Cotnari, GHG emissions assessment was processed on two groups of plots that present the same cultural itinerary, for the cultural year 2016-2017. Some characteristics of the technical itineraries, useful to interpret the results, are presented in Table 7. On the plot “B1-B2”, the tractor used has a smaller motor rated power and there are slightly less interventions than on the second plot. The two plots are equipped with the same metallic trellising.

| | Plot B1-B2 | Plot N1-N2-T1-T2-V1-V2 |
|--|------------|------------------------|
| 9 – Winter pruning | 0 | 0 |
| 8 – Vine maintenance | 0 | 0 |
| 7 – Trellis management and maintenance | 0 | 0 |
| 6 – Soil maintenance | 4 | 7 |
| 5 – Plot management and maintenance | 0 | 0 |
| 4 – Pest and disease management | 6 | 7 |
| 3 - Harvest | 0 | 0 |
| 2 – Canopy management | 0 | 1 |
| 1 – Application of fertilizers and manure | 0 | 0 |
| Distance between winery and plot (km) | 0-0,5 | 0-0,5 |
| Motor rated power of the main tractor (hp) | 45 | 68 |

Table 7 : Number of intervention days for each vineyard operation and each plot for the year 2016-2017 (Cotnari)

2.2.2. GHG EMISSIONS RESULTS

The Figure 5 first highlights an important difference of GHG emissions between the two type of plots. The emissions level of the most emitting plot (2537 kg eq CO₂/ha/year) is twice more than the emissions level of the least emitting plot (1136 kg eq CO₂/ha/year).

Considering the total emissions, the main emitting vineyard operation types are:

- Trellising management through the indirect emissions of trellising equipment (about 50% of the total emissions for the plot B1-B2).
- Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance.

According to Figure 6, the indirect impact of trellising equipment is important, as it is metallic trellising. Therefore, the indirect emissions are the most important for the plot B1-B2 (71% of the total emissions), or are at the same level as the direct emissions for the second plot.

For both plots, the main direct emissions are due to Pest and disease management, and Soil maintenance (Figure 7 and Figure 8). The difference of direct emissions level between the two plots is

explained by the motor rated power (30 hp of difference), and three more interventions of Soil maintenance for the plot N1-N2-T1-T2-V1-V2.

Harvest is manual in both cases, and the impact of road transport is negligible as the distance of each plot to the winery is less than 500 meters (Table 7).




Figure 5 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the two plots of Cotnari and each vineyard operation




Figure 6 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the two plots of Cotnari (direct and indirect emissions)




Figure 7 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot B1-B2




Figure 8 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot N1-N2-T1-T2-V1-V2

2.3. Val de Loire pilot site

2.3.1. PLOTS DESCRIPTION

For Val de Loire, GHG emissions assessment was processed on five plots for the cultural year 2015-2016. Some characteristics of the technical itineraries, useful to interpret the results, are presented in Table 8.

A good variability of the distance between winery and plot can be observed, as well as the number of pest and disease management interventions. Only one plot is harvested mechanically.

The collected data didn't contain any information about trellising equipment. By default, the same classic wooden trellising as the one of Saint-Emilion plots has been modelled for Val de Loire plots.

| | Plot 1 | Plot 2 | Plot 3 | Plot 4 | Plot 5 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 9 – Winter pruning | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 – Vine maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 – Trellis management and maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 – Soil maintenance | 7 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| 5 – Plot management and maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 – Pest and disease management | 8 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 - Harvest | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 – Canopy management | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 – Application of fertilizers and manure | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Distance between winery and plot (km) | 0-0,5 | 1,3 | 2,5 | 0-0,5 | 2,4 |
| Motor rated power of the main tractor (hp) | 69 | 70-80 | 70-80 | 70-80 | 65 |

Table 8 : Number of intervention days for each vineyard operation and each plot for the year 2015-2016 (Val de Loire)

2.3.2. GHG EMISSIONS RESULTS

The Figure 9 first highlights an important variability of GHG emissions between the five plots. The emission level of the most emitting plot (1853 kg eq CO₂/ha/year) is 2,2 times more than the emission level of the least emitting plot (840 kg eq CO₂/ha/year).

Considering the total emissions, the main emitting vineyard operation types are:

- for all the plots : Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance.
- for the plots 3 and 4, the emissions due to Harvest are significant as it is mechanical harvest.
- for the plots 2,3 and 5, the emissions due to Transport on road are also significant as the plots are at least at 1,3 km from the winery.

For all plots, the direct emissions are more important than indirect emissions, and represent from 59 to 68% of the total emissions (Figure 10). The trellising equipment, which is a Classic 1.2.1 type with

wooden poles, has significant impact on indirect emissions even if not the main explicative factor of indirect emissions.




Figure 9 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the five Val de Loire plots and each vineyard operation




Figure 10 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the five Val de Loire plots (direct and indirect emissions)




Figure 11 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Val de Loire 1




Figure 12 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Val de Loire 2




Figure 13 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Val de Loire 3




Figure 14 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Val de Loire 4




Figure 15 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Val de Loire 5

2.4. Plumpton pilot site

2.4.1. PLOTS DESCRIPTION

For Plumpton, GHG emissions assessment was processed for the cultural year 2016-2017. Only one representative plot of Plumpton has been assessed as all the plots are managed exactly the same way, whatever the planted variety. Some characteristics of the technical itineraries, useful to interpret the results, are presented in Table 9. The collected data didn't contain any information about trellising equipment. By default, the same classic wooden trellising as the one of Saint-Emilion plots has been modelled for Plumpton plot.

| | Representative plot of Plumpton |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 9 – Winter pruning | 1 |
| 8 – Vine maintenance | 0 |
| 7 – Trellis management and maintenance | 1 |
| 6 – Soil maintenance | 11 |
| 5 – Plot management and maintenance | 3 |
| 4 – Pest and disease management | 7 |
| 3 - Harvest | 0 |
| 2 – Canopy management | 3 |
| 1 – Application of fertilizers and manure | 0 |
| Distance between winery and plot (km) | 0-0,5 |
| Motor rated power of the main tractor (hp) | 70 |

Table 9 : Number of intervention days for each vineyard operation for the year 2016-2017 (Plumpton)

2.4.2. GHG EMISSIONS RESULTS

The Figure 16 first highlights the most emitting types of vineyard operation :

- Pest and disease management (39% of the total emissions)
- Soil maintenance (24%)
- Trellising management (23%).

The range of importance of each viticultural operation is the same, whether considering direct or indirect emissions (Figure 18).

In the case of Plumpton, the direct emissions are a bit more important (60%) than indirect emissions (Figure 17).




Figure 16 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the Plumpton plot and each vineyard operation




Figure 17 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the Plumpton plot (direct and indirect emissions)




Figure 18 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the Plumpton plot and each vineyard operation (splitting direct and indirect emissions)

2.5. Gesenheim pilot site

2.5.1. PLOTS DESCRIPTION

For Gesenheim, GHG emissions assessment was processed on three plots for the year 2017-2018. Some characteristics of the technical itineraries, useful to interpret the results, are presented in Table 10. The particularity of Gesenheim plots is that the main explicative factors of the GHG emissions variability are the same (number of interventions, motor rated power, distance from the winery). The collected data didn't contain any information about trellising equipment. By default, the same classic wooden trellising as the one of Saint-Emilion plots has been modelled for Gesenheim plots.

| | Plot 1 | Plot 2 | Plot 3 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| 9 – Winter pruning | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 – Vine maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 – Trellis management and maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 – Soil maintenance | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 – Plot management and maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 – Pest and disease management | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 3 - Harvest | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 – Canopy management | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 – Application of fertilizers and manure | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Distance between winery and plot (km) | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Motor rated power of the main tractor (hp) | 101 | 101 | 101 |
| Plot size (ha) | 0.38 | 0.68 | 1.25 |

Table 10 : Number of intervention days for each vineyard operation and each plot for the year 2017-2018 (Gesenheim)

2.5.2. GHG EMISSIONS RESULTS

The Figure 19 shows that the difference of GHG emissions between the three plots is significant. Indeed the intervention duration for each operation is the same, but the size plot varies, so the time spent per ha varies proportionally. The Transport operation emissions are very different too, as the distance from the winery to the plot range from 3 to 6 km and the plot size range from single to triple.

Considering the total emissions, the two main emitting vineyard operation types are Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance. To a lesser extent, Canopy management and Winter pruning can be significant.

For all plots, the direct emissions are majority (Figure 20).




Figure 19 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the three Gesenheim plots and each vineyard operation




Figure 20 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the three Gesenheim plots (direct and indirect emissions)




Figure 21 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Gesenheim plot 1




Figure 22 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Gesenheim plot 2




Figure 23 : Results of the GHG emissions assessment for the plot Gesenheim plot 3

Conclusion

Generic conclusions can be drawn from the results of GHG emissions assessment of the current situation on the five pilot sites:

- Direct emissions are, for most of the plots, more important than indirect emissions, excepting for Cotnari plots, due to metallic trellising.
- Total emissions are, for most of the plots, due to Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance, excepting for Val-de-Loire plots, where Transport and Winter pruning emit significant quantities of GHG.

The total emissions range between 800 and 3000 kg eq CO₂/ha. The variability between plots and pilot sites of the total emissions can be explained by :

- the number of interventions : 2 to 12 times for Soil maintenance, 6 to 16 times for Pest and disease management
- the motor rated power : from 45 to 150 hp
- the distance from the winery to the plot : up to 2,5 km
- the manual or motorized harvest,
- the climatic conditions between pilot sites.

For Gesenheim, viticultural practices are the same for all plots, but the time per ha varies among them.

Action B2 results showed the interest of getting deep inside the technical itineraries to distinguish the hotspots of GHG emissions between the vineyard operations. It also demonstrates that mitigation actions are, from the life cycle point of view, accessible for vine-growers, as the emissions are mainly direct emissions. However, this conclusion has to be crossed with the possibility of changes considering technical, economical, logistical and social aspects. It has to be kept in mind that the vinegrowers have to tackle several environmental stakes at the same time (climate change, water quality and quantity, pesticides use reduction, ...), and the technical itineraries have to be ecodesigned in a systemic way.

Probably the first mitigation action that can be proposed, decreasing the number of interventions for Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance, is simplistic, as there is an agronomic and environmental logic behind it. However, the large variability of the number of interventions among the 27 plots suggests that there might be progress margins for some vinegrowers. A comprehension on how the vinegrowers manage the systems that need the least interventions would be very interesting to transfer to others.

Apart from optimization on current systems number of interventions, the most efficient mitigation actions seem to be in agronomic and technologic innovations, such as:

- operations combination (two operations during the same intervention),
- practices that reduces the need of an intervention (mulching for example)
- resistant vine varieties
- carbon storage (through vine shoot shredding for example, in the regions where it is not yet widespread)
- electrical robots, namely for Pest and disease management and Soil maintenance.

The assessment of adaptation scenarios regarding GHG emissions has not been possible during Adviclim project, but is still important to pursue, as some of adaptation actions can make the GHG balance changing (more trimming, more tillage or more equipments such as shading or irrigation systems).

Appendix 1: Loading rates references

| Tool | Loading rate – inter-row tractor | Tool | Loading rate – straddle tractor |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Pre-pruner | 0,3 | Pre-pruner | 0,287 |
| Vine shoot shredder | 0,7 | Vine shoot shredder | 0,7 |
| Fertilizer spreader | 0,3 | Fertilizer spreader | 0,3 |
| Soil maintenance tool | 0,6 | Soil maintenance tool | 0,4 |
| Mower | 0,5 | Mower | 0,5 |
| Intervine / Toothed tool | 0,3 | Intervine / Toothed tool | 0,29 |
| Intervine / Discs tool | 0,3 | Intervine / Discs tool | 0,23 |
| Intervine | 0,3 | Intervine | 0,29 |
| Intervine / Bladed tool | 0,3 | Intervine / Bladed tool | 0,24 |
| Intervine / Animated tool | 0,4 | Intervine / Animated tool | 0,33 |
| Intervine / Weeding tool | 0,4 | Intervine / Weeding tool | 0,34 |
| Boom sprayer | 0,3 | Boom sprayer | 0,291 |
| Thermic weeder | 0,3 | Thermic weeder | 0,291 |
| Chemical trunk cleaner | 0,3 | Chemical trunk cleaner | 0,291 |
| Mechanical trunk cleaner | 0,5 | Mechanical trunk cleaner | 0,485 |
| Trellising and wire lifting | 0,3 | Trellising and wire lifting | 0,291 |
| Trimmer | 0,3 | Trimmer | 0,306 |
| Leaf remover | 0,5 | Leaf remover | 0,287 |
| Pneumatique sprayer | 0,8 | Pneumatique sprayer | 0,6 |
| Air blast sprayer | 0,7 | Air blast sprayer | 0,55 |
| Nozzle sprayer | 0,5 | Nozzle sprayer | 0,45 |
| Tunnel sprayer | 0,8 | Tunnel sprayer | 0,6 |

Appendix 2: Data sets for pesticide active ingredients

| Active ingredient type | Active ingredient name | Data set | Unit |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------|
| Fungicides | cymoxanil | [sulfonyl]urea-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | cyprodinil | | |
| | thiophanate-methyl | | |
| | bupirimate | [thio]carbamate-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | propamocarb hcl | | |
| | iprovalicarb | | |
| | acetochlor | acetamide-anillide-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | fenhexamid | | |
| | méfénoxam | | |
| | pyriméthanil | | |
| | zoxamide | | |
| | cyazofamid | benzimidazole-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | iprodione | | |
| | prochloraz | | |
| | captan | Captan, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| | chlorothalonil | Chlorothalonil, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| | copper sulphate | Copper oxide, at plant/kg/RER | kg |
| | cuivre de l'hydroxyde de cuivre | | |
| | cuivre de l'oxyde cuivreux | | |
| | cuivre oxychlorure | | |
| | cuivre | Copper, primary, at refinery/kg/RER | kg |
| | cyproconazole | cyclic N-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | diméthomorphe | | |
| | dodemorph acetate | | |
| | epoxiconazole | | |
| | fenbuconazole | | |
| | fenpropidin | | |
| | fenpropimorph | | |
| fluquinconazole | | | |
| flusilazole | | | |
| flutriafol | | | |
| metconazole | | | |
| penconazole | | | |
| procymidone | | | |
| propiconazole | | | |
| prothioconazol | | | |
| quinoxifèn | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------------|--|----|
| | tébuconazole | | |
| | tétraconazole | | |
| | triadimérol | | |
| | azoxystrobine | Dinitroaniline-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | dimoxystrobin | | |
| | fluoxastrobin | | |
| | krésoxim-méthyl | | |
| | picoxystrobin | | |
| | pyraclostrobine | | |
| | trifloxystrobin | | |
| | thiram | dithiocarbamate-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | ziram | | |
| | fosétyl-aluminium | Fosetyl-al, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| | fosetyl | | |
| | manèbe | Maneb, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | dithianon | nitrile-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | myclobutanyl | | |
| | dodine | pesticide unspecified, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | fentin acetate | | |
| | phosphite de potassium | | |
| | tolyfluanid | | |
| | clodinafop-propargyl | phenoxy-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | boscalid | Pyridine-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | fluazinam | | |
| | souffre pour poudrage | Secondary sulphur, at refinery/kg/RER | kg |
| | soufre | | |
| | soufre micronisé | | |
| Herbicides | iodosulfuron | [sulfonyl]urea-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | iodosulfuron-méthyl-sodium | | |
| | mesosulfuron-méthyl (prop) | | |
| | metoxuron | | |
| | metsulfuron-méthyl | | |
| | nicosulfuron | | |
| | tribenuron-méthyl | | |
| | triflusulfuron-méthyl | | |
| | diuron | | |
| | carbetamide | [thio]carbamate-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | desmedipham | | |
| | phenmedipham | | |
| | prosulfocarb | | |
| | tri-allate | | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|----|
| 2,4-d | 2,4-D, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| diflufenican | acetamide-anillide-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| dimethachlor | | |
| florasulam | | |
| isoxaben | | |
| metazachlor | | |
| propyzamide | | |
| aclonifen | Aclonifen, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| ethofumesate | benzimidazole-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| bentazone | benzo[thia]diazole-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| molybdène | chemicals inorganic, at plant/kg/GLO | kg |
| chlorotoluron | Chlorotoluron, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| aminotriazole | cyclic N-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| clomazone | | |
| flumioxazin | | |
| isoxaflutole | | |
| lenacil | | |
| quinmerac | | |
| chloridazon | Diazine-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| imazamox | | |
| dicamba | Dicamba, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| dimethenamid-p | Dimethenamide, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| oryzalin | Dinitroaniline-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| trifluralin | | |
| oxyfluorène | diphenylether-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| glyphosate | Glyphosate, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| glyphosate acide | | |
| isoproturon | Isoproturon, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| linuron | Linuron, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| 2.4 mcpa | MCPA, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| metamitron | Metamitron, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| s-metolachlor | Metolachlor, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| napropamide | Napropamide, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| bromoxynil | nitrile-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| ioxynil | | |
| sulfosate | organophosphorus-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| pendiméthaline | Pendimethalin, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg |
| abamectin | pesticide unspecified, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| clethodim | | |
| cycloxydim | | |
| fluorochloridone | | |
| flurtamone | | |

| | | | |
|--------------|---|--|----|
| | mefenpyr-diethyl | | |
| | mesotrione | | |
| | thiocyanate d'ammonium | | |
| | 2,4-db | phenoxy-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | diclofop-methyl | | |
| | fenoxaprop-p-ethyl | | |
| | fluzifop p-butyl | | |
| | fluzifop-butyl | | |
| | haloxyfop | | |
| | propaquizafop | | |
| | quizalofop p-ethyl | | |
| | quizalofop-ethyl | | |
| | clopyralid | | |
| | fluroxypyr | | |
| | paraquat | | |
| | hexazinone | triazine-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | metribuzin | | |
| zinc | Zinc, primary, at regional storage/kg/RER | kg | |
| Insecticides | diflubenzuron | [sulfonyl]urea-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | lufénuron | | |
| | aldicarb | [thio]carbamate-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | benfuracarb | | |
| | bifenazate | | |
| | carbaryl | | |
| | carbosulfan | | |
| | fénoxycarbe | | |
| | formetanate | | |
| | isoprocarb | | |
| | méthomyl | | |
| | pirimicarb | | |
| | pyrimicarbe | | |
| | acide-alpha-naphtylacetique | | |
| | carbofuran | Carbofuran, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | copper oxide | Copper oxide, at plant/kg/RER | kg |
| | copper(ii)hydroxide | | |
| | acetamiprid | cyclic N-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | fénazaquin | | |
| | fenpyroximate | | |
| hexythiazox | | | |
| imidacloprid | | | |
| pyridabène | | | |
| thiamethoxam | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|----|
| | triazamate | | |
| | thiabendazole | Diazole-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | thiacloprid | | |
| | pyriproxyfen | diphenylether-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | folpet | folpet, at regional storage/kg/rer | kg |
| | acephate | organophosphorus-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | chlorfenvinfos | | |
| | chlormephos | | |
| | chlorpyrifos | | |
| | chlorpyrifos ethyl | | |
| | dimethoate | | |
| | éthéphon | | |
| | fenitrothion | | |
| | fenthion | | |
| | malathion | | |
| | methidathion | | |
| | parathion | | |
| | phosmet | | |
| | trichlorfon | | |
| | chlorpyrifos méthyl | | |
| | clofentézine | | |
| | dinocap | | |
| | endosulfan | | |
| | flazasulfuron | | |
| | fluazifop-p | | |
| | flufénoxuron | | |
| | indoxacarb | | |
| | insektizide unspez | | |
| | metiram-zinc | | |
| | pyrethrine | | |
| | rotenone | | |
| | spinosad | | |
| | terbuthylazine | | |
| | acrinathrin | pyretroid-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | alphaméthrine | | |
| | bétacyfluthrine | | |
| | bifenthrin | | |
| | cyfluthrin | | |
| | cyperméthrine | | |
| | deltaméthrine | | |
| | esfenvalérate | | |
| | fenpropathrin | | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|---|----|
| | lambda-cyhalothrin | | |
| | tau fluvalinate | | |
| | tefluthrin | | |
| | flonicamid | Pyridine-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | tébufenpyrad | | |
| | pymetrozine | triazine-compounds, at regional storehouse/kg/RER | kg |
| | | | |