We thank the Associate Editor and the reviewers for their clever and useful suggestions. Here below we present in red the reply to the Associate Editor report. The answers to the reviewers were uploaded last time without including references to the manuscript, as the revision of the text was under finalisation. In order to clarify the replies to the reviewers, we report them below equipped with the references to the page (*p.*) and lines (*l.*) of the marked-up version of the manuscript, which is presented at the end of the document. We also add references to the most important changes in the text based on the specific and technical comments of Reviewer 1.

Associate Editor Report

Associate Editor Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (Editor review) (30 Oct 2015) by Dr. Andreas Ibrom

Comments to the Author:

Dear Authors,

thank you very much for your replies.

We wish to thank the Editor for his invaluable work and positive decision about our manuscript.

Both reviewers are generally positive but make some remarks related to the scope of the study. Your replies make sufficiently clear how you limit it. But it is good to mention this explicitly in the text that this is not a full LCA.

The LCA was used in a part of the GHG balance to estimate emissions due to field management. We agree that this is not a full LCA, and we specified it in the text (*p. 17, l. 370-372*).

Your strategy on non-CO2 GHG fluxes is clear and you made a reasonable compromise between efforts and role of these gasses for the GHG budget. Maybe you can discuss whether you deem high emission events like freeze thaw cycles relevant for your site that might have not been included in your manual chamber measurements.

We are aware that discontinuous samplings of gas made by manual chambers might lead to miss some peaks of emission in special climate conditions. This was the reason to include in our experiment the laboratory experiment and to increase the frequency of measurements in occasion of rain, irrigation and fertigation in both the SRC and the REF sites. For that we think we sufficiently discussed soil non-CO_2 low emissions in our manuscript. The reason for not including the freeze/thaw cycles in this discussion was due to the Mediterranean climate of the area: the number of days where the soil is frozen is very limited, and the very low temperatures were expected to prevent soil emissions.

I appreciate that you split your results part and for a discussion section.

At this stage I can't evaluate how successful your changes are, as you did not copy them into the reply. In your revised manuscript, please mark-up all changes and refer to them in your response. To clarify, you do not need to add further explanations but you should give references to the final manuscript for any change you make in the existing text.

See below the answers (in red) to the reviewers' comments (in black) with the references to the final text.

Reviewer: 1

General remarks: Sabbatini and colleagues present a greenhouse gas balance of a Mediterranean site planted with bioenergy poplar short rotation coppice (SRC) measured over two years and compare results to a reference site under agricultural use. They conclude that the reference site is a small greenhouse gas (GHG) source, while the poplar short rotation coppice is a considerable GHG sink of 2.2 kg CO_2 eq m^{-2} over the two years of investigation taking into account CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O fluxes, management activities, soil organic carbon losses, GHG offset in terms of natural gas savings in the process of heat production, and biomass exports with regard to reemissions as CO_2 after burning. The topic is within the scope of the journal and of high environmental and political relevance as the production of bioenergy in Europe is a possible strategy to reduce GHG emissions. General design and approach are valid and mostly well presented; methods are thoroughly described. However, the current version of the manuscript has quite a number of shortcomings – most of them are minor – so that revisions are needed in order to bring it into an acceptable form. If the below-mentioned points are considered – mainly by putting some clarifications into the text – I feel that this will be a nice and much appreciated contribution to the scientific community.

We thank the reviewer for considering our paper and for her/his interesting suggestions. We tried to implement as much as possible the suggested changes.

Major points:

- This paper offers comprehensive details at some points, but lacks transparency at others. For example, the presented GHG budget is based on two years of measurements, i.e. one poplar rotation. It should be clearly pointed out in the Abstract and Discussion that this budget does not represent the period right after conversion from arable land to poplar coppice as one would expect much higher GHG release from the ecosystem to the atmosphere immediately after conversion. This fact needs to be discussed in the right context and conclusions should be verified with regard to a possibly changing budget of the newly established SRC site over time.

We agree that the period of calculation of the GHG budget has to be clear from the beginning, and we put in higher evidence than before the indication that the GHG budget was not calculated right after the conversion of the arable land, but starting from two years later (*p. 2, l. 35-36; p-9, l. 176-177*). To include the expected large emissions following the arable land conversion in the calculation of the GHG budget, a linear regression between the SOC content of the studied SRC and an older SRC located close-by was built (*p.10, l. 205-206; p. 27, l. 630-632; p.28, l. 644-646*). The expected value at the beginning of the cultivation was then extrapolated from the regression, and compared with the one of the REF site: the difference between them was attributed to the SOC loss at the conversion. CH_4 and N_2O emissions at the installation were considered negligible on the basis of the low fluxes measured both in the REF site and the lab experiment. A paragraph was inserted in the discussion section (*p. 30, l. 700-705*).

- CO_2 fluxes are identified to be the major contributor to the full budget. However, their presentation is poor. Please provide an additional figure showing the seasonal development of CO_2 exchange so that the reader gets an idea of possible controlling factors and an illustration of periods when discrepancies occur between sites and years.

We thank the reviewer for his suggestion. Even if we did not include a detailed ecological analysis of the F_{CO2} to avoid lengthening the manuscript, however we agree that it is worth it to show the seasonal trends of the most important flux contributing to the GHG budget. We added a figure to this end (*p. 56, l. 1156-1158*) and the trends of the two most important drivers (air temperature and soil water content), briefly discussing the inter-annual variability and the differences between sites (*p.21, l. 474-481*; *p. 26, l. 586-603*).

- Discussion is missing on sustainability of the presented conversion method, particularly on field operations such as irrigation. With regard to the GHG balance, this strategy seems to work out quite well, but what about other parts of the environment, e.g. the local water balance, etc.? Please add some thoughts on that.

In order to improve the readability of the manuscript and avoid possible confusion in the reader, we decided to focus the evaluation of the suitability of the LUC on the calculation of GHG budget, leaving outside other environmental factors. We agree that a comprehensive environmental LUC suitability would include the analysis of impacts on local water balance, nitrates leakage, VOCs, etc., though the discussion of these points was beyond our scopes. That said, we agree that the point should be cited and we added some considerations on irrigation-related aspects because of their relevance for poplar cultivations in Mediterranean areas (*p. 33, l. 770-781*).

- Manual chamber measurements: Using just three samples to calculate one flux rate is a bit dangerous. A huge additional uncertainty is induced. I know how challenging these measurements are and I appreciate their consideration in this study, but proper error estimations should be provided (see specific points).

We are aware that 3 is the minimum number of samples required for flux calculation, and that increasing this number might result in a more accurate calculation of fluxes. However, as the reviewer correctly underlines, manual chambers entail a huge amount of work. For that reason in order to have a higher number of samples we would have needed to reduce the number of collars in the sites. Instead we preferred to have 9 sampling points in each site, which was crucial especially in the SRC where we wanted to account for all the three different conditions (line, irrigated and non-irrigated interlines), sampled 3 times each. 3 samplings in time, frequently used in studies performing manual chamber measurements (e.g. von Arnold et al., 2005), have been chosen as an acceptable trade-off between excessive labour and uncertainty in flux calculations. The error we observed was variable and the magnitude of the fluxes low. For that reason we expect that even adding 1 point (so 4 rather than 3 points to the fit) would not dramatically improve the results, as a slight variation in the slope would not induce significant changes in the overall picture we have defined. Hence the uncertainty estimation, based on the standard deviation of the different collars and thus representing the spatial variability, provides in our opinion more relevant info for the GHG budget. This fact has been highlighted in the discussion of the low non-CO_2 emissions from soil (*p. 30, l.692-695*).

- I'm a bit skeptical whether (such) a (comprehensive) presentation of the soil incubation studies is needed. Do they add any valuable insights with regard to the main aim, i.e. the GHG budget, of the paper?

We think that the laboratory studies help to understand the field dynamics. Despite our effort, we are aware that manual sampling might not cover the whole temporal variability occurring in the field, in particular we could miss peaks of emissions, thus introducing some subjectivity. In this specific case we wanted to be sure that the low emission values, in particular of N_2O, were due to specific field factors, e.g. the lack of occurrence of combined conditions which can trigger high N fluxes (i.e., high water content and high N availability) or biological specific limitations, e.g. slow microbial processes due to soil conditions as found in other sites. Laboratory data brought more evidence to discuss these topics on the basis of scientific evidence rather than pure hypotheses. We better clarified the need for this lab experiment in the manuscript (*p.15, l. 330-331*).

- All in all, the paper reads well and I like it. Nevertheless, please avoid these terribly long sentences. Also, check for correct grammar (prepositions, etc.). It doesn't sound quite right at some points in the text. I guess it'll be quickly and easily fixed. There is not so much to change, but it will greatly improve readability and overall quality of the paper.

We tried to improve English grammar and clarify some parts of the text. However we are aware that the BG charges include an English copy-editing service for final revised papers (http://publications.copernicus.org/services/copy_editing_for_english.html)

Specific comments and technical corrections required:

All the specific comments and technical corrections required were implemented in the test. Most important changes and answers to reviewer's requests are listed in the following:

- General comment on Abstract:

- Add brief information on type of crop at REF site, field management
- It is unclear whether the SRC site had been converted just before the start of the measurements at SRC. Also, is the land use history of the two sites (before conversion to SRC) identical? (*p.2, l.31-33*)

- P.8039, l.24: Remove part in brackets. SRC has been defined earlier.

SRC has been defined earlier, here we define the name of the sites, e.g. "SRC site".

- P.8040, l.4: What is an 'overall method' in this context? Consider using a subtitle like 'Assessment approach' or something more meaningful than 'overall method' (*p. 7, l. 121*)

- P.8040, l.6: 'second rotation cycle': Does that mean your measurements did not commence right after conversion from arable land to SRC? If so, this needs to be indicated earlier, otherwise Abstract and Introduction are misleading. (*p.2, l.35-36; p.9, l. 176-177*)

- P.8040, l.7: I understand what you mean, but the phrasing might be a little bit confusing to some readers. Please indicate your sign convention clearly and in a way that everybody understands that an 'uptake' is a 'negative' GHG contribution quantitatively, but not qualitatively. (*p.7, l.125-126*)

- P.8040, l.10: Did you consider the possible role of nitrogen compounds in your estimation? Ammonia and aerosol NH4NO3 do also influence the GHG budget at local scale. Also, by substantially modifying the surface resistance through growing poplar trees, an increase in nitrogen deposition can be expected. However, it's tricky to include these aspects into CO2 equivalents due to their reactivity, uncertain emission factors, etc. I'm not asking for an extra term in Equation (1), but since a GHG balance is investigated, the nitrogen part should be kept in mind and should at least be mentioned at some point in the paper.

The role of nitrogen compounds in this study was attributed to the emissions from soil as N_2O (F_{N2O}), and to the energetic costs due to the production of fertilisers (in F_{MAN}). Other possible contributions to the balance (e.g. aerosol NH4NO3, N deposition and leaching) were considered minor and not included in the GHG budget. This fact was highlighted in the discussion section (*p.30, l.706-708*). We stress here however that Schmidt-Walter and Lamersdorf, 2012 found that nitrate leaching from SRC cultivation is small once the SRC is established, compared with arable rotations, and that the possible higher nitrate losses at the installation would be likely compensated by lower losses in the productive system in respect to croplands. Hence, speculating an analogy with this analysis for our study, this result would strengthen the advantage of the GHG budget of the SRC site in respect to the REF site.

- P.8041, l.21: Just to make sure: The land use history of REF and SRC were completely identical before 2010? Otherwise the whole approach wouldn't make much sense regarding the main aim of the study (*p.2, l. 32-33; p. 8, l. 165-166*)

- P.8046, l.13-14: This means that only three samples were used to calculate one flux, right? In my opinion four samples are required to derive a somewhat robust flux estimate. A huge error is additionally induced, let alone the uncertainty of vial sampling with subsequent GC analysis itself. This needs to be discussed and the respective error estimates need to be included in the final numbers.

See answer above

- P.8046, l.18-19: I understand the dependency on land management as it is described below. But what is meant by 'weather dependent'? Before, during, after rain? Are all important weather conditions covered by the measurements? (*p. 15, l. 321-322*)

- P.8047, l.22 to p.8048, l.2: No details are given on how nitrification and mineralization rates were calculated. Please add (*p. 13, l. 355-359*)

- P.8052, l.5-11: This is insufficient. FCO2 is the major contributor to the GHG balance. More information on seasonal course and main reasons (players, controlling factors) for differences among sites and years ideally in a new figure are needed. This doesn't need to be extensive, but some above-mentioned key points will help to better illustrate the results. (*p. 21, l. 474-481; p.26, l. 586-602; p.56, l. 1156-1158*)

- P.8053, l.2: What is the detection limit of the GC? What is the lower flux detection limit? (*p. 14, l. 309-312*)

- P.8054, l.21: What is supposed to happen after 12 years? Keep in mind that this time span builds the frame for some of your calculations. How reliable is this number? (*p. 8, l. 158-162*)

- P.8057, l.2: Why 4 years old? I thought SRC was harvested in January 2012 and the period you are looking at is from January 2012 to January 2014.
- P.8057, l.2: Isn't -293 within the range of -77 to -4756?

- P.8057, l.1-6: In general, the discussion could be spiced up a bit. Instead of solely citing numbers from other studies, possible reasons could be discussed, e.g., Jassal et al. (2013) measured at a site with a much lower stem density, which is the likely reason for lower C sequestration compared to SRC in this study (*p. 27, l.614-616*)

- P.8058, l.10: Again, why 12 years? What happens then? If SRC will be used for other crops, etc., after let's say 6 years, your reasoning fails. (*p. 8, l. 158-162*)

- P.8058, l.15 – p.8059, l.23: The authors do not take into account that N2O and CH4 were not measured immediately after conversion, which leads to a distorted image. An estimation (if possible) and discussion is needed on how the GHG balance would have changed, otherwise the numbers presented here remain a stand-alone two-yearwindow with limited force of expression (*p. 30, l. 700-705*)

Figure 3: Why only 14 months of measurements at REF site?

We began manual chambers measurements in the REF site at the beginning of April 2012 due to a technical problem: this fact has been clarified in the text (*p.9, l.174-175*). This means that the first months of cultivation for the REF site were not covered by non-CO2 soil measurements. However as this period was in wintertime we did not expect substantial differences with the rest of the time, and thus we considered zero emissions from this period in the calculation of the GHG budget.

Reviewer: 2

I have read with great interest the manuscript and my final recommendation is that it could be published in this Journal after minor revision. The subject of the paper, in fact, addresses relevant scientific questions within the scope of the Journal and it can me seen as a possible strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The paper refers to a real case-study in a Mediterranean site, in Italy, where a greenhouse gas balance of two different agricultural land, planted with Poplar SRC and grassland-wheat rotation, has been made over a period of two years to evaluate the feasibility of the land use change to reduce GHG emissions. By taking into account all emissions coming from all crops management activities, results show that Poplar SRC represents a GHG sink by having -2202 gCO2eqm-2 compared with 156gCO2eq m-2 of the grassland-wheat rotation crop. This allow authors to conclude that the experiment led to a reduction of GHG concentration in the atmosphere, that is Poplar SRC for energy purpose is a suitable crop for the climate mitigation. In general the manuscript is well structured and clear: title reflects the content of the paper and the scientific methods are valid and clearly described. Assumptions are also well outlined as well as the credit to other works already present in literature. Moreover, authors describe the experiment in detail and results are quite sufficient to support the conclusion.

We thank the reviewer for appreciating our work and for useful comments on it, which we think helped us to make the paper more clear

Authors, in fact, refer only to one cycle of the short rotation coppice (i.e., two years) and not to the whole crop cycle that usually is 12 years. I suggest underlining this aspect both in the abstract and in the text.

We better clarified in the text the information concerning the period considered in the GHG budget calculation (*p.2, l.30-31; p. 8, l.158-162*)

Concerning the discussion of results, I suggest to divide section 4 (Discussion and Conclusion) into two parts, that are Discussion and Conclusion, respectively.

We agree and split the section in two parts (*p.34, l.783*)

This is because the manuscript not only could appear more clear but also because Discussion need to be extended by considering all the aspects of the crops management related to all impacts to the environment (air, soil, water), both for Poplar and grassland-wheat.

We thank the reviewer for her/his suggestion. The objective of our work and of the present manuscript was to test the suitability of a LUC towards SRC from a GHG perspective. We are aware that an overall environmental assessment would have contemplated the inclusion of several other factors, but we decided to focus only in the GHG budget, otherwise the paper would become too complex and long. However, due to the specific climate condition (Mediterranean) where the SRC is cultivated, we added some thought related to irrigation, and thus to the expected impact of the LUC into the water balance (*p.33, l.770-781*).

Concerning English language, a revision is suggested.

We tried to improve English grammar and clarify some parts of the text. However we are aware that the BG charges include an English copy-editing service for final revised papers (http://publications.copernicus.org/services/copy_editing_for_english.html)

Moreover, check the use of parenthesis when data are presented and when references are reported. Sometimes they seem to be in a wrong place in the text, as for example line 15 in the abstract or pag. 8039 line 9-10.

We are grateful for the suggestion. The indicated unclear parts of the test have been clarified (*p.2, l.45; p.5, l.93*)

Table 3 is not clear: does Tractor1+2 mean the total diesel consumption of these tractors together or it is the same for each tractor? Please refer to tractors also in the site description when you describe the operations and then also in section 2.6.

We thank the reviewer for his comment. We clarified this point both in the test (*p. 10, l. 200-202*) and in the Table (*p.51, l. 1127-1128*)

References

Schmidt-Walter, P., & Lamersdorf, N.P. (2012). Biomass production with willow and poplar short rotation coppices on sensitive areas—the impact on nitrate leaching and groundwater recharge in a drinking water catchment near Hanover, Germany. BioEnergy Research, 5(3), 546-562.

von Arnold, K., Nilsson, M., Hånell, B., Weslien, P., & Klemedtsson, L. (2005). Fluxes of CO 2, CH 4 and N 2 O from drained organic soils in deciduous forests. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 37(6), 1059-1071.

1. Title

GREENHOUSE GAS BALANCE OF CROPLAND CONVERSION TO BIOENERGY POPLAR SHORT ROTATION COPPICE

Running title: From cropland to bioenergy SRC: a GHG balance

Simone Sabbatini[1], Nicola Arriga[2], Teresa Bertolini[3], Simona Castaldi[3], Tommaso Chiti[1], Claudia Consalvo[1], Sylvestre Njakou Djomo[4,5], Beniamino Gioli[6], Giorgio Matteucci[7], Dario Papale[1]

[1] University of Tuscia, Department for Innovation in Biological, Agro-food and Forest systems, Via S. Camillo de Lellis snc, 01100 Viterbo, Italy.

[2] University of Antwerp, Department of Biology, Research Group of Plant and Vegetation Ecology, Universiteitsplein 1, B-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

[3] Second University of Naples, Department of Environmental, Biological, Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technologies, Via Vivaldi 43, 81100 Caserta (CE), Italy

[4] Hasselt University, Department of Economic, Research Group of Environmental Economics, Martelarenlaan 42, 3500 Hasselt, Belgium

[5] Aarhus University, Department of Agroecology, Blichers Alle 20, 8830, Tjele, Denmark

[6] Institute of Biometeorology, National Research Council, Via G. Caproni 8, 50145 Firenze, Italy

[7] Institute for Agricultural and Forestry Systems in the Mediterranean, National Research Council, Via Cavour 4-6, I-87036 Rende (CS), Italy

Corresponding author: Simone Sabbatini, tel. +393396521486, fax +39 0761 357389 email: simone.sabbatini@unitus.it

Field Code Changed

Keywords: land use change, GHG budget, climate mitigation, bioenergy SRC, eddy covariance, SOC change, GHG offset

Paper type: Original Research

2. Abstract

The production of bioenergy in Europe is one of the strategies conceived to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The suitability of the land use change from a cropland (REF site) to a short rotation coppice plantation of hybrid poplar (SRC site) was investigated by comparing the GHG budgets of these two systems over 24 months in Viterbo, Italy. This period corresponded to a single rotation of the SRC site. The REF site was a crop rotation between grassland and winter wheat, i.e. the same management of the SRC site before the conversion to short rotation coppice. Eddy covariance measurements were carried out to quantify the net ecosystem exchange of CO_2 (F_{CO2}), whereas chambers were used to measure N_2O and CH_4 emissions from soil. The measurements began two years after the conversion of arable land to SRC: for that ~~Soil organic carbon (SOC) of~~ an older poplar plantation was used to estimate ~~via a regression~~ the soil organic carbon (SOC) ~~SOC~~ loss due to SRC establishment, and to estimate SOC recovery over time. Emissions from tractors and from production and transport of agricultural inputs (F_{MAN}) were modelled. The C emission rate of heat produced from natural gas was then used to credit to the SRC site the ~~and~~ GHG emission offset due to ~~fossil fuel~~ its substitution ~~was credited to the SRC site considering the C intensity of natural gas~~. Emissions generated by the ~~due to the~~ use of ~~the~~ biomass (F_{EXP}) were also considered. ~~The s~~Suitability was finally assessed by comparing the GHG budgets of the two sites. Cumulative F_{CO2} ~~was the higher flux~~ at ~~in~~ the SRC site was ~~(~~-3512 ± 224 gCO_2~~eq~~ m^{-2} in two years~~)~~, while in the REF site it was -1838 ± 107 gCO_2 m^{-2} in two years. F_{EXP} was equal to 1858 ± 240 gCO_2 m^{-2} in 24 months in the REF site, thus basically compensating F_{CO2}, while it was 1118 ± 521 gCO_2~~eq~~ m^{-2} in 24 months in the SRC site. This latter could offset -379.7 ± 175.1 gCO_2eq m^{-2} from fossil fuel displacement. Soil CH_4 and N_2O fluxes were negligible. F_{MAN} weighed 2% and 4% in the GHG budgets of SRC and REF sites respectively, while the SOC loss weighed 455 ± 524 gCO_2 m^{-2} in two years.

Formatted: Justified, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Font: Italic

Overall, the REF site was close to neutrality in a GHG perspective (156 ± 264 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$), while the SRC site was a net sink of -2202 ± 792 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$. In conclusion the experiment led to a positive evaluation from a GHG viewpoint of the conversion of cropland to bioenergy SRC from a GHG viewpoint.

3. Introduction

In the articulated regulation concerning energy and climate change policies, the European Union (EU) established two targets for ~~the~~ 2020: (i) reduction of 20% of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions relative to the levels of 1990, and (ii) share of 20% renewable energy use in gross final energy consumption (European Commission, 2007; European Commission, 2008). For Italy the latter is modulated to 17% (European Commission, 2009).

In the context of climate mitigation, bioenergy crops are expected to play a key role in the renewable energy supply in the EU in the next coming decades (Djomo et al., 2013). Short rotation coppice (SRC) of fast growing trees, and especially of poplar (*Populus* spp.), is a promising culture in this context. SRC has the~~sense, having the~~ potential to reduce GHG emissions to the atmosphere ~~both~~ during both its production (by capturing CO_2 from the atmosphere and storing it in aboveground biomass and ~~into the~~ soil) and use (by avoiding CO_2 emissions from fossil fuel burning). However, the management of SRC requires energy inputs, and converting ~~the~~ land ~~conversion~~ for ~~to~~ SRC production ~~systems~~ (i.e. land use change, LUC) may alter the equilibrium of the existing ecosystems, causing an impact that in some cases can counterbalance the positive effects on climate mitigation of the SRC (Zona et al., 2013; see also Crutzen et al., 2008; Fargione et al., 2008 for bioenergy crops in general). The LUC to SRC may imply losses of soil organic carbon (SOC) at the installation (Don et al., 2012), especially in C-rich soils, and the management of SRC requires the use of fossil fuels which in some cases can outweigh part of the benefits of the supposed carbon neutral SRC systems (Abbasi and Abbasi, 2009). A recent study (Djomo et al., 2011), however, showed that poplar and willow SRCs biomass use can ~~are capable to~~ save up to 80%-90% of GHG emissions compared to using coal for energy production. Studies on the climate mitigation potential of poplar cultivations constitute an important tool in supporting energy and environmental policies at different scales. In recent years researchers approached poplar

SRCs from different perspectives: ecological (Jaoudé et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2013), economic (Strauss and Grado, 1997; Mitchell et al., 1999; El Kasmioui and Ceulemans, 2012, 2013), energetic and environmental ~~points of view~~ (Jungmeier and Spitzer, 2001; Cherubini et al., 2009; Devis et al., 2009; Nassi o Di Nasso et al., 2010; Arevalo et al., 2011; Don et al., 2012; Dillen et al., 2013; Djomo et al., 2013). However, these studies often used different approaches making it difficult to compare their results ~~between each other~~ (Migliavacca et al., 2009; Djomo et al., 2011). Furthermore, ~~and~~ emphasis was mainly given to emissions from fossil fuels compared with the biogenic emissions due to the LUC (Djomo et al., 2013). Including the different contributions of the LUC in the assessments of emission savings related to energy crops is crucial ~~The production chain of biomass for energy indeed implies the conversion from a previous land use, and thus the substitution of a system of GHG exchanges with a new one, making the inclusion of this contribution in the analysis crucial, especially when assessing the emission savings related to energy crops~~ (Davis et al., 2009). A full GHG budget ~~(Byrne et al., 2007; Ceschia et al., 2010)~~ based on long-term measurements of CO_2 and non-CO_2 GHGs ~~using~~ via ~~the~~ eddy covariance (EC) methodology (Aubinet et al., 2012) and soil chambers measurements (Allard et al., 2007), can be used to assess the GHG mitigation potential of ~~the GHG fluxes due to the~~ land conversion to SRC (Byrne et al., 2007; Ceschia et al., 2010).~~, and thus validating the GHG mitigation potential of this conversion~~~~(Byrne et al., 2007; Ceschia et al., 2010)~~. Several authors (e.g. Ceschia et al., 2010; Osborne et al., 2010) highlighted the need for a more consistent number of studies on GHG budgets, including different types of management practices, climate conditions, and soil characteristics, in order to reduce the uncertainty in GHG budgets at large scale (Smith et al., 2010). A GHG budget ~~This kind of~~ approach was used by Gelfand et al., 2011 in a ~~for~~ conversion of unmanaged lands to herbaceous biofuel crops in the US. In Europe, Zona et al., 2013 estimated the GHG balance in the first year after the conversion from agricultural lands to a poplar SRC in Belgium, focusing on biogenic contributions. The present study considered a conversion of a cropland (hereafter indicated as “REF site”) to a poplar SRC (hereafter indicated as “SRC site”) for bioenergy production in the Mediterranean area (Viterbo, Central Italy). The aim was ~~aimed~~ to extend the GHG balance to emissions generated by ~~due to~~ field management and to the offset of GHG from ~~due to~~ fossil fuels substitution. ~~, considering a conversion of a cropland (hereafter indicated as “REF site”) to a poplar SRC (hereafter indicated as “SRC site”) for bioenergy production in the Mediterranean area (Viterbo, Central Italy). In this particular climate condition t~~The number of studies on SRC systems cultivated in Mediterranean areas is limited, where ~~, despite the fact that w~~water availability can constitute a limiting factor for biomass yield and thus climate mitigation (Cherubini et al., 2009). Given that the warming mitigation potential of energy crops is the main reason for subsidies to arable land conversion, our ~~The scope of the~~ study aimed~~was~~ to assess the suitability of the LUC to SRC in terms of mitigation of GHG emissions.~~, as the main reason for subsidies is the climate mitigation potential of this type of conversion.~~

4. Materials and methods

4.1 ~~Overall method~~GHG budgets assessment

The GHG budgets were calculated for the SRC and for the REF sites on a temporal basis of two years (24 months), corresponding to the second rotation cycle of the SRC site. They included ~~, and including~~ several positive ~~(i.e. release)~~ and negative ~~(i.e. uptake)~~ GHG contributions, with the following ~~,~~ sign convention: a positive flux indicates a release into the atmosphere, while a negative flux represents an uptake from the atmosphere. For the SRC site, the net GHG budget (B_{SRC}) was calculated as the algebraic sum of all GHG contributions as indicated in Eq. (1):

$$B_{SRC} = F_{CO2} + F_{CH4} + F_{N2O} + F_{MAN} + F_{SOC} + F_{SAV} + F_{EXP} \quad (1)$$

In ~~this~~ equation (1), F_{CO2} represents the flux of CO_2, i.e. the net ecosystem exchange (NEE) of CO_2, while F_{CH4} and F_{N2O} represent the biogenic methane and nitrous oxide soil-atmosphere exchanges. ~~,~~ F_{MAN} includes~~represents~~ the GHG emissions related ~~due~~ to the management of the SRC site, and F_{SOC} is~~represents~~ the loss of soil organic carbon content due to the installation of the cuttings. ~~,~~ F_{SAV} represents the GHG offsets, i.e. avoided GHG emissions due to the substitution of natural gas by biomass in the heat production, and F_{EXP} ~~represents~~ the biomass exported from the site at the end of the cycle and reemitted as CO_2 at burning.

Similarly, the net GHG budget of the REF site (B_{REF}) was estimated with the algebraic sum indicated in Eq. (2), where in respect to Eq. (1) there is not F_{SOC} and F_{SAV}, and F_{EXP} is the portion of the exported biomass that returns to the atmosphere as CO_2 or CH_4:

$$B_{REF} = F_{CO2} + F_{CH4} + F_{N2O} + F_{MAN} + F_{EXP} \quad (2)$$

All the contributions of B_{SRC} and B_{REF} were expressed as CO_2-equivalent (CO_2eq) fluxes per unit of surface, as ~~being~~ the functional unit of the study was one square meter of land. Finally, the net GHG cost or benefit of converting the cropland to a SRC plantation ~~were~~ was calculated by comparing B_{SRC} and B_{REF}. Displacement of food and feed production due torelated to SRC cultivation on cropland was beyond the scope of this study.

4.2 Site description

Two sites close to each other located in a private farm (*Gisella ed Elena Ascenzi S.A.A.S.*) in Castel d'Asso, Viterbo, Italy (coordinates: 42°22' N, 12°01' E), were selected during the summer 2011. for the installation of Two EC towers were installed in the two sites to measure the exchanges of CO_2 and H_2O between the ecosystem and the atmosphere following the methodology reported in Aubinet et al., 2000. The climate of the area is Mediterranean, with a yearly average rainfall of 766 mm, mean temperature of 13.76 °C and weak summer aridity in July-August (Blasi, 1993). The SRC site was a 2-year rotation cycle managed poplar (*Populus x canadensis* – clone AF2 selected in *Alasia Franco Vivai*'s nurseries) plantation of 11 ha, planted in 2010 and expected to be cultivated for 12 years to produce biomass for energy (heat). Poplar cultivar was *Populus x canadensis* – clone AF2 selected in *Alasia Franco Vivai*'s nurseries. According to the regional law (Rural Development Programme of Latium 2007-2013, Latium Region, 2015) 12 years is the maximum period to get subsidies for SRC, and corresponded to the time the farmer decided to cultivate the SRC site (personal communication). For that reason the calculations of the present study will be referred to a 12-years lifespan. The site was previously used managed withas a 2-year rotation between a clover grassland (*Trifolium incarnatum L.*) in mixture with ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum Lam*) and winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum L. emend. Fiori et Paol*). The REF site was —a 9 ha grassland-winter wheat rotation located at a short distance (300 m). Having -the identical land use and management of the SRC site before the installation of the poplars, it —was selected for representing the previous land use to in the purpose of assessing the GHG effects of the LUC. GHG balances were calculated over a period of 24 months in both sites.

However, these 24-month periods did not completely overlap, as the two cultivations had different beginning times: for the SRC site the ~~estimate of the~~ GHG budget estimation went~~as~~ from 12 January 2012 (immediately after the first harvest of the SRC site) to 11 January 2014, corresponding to the second cycle of cultivation. ~~, while for~~ The period of calculation of ~~the REF site~~ the GHG budget for the REF site ~~estimate started~~ went instead from 1 September 2011 until 31 August 2013. However, manual chamber measurements of CH_4 and N_2O in the REF site started at the beginning of April 2012. The 24 months considered for the SRC site corresponded to the second cycle of the short rotation coppice, and thus did not include the period right after the conversion of agricultural land. This rotation was ~~were~~ supposed to ~~end up~~terminate with the harvest.~~ at the end of the cycle.~~ However, due to unfavourable climate conditions (a strong drought during summer), the harvest of the SRC site planned for 2014 was postponed to 2015.

The SRC site had a planting density of around 5300 cuttings per hectare, that were planted in rows spaced 2.5 m at a distance of 0.75 m between each other. The first harvest occurred in January 2012. The SRC site was irrigated during the driest periods in summer using a system of tubes installed 35 cm belowground on alternate inter-rows, summing up to about 210 mm in 2012 and 80 mm in 2013 of equivalent precipitation added to the soil. No fertiliser was provided to the SRC site in 2012, while 40 kg per hectare of urea were dissolved in the irrigation water in a single event in 2013. Insecticide (DECIS) was used in May 2012 against *Chrysomela populi* L. In the REF site a shallow tillage (15 cm) was performed in September 2011 with a rotary harrow, and clover and ryegrass were sown. At the end of April 2012 half of the crop was converted to sorghum (*Sorghum vulgare Pers.*) after a period of aridity in spring time. Both the clover and the sorghum were grazed during the growing season, with grazing removing all the above-ground biomass from the sorghum, while the clover was harvested at the end of the cycle. At the end of October 2012 the land was tilled at 40 cm depth, and winter wheat was sown in November. In April 2013 herbicide was distributed over wheat (Buctril at a rate of 1 l ha^{-1}), which was harvested at the beginning of July 2013 and no other operation was performed until the end of August. Sorghum was irrigated in several day~~te~~s in summer using a sprinkler with a total amount of 275 mm of equivalent precipitation, while no irrigation was applied to the winter wheat. Sorghum was also fertilised twice with 150 kg ha^{-1} of ammonium nitrate, while 200 kg ha^{-1} of the same fertiliser were provided once to the wheat. Apart from irrigation and fertigation, all the operations described above were performed using two different types of tractors, generating different diesel consumptions associated to each operation (Table 3).

An older SRC site (indicated hereafter as O_SRC site) located alongside ~~of~~ the other one and subjected to the same type of management, but planted in 2007, was used in the estimation of SOC content loss caused by~~due to~~ the LUC. This was necessary as the expected SOC loss following the conversion (i.e. during the first rotation) was not measured.

In the 24 months considered for the GHG budget of the SRC site, precipitations summed up to 1078 mm, with an average temperature of 14.72 °C, while in the 24 months used for the REF site precipitations were 1157 mm and average temperatures 15.31 °C. In both cases yearly values of precipitation~~s~~ were lower than the long-term average of 766 mm (Blasi, 1993). ~~, and especially in summer 2012 a~~An intense drought occurred in summer 2012, with no rain from the beginning of June until the end of August, in contrast to the long-period average of cumulate rainfall in these months (110 mm, Blasi, 1993). Soils were classified as *Chromic Luvisol* according to the World Reference Base classification (USS 2014), with a clay-loam texture. Values of pH ranged between 5.88 in the REF site, 6.66 in the O_SRC site and 6.69 in the SRC site. ~~, while t~~The stock of nitrogen (N) up to 70 cm was not significantly different between sites, ranging from 3.16 ± 1.60 MgN ha^{-1} to 3.19 ± 1.47 MgN ha^{-1} and

3.25 ± 1.47 MgN ha^{-1} respectively for SRC, O_SRC and REF sites. See Fig. 1 for a schematic representation of land cover and management events of the two sites.

4.3 F_{CO2}: eddy covariance measurements

The EC technique was used to determine the turbulent vertical fluxes of momentum, CO_2, latent and sensible heat. ~~To this end a~~A 3-D sonic anemometer was installed in each site for high-frequency measurements of wind speed, wind direction and sonic temperature. ~~Data of~~ CO_2 and water vapour mass densities~~concentration~~ were collected using a fast-response open-path infrared gas analyser, (see Table 1 for models and manufacturers). These instruments were mounted on towers located in the centre of the fetches. On the REF site the mast was 3 m high, while an extendible telescopic pole was used in the SRC site in order to always measure turbulences above the roughness layer (Foken, 2008). ~~For a proper calculation of the fluxes and characterisation of the two sites, s~~Several meteorological variables above and belowground were continuously measured on a 30 min basis to properly calculate fluxes and characterise the two sites. In Table 1 the complete instruments setup is described, including~~for~~ both meteorological and high-frequency variables ~~is described~~.

Half-hourly f~~F~~luxes ~~on a 30 min basis~~ were calculated ~~using~~ with~~the~~ EddyPro® software (LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA). ~~, applying S~~several corrections to the time series (Aubinet et al., 2012) were applied as reported in Table 2. ~~The convention used in this paper is that uptake of CO_2 (i.e. net fluxes from the atmosphere to the ecosystem) are reported as negative values of F_{CO2}, whereas release is reported as positive F_{CO2}, with the same meaning given hereafter to negative and positive fluxes of other GHGs.~~

Post-processing included spike removal and friction velocity (u_* ~~$u*$~~) filtering (Papale et al., 2006), gap-filling using the marginal distribution sampling (MDS) approach and partitioning of F_{CO2} into gross primary production (GPP) and ecosystem respiration (R_{eco}) components

Formatted: English (U.K.)

(Reichstein et al., 2005). The gap-filled F_{CO2} and its components were then cumulated along the 24-month period considered.

Uncertainty in F_{CO2} was calculated on the basis of the uncertainty in the u_*~~u*~~ filtering, assuming that the main potential systematic error is due to advection and thus linked to the u_*~~u*~~ filtering. One hundred thresholds were calculated using a bootstrapping technique and then applied to filter the data. For each half-hour, ~~T~~the median of the distribution of F_{CO2} obtained using the 100 thresholds was used for the GHG budget (Gielen et al., 2013)~~). The median of the distribution of F_{CO2} was used in this study for redacting the GHG budget~~, and the range of uncertainty ~~range~~ was derived as half the range 16th-84th percentile.

4.4 *Soil characteristics and SOC stock and changes*

To better characterize the soil properties and to quantify the changes in SOC stocks due to the installation of the poplar plantation, a number of soil analyses were performed in the three sites in two different periods. In a first phase on February 2012 three soil trenches 150 cm wide were opened randomly in each site and the soil sampled by depth (0-5, 5-15, 13-30, 30-50, 50-70, 70-100 cm) at both the opposite sides of the profiles to have six replicate samples per depth. The bottom layer (70 cm – 100 cm) was absent in the REF site due to the presence of the bedrock at 80 cm, rather than 100 cm as in both the SRC sites. Samples were collected using a cylinder to determine also the bulk density. Main goals of this first sampling campaign were to describe the soil characteristics and to determine the number of replicates necessary to detect with statistical significance a change in SOC content of 0.5 gC kg^{-1} soil (Conen et al., 2003). In the SRC and O_SRC sites ten samples of the organic layer were also taken removing all the material present over the mineral surface within a squared frame with an area of 361 cm^2. In the REF site this sampling was not performed because a permanent organic layer was missing. All samples were air-dried at room temperature and then sieved at

2 mm to separate the coarse fraction, and the analyses performed on the fine earth. The pH was measured in deionised water with a sure-flow electrode, using a ratio soil-solution of 1:2.5 (w/w), and texture was determined after destruction of the cement using sodium hypochlorite adjusted at pH 9 (Mikutta et al., 2005). The sand fraction was separated by wet sieving at 53 µm while the silt and the clay fractions were separated by time sedimentation according to the Stokes law. Total carbon (C) and nitrogen concentrations were measured on finely ground samples by dry combustion (ThermoFinnigan Flash EA112 CHN), while SOC and N stocks were determined taking into account soil C and N concentrations and a weighed mean of bulk density, depth of sampling and stoniness (Boone et al., 1999). During the second phase in March 2014 a new sampling was performed in the REF, SRC and O_SRC sites. The number of samples necessary to detect statistically a SOC change was 50, as derived from the first phase. Samples were taken from the first 15 cm of soil, as most of the changes in a short period occur in the shallower layers. C concentration was measured and SOC stocks re-calculated. The normality of the distributions was checked using a Chi-squared test (Pearson, 1900). An ANOVA test (Fisher, 1919), combined with a Tukey multiple comparison test were used to check if SOC stocks were different between the sites. As data of F_{CO2} from the beginning of the cultivation are missing, SOC changes due to the installation of the poplar cuttings were calculated building a linear regression between SOC content of the SRC site (4 years old) and the O_SRC site (7 years old), then estimating the SOC at the time of plantation (year “0”). Following the “free-intercept model” described by Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2009, the SOC content change due to the plantation of the SRC was then extrapolated considering the difference between the SOC content at year 0 and the one measured in the REF site, assuming the SOC content in the REF site in equilibrium, as this type of land use was constant in the last 30 years. Uncertainties in SOC concentration and stock were calculated as standard deviations from the mean values of each repeated measure,

while errors were estimated using the law of error propagation as reported by Goodman, 1960.

4.5 Soil CH_4 and N_2O fluxes

On-site measurements of CH_4 and N_2O soil fluxes were combined with laboratory incubation analyses, where soil samples were tested at different water contents and N addition levels. Field measurements of soil N_2O and CH_4 fluxes were carried out in the two sites using nine manual, dark, static PVC chambers (15 cm diameter, 20 cm height, and total volume 0.0039 m^3) per site, placed over as many PVC collars (7 cm height, 15 cm diameter) permanently inserted into the soil at 5 cm depth for the period of observationall the period of observation. At the SRC site, three collars were distributed along In the SRC site the collars were distributed three along the tree line (between two trees), three along the irrigated inter-rows and three along the non-irrigated inter-rows, while in the REF site collars were placed in three different blocks of three collars each. Gas samples were collected from each chamber at the closure time, and 30 and 60 minutes after closure. Samples were stored in glass vials provided with butyl rubber air tight septum (20 ml) and concentration of N_2O and CH_4 was measured using a trace Ultra gas chromatograph (GC) (Thermo Scientific, Rodano, IT). The flux detection limit of the GC was in the order of about 0.1 mg of CH_4 or N_2O m^{-2} day^{-1}, and the analytical precision of the GC for standards at ambient concentration was approximately 3-5 %, using one standard deviation as a measure of mean error. For urther details on f the GC set in see Castaldi et al., 2013. Measurements started two weeks after collar insertion and samples were collected every 2-4 weeks, depending on land management practices and weather conditions, for a total of 30 dates in the SRC site and 24 for the REF site. Similar frequencies were used in previous studies (e.g. Pihlatie et al., 2007; Weslien et al., 2009), and considered pertinent on the basis of the low variability magnitude ofin the measured fluxes.

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

To test if fertilisation could trigger a peak of N_2O emission as found in previous studies (e.g. Gauder et al., 2012), measurements in both sites were carried out more frequently in occasion of fertilisation events (on average every two days), starting from the day before the application of fertiliser and for a week. Measurements also covered different soil and meteorological conditions, including periods of drought and rewetting. Measured average daily soil CH_4 and N_2O fluxes were cumulated over the 24 months by linear interpolation as described by Marble et al., 2013, and uncertainty calculated propagating the standard deviations of the replicates. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Changes (IPCC) 100-year global warming potential (GWP) weighed estimates of GHGs (Forster et al., 2007) were used to convert F_{N2O} and F_{CH4} into CO_2 equivalents: factors 298 and 25 respectively.

4.5.1 *Laboratory incubations*

Due to the fact that we don't have continuous measurements of non-CO_2 fluxes from soil, we performed laboratory analysis to verify the accuracy of field campaigns. Laboratory incubations were carried out to assess the GHG emission rates under controlled laboratory conditions in soil treated with both water and nitrogen addition, and to quantify the rates of soil mineralization and nitrification. The rational of the incubation was to assess ~~if~~ whether the fluxes were driven by limiting conditions like water and/or nitrogen, or slow rate of organic N mineralization, as found in a Mediterranean coppice site in the same region (Castaldi et al., 2009; Gundersen et al., 2012). Addition of N allowed to check if short-time peaks of emissions occurred that could escape due to the selected frequency of sampling. Soil cores (7 cm diameter, 10 cm height) sampled in the two ecosystems were incubated at 20 °C. Water was then added to reach ~~and led via water addition to~~ three different ranges of Water Filled Pore Space (WFPS%): 20% (i.e. the value estimated at sampling), 50% and 90%, each of them replicated five times. The sample at the highest WFPS% was also replicated with or

Formatted: Subscript

without nitrogen supply (100 kgN ha^{-1} of NH_4NO_3). Cores were placed in gas-tight 1-litre jars and 6 ml air samples were collected immediately after closure and after 3 hours of incubation for N_2O production determination. Gas concentration was determined by gas chromatography the day after the treatment and in the following 5 days, leaving the jars open during this period and closing them only when N_2O production needed to be determined, in orderso to avoid developing of liquid oxygen tension conditions. Net mineralization and nitrification, and net potential nitrification rate were determined on sieved (2 mm mesh) soil samples over 14 days of incubation, while for the determination of potential nitrification soil was amended with ammonium sulphate $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ (100 µgN g^{-1} dry soil). A modified method (Kandeler, 1996; Castaldi and Aragosa, 2002) was used to extract NH_4^+ and NO_3^- from the soil at T_0 and T_{14} days for further concentration determination with calibrated specific electrodes after the addition of a pH and ionic buffer 0.4 ml di ISA (Ionic Strength Adjustor; Orion cat. No. 951211 e Orion cat No. 930711). Mineralization rates were calculated as the total soil mineral N (µg of N-$NH4^+$ + N-$NO3^-$ per gram of dry soil) measured after 14 days of incubation (T_{14}) minus total mineral N measured at incubation start (T_0) divided by the number of days of incubation. Nitrification rates were calculated similarly, considering only the amount of N-$NO3^-$ produced at T_{14} minus the amount of N-$NO3^-$ present at T_0.

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

In order to compare results obtained with soil cores to field conditions, in situ *WFPS%* was calculated for the whole period of field monitoring:

$$WFPS\% = \frac{M_{SOIL}}{1-\left(\rho_{BULK}/\rho_{PART}\right)} * 100 \qquad (3)$$

where M_{SOIL} is the volumetric soil moisture in volumes (m^3 m^{-3}), ρ_{BULK} is the bulk density (Mg m^{-3}) and ρ_{PART} is the particle density (Mg m^{-3}). For mineral soil ρ_{PART} is approximated to that of common silicate materials (2.65 Mg m^{-3}, Chesworth, 2008).

4.6 Emissions due to management

Life cycle assessment (LCA) was used to estimate the anthropogenic GHG emissions due to farming operations (Robertson et al., 2000) in both sites (Table 3), and the GHG emissions due to grazing in the REF site (Table 4). The present study is not a full LCA, but the LCA approach was used to estimate emissions caused by field management as described in the following. Fossil fuel emissions associated with the cultivation of the SRC and REF sites included on-site emissions from tractors (used to carry out all the main operations: ploughing, seeding, solid fertilisation, harvesting) and irrigation, as well off-site emissions from the production and transport of agricultural inputs (fertiliser, insecticide, herbicide). Emissions due to the production of tractors were considered negligible as in Budsberg et al., 2012 and Caputo et al., 2014. On-site GHG emissions due to diesel consumption were calculated as the product of the amount of fuel diesel consumed to carry out a given farm activity (e.g. harvesting) and the emissions factor of diesel, 90 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$ (Table 3). This factor includes emission costs due to the combustion of diesel (74 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$), and emissions due to its production and transportation (16 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$) (Edwards et al., 2007). Considering energy density of diesel to be 38.6 $MJ\ l^{-1}$ (Alternative Fuel Data Center, 2014), producing, transporting and burning 1 l of diesel emitted 3474 gCO_2eq. An exception was made for harvesting in the SRC site, for which emissions for diesel consumption relative to the previous harvest (2012) were considered, as the harvest at the end of the cycle was postponed. Emissions due to irrigation were calculated by multiplying the electricity consumed in powering the pumps by an emissions factor of 750 $gCO_2\ kWh^{-1}$, calculated as the average of different emission factors for different sources of electricity (Bechis and Marangon, 2011) weighted on the Italian electricity grid mix, derived from the Italian energetic balance 2012 (Italian Ministry of Interior, 2013). Off-site emission costs for fertilisers and insecticides were estimated as the product of applied amount of fertiliser or insecticide and the emission factors for manufacturing 1 kg of fertiliser/insecticide: 4018.9 $gCO_2\ kg^{-1}$ N for urea (NPK rating 40-

0-0), 4812 $gCO_2\ kg^{-1}$ N for diammonium phosphate (NPK 18-46-0)[1], 7030.8 $gCO_2\ kg^{-1}$ N for ammonium nitrate (NPK 33-0-0) and 7481.9 $gCO_2\ kg^{-1}$ N for calcium ammonium nitrate (NPK 27-0-0) (Wood and Cowie, 2004). Although emission factors differ among insecticide types, in this analysis we assumed that the difference is negligible as the use of insecticides was limited, and thus considered the emission factor of insecticide (active ingredient: deltamethrin) as the product of energy required to produce 1 kg of insecticide (310 MJ kg^{-1}) and the emission rate of insecticide (60 $gCO_2\ MJ^{-1}$) (Barber, 2004; Liu et al., 2010). The emission factor of herbicide was taken from literature (Ceschia et al., 2010): 3.92 kgC per kg of product. Fuel used for the application of chemical products was included in the on-site calculations described above. All the contributions listed above were converted on a surface basis (Table 3).

4.7 Biomass use and GHG offset

During the first year of cultivation the REF site was grazed by sheep, which were brought to the field in defined periods (Table 4). Hence, the aboveground biomass (AGB) from the REF site was rather grazed by sheep or provided as hay to other livestock, destined to meat and milk production, or in the case of wheat used in food (grains) and feed (foliage) production. Due to the different species cultivated throughout the two years and to the different uses of the biomass, F_{EXP} of the REF site (Eq. (2)) includes the following:

$$F_{EXP} = E_{CH4,on} + E_{CO2,on} + E_{CH4,off} + E_{CO2,off} \qquad (4)$$

where the first subscript indicates whether the exported C is reemitted to the atmosphere as CO_2 or CH_4, and the second subscript distinguishes between emissions occurring on-site (*on*) and off-site (*off*). In fact, the percentage of AGB ingested by herbivores on grassland varies

[1] This includes production and transport costs of the overall fertiliser, including P.

with the intensity of management (Soussana et al., 2010). In the present study, however, what was left in the field by the sheep was then harvested and provided them off-site. We assumed then that, apart from the grains in wheat ears, all the AGB was ingested by sheep or other livestock, and that the digestible portion of the organic C ingested was respired back to the atmosphere as CO_2 or emitted as CH_4 via enteric fermentation (Eq. (4)) (Soussana et al., 2007). Biomass in the REF site was sampled every 2-3 weeks in five plots (0.5 m x 0.5 m) randomly selected within the field. In three dates samples were collected immediately after grazing in a grazed area and in an undisturbed area to quantify the intensity of mowing (68%) and identify the C ingested on-site and off-site. Biomass samples were oven-dried at 70 °C to constant mass and weighed. Total AGB was obtained cumulating dry weights measured immediately before each grazing event, subtracting each time the 32% of the dry weight of the previous sample to consider mowing intensity. IPCC methodology (Dong et al., 2006) was then used to estimate $E_{CH4,on}$ (Eq. (4)), adjusting the methane emission factor per animal considering the average weight (55 kg) of sheep (19 gCH_4 $head^{-1}$ day^{-1}), and multiplying it by the daily number of sheep present on-site. The method in Soussana et al., 2007 (their Eq. (4)) was then adapted to estimate the other three components in Eq. (4): $E_{CH4,off}$ was estimated applying to the C ingested off-site the ratio between the C weight in $E_{CH4,on}$ and the C ingested on-site. The C emitted as CH_4 was subtracted from the digestible portion of the C ingested, assumed to be 65%, and the remaining converted in CO_2 as to estimate $E_{CO2,on}$ and $E_{CO2,off}$. The remaining, non-digestible C (35%) was assumed to be returned to the SOC of the grassland (for the on-site part) or of other systems (for the off-site part) as faeces, thus not contributing to the GHG balance. The portion of C that was stock in the body mass of animals was considered negligible (Soussana et al., 2007). For the sake of simplicity, we assumed that also the C content of wheat ears will be shortly respired back to the atmosphere as CO_2, and thus included in $E_{CO2,off}$ (Eq. (4)).

At the end of the cycle, poplar aboveground woody biomass (AGWB) of the SRC site was supposed to be harvested and burnt, thus from one side releasing C back to the atmosphere, and from the other offsetting GHG emissions for fossil fuels displacement. To estimate poplar AGWB diameters were measured at the end of the cycle, after the leaves fall. Three rows of trees were selected inside the plantation and the diameters of these trees were measured (minimum threshold 0.5 cm) at 1 m height. A simple model considering the regression between individual shoot dry weight (W_D) and 1 m diameter (D) was used:

$$W_D = b * D^c \tag{5}$$

where b and c are empirical parameters, W_D is in kg DM (kg of Dry Mass), and D is in cm. Parameters were set as b = 0.0847 and c = 2.112 following Mareschi, 2008 (see also Paris et al., 2011) for the second rotation cycle of clone AF2 of the plantation located in Bigarello (Mantua province), as the one with the more similar climatic and soil characteristics, and also with the same root and shoot age. Dry combustion (1108EA, Carlo Erba, Milan, IT) was used to determine the C concentration for both sites. Regarding the GHG emissions offset, it was assumed that heat produced from SRC biomass will substitute heat produced from natural gas. The GHG offset (F_{SAV}) was estimated based on the yield of the SRC site, the energy density of poplar, the conversion efficiency of typical biomass boiler in Italy, and the emission rate of heat production from natural gas in Italy:

$$F_{SAV} = Y * H_L * \eta_{CONV} * I_{NG} \tag{6}$$

where Y is the biomass yield (kg m^{-2}), H_L is the low heating value of poplar (13 MJ kg^{-1} at 30% moisture content, Boundy et al., 2011), η_{CONV} is the efficiency of conversion of poplar chips to heat, assumed in this study to be 84% (Saidur et al., 2011), and I_{NG} is the carbon emission rate (intensity) of heat produced from natural gas (i.e. 55.862 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$) for Italy (Romano et al., 2014).

5. Results

5.1 *Biogenic fluxes of CO_2*

The cumulative F_{CO2} in the REF site for the two years considered was -1838 ± 107 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$, partitioned in 8032 ± 313 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$ absorbed through photosynthesis (GPP) and 6216 ± 338 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$ emitted by total R_{eco}. In the SRC site cumulative F_{CO2} summed up to -3512 ± 224 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$, with GPP equal to 8717 ± 298 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$ and R_{eco} equal to 5205 ± 425 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}$ (Fig. 2). Hence, the SRC site was a larger CO_2 sink compared to the REF site over the measuring period, due to both the higher GPP and the lower ecosystem respiration of the SRC site relative to the REF site.

Seasonal differences between the sites in the net flux of CO_2 were observed (Fig. 3). The main dissimilarity was the timing of the peak of CO_2 uptake, during the spring in the REF site and in summer for the SRC site. In both sites, peaks of CO_2 uptake were higher in 2013 than in 2012. In the latter, however, a minor peak of uptake were observed in early fall in the SRC site. Periods with positive net fluxes of CO_2 appeared longer and with higher values in the REF site (Fig. 3, top). Air temperatures registered in the two sites were similar, but higher in summer 2012, while the SWC at 30 cm depth was higher in the REF than in the SRC site (Fig. 3, bottom).

5.2 *Soil CH_4 and N_2O fluxes*

Daily average of both F_{N2O} and F_{CH4} were very low in almost every measurement (Fig. 43), leading to low total cumulative soil F_{N2O} and F_{CH4} for both the sites: overall soil non-CO_2 fluxes were 15.5 ± 4.7 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ in two years for the SRC site and 0.5 ± 1.6 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ in two years for the REF site. Both sites were small sources of N_2O and small sinks of CH_4. CH_4 sink at the SRC site was not significantly different from the one at the REF site, although on average slightly higher, and significantly higher N_2O emissions were observed at the SRC site, although still very low. Measurements carried out in occasion of fertilisation events showed no significant increase in the emission rates of N_2O in respect to non-fertilisation periods: fluxes in the SRC site in the period of the unique fertilisation occurred in the two years of study remained low, and in the REF site none of the four measurements taken in the period of the fertilisation event of June 2012 exceeded the detection limit of the GC.

5.2.1 Laboratory incubations

N_2O emissions determined in laboratory incubations confirmed that over most of the analysed WFPS% values both soils were producing little N_2O in absence of N addition, even at WFPS% normally considered to trigger N_2O emission (WFPS% 60-80%) (Fig. 54). Addition of N did not seem sufficient to stimulate N_2O production. In contrast, very high WFPS%, close to saturation, was able to trigger a strong increase of N_2O production in the soil of the REF site. Comparing the data reported in Fig. 54 with the field data of WFPS% for the REF site (Fig. 65), it can be seen that most of the time WFPS% was significantly below 70% in the whole profile and that at 5 cm, where most of the interaction with added fertilizer might have occurred, the WFPS% never exceeded 50%. Mineralization and nitrification rates were quite low in both sites, with slightly positive mineralization rates in the SRC site (0.28 ± 0.05 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1}) and a very small net immobilization in the REF samples (-0.2 ± 0.2 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1}). Net nitrification rates calculated in the control (no N addition) were also quite low and varied between 0.5 ± 0.05 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1} and -0.1 ± 0.2 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1} in the REF site, that might suggest either a quite slow ammonification phase as a limiting step of the nitrification or a slow nitrification rate. However, when ammonium sulphate was added to soil samples the potential nitrification rates significantly increased reaching 1.8 ± 0.1 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1} and 1.4 ± 0.3 μgN g^{-1} d^{-1} in the SRC and the REF sites respectively, suggesting that mineralization might be the limiting step of subsequent nitrification and denitrification processes in the field.

5.3 *Emissions due to management*

The GHG emissions due to management practices were in total 100.9 ± 20 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ for the SRC site and 135.7 ± 27.1 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ for the REF site. Analysing the single contributions, differences arose between the two sites (Fig. 7~~6~~): fertilisation was the main source of emission of GHGs in the REF site, while its contribution to GHG emissions of the SRC site was limited. Irrigation constituted a big portion of the GHG emissions from management operations in the SRC site, while in the REF site, despite similar amounts of water provided, irrigation played a smaller role, similar to harvesting and tillage. Emissions due to the latter were more relevant in the REF site than in the SRC site.

5.4 *SOC content changes*

In the first 15 cm of soil total C stocks were 1603 ± 376 $gC\ m^{-2}$ in the REF site, 1169 ± 442 $gC\ m^{-2}$ in the SRC site and 1403 ± 279 $MgC\ ha^{-1}$ in the O_SRC site. The statistical analysis performed on the SOC stocks showed that there were statistically significant differences between SOC data of the three sites (Table 5; p-value = $2.05*10^{-7}$). The linear regression between SOC content of SRC and O_SRC sites led to the relation:

$$SOC(t) = 78 * t + 857 \qquad (7)$$

where *t* are the years from plantation and *SOC* is the soil organic carbon content expressed in $gC\ m^{-2}$. Estimated uncertainty was 25 $gC\ m^{-2}$ for the slope value, and 139 $gC\ m^{-2}$ for the intercept (Fig. 8~~7~~), meaning that the yearly SOC accumulation after poplar plantation was 78 ± 25 $gC\ m^{-2}$ and the initial value (t=0) was 857 ± 139 $gC\ m^{-2}$, 746 ± 858 $gC\ m^{-2}$ lower than the REF value, corresponding to the SOC content loss due to the installation of the SRC. As this loss was a positive flux occurring only once in a LUC at the installation of the cuttings (Arevalo et al., 2011), and that the expected lifespan of the SRC site was 12 years, the value considered for the 24-month GHG budget was 1/6, corresponding to 124 ± 143 gC m^{-2} (455 ± 524 gCO_2 m^{-2}).

5.5 *Biomass use and GHG offset*

The dry weight of AGB in the REF site summed up to 0.72 ± 0.18 kg m^{-2} for the grassland, of which 0.35 ± 0.07 kg m^{-2} due to the clover in mixture and 0.37 ± 0.17 kg m^{-2} from the sorghum, while the winter wheat totalled 0.63 ± 0.09 kg m^{-2}, of which 0.36 ± 0.05 kg m^{-2} in the ears. The C content measured was 46% for all species, leading to a total of 621.0 ± 93.2 gC m^{-2} in AGB, of which 265.5 ± 79.2 gC m^{-2} ingested by sheep on-site, 191.2 ± 49.8 gC m^{-2} used by livestock off-site, and 163.9 ± 21.9 gC m^{-2} converted to food. The estimated emissions of CH_4 due to enteric fermentation was 4.3 ± 1.3 gCH_4 m^{-2}, equal to 3.3 ± 1.0 gC m^{-2} emitted as CH_4, and thus corresponding to 109 ± 33 gCO_2eq m^{-2} ($E_{CH4,on}$, Eq. (4)). Hence, about 1.25% of the ingested C became CH_4 in the digestive process. Using this ratio led to estimate other 2.4 ± 0.6 gC m^{-2} emitted as CH_4 off-site, i.e. 3.2 ± 0.8 gCH_4 m^{-2}, or 80 ± 20 gCO_2eq m^{-2} ($E_{CH4,off}$). Subtracting the C emitted as CH_4 on- and off-site to the respective digestible C ingested by sheep and other livestock led to 621 ± 189 gCO_2eq m^{-2} emitted on-site ($E_{CO2,on}$) and 447 ± 118 gCO_2eq m^{-2} offsite. Adding to this latter the emissions expected from wheat ears use (i.e. 601 ± 80 gCO_2eq m^{-2}) gave 1048 ± 143 gCO_2eq m^{-2} ($E_{CO2,off}$): in total 1858 ± 240 gCO_2eq m^{-2} in two years (F_{EXP}, Eq.(4)).

For the SRC site, applying Eq. (5) with the diameters distribution led to estimate AGWB (dry matter) in 0.62 ± 0.29 kg m^{-2}, which with a C content of 49%, corresponded to a F_{EXP} of

1118 ± 521 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ per two years that are expected to be reemitted to the atmosphere at the combustion. This value of AGWB then corresponded to 8.1 ± 3.7 MJ m^{-2} of gross energy from biomass chips, which decreased to 6.8 ± 3.1 MJ m^{-2} of final heat obtainable from burning biomass chips when the conversion efficiency is considered. This could offset about 379.7 ± 175.1 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ from final heat produced using natural gas.

5.6 GHG budgets

All the contributions reported in the previous sections were summed up to calculate the GHG budgets of the two sites. The net GHG budget of the REF site (B_{REF}, Eq. (2)) amounted to 156 ± 264 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$, indicating that the REF site was close to neutrality from a GHG perspective, while for the SRC site the B_{SRC} (Eq. (1)) resulted in a cumulative sequestration of -2202 ± 792 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$. The different components of the GHG budget of the two sites are summarized in Fig. 98. In the REF site the F_{CO2}, weighing about 48% in the GHG budget, was completely compensated by the emissions of CO_2 and CH_4 due to the biomass utilisation (about 44% and 5% respectively), while the other components had a minor role (F_{MAN} around 4%, soil non-CO_2 <1%). F_{CO2} was the main contribution also in the SRC site, where it represented the 63% of B_{SRC}, while F_{EXP} represented the 20%, SOC loss (8%) and the GHG offset for the fossil fuel substitution (7%) had a similar weight, and the other contributions played a minor role. As B_{REF} was almost neutral and the SRC site a sink of GHGs, the difference between the two GHG budgets was favourable to the SRC site (2358 ± 835 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ saved), highlighting the advantages in terms of GHGs of the LUC from common agricultural to SRC of poplar in the study area.

6. Discussion ~~and conclusions~~

The two ecosystems behaved differently in the measuring period: they were both characterised by a seasonal uptake of CO_2 (Fig. 3), driven by the timing and duration of the growing season, occurring in spring at the REF site and in summer at the SRC site. The peak of CO_2 uptake was similar at both sites in 2012, while it was higher at the REF site in 2013. Periods with positive CO_2 fluxes were longer in the REF site, and often higher in magnitude, likely as a consequence of the shorter growing season of grasses and winter wheat compared to the poplars trees of the SRC site~~:~~. Also the land cover of the two sites during the dormant periods and the shift in time between them might have played a role on this difference: some herbaceous vegetation kept growing in the SRC site in wintertime, while harvesting and ploughing in the REF site in late summer/early fall might have enhanced ecosystem respiration. Inter-annual differences were also observed at both sites. Both the higher air temperature and the more extended period of low SWC proved the strong aridity of summer 2012, responsible for the autumnal increase of CO_2 uptake at the SRC site, corresponding to the rewetting of the soil. At the REF site, autumn uptake was higher in 2011, while the springtime uptake was much higher in 2013 than in 2012 (Fig. 3). This different behaviour was mostly ascribable to the different cultivations (grassland – winter wheat), and to some extent to the different climate conditions in springtime. All these differences in ecosystems responses ~~combination of physiological differences between species, diverse land cover types and diverse type of management~~ resulted in a net sink of GHGs from the SRC site and in a neutral GHG balance for the REF site.

A GHG balance not significantly different from zero is in agreement with the average results for a set of sites in Soussana et al., 2007, where however management costs were not considered, and on-site CO_2 emissions from grazing animals were measured with EC. C sequestered by the SRC site in our study was higher than that of the Belgian site in the study

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

of Zona et al., 2013. In the latter ~~, where~~ the net budget was positive (i~~o~~n a time span of one year and a half) with a net emission of 280 ± 80 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$, due to both ~~to~~ the higher emission rates of CH_4 and N_2O fluxes from soil (350 ± 50 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$), and to the lower CO_2 sink (−80 ± 60 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$) as compared to the present study. Also Jassal et al., 2013 found lower F_{CO2} in a 3-year-old poplar SRC in Canada (-293 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$) as compared to ~~, while the~~ F_{CO2} of the SRC site of the present study (root age: 4 years ~~old~~), likely due to the lower stem density of their site. All these values lied in the range found by Arevalo et al., 2011, i.e. -77 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$ and -4756 $gCO_2\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$ relative to a 2-year-old and 9-year-old poplar SRC respectively. These results show that even in a Mediterranean area, where plants are subjected to drought stress, with a proper use of irrigation there is the potential for a positive effect~~s~~ on climate mitigation.

Several studies (Grigal and Berguson, 1998; Price et al., 2009) confirmed that converting agricultural land to SRC resulted in an initial release of SOC due to SRC establishment, and then in a slow and continuous accumulation of SOC due to vegetation activity and wood encroachment (Arevalo et al., 2011). Despite the deep tillage at the SRC establishment, and the fact that the REF site was ploughed every year at different depths, a gradient decreasing with depth in the C distribution of the vertical profile was evident in the three sites (not shown). ~~, t~~This~~us~~ suggests~~ing~~ that the changes in SOC were attributable only to the plantation of the SRC due to the effects of tillage (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2009), and not to the mechanical redistribution of SOC. This study indicates a SOC loss of 47% in respect to the value measured in the REF site, due to the installation of poplar cuttings. This loss was not measured at the time it occurred, i.e. right after the conversion of arable land to poplar short rotation coppice, but was estimated with data from the O_SRC site. The reported ~~is~~ value was close to the range maximum ~~of the range~~ reported in the review by Post and Kwon, 2000 (20%-50%), but was higher than the results ~~what~~ found by Arevalo et al., 2011 (7%). The absolute value, however, was close to the one of this latter study (8 MgC ha^{-1}), where though the initial SOC was one order of magnitude higher (114.7 MgC ha^{-1}). To correctly interpret this rapid loss of SOC for a conversion of a cropland to a SRC the low degree of disturbance that characterises the REF site must be taken into account. Furthermore ~~this result~~the loss of SOC found in the present study has to be considered ~~together~~ along with its own uncertainty that was as large as the estimated value: in the purposes of the GHG balance, where the uncertainty of the single components are propagated to the net budget, this result is correctly interpreted as a range. We highlight that a loss of SOC ~~loss~~ close to the minimum of the abovementioned range by Post and Kwon, 2000, e.g. 321 gC m^{-2}, would have changed B_{SRC} (-2202 ± 792 gCO_2eq m^{-2}) by only -259 gCO_2eq m^{-2}. Thus, even if a measured value would have probably been more accurate, the sensitivity of the total GHG budget to this loss was shown to be relatively low. The estimated annual SOC accumulation rate was in the range reported by Don et al., 2011 for SRCs (0.44 ± 0.43 MgC ha^{-1} y^{-1}), which explained how the frequent harvest of above ground biomass was likely to facilitate the die off of the roots that contributes to SOC accumulation. In our study, the low biomass yield supports the hypothesis that a big fraction of C taken up via photosynthesis was transferred to roots and soil. In our study the break-even point, where the initial SOC content would be restored and a net SOC accumulation would start, was 10 years, in agreement with findings from other studies (e.g. Hansen, 1993; Arevalo et al., 2011 found a value of 7 years, while Grigal and Berguson, 1998, calculated a break-even point of 15 years). This result, not directly involved in the 24-month GHG budget, is relevant considering that the SRC of the present study is expected to be used for 12 years, thus enough to allow the complete recovery of the SOC loss occurred at the plantation. Different previous land uses, soil types (in particular clay content), climate conditions, fertilisation rates may be the main causes of differences between studies, as shown in a meta-analysis by Laganière et al., 2010.

Our ~~R~~results showed that CH_4 and N_2O soil fluxes were not relevant in the GHG budgets due to the combination of soil characteristics and climatic trends at~~in~~ both sites. Low values are reported in other studies for SRCs: e.g. Gauder et al., 2012 found that the soil of different energy crops acted as weak sink~~s~~ of CH_4 even in case of fertilisation, while emissions of N_2O turned out to be higher for annual than perennial (willow) crops, which ~~the latter~~ showed~~ing~~ no significant effect of fertilisation on N_2O fluxes. Agricultural sites usually have higher N_2O effluxes from soil, though their magnitude depends on ~~the~~ cultivations ~~species~~ and on ~~the~~ management practices, as shown by Ceschia et al., 2012. The SRC site as a perennial woody crop was subjected to low soil disturbance during its lifespan, while the REF site was ploughed once per year, with an impact~~ing~~ on the ecosystem respiration. Zona et al., 2012 found high N_2O emissions in the first growing season of a poplar SRC in Belgium: 197 ± 49 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ in six months, which drastically decreased to 42 ± 17 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ for the whole following year. This suggested an influence of soil disturbance during land conversion on the stock of N in soil, which was almost 1/3 lower in our study sites than in the one of Zona (9.1 ± 2.1 $MgN\ ha^{-1}$). In the present experiment however, N_2O fluxes were low both in the SRC and REF sites, even during ~~the~~ periods of fertilisation, with no clear patterns. The low N_2O fluxes were confirmed by laboratory analyses, as the presence of extra N did not affect the emission rates of N_2O, and only very high WFPS% could trigger significant N_2O fluxes. ~~–~~The needed conditions of soil humidity were never reached in the REF site and reached only for a few days at 35 cm depth in the SRC site (Fig. 6~~5~~). At this depth fertilizer was added as fertigation in the SRC site: we hypothesize that the very low porosity, the compaction and strength of the soil might have favoured slow gas release and further N_2O reduction, thus leaving little N_2O to escape to the atmosphere from soil surface. In the REF site, winter fertilisation was also associated ~~to~~ with low temperatures, a further constraint to microbial activity. These results provide further evidence of how the simple application of the

IPCC N_2O emission factor to the analysed systems might have led to an overestimation of the field GHG contribution to the overall GWP in both sites. Laboratory estimates of mineralization and nitrification rates suggested that N mineralization might be the limiting process of the chains of mineral N microbial transformations, that contributeding to maintain N_2O emissions low even during events of intense rainfall and soil saturation. The clay content and compaction of the analysed soils might be an important factor in limiting oxygen and substrate diffusion that are both necessary to have optimal rates of soil organic matter mineralization. From a methodological point of view, the low emissions of both CH_4 and N_2O from soil also suggest that using 4 samples of gas concentration per chamber instead of 3 would have not dramatically improved the accuracy of the calculated fluxes, as a slight variation in the slope would have not induced significant changes in the results. The relevance of this result lies in the fact that fertilising a poplar SRC in a Mediterranean area and in this kind of soil does not necessarily lead to increased emissions of N_2O, with the requirement on condition that the right correct equilibrium is found between irrigation and WFPS%. Thus Iit is then possible to maximise yield and GHG mitigation with the right management practices to maximise yield and GHG mitigation (Nassi o Di Nasso et al., 2010). CH_4 and N_2O fluxes might have been enhanced by the land conversion in the first period of cultivation of the SRC site, as found for CO_2. However, measurements carried out in the REF site, ploughed every year, and the incubation experiment showed very low fluxes, mostly related to soil characteristics and not to management activities. Thus, a low sensitivity of the total GHG budget to these components can be expected.

Other components of the GHG budget related to N compounds (e.g. aerosol NH_4NO_3, N deposition and leaching) were considered negligible in this study as compared to the role of N_2O emissions from soil and related to fertiliser production.

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Regarding the use of ~~the~~ biomass, comparisons with other studies for the REF site are complicated because half of the field was ~~of the~~ converted~~sion~~ to sorghum ~~of half of the field~~ in spring for the low productivity experienced during the drought. However, the productivity of the clover in mixture was found highly variable by Martiniello, 1999, and the results of the present study are comparable with the lower values found by this author in non-irrigated stands in Mediterranean climate (0.39 kg m^{-2}). Sorghum productivity was lower than that reported by Nassi o Di Nasso et al., 2011 (around 0.75 kg m^{-2}) in a similar climate, likely due to the short period of cultivation and to grazing. The productivity of winter wheat was similar to that of Anthoni et al., 2004 (0.32 ± 0.03 kg m^{-2}). The drought in summer 2012 had an important influence on the AGWB of the SRC site, which was lower ~~as~~ compared to other studies (e.g. Scholz and Ellerbrock, 2002, 0.4 to 0.7 kg m^{-2} $year^{-1}$), and to the F_{CO2} values found with EC. Our hypothesis is that the period of drought had influenced the aboveground/belowground ratio, and that the herbaceous vegetation contributed to increase the F_{CO2}. In terms of C, the difference $F_{CO2} - F_{EXP}$ represents to a first approximation the C stocked by each ecosystem that does no~~'~~t return shortly to the atmosphere after utilisation, minus heterotrophic respiration (Rh). While in the SRC site that difference was negative (C sink of 650 gC m^{-2}), the REF site acted like a small source of C (120 ± 98 gC m^{-2}). Small sources were also found by Anthoni et al., 2004 (between 50 gC m^{-2} and 100 gC m^{-2}), while Aubinet et al., 2009 reported a 4-year rotation crop being a source of 340 gC m^{-2}. For poplar, Deckmyn et al., 2004 found a similar behaviour in a poplar SRC in Belgium. Concerning the ~~part~~ fraction of the exports that ~~are~~ is emitted as CH_4 from enteric fermentation, our estimates were in agreement with those of Dengel et al., 2011. Several studies (e.g. Gilmanov et al., 2007) used EC to measure CO_2 and CH_4 fluxes from grazed systems. ~~, s~~Some included~~ing~~ in the GHG budget only F_{CO2}, F_{CH4} and F_{N2O}, and made~~king~~ a C budget for lateral fluxes like biomass export (e.g. Allard et al., 2007). However, the EC method is not capable of measuring point sources of trace gases moving inside and outside the footprint (data discarded by QA/QC procedures: see also Baldocchi et al., 2012). Thus we adapted the method described in Soussana et al., 2007 for off-site emissions, extending it also to~~ the~~ on-site emission~~one~~s, to include the effects of aboveground biomass use in the GHG budget.

Different studies (e.g. Cherubini et al., 2009; Djomo et al., 2013) confirmed the advantages of using biomass from SRC over fossil fuels in mitigating the increase of atmospheric GHG concentrations, while Abbasi and Abbasi, 2010 found that the SRC management led to GHG emissions that compensate the gain due to the fossil substitution. The low yield of the SRC site led to lower GHG savings compared to those~~at~~ found by~~ of~~ Cherubini et al., 2009 for production of heat from woody products (379.7 ± 175.1 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ in two years against 600 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}$ per year). ~~In this paper~~These latter found GHG mitigation ~~is found~~ to be directly proportional to crop yield for dedicated bioenergy crops. In a GHG budget perspective, however, the yield is also proportional to C emissions from combustion, and correlated with F_{CO2}. ~~In t~~The same study reported ~~,~~GHG savings of other bioenergy systems, ~~are reported: in terms of GHG offset, it is~~ showing~~n~~ that the performance of wood-based systems is lower in terms of GHG offset than the one of other bioenergy crops, e.g. switchgrass (1300 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$), Miscanthus (1600 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$) and fibre sorghum (1800 $gCO_2eq\ m^{-2}\ year^{-1}$). In the present study the role of GHG offset was relevant in the GHG balance; however it's important to consider~~, however,~~ that ~~the~~ natural gas, while being the most used fossil fuel for heating systems in Italy, has also a lower carbon intensity for heat production ~~of heat~~ (55.862 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$) as compared to coal (76.188 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$) and oil (73.693 $gCO_2eq\ MJ^{-1}$) (Romano et al., 2014). A different scenario, where ~~the~~ biomass would substitute the use of other energy sources with higher emission factors (like coal) would lead to a higher GHG offset.

~~The ~~Our study confirmed that farming operations have only a limited importance in the overall GHG budget when conditions of relevant CO_2 uptake by vegetation are met, and the values we found we~~a~~re similar to the ones found by Gelfand et al., 2011. In the SRC site irrigation was more important than other contributions and caused more emissions than irrigation in the REF site. This~~,~~ suggests~~ing~~ that belowground irrigation was less efficient in terms of GHG emissions than the sprinkler. Fertilisers and other chemical products often have a higher impact on the GHG balance as compared to other field operations due to the off-site GHG emissions (Ceschia et al., 2010). At the study sites ~~In the sites under study ~~the amount and frequency of applications were relatively small, and this justifies the minor role of fertilisation in the total GHG budget. Thus the ~~proportion ~~importance of farming operations can vary from year to year, depending on climate conditions and on farmer decisions.

This study reports on the GHG budget of poplar SRC in Mediterranean areas. However, when considering the implications of SRC in a wider perspective, other factors should also be considered to assess the overall sustainability of this type of LUC. Among them, irrigation is one of the most important (Dougherty and Hall, 1995), as poplar cultivations in Mediterranean climate require considerable amounts of water. In the LUC presented here, both the SRC and the REF sites were irrigated with similar amounts of water, using a less efficient technique at the REF site (sprinkler system) than at the SRC site (belowground drip system; e.g. Camp, 1998). The impact of the LUC on the local water balance is thus expected to be small in this particular case, but not in general. An appropriate design of these systems is also crucial to avoid water dispersion: in the present study we observed that irrigation could not compensate the drought stress experienced by the SRC site in 2012, thus concerns arise on the proper location of the belowground tubes and on the amounts of water applied.

7. Conclusions

The comparison of the two net GHG budgets led to conclude that poplar SRC cultivation for biomass production in the analysed sites of Central Italy was suitable from the point of view of the climate mitigation at farm level when this is performed converting former agricultural land. The cultivation and use of the SRC site in the place of traditional crop rotation led to a reduction of GHG concentration in the atmosphere, even taking into consideration the disadvantages of the SOC content loss at the installation of the SRC. This result was in agreement with previous studies on Mediterranean climate, where the cultivation of poplar SRC may be critical for its dependence on water availability, but with possibility of success (see for example Gasol et al, 2009). In our study, however, the inclusion into the net GHG budget of all the contributions, from the management and biological activities to the use of the biomass and the effects of the land use change on the SOC content, highlighted the importance of the C distribution in respect to the biomass use, whereas the SOC loss at the installation, while being an important part of the budget, did not result to be crucial in the evaluation of LUC suitability. Estimated uncertainty was quite large, underlining the high variability of the GHG budgets and confirming the need of large efforts in terms of data collection to correctly estimate the different components. Furthermore in this type of analyses there is a set of factors – like climatic conditions, irrigation and farmer needs – that influence the sensitivity of the net GHG balance, acting on the F_{CO2}, the biomass yield, the emissions from management activities and the offset of GHG (Cherubini et al., 2009). The magnitude of the benefits deriving from the LUC from common agriculture to SRC of hybrid poplar for biomass production, thus, depends on the interaction between the diverse components of the budget and their variability.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Bold

7. Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the GHG Europe Project (EU Seventh Framework Programme, FP7) and the MIUR-PRIN project “Climate change mitigation strategies in tree crops and forestry in Italy” (CARBOTREES). The authors wish to acknowledge the technical employees of DIBAF (A. Baiocco, A. Boschi, M. Tomassucci), CNR IBAF (G. Santarelli) and CNR IBIMET (A. Zaldei) for their irreplaceable support and logistic help during the field campaign, and the database staff (E. Canfora, A. Ribeca, D. Polidori, C. Trotta) for their support in the data post-processing. S. Sabbatini is supported by the ICOS-Inwire EU project and S. Njakou Djomo was supported by the ERC Advanced Grant 233366 POPFULL. We further thank G. Parisi for gas chromatography analysis. We are also grateful to the farm *Gisella ed Elena Ascenzi S.A.A.S.*, and in particular to A. Trani, the farmer that kindly allowed us to install our instruments on his fields and to access his farm whenever we needed it and that supported our scientific activities with his interest and availability. All the data collected are available at the European Ecosystem Fluxes Database at www.europe-fluxdata.eu, site codes IT-CA1, IT-CA2 and IT-CA3.

Field Code Changed

8. References

Abbasi, T., and Abbasi, S.A.: Biomass energy and the environmental impacts associated with its production and utilization. Renew Sust Energ Rev, 14(3), 919-937, 2010.

Allard, V., Soussana, J.F., Falcimagne, R., Berbigier, P., Bonnefond, J.M., Ceschia, E., D'hour, P., Hénault, C., Laville, P., Martin, C., and Pinarès-Patino, C.:. The role of grazing management for the net biome productivity and greenhouse gas budget (CO_2, N_2O and CH_4) of semi-natural grassland. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 121(1), 47-58, 2007.

Alternative Fuels Data Center: Fuel properties comparison. Available at: http://www.afdc.energy.gov/fuels/fuel_comparison_chart.pdf (last access: 10 March 2015), 2014

Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., Davis, S.C., Masters, M.D., and Delucia, E.H.: Changes in soil organic carbon under biofuel crops. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 1(1), 75–96, doi:10.1111/j.1757-1707.2008.01001.x, 2009

Anthoni, P., Freibauer, A., Kolle, O., and Schulze, E.: Winter wheat carbon exchange in Thuringia, Germany. Agr Forest Meteorol, 121, 55-67, 2004.

Arevalo, C., Bhatti, J.S., Chang, S.X., and Sidders, D.: Land use change effects on ecosystem carbon balance: from agricultural to hybrid poplar plantation. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 141(3), 342-349, 2011.

Aubinet, M., Grelle, A., Ibrom, A., Rannik, Ü., Moncrieff, J., Foken, T., Kowalski, A.S., Martin, P.H., Berbigier, P., Bernhofer, C., Clement, R., Elbers, J., Granier, A., Grünwald, T., Morgenstern, K., Pilegaard, K., Rebmann, C., Snijders, W., Valentini, R., and Vesala, T.: Estimates of the annual net carbon and water exchange of forests: the EUROFLUX methodology. Adv Ecol Res, 30, 113-175, 2000.

Aubinet, M., Moureaux, C., Bodson, B., Dufranne, D., Heinesch, B., Suleau, M., Dufranne, D., Heinesch, B., Suleau, M., Vancutsem, F., and Vilret, A.: Carbon sequestration by a crop over a 4-year sugar beet/winter wheat/seed potato/winter wheat rotation cycle. Agr Forest Meteorol, 149(3), 407-418, 2009.

Aubinet, M., Vesala, T., and Papale, D. (Eds.): Eddy covariance: a practical guide to measurement and data analysis, Springer, New York, USA, 2012.

Baldocchi, D., Detto, M., Sonnentag, O., Verfaillie, J., Teh, Y.A., Silver, W., and Kelly, N.M.: The challenges of measuring methane fluxes and concentrations over a peatland pasture. Agr Forest Meteorol, 153, 177-187, 2012.

Barber, A.: Seven case study farms: total energy & carbon indicators for New Zealand arable & outdoor vegetable production. AgriLINK New Zealand Ltd, 288, 2004.

Bechis, S., and Marangon, F.: Analisi delle emissioni di CO_2 nelle diverse fonti energetiche, report, Department of Economy, Agricultural, Forest and Environmental Engineering, University of Turin, Italy, 2011.

Blasi, C.: Carta del fitoclima del Lazio. Regionalizzazione e caratterizzazione climatica, map, Regione Lazio, Assessorato Agricoltura e Foreste, Caccia e Pesca, Usi civici. Sapienza University, Dept of Vegetal Biology, Rome, 1993.

Boone, R.D., Grigal, D.F., Sollins, P., Ahrens, R.J., and Armstring, D.E.: Soil sampling, preparation, archiving, and quality control, in: Standard Soil methods for Long-term Ecological Research (eds. Robertson, G.P., Coleman, D.C., Bledsoe, C.S., and Sollins, P.), Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 3-28, 1999.

Boundy, B., Diegel, S.W., Wright, S.W.L., and Davis, S.C.: Biomass energy data book: edition 4. Report #ORNL/TM-2011/446 by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the Office of the Biomass Program, US Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 2011

Byrne, K.A., Kiely, G., and Leahy, P.: Carbon sequestration determined using farm scale carbon balance and eddy covariance. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 121(4), 357-364, 2007.

Budsberg, E., Rastogi, M., Puettmann, M.E., Caputo, J., Balogh, S., Volk, T.A., Gustafson, R., and Johnson, L.: Life-cycle assessment for the production of bioethanol from willow biomass crops via biochemical conversion. Forest Prod J, 62(4), 305, 2012.

Caputo, J., Balogh, S.B., Volk, T.A., Johnson, L., Puettmann, M., Lippke, B., and Oneil, E.: Incorporating uncertainty into a life cycle assessment (LCA) model of short-rotation willow biomass (Salix spp.) crops. BioEnergy Research, 7(1), 48-59, 2014.

Castaldi, S., and Aragosa, D.: Factors influencing nitrification and denitrification variability in a natural and fire-disturbed Mediterranean shrubland. Biol Fert Soils, 36(6), 418-425, 2002.

Castaldi, S., Carfora, A., Fiorentino, A., Natale, A., Messere, A., Miglietta, F., and Cotrufo, M.F.: Inhibition of net nitrification activity in a Mediterranean woodland: possible role of chemicals produced by Arbutus unedo. Plant Soil, 315, 273-283, 2009.

Castaldi, S., Bertolini, T., Valente, A., Chiti, T., and Valentini, R.: Nitrous oxide emissions from soil of an African rain forest in Ghana. Biogeosciences, 10, 4179-4187, 2013.

Ceschia, E., Béziat, P., Dejoux, J.F., Aubinet, M., Bernhofer, C., Bodson, B., Buchmann, N., Carrara, A., Cellier, P., Di Tommasi, P., Elbers, J.A., Eugster, W., Grünwald, T., Jacobs, C.M.J., Jans, W.W.P., Jones, M., Kutsch, W., Lanigan, G., Magliulo, E., Marloie, O., Moors, E.J., Moureaux, C., Olioso, A., Osborne, B., Sanz, M.J., Saunders, M., Smith, P., Soegaard, H., and Wattenbach, M.: Management effects on net ecosystem carbon and GHG budgets at European crop sites. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 139(3), 363-383, 2010.

Cherubini, F., Bird, N.D., Cowie, A., Jungmeier, G., Schlamadinger, B., and Woess-Gallasch, S.: Energy-and greenhouse gas-based LCA of biofuel and bioenergy systems: Key issues, ranges and recommendations. Resour Conserv Recy, 53(8), 434-447, 2009.

Chesworth, W.: Encyclopedia of soil science. Encyclopedia of Earth Sciences Series, Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherland, 2008.

Conen, F., Yakutin, V., and Sambuu, A.D.: Potential for detecting changes in soil organic carbon concentrations resulting from climate change. Glob Change Biol, 9, 1515–1520, 2003

Crutzen, P.J., Mosier, A.R., Smith, K.A., and Winiwarter, W.: N_2O release from agro-biofuel production negates global warming reduction by replacing fossil fuels. Atmos Chem Phys, 8, 389–395, 2008.

Davis, S.C., Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., and DeLucia, E.H.: Life-cycle analysis and the ecology of biofuels. Trends Plant Sci, 14(3), 140-146, 2009.

Dengel, S., Levy, P.E., Grace, J., Jones, S.K., and Skiba, U.M.: Methane emissions from sheep pasture, measured with an open-path eddy covariance system. Glob Change Biol, 17(12), 3524-3533, 2011.

Deckmyn, G., Muys, B., Garcia Quijano, J., and Ceulemans, R.: Carbon sequestration following afforestation of agricultural soils: comparing oak/beech forest to short-rotation poplar coppice combining a process and a carbon accounting model. Glob Change Biol, 10(9), 1482-1491, 2004.

Dillen, S.Y., Djomo, S.N., Al Afas, N., Vanbeveren, S., and Ceulemans, R.: Biomass yield and energy balance of a short-rotation poplar coppice with multiple clones on degraded land during 16 years. Biomass Bioenerg, 56, 157-165, 2013.

Djomo, S.N., El Kasmioui, O., and Ceulemans, R.: Energy and greenhouse gas balance of bioenergy production from poplar and willow: a review. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 3(3), 181–197, doi:10.1111/j.1757-1707.2010.01073.x, 2011

Djomo, S.N., El Kasmioui, O., De Groote, T., Broeckx, L.S., Verlinden, M.S., Berhongaray, G., Fichot, R., Zona, D., Dillen, S.Y., King, J.S., Janssens, I.A., and Ceulemans, R.: Energy and climate benefits of bioelectricity from low-input short rotation woody crops on agricultural land over a two-year rotation. Appl Energ, 111, 862-870, 2013.

Don, A., Osborne, B., Hastings, A., Skiba, U., Carter, M.S., Drewer, J., Flessa, H., Freibauer, A., Hyvönen, N., Jones, M.B., Lanigan, G.J., Mander, Ü., Monti, A., Djomo, S.N., Valentine, J., Walter, K., Zegada-Lizarazu, W., and Zenone, T.: Land-use change to bioenergy production in Europe: implications for the greenhouse gas balance and soil carbon. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 4(4), 372-391, 2012.

Dong, H., Mangino, J., and McAllister, T.A.: Emissions from livestock and manure management, in: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme (eds. Eggleston, H.S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., and Tanabe, K.), Hayama, Japan, PP. 10.1-10.89., 2006.

Dougherty, T.C., and Hall, A. W.: Environmental impact assessment of irrigation and drainage projects. Irrigation and Drainage Paper 53, FAO, Rome, 1995.

Edwards, R., Larivé, J.F., Mahieu, V., and Rouveirolles, P.: Well-to-wheels analysis of future automotive fuels and powertrains in the European context, Tank-to-Wake Report Version 2c, EUCAR, CONCAWE, & JRC, Ispra, Italy, 2007.

El Kasmioui, O., and Ceulemans, R.: Financial analysis of the cultivation of poplar and willow for bioenergy. Biomass Bioenerg, 43, 52-64, 2012.

El Kasmioui, O., and Ceulemans, R.: Financial Analysis of the Cultivation of Short Rotation Woody Crops for Bioenergy in Belgium: Barriers and Opportunities. BioEnergy Research, 6, 336-350, 2013

European Commission: Renewable energy road map—renewable energies in the 21st century: building a more sustainable future. COM(2006) 848 final, Brussels, Belgium, 2007.

European Commission: 20 20 by 2020—Europe's climate change opportunity. COM(2008) 30, Brussels, Belgium, 2008

European Commission: Directive 2009/28/Ec Of The European Parliament And Of The Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC Official Journal of the European Union, L 140/16-62, EU, Brussels, Belgium, 2009.

Fargione, J., Hill, J., Tilman, D., Polasky, S., and Hawthorne, P.: Land clearing and the biofuel carbon debt. Science, 319(5867), 1235-1238, 2008.

Fisher, R.: The Correlation between Relatives on the Supposition of Mendelian Inheritance. T Rse Earth, 52(02), 399-433, 1919.

Foken, T.: Micrometeorology, Eds. Nappo C.J., Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany, 308 pp., 2008.

Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D.W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D.C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schulz, M., and Van Dorland, R.: Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing, in: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen. Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, PP. 129-234, 2007.

Gash, J.H.C., and Culf, A.D.: Applying a linear detrend to eddy correlation data in realtime. Bound-Lay Meteorol, 79(3), 301-306, 1996.

Gasol, C.M., Gabarrell, X., Anton, A., Rigola, M., Carrasco, J., Ciria, P., and Rieradevall, J.: LCA of poplar bioenergy system compared with Brassica carinata energy crop and natural gas in regional scenario. Biomass Bioenerg, 33(1), 119–129, 2009.

Gauder, M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Graeff-Hönninger, S., Claupein, W., and Wiegel, R.: Soil-derived trace gas fluxes from different energy crops–results from a field experiment in Southwest Germany. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 4(3), 289-301, 2012.

Gelfand, I., Zenone, T., Jasrotia, P., Chen, J., Hamilton, S.K., and Robertson, G.P.: Carbon debt of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) grasslands converted to bioenergy production. P Natl Acad Sci Usa, 108, 13864-13869, 2011.

Gielen, B., De Vos, B., Campioli, M., Neirynck, J., Papale, D., Verstraeten, A., Ceulemans, R., and Janssens, I.A.: Biometric and eddy covariance-based assessment of decadal carbon sequestration of a temperate Scots pine forest. Agr Forest Meteorol, 174, 135-143, 2013.

Gilmanov, T.G., Soussana, J.F., Aires, L., Allard, V., Ammann, C., Balzarolo, M., Barcza, Z., Bernhofer, C., Campbell, C.L., Cernusca, A., Cescatti, A., Clifton-Brown, J., Dirks, B.O.M., Dore, S., Eugster, W., Fuhrer, J., Gimeno, C., Gruenwald, T., Haszpra, L., Hensen, A., Ibrom, A., Jacobs, A.F.G., Jones, M.B., Lanigan, G., Laurila, T., Lohila, A., Manca, G., Marcolla, B., Nagy, Z., Pilegaard, K., Pinter, K., Pio, C., Raschi, A., Rogiers, N., Sanz, M.J., Stefani, P., Sutton, M., Tuba, Z., Valentini, R., Williams, M.L.., and Wohlfahrt, G.: Partitioning European grassland net ecosystem CO2 exchange into gross primary productivity and ecosystem respiration using light response function analysis. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 121(1), 93-120, 2007.

Goodman, L.A.: On the exact variance of products. J Am Stat Assoc, 55(292), 708-713, 1960.

Grigal, D.F., and Berguson, W.E.: Soil carbon changes associated with short-rotation systems. Biomass Bioenerg, 14(4), 371-377, 1998.

Gundersen, P., Christiansen, J.R., Alberti, G., Brüggemann, N., Castaldi, S., Gasche, R., Kitzler, B., Klemedtsson, L., Lobo-do-Vale, R., Moldan, F., Rütting, T., Schleppi, P., Weslien, P., and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S.: The response of methane and nitrous oxide fluxes to forest change in Europe. Biogeosciences, 9, 3999-4012, 2012.

Italian Ministry of Interior: Bilancio energetico nazionale 2012. Dipartimento per l'energia, Direzione generale per la sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento e le infrastrutture energetiche, available at: http://dgerm.sviluppoeconomico.gov.it/dgerm/ben.asp, (last access: 25 February

2015), 2013.

Jassal, R.S., Black, T.A., Arevalo, C., Jones, H., Bhatti, J.S., and Sidders, D.: Carbon sequestration and water use of a young hybrid poplar plantation in north-central Alberta. Biomass Bioenerg, 56, 323-333, 2013.

Jaoudé, R.A., Lagomarsino, A., and De Angelis, P.: Impacts of nitrogen fertilisation and coppicing on total and heterotrophic soil CO_2 efflux in a short rotation poplar plantation. Plant Soil, 339(1-2), 219-230, 2011.

Jungmeier, G., and Spitzer, J.: Greenhouse gas emissions of bioenergy from agriculture compared to fossil energy for heat and electricity supply. Nutr Cycl Agroecosys, 60(1-3), 267-273, 2001.

Kandeler, E.: Nitrification during long term incubation, in: Methods in soil biology (eds. Schinner, F., Kandeler, E., Ohlinger, R., and Margesin, R.), Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, USA, pp. 149-151, 1996.

Laganiere, J., Angers, D.A., and Pare, D.: Carbon accumulation in agricultural soilsafter afforestation: a meta-analysis. Glob Change Biol. 16, 439–453, 2010.

Latium Region, Regional Direction of Agriculture and Rural Development, Hunting and Fishing: Rural Development Program of Latium 2007- 2013. Reg. (CE) n. 1698/05, Rome, available at: http://www.agricoltura.regione.lazio.it/psr/programma/?vms=5&ref=Il-testo-integrale-psr (Last access: 20 October 2015), 2015.

Liu, Y., Langer, V., Høgh-Jensen, H., and Egelyng, H.: Life cycle assessment of fossil energy use and greenhouse gas emissions in Chinese pear production. J Clean Prod, 18(14), 1423-1430, 2010.

Mareschi, L.: Piantagioni da bioenergia: sostenibilita' produttiva ed ambientale di nuovi cloni ibridi di pioppo (Populus spp.), Ph.D. thesis, University of Tuscia, Italy, 2008.

Formatted: Font color: Auto, English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Martiniello, P.: Effects of irrigation and harvest management on dry-matter yield and seed yield of annual clovers grown in pure stand and in mixtures with graminaceous species in a Mediterranean environment. Grass Forage Sci, 54(1), 52-61, 1999.

Migliavacca, M., Meroni, M., Manca, G., Matteucci, G., Montagnani, L., Grassi, G., Zenone, T., Teobaldelli, M., Goded, I., Colombo, R., and Seufert, G.: Seasonal and interannual patterns of carbon and water fluxes of a poplar plantation under peculiar eco-climatic conditions. Agr Forest Meteorol, 149(9), 1460-1476, 2009.

Mikutta, R., Kleber, M., Kaiser, K., and Jahn, R.: Review: Organic Matter Removal from Soils using Hydrogen Peroxide, Sodium Hypochlorite, and Disodium Peroxodisulfate. Soil Sci Soc Am J, 6, 120-135, 2005.

Mitchell, C.P., Stevens, E.A., and Watters, M.P.: Short-rotation forestry— operations, productivity and costs based on experience gained in the UK. Forest Ecol Manag, 121(1–2), 123–136, 1999.

Moncrieff, J.B., Massheder, J.M., De Bruin, H., Elbers, J., Friborg, T., Heusinkveld, B., Kabat, P., Scotta, S., Soegaard, H., and Verhoef, A.: A system to measure surface fluxes of momentum, sensible heat, water vapour and carbon dioxide. J Hydrol, 188, 589-611, 1997.

Nassi o Di Nasso, N., Guidi, W., Ragaglini, G., Tozzini, C., and Bonari, E.: Biomass production and energy balance of a 12-year-old short-rotation coppice poplar stand under different cutting cycles. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 2(2), 89-97, 2010.

Nassi o Di Nasso, N., Bosco, S., Di Bene, C., Coli, A., Mazzoncini, M., and Bonari, E.: Energy efficiency in long-term Mediterranean cropping systems with different management intensities. Energy, 36(4), 1924-1930, 2011.

Osborne, B., Saunders, M., Walmsley, D., Jones, M., and Smith, P.: Key questions and uncertainties associated with the assessment of the cropland greenhouse gas balance. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 139(3), 293-301, 2010.

Pearson, K.: On the criterion that a given system of deviations from the probable in the case of a correlated system of variables is such that it can be reasonably supposed to have arisen from random sampling. The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science, 50(302), 157-175, 1900.

Papale, D., Reichstein, M., Aubinet, M., Canfora, E., Bernhofer, C., Kutsch, W., Longdoz, B., Rambal, S., Valentini, R., Vesala, T., and Yakir, D.: Towards a standardized processing of Net Ecosystem Exchange measured with eddy covariance technique: algorithms and uncertainty estimation. Biogeosciences, 3, 571-583, 2006.

Paris, P., Mareschi, L., Sabatti, M., Pisanelli, A., Ecosse, A., Nardin, F., and Scarascia-Mugnozza, G.: Comparing hybrid Populus clones for SRF across northern Italy after two biennial rotations: Survival, growth and yield. Biomass Bioenerg, 35(4), 1524-1532, 2011.

Pihlatie, M., Pumpanen, J., Rinne, J., Ilvesniemi, H., Simojoki, A., Hari, P., and Vesala, T.: Gas concentration driven fluxes of nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide in boreal forest soil. Tellus B, 59(3), 458-469, 2007.

Post, W., and Kwon, K.: Soil carbon sequestration and land-use change: processes and potential. Glob Change Biol, 6, 317-328, 2000.

Price, D., Orchansky, A., Jassal, R., Arevalo, C., and Thomas, B.: Soil respiration in a hybrid poplar plantation located in central Alberta, Alberta Soil Science Workshop 2009, Edmonton, Alberta, CA, 2009.

Reichstein, M., Falge, E., Baldocchi, D., Papale, D., Aubinet, M., Berbigier, P., Bernhofer, C., Buchmann, N., Gilmanov, T., Granier, A., Grünwald, T., Havránková, K., Ilvesniemi, H., Janous, D., Knohl, A., Laurila, T., Lohila, A., Loustau, D., Matteucci, G., Meyers, T., Miglietta, F., Ourcival, J.M., Pumpanen, J., Rambal, S., Rotenberg, E., Sanz, M., Tenhunen, J., Seufert, G., Vaccari, F., Vesala, T., Yakir, D., and Valentini, R.: On the separation of net ecosystem exchange into assimilation and ecosystem respiration, review and improved algorithm. Glob Change Biol, 11, 1424–1439, 2005.

Robertson, G.P., Paul, E.A., and Harwood, R.R.: Greenhouse gases in intensive agriculture: contributions of individual gases to the radiative forcing of the atmosphere. Science, 289(5486), 1922-1925, 2000.

Romano, D., Arcarese, C., Bernetti, A., Caputo, A., Cóndor, R.D., Contaldi, M., De Lauretis, R., Di Cristofaro, E., Gagna, A., Gonella, B., Lena, F., Liburdi, R., Taurino, E., and Vitullo, M.: Italian Greenhouse Gas Inventory 1990–2012, National Inventory Report 2014, ISPRA – Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, Rome, 2014.

Saidur, R., Abdelaziz, E.A., Demirbas, A., Hossain, M.S., and Mekhilef, S.: A review on biomass as a fuel for boilers. Renew Sust Energ Rev, 15(5), 2262-2289, 2011.

Scholz, V., and Ellerbrock, R.: The growth productivity, and environmental impact of the cultivation of energy crops on sandy soil in Germany. Biomass Bioenerg, 23(2), 81-92, 2002.

Smith, P., Lanigan, G., Kutsch, W.L., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., Aubinet, M., Ceschia, E., Béziat, P., Yeluripati, J.B., Osborne, B., Moors, E.J., Brut, A., Wattenbach, M., Saunders, M., and Jones, M.: Measurements necessary for assessing the net ecosystem carbon budget of croplands. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 139(3), 302-315, 2010.

Soussana, J.F., Allard, V., Pilegaard, K., Ambus, P., Amman, C., Campbell, C., Ceschia, E., Clifton-Brown, J., Czobel, S., Domingues, R., Flechard, C., Fuhrer, J., Hensen, A., Horvath, L., Jones, M., Kasper, G., Martin, C., Nagy, Z., Neftel, A., Raschi, A., Baronti, S., Rees, R.M., Skiba, U., Stefani, P., Manca, G., Sutton, M., Tuba, Z., and Valentini, R.: Full accounting of the greenhouse gas (CO2, N2O, CH4) budget of nine European grassland sites. Agr Ecosyst Environ, 121(1), 121-134, 2007.

Soussana, J.F., Tallec, T., and Blanfort, V.: Mitigating the greenhouse gas balance of ruminant production systems through carbon sequestration in grasslands. Animal, 4(03), 334-350, 2010.

Strauss, C.H., and Grado, S.C.: Economics of producing Populus biomass for energy and fiber systems, in: Micropropagation, genetic engineering, molecular biology of Populus. (eds. Klopfenstein, N.B., Chun, Y.W., Kim, M-S., and Ahuja, M.R.), USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, pp. 241-248, 1997.

USS Working Group WRB: World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014. International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps, World Soil Resources Reports, 106, FAO, Rome, Italy, 2014.

Vickers, D., and Mahrt, L.: Quality control and flux sampling problems for tower and aircraft data. J Atmos Ocean Tech, 14(3), 512-526, 1997.

Webb, E.K., Pearman, G.I., and Leuning, R.: Correction of flux measurements for density effects due to heat and water vapour transfer. Q J Roy Meteor Soc, 106(447), 85-100, 1980.

Weslien, P., Kasimir Klemedtsson, Å., Börjesson, G., and Klemedtsson, L.: Strong pH influence on N_2O and CH_4 fluxes from forested organic soils. Eur J Soil Sci, 60(3), 311-320, 2009.

Wood, S.W., and Cowie, A.: A review of greenhouse gas emission factors for fertiliser production, International Energy Agency Bioenergy Task 38, 1-20, 2004

Zhou, J., Zhang, Z., Sun, G., Fang, X., Zha, T., McNulty, S., Chen, J., Jin, Y., and Noormets, A.: Response of ecosystem carbon fluxes to drought events in a poplar plantation in Northern China. Forest Ecol Manag, 300, 33-42, 2013.

Zona, D., Janssens, I.A., Aubinet, M., Vicca, S., Gioli, B., Fichot, R., and Ceulemans, R.: Fluxes of the greenhouse gases (CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O) above a short-rotation poplar plantation after conversion from agricultural land. Agr Forest Meteorol, 169, 100-110, 2013.

9. Tables

Table 1 – Instrumental setup of the two towers. SRC = short rotation coppice site; REF = reference site; T = temperature; RH = relative humidity; PAR = photosynthetically active radiation; M_{SOIL} = soil water content; P = precipitation; EC = eddy covariance; prof = profile. 4-component radiometers were used to measure short- and long-wave radiations, and derive net radiation. SRC site soil profiles were located in irrigated and not-irrigated inter-rows. Precipitation was assumed to be consistent in the two ecosystems.

	SRC	REF
Meteo		
Air T and RH	MP-100, Rotronic AG, Bassersdorf, CH	MP-100, Rotronic AG, Bassersdorf, CH
PAR	Li-190, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA	-
Radiations	CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen, Delft, NL	NR01, Hukseflux, Delft, NL
M_{SOIL}	CS616, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA (2 prof.)	CS616, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA (1 prof.)
Soil T	107, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA (2 prof.)	107, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA (1 prof.)
Soil heat flux	HFT3, REBS Inc., Seattle, WA, USA	HFP01, Hukseflux, Delft, NL
P	-	ARG100, EML, North Shield, UK
Logger	CR3000, Campbell Scient., Logan, UT, USA	CR1000 Campbell Scient. Logan, UT, USA
EC		
Anemometer	CSAT3, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA	USA-1, Metek GmbH, Elmshorn, DE
Gas-Analyser	LI-7500, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA	LI-7500A, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA

Table 2 – Correction steps applied to the time series using LICOR EddyPro software.

Correction	Reference
Despiking	Vickers and Mahrt (1997)
Density fluctuations	Webb et al. (1980)
Maximisation of covariance for time lag compensation	Aubinet et al. (2000)
Linear detrending for trend removal	Gash and Culf (1996)
2-D coordinate rotation	Wilczak et al. (2001)
High-pass filtering effect	Moncrieff et al. (1997)
Low-pass filtering effect	Ibrom et al. (2007)

Table 3 – Farming activities. Three tractors of different power were normally used to collect chips: two of the type 1, and one of the type 2. DAP = diammonium phosphate; AN = ammonium nitrate; CAN = calcium ammonium nitrate. SRC and REF as defined previously.

Operation	Fuel consumption (unit ha^{-1})	Input rates (unit ha^{-1})	Site
Harvesting – wood chipper	30 l diesel	-	SRC
Harvesting – Tractor type1~~+2~~	20 l diesel	-	SRC
Harvesting – Tractor type 2~~3~~	10 l diesel	-	SRC
Shallow tillage	8 l diesel	-	SRC, REF
Application of insecticide	1.125 l diesel	1.25 kg DECIS®	SRC
Mechanical weeding	4 l diesel	-	SRC
Ploughing	8 l diesel	-	SRC, REF
Sowing	2 l diesel	-	REF
Seed covering	4 l diesel	-	REF
Application of fertiliser	2 l diesel	a. 150 kg DAP b. 150 kg AN c. 200 kg CAN d. 40 kg Urea	a. REF b. REF c. REF d. SRC
Reaping	20 l diesel	-	REF
Chemical weeding	1.125 l diesel	1 l Buctril®	REF
Bale	7.5 l diesel	-	REF
Irrigation	a. 471 kWh electricity b. 149 kWh electricity	a. 16 l H_2O b. 46 l H_2O	a. SRC b. REF

Table 4 – Grazing calendar and methane emissions in the REF site. Graz_days = number of days with grazing; Num = number of sheep in the cropland

Months	**Graz_days**	**Num (per 9 ha)**
Dec 2011	10	800
Jan 2012	7	400
Jun 2012	2	580
Aug 2012	1	580
Sep 2012	2	580
Oct 2012	5	400

Table 5 – Soil characteristics of the ecosystems of the layer 0-15 cm. SRC and REF as previously defined; SOC = soil organic carbon; ρ_{BULK} = bulk density. Superscripts a-c indicate statistically significant differences between the means of SOC.

Site	Variable	Value ± dev. std.
REF	C (%)	1.46 ± 0.34
	ρ_{BULK} (Mg m^{-3})	1.00 ± 0.11
	SOC (MgC ha^{-1})	16.03 ± 3.76$^{(a)}$
SRC	C (%)	1.05 ± 0.40
	ρ_{BULK} (Mg m^{-3})	1.12 ± 0.15
	SOC (MgC ha^{-1})	11.69 ± 4.42$^{(b)}$
O_SRC	C (%)	1.38 ± 0.27
	ρ_{BULK} (Mg m^{-3})	1.02 ± 0.11
	SOC (MgC ha^{-1})	14.03 ± 2.79$^{(c)}$

10. Figures

Fig. 1 – Scheme of the chronological land cover during the cultivation cycle taken into account for GHG budget calculation in the two ecosystems. The expected harvest of poplar at the beginning of 2014 was postponed of one year: for that reason data from the previous harvest (beginning 2012) were taken into account for GHG budget calculation. Textures indicate different land cover type, symbols mark the most important management practices, straight lines indicate the periods in which sites were irrigated, dashed line period of grazing. SRC = short rotation coppice site; REF = reference site; in the x axis dates are reported as month-year (mm-yy)



Fig. 2 – Boxplot of the 24-month cumulative fluxes of net ecosystem exchange of CO_2 (F_{CO2}) (a), gross primary production (GPP) (b) and ecosystem respiration (Reco) (c) from eddy covariance (EC) data in the REF and SRC sites. Each box represents the range 16th-84th percentile: the central mark is the median, while the whiskers extend to the 5th and 95th percentiles



Fig. 3 – Monthly averages of F_{CO2} in the REF and SRC sites (top panel). The bottom panel shows monthly averages of air temperature (Tair) and soil water content (SWC) at 30 cm depth. In both subplots dotted lines are used for the SRC site and continuous lines for the REF site, while in the bottom panel SWC is in grey and the Tair in black.



Fig. ~~3~~4 – Fluxes of soil N_2O (crosses) and CH_4 (circles) in the SRC (a –c) and the REF (b – d) sites. Each marker represents the average of the nine chambers, with bars indicating their standard deviation. First letter of month in the x-axis



Fig. 54 – N_2O fluxes from incubation experiment reported in function of the water filled pore space estimated for each single replicate. In (a) data from samples taken in the SRC site are shown, in (b) data from REF site samples



Fig. 65 – WFPS% in the REF site at three different depths for the 24-month integration periods. Dashed line points to the threshold (70%) unleashing N_2O from lab incubations. First letter of month in the x-axis



Fig. 76 –GHG emissions of the different farming operations. Harv = harvesting; plow = ploughing; sow = sowing; irr = irrigation; fert = fertilisation; othe= minor contributions. SRC and REF as previously defined



Fig. 87 – Regression line of SOC content in time *t* (years). The gap between SOC(0) and SOC content in the REF site represented the loss of SOC for the land use change. Est = estimated values; meas = measured values; SRC and REF as previously defined; O_SRC is the older short rotation coppice site used to build the regression



Fig. 98 – GHG balances of the SRC and the REF sites: components (left) and net (right). F_{CH4} and F_{N2O} from soil are negligible and not inserted in the graph. F_{MAN} = management; E_{CH4} = exported biomass reemitted as CH_4 by enteric fermentation; E_{CO2} = exported biomass reemitted as CO_2 by sheep respiration; F_{SOC} = initial SOC change at the installation of cuttings; F_{SAV} = GHG savings for replacement of fossil fuel use; F_{CO2} as previously defined