

1 **Environmental impacts and production performances of organic agriculture in China: a**
2 **monetary valuation**

3

4 Fanqiao Meng^{a, *}, Yuhui Qiao^a, Wenliang Wu^a, Peter Smith^b, Steffanie Scott^c

5

6 ^a *Beijing Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Organic Farming, College of Resources and*
7 *Environmental Sciences, China Agricultural University, Beijing 100193, China*

8 ^b *Institute of Biological & Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, 23 St Machar Drive,*
9 *Aberdeen, AB24 3UU, UK*

10 ^c *Department of Geography & Environmental Management, University of Waterloo, Waterloo,*
11 *Canada*

12

13 * Correspondence to: Fanqiao Meng, No. 2 Yuanmingyuan Xilu, Haidian District, Beijing
14 100193, College of Resources and Environmental Sciences, China Agricultural University,
15 China; Email: mengfq@cau.edu.cn; Tel: 0086 186 01035665; Mobile: 0086 18601035665; Fax:
16 0086 10 62827958

17

18

19 ABSTRACT: Organic agriculture has developed rapidly in China since the 1990s, driven by the
20 increasing domestic and international demand for organic products. Quantification of the
21 environmental benefits and production performances of organic agriculture on a national scale
22 helps to develop sustainable high yielding agricultural production systems with minimum
23 impacts on the environment. Data of organic production for 2013 were obtained from a national
24 survey organized by the Certification and Accreditation Administration of China. Farming
25 performance and environmental impact indicators were screened and indicator values were
26 defined based on an intensive literature review and were validated by national statistics. The
27 economic (monetary) values of farming inputs, crop production and individual environmental
28 benefits were then quantified and integrated to compare the overall performances of organic vs.
29 conventional agriculture. In 2013, organically managed farmland accounted for approximately
30 0.97% of national arable land, covering 1.158 million ha. If organic crop yields were assumed to
31 be 10% to 15% lower than conventional yields, the environmental benefits of organic agriculture

1 (i.e., a decrease in nitrate leaching, an increase in farmland biodiversity, an increase in carbon
2 sequestration and a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions) were valued at 1921 million RMB
3 (320.2 million USD), or 1659 RMB (276.5 USD) per ha. By reducing the farming inputs, the
4 costs saved was 3110 million RMB (518.3 million USD), or 2686 RMB (447.7 USD) per ha.
5 The economic loss associated with the decrease in crop yields from organic agriculture was
6 valued at 6115 million RMB (1019.2 million USD), or 5280 RMB (880 USD) per ha. Although
7 they were likely underestimated because of the complex relationships among farming operations,
8 ecosystems and humans, the production costs saved and environmental benefits of organic
9 agriculture that were quantified in our study compensated substantially for the economic losses
10 associated with the decrease in crop production. This suggests that payment for the
11 environmental benefits of organic agriculture should be incorporated into public policies. Most
12 of the environmental impacts of organic farming were related to N fluxes within agroecosystems,
13 which is a call for the better management of N fertilizer in regions or countries with low levels of
14 N-use efficiency. Issues such as higher external inputs and lack of integration cropping with
15 animal husbandry should be addressed during the quantification of change of conventional to
16 organic agriculture, and the quantification of this change is challenging.

17

18 Keywords: organic agriculture; environmental benefits; crop yield; nitrogen fertilizer; economic
19 value

20

21 1. Introduction

22 Chinese farmers have achieved harmonious coordination with nature over the past several
23 millennia using traditional farming technologies (King, 1927; Ellis and Wang, 1997). From the
24 1970s to the 2000s, agriculture was intensified through farming practices of high-yield crop
25 varieties and increasing reliance on irrigation and agro-chemicals. With the introduction of
26 relevant laws, regulations and standards in 2005, organic agriculture in China has developed
27 rapidly, driven by an increasing domestic demand (Guo and Zheng, 2011) and exportation to
28 developed countries (CNCA, 2014). By the end of 2013, China became one of the largest
29 organic producers worldwide (Willer and Lernoud, 2014) and is expected to see a rapid growth
30 in organic agriculture in the future (CNCA, 2014).

1 Organic agriculture is a production system that sustains the health of the ecosystem and
2 human beings by relying on processes and cycles of ecological biodiversity adapted to local
3 conditions. External (synthetic) inputs are dramatically reduced in organic agriculture because of
4 the prohibition of synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, and additives (IFOAM, 2014). Organic
5 agriculture has been promoted as an environmentally friendly alternative to conventional
6 agriculture (Giovannucci, 2006; De Schuter, 2010; The National Academies, 2010). Within the
7 past decades, a multitude of studies have been undertaken to compare the performances of
8 organic agriculture with that of conventional agriculture, in various dimensions. Generally, these
9 studies have shown that organic agriculture performs better than conventional agriculture in most
10 environmental aspects (Gomiero et al., 2008; Schader et al., 2012; Tuomisto et al., 2012; Meier
11 et al., 2015), social well-being (Reganold and Wachter, 2016) and economic viability (Crowder
12 and Reganold, 2015), although the crop yields are lower (Badgley and Perfecto, 2007;
13 Kirchmann et al., 2008; De Ponti et al., 2012; Seufert et al., 2012). As the key function of
14 agriculture is the production of food and fiber, one critical important question to be answered is:
15 can the environmental benefits and production performances of organic agriculture compensate
16 for its lower crop yields?

17 Instead of focusing on individual aspects, many comparative studies emphasized the
18 importance of a comprehensive assessment, i.e., integrating the research from various related
19 categories (Gomiero et al., 2008; Schader et al., 2012; Tuomisto et al., 2012; Reganold and
20 Wachter, 2016). In 2005, the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) conducted
21 a survey in China and India and concluded that organic agriculture could ensure long-term soil
22 fertility, reduce external resource consumption and promote regional food security and poverty
23 alleviation (Giovannucci, 2006). In UK, organic production mostly utilizes less energy than
24 conventional production (except poultry and eggs), but organic production often results in
25 increased burdens in greenhouse warming potential (GWP), acidification and eutrophication
26 (Williams et al., 2006). In the studies mainly for European countries, Schader et al. (2012)
27 concluded that organic agriculture has positive impacts on biodiversity, nutrients and energy
28 efficiency, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, eutrophication, ammonia volatilization and soil
29 biological activity. Reganold and Wachter (2016) found that the performances of organic
30 agriculture were better than that of conventional agriculture in many ecological, social and
31 economic dimensions, though not in crop yields. However, few of these studies were undertaken

1 at a relatively larger spatial-temporal scale, such as by targeting a region or nation as the study
2 context, and this has lowered the efficacy of transferring the research conclusions to policy
3 making. In addition, the assessment impacts can be expressed either in physical (e.g., carbon (C)
4 sequestered) or monetary terms. In the communication of the assessment results to farmers,
5 consumers and policy makers, the monetary approach is particularly useful because the
6 environmental impacts can then be easily understood, aggregated and compared (Schader et al.,
7 2012). Hence, as proposed and used in farming systems research (Pretty, 2000; Pizzol et al.,
8 2015), a simple language, such as monetary value, can better quantify and compare the
9 performances of organic and conventional agriculture.

10 Given China's rapidly growing economy and the need to protect the environment and enhance
11 ecosystem services, development of sustainable agriculture, including organic agriculture, has
12 become one of the nation's priority strategies (Ministry of Finance, 2015). According to the
13 Organic Agriculture Development Report (CNCA, 2014), the area of organically managed
14 farmland in China was 1.158 million ha in 2013. An integrated comparative study for organic
15 production at this scale could provide support for sound decision making on agriculture
16 development in China. The aims of this study are to 1) analyze the individual environmental
17 impacts and production of organic agriculture across China as a whole in 2013 and 2) to quantify
18 the environmental impacts and saved production costs in monetary terms and compare them with
19 the economic losses due to crop yield decreases. In the discussion section, we analyze the
20 methodological difficulties and uncertainties of the current study, while examining those
21 implications from this assessment that should be incorporated into future agricultural research
22 and development.

23

24 2. Materials and Methods

25 2.1 Theoretical framework and assessment indicator, boundary and unit

26 This study targeted the total certified organic farmland (arable land), including that in
27 conversion, in China in 2013. As the relationship between an agricultural system and the
28 environment is complex, we chose the Driver-State-Response (DSR) framework (van
29 Huylenbroek et al., 2009), in which a social activity, agriculture in our study, is the "driving
30 force" disturbing the environment. Agricultural functions can be categorized into four key
31 metrics: productivity, environmental impact, social well-being and economic viability (Reganold

1 and Wachter, 2016). Although evidence indicates that a greater social well-being is also
2 delivered by organic agriculture than by conventional agriculture, this was not covered in our
3 study because of lack of appropriate quantification methodologies considering the complexities
4 between farming activities and social well-being, e.g., the social benefits of soil C sequestration
5 (Pretty et al., 2000; Forman et al., 2012; Schader et al., 2012). For the economic viability
6 category, as Crowder and Reganold (2015) highlighted in a global meta-analysis, the total and
7 variable costs are not significantly different, except the higher costs of labor in organic
8 agriculture, and higher use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides in conventional agriculture.
9 Based on a state-of-the-art literature screening, we selected the following assessment indicators
10 for use in our comparison (Table 1): 1) inputs of synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, labor and
11 energy; 2) agricultural production; and 3) environmental impacts of soil C sequestration, GHG
12 emissions, biodiversity and nitrate leaching.

13 The use of various methodologies to assess farming systems make comparison among
14 systems difficult. This is particularly true for determining farming system boundaries (Gomiero
15 et al., 2011; Schader et al., 2012). For the system boundary, we analyzed only the production of
16 organic crops because the organic livestock production is in the very early stages of development
17 and total production quantity is low in China (CNCA, 2014). Although organic food/product
18 processing is important throughout the entire food chain, particularly in life cycle assessment
19 (LCA) studies (Ziesemer, 2007), the processing does not differ significantly from conventional
20 processing in causing environmental impacts, except for the use of fewer additives and
21 processing aids. Therefore, processing is not analyzed in most studies and nor was it in our study
22 (Schader et al., 2012; IFOAM, 2014; Reganold and Wachter, 2016). Transportation stage was
23 not included in the assessment because both organically and conventionally produced foods need
24 to be transported from the farm gate to consumers, although transportation may account for a
25 substantial proportion of the environmental impacts (Luo et al., 2011).

26 The farming performances and environmental impacts of agricultural activities can be
27 expressed on the basis of different functional units: per unit of product or per unit of field area
28 (Schader et al., 2012; Tuomisto et al., 2012). In our study, the performances and impacts were
29 evaluated on a per ha of land area basis. Food production is the most important function of
30 agriculture, and most of the environmental consequences are also from farmland use (Reganold
31 and Wachter, 2016). This was particularly the case in our study (CNCA, 2014). It poses a

1 daunting challenge to both feed a growing global population that is expected to reach 9 to 10
2 billion people by 2050 and provide long-term protection for the environment (Pimentel and
3 Wilson, 2004). With land resources finite and scarce, agriculture and food production must
4 compete with other land uses (e.g., housing and industry). When performances and
5 environmental impacts are expressed per unit area, policy-makers can account for differences in
6 land use efficiency (Gomiero et al., 2008, 2011; Schader et al., 2012).

7 8 2.2 Data collection for organic production in China

9 Data were obtained from a 2014 survey organized by the Certification and Accreditation
10 Administration of China (CNCA) for all certified organic farms and enterprises, which is
11 accessible in the Food and Agro-product Certification Information of China System (FACICS,
12 <http://food.cnca.cn>). The data were current as of Dec 31, 2013, and included the certified
13 (organic and in conversion) acreage of farmland, production quantity and marketing price of the
14 products. Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan were not included in the survey. The organic products
15 were grouped into categories of vegetables, fruits, tea, soya and other beans, cereals and others,
16 according to the CNCA survey (CNCA, 2014).

17 18 2.3 Quantification of economic value of farming performance and environmental impact

19 Indicator values of farming performance and environmental impact (the differences between
20 organic and conventional agriculture per ha of farmland area) were collected from the global
21 literature, governmental data sets and our own studies (detailed in the following parts and Table
22 1). For the impact/performance pricing, we used commonly accepted methods in ecosystem
23 service studies (D'Amato et al., 2016), i.e., the market price and avoided cost method, to produce
24 a general approximation of the monetary value of provisioning services, production and inputs
25 for organic agriculture and then compared these approximations with those for conventional
26 agriculture. The market price method is applicable to crop products, synthetic fertilizer and
27 pesticide inputs, labor, energy and reduced GHG emissions. The cost-based (or avoided costs)
28 method is based on the costs avoided from environmental impacts or those required to restore
29 certain ecological services; for example, the cost of nitrate treatment is the “monetary value” for
30 nitrate pollution. Similarly, we determined the price for farmland biodiversity (Pretty et al.,
31 2000; Sandhu et al., 2010).

1 For the economic (monetary) values of the farming performances and environmental
2 impacts between organic and conventional agriculture at the national level, the area of organic
3 arable land was multiplied by the price for each performance or impact indicator. Then, we
4 summed the economic values of each individual performance or impact to quantify 1) the input
5 costs, which included synthetic fertilizers, pesticides and energy, 2) the economic value losses
6 due to crop yield decreases, and 3) the environmental impacts, which included C sequestration
7 and GHG emissions, nitrate pollution and farmland biodiversity. In our study, the quantified
8 economic values were for December, 2013 and were not adjusted for purchasing power parity or
9 inflation.

10 11 2.3.1 Farming inputs I: Synthetic fertilizers and pesticides

12 In organic agriculture, the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides is prohibited and the
13 costs are thereby saved compared with conventional agriculture. For the conventional production
14 of vegetables, fruits and tea, we collected the average fertilizer and pesticide input rates from
15 published studies (Ma et al., 2000; Hao and Jiang, 2001; Guo, 2007; Huang et al., 2009; Guo and
16 Guo, 2010; Zhang, et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2013; Ruan and Wu, 2001), which were validated
17 based on national datasets (<http://data.stats.gov.cn>, accessed on Nov 18, 2014; National Bureau
18 of Statistics of China, 2014; Tables 2 and 3). For the conventional production of cereal, soya,
19 beans and other crops, we obtained the national average input rate and the price of fertilizers and
20 pesticides in 2013 from governmental data sets (<http://data.stats.gov.cn/easyquery.htm?cn=C01>,
21 accessed on Nov 18, 2014; National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2014).

22 23 2.3.2 Farming inputs II: Energy

24 For organic and conventional production, the input of direct energy (oil, electricity, etc.) on
25 an area-unit basis is similar because most of the energy-consuming field operations are the same
26 (Halberg, 2008). The energy consumed in synthetic fertilizer manufacturing is the largest energy
27 difference between organic and conventional agriculture (Halberg, 2008; Tuomisto et al., 2012)
28 and included in the study. The energy parameters for synthetic fertilizer use were obtained from
29 Brentrup and Pallière (2008).

30 31 2.3.3 Crop production

1 Globally, the yields of organic crops are 15% to 50% lower than the conventional yields
2 (Badgley and Perfecto, 2007; Kirchmann et al., 2008; Gomiero et al., 2011; Seufert et al., 2012);
3 however, the context is very important in interpreting yield differences. For vegetables and
4 fruits, the yield differences between organic and conventional farms were lower than those for
5 other crops because vegetables and fruits are more sensitive to the balanced nutrient supply that
6 results from the higher soil organic matter content in organic fields than in conventional fields
7 (Tuomisto et al., 2012), although Seufert et al. (2012) found the opposite result. In China,
8 certified organic farms rely heavily on organic fertilizer inputs, so there was a smaller yield
9 difference between organic and conventional agriculture (Oelofse et al., 2010). Based on the
10 literature analysis above, we set the yield decrease between organic and conventional agriculture
11 at 10% for vegetables, fruits and tea and at 15% for all other crops (Table 4). The market prices
12 for organic and conventional products were collected from the FACICS system
13 (<http://food.cnca.cn>).

14

15 2.3.4 Environmental impact I: Soil C sequestration and GHG emissions

16 Compared with conventional agriculture, organic agriculture exhibits soil C sequestration
17 and reduces GHG emissions. As indicated in the energy section, the energy use is similar in
18 organic and conventional farming systems; hence, we only considered the increase in soil
19 organic carbon (SOC) and the decreases in N₂O and CH₄ emissions. The SOM (or SOC) is
20 higher in organic than in conventional farming systems by 3% to 23% (Tuomisto et al., 2012), or
21 $0.45 \pm 0.21 \text{ t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Gattinger et al., 2012). From a meta-analysis of long-term experimental
22 studies in China (Wang et al., 2010), organic and chemical fertilizers increase the SOC
23 compared with pre-experiment levels at rates of 0.24 and $0.11 \text{ t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, respectively,
24 indicating that approximately $0.13 \text{ t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ is sequestered in soils via organic farming
25 operations. Because the organic manure input and crop residue incorporation are much higher in
26 vegetables, orchards and tea gardens than those in croplands, we estimated that the increases in
27 the SOC stock were 0.6 , 0.5 and $0.5 \text{ t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, respectively (Jin, 2008). The SOC also
28 increases in conventional agriculture when organic manures and crop residues are recycled.
29 However, due to the lower proportion of recycled organic materials within farming systems
30 (including organic farm) in China (Liu et al., 2008), we assumed that 1/3 of the organic materials
31 in organic agriculture were recycled, whereas no recycling occurred in conventional agriculture.

1 Consequently, the above SOC sequestration rates for organic farming were multiplied by 1/3.
2 The emissions of GHGs (N₂O and CH₄) are similar or higher (Tuomisto et al., 2012; Skinner et
3 al., 2014) in organic farming, compared with those in conventional farming. Considering the
4 high external nitrogen (N) input in organic agriculture in China (Oelofse et al., 2010) and the
5 high heterogeneity and uncertainty in GHG measurements (Skinner et al., 2014), we considered
6 only the reductions in GHG emissions caused by the non-use of chemical fertilizers in organic
7 farming (Zhang et al., 2013) (Table 5). We set the price of C sequestered or reduced CO₂
8 emissions at 75 RMB t⁻¹ CO₂-eq (or 12.5 USD according to the exchange rate (1 USD=6 RMB)
9 in Dec, 2013) according to the average price from Nov 1 to Dec 31, 2013
10 (<http://www.tanjiaoyi.com>, accessed on March 1, 2016), on the Shenzhen Carbon Trading
11 Market, the first national carbon market in China.

12

13 2.3.5 Environmental impact II: Farmland biodiversity

14 Biodiversity is the number, variety and variability of living organisms in an environment
15 (Gomiero et al., 2011), which is commonly higher under organic farming than in conventional
16 farming systems (Du et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2007; Lynch, 2009; Mondelaers et al., 2009;
17 Wang et al., 2012; Schader et al., 2012; Reganold and Wachter, 2016). A high biodiversity
18 improves ecosystem services, including the biological control of pests, the formation of soils and
19 the mineralization of nutrients. Cobb et al. (1999) attached a price of £23 to £130 ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ to the
20 value of the additional biodiversity and countryside amenity of organic agriculture under the UK
21 agri-environmental policy inducement. Using the market price and avoided cost methods,
22 Sandhu et al. (2010) quantified the economic value of these ecosystem services in organic
23 farming at 37 USD ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ higher than conventional farming. We adopted this value for
24 croplands (240 RMB, or 40 USD ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹), with the vegetable and fruit and tea farm values set at
25 325 RMB (54.2 USD) and 260 RMB (43.3 USD) ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, respectively (Table 6).

26

27 2.3.6 Environmental impact III: Nitrate leaching

28 Because the N input is lower in organic form, the N surplus and therefore nitrate leaching is
29 lower in organic farms than in conventional farms (Hansen et al., 2000; Xi et al., 2010; Ning et
30 al., 2011; Meier et al. 2015). Globally, the average nitrate leached from organic farmlands is
31 approximately 10-30 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ lower than that leached from conventional farmlands

1 (Torstensson et al., 2006; Bergström et al., 2008; Meng et al., 2014). In China, conventional
2 farming is being intensively operated with high rates of fertilizer and irrigation, which leads to
3 high levels of N leaching, e.g., 24 (wheat season) and 65 kg N ha⁻¹ (maize season) reported
4 (Chen et al., 2014). For similar intensive organic production in China, less nitrate may be
5 leached because of lower rates of N input and the increase in cropping rotations. Therefore,
6 based on the above intensive analysis, we set the difference in nitrate leaching between organic
7 and conventional farming at ca. 10 (crop), 15 (tea and fruits) and 20 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (vegetables)
8 (Table 7). Based on studies in China (Zhang et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2015), the pollution control
9 costs for nitrate-polluted water are from 0.6 to 7 RMB m⁻³ yr⁻¹, with a reduction in total nitrate
10 from 40 to 60 to < 10 mg N L⁻¹ that is equivalent to 20 to 210 RMB kg⁻¹ N yr⁻¹. For the treatment
11 of water polluted with leached nitrate in this study, we set the price at 100 RMB (16.6 USD) kg⁻¹
12 N yr⁻¹.

13

14 3. Results

15 By the end of 2013 in China, 1.158 million ha were devoted to organic farmland, including
16 0.588 million ha of cereals, 0.236 million ha of soya and other bean crops, 0.211 million ha of
17 fruits, 0.048 million ha of vegetables, 0.053 million ha of tea and 0.022 million ha of other plants
18 (Table 2). Organically managed farmland accounted for 0.97% of the total farmland in China.

19

20 3.1 Farming inputs and economic values

21 - Pesticides saved: In organic agricultural production, the pesticide saved was approximately 3
22 million tons in 2013 (Table 2), and the associated economic value was 899 million RMB, or
23 149.8 million USD.

24 - Synthetic fertilizer saved: In organic farming, synthetic fertilizers are not used. The amounts of
25 urea, diammonium phosphate and potassium chloride saved were 467*10³, 353*10³ and 260*10³
26 t, respectively. The total costs saved was 2211 million RMB, or 368.5 million USD (Table 3).

27 - Reduction in energy consumption: The reduction in fertilizer use in 2013 in organic farming
28 was 467*10³ t of urea, 353*10³ t of diammonium phosphate and 260*10³ t of potassium chloride,
29 which were equivalent to energy savings of 12,000, 2000 and 1200 TJ, respectively. The total
30 direct energy saved was estimated at approximately 508*10³ t of standard coal equivalent. We
31 used the conversion of 1 t of raw coal = 0.7143 t of standard coal and a raw coal price of 500

1 RMB t⁻¹; consequently, the cost saved was 356 million RMB, or 59.3 million USD. However,
2 because the cost saved of synthetic fertilizer was already quantified above, it was not included in
3 the calculation of total farming input cost savings.

4 5 3.2 Economic value of crop production decreases

6 Compared with conventional farming, the decrease in the total economic value caused by the
7 lower levels of production in organic farming was 6115 million RMB (1019.2 USD), which
8 included 1296 million RMB for vegetables, 2114 million RMB for fruit, 198 million RMB for
9 tea, 485 million RMB for soya and other bean crops, 1725 million RMB for cereals and 297
10 million RMB for other crops (Table 4).

11 12 3.3 Economic value of environmental impacts

13 - C sequestration and GHG emissions reduction: In organic farming, the C sequestration and the
14 direct plus indirect reductions in N₂O emissions were calculated to be 314*10³ and 3.63*10⁶ t
15 CO₂-eq yr⁻¹, respectively. The total economic value was 296 million RMB, or 49.3 million USD
16 (Table 5).

17 - Increase in ecosystem services due to improved farmland biodiversity: the economic value was
18 estimated at approximately 287 million RMB, or 47.8 million USD (Table 6).

19 - Reduction in nitrate leaching: in 2013, the reduction in nitrate leaching was approximately
20 13,380 t as a result of organic agriculture, and the associated economic value was estimated at
21 1338 million RMB, or 223 million USD (Table 7).

22 The economic costs saved in farming inputs because of the adoption of organic agriculture
23 in 2013 was 3110 million RMB (518.3 million USD), of which pesticides and synthetic
24 fertilizers accounted for 28.9% and 71.1%, respectively (Tables 2 and 3). The monetary value of
25 the environmental benefits of organic agriculture in 2013 was estimated at 1921 million RMB
26 (320.2 million USD), of which the reduction in nitrate leaching, carbon sequestration and GHG
27 emission and farmland biodiversity enhancement accounted for 69.7%, 15.4% and 14.9%,
28 respectively (Tables 5, 6 and 7). The total economic value due to the implementation of organic
29 agriculture, i.e., cost saved in farming inputs and environmental benefits, amounted at 5031
30 million RMB (838.5 million USD), or accounted for 82.3% of the total economic losses due to
31 crop yield decrease (6115 million RMB, or 1019.2 USD; Table 4).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

4. Discussion

4.1 Methodological difficulty and uncertainty analysis

Finding appropriate methods for comparing agricultural systems is more difficult than for many other goods and services due to the high variations in the study goal and natural and social contexts (Schader et al. 2012). For our study, we tried to quantify the production performances and environmental impacts on the basis of a unit of area, i.e., for the 1.158 million ha of organic farmland in China. The different performances and impacts that occurred in these organic farmlands, compared with the scenario of conventional agriculture, were mostly identified and determined (Table 1). Our quantification results sensitively identified the magnitudes of individual elements and their performances and the impacts between organic and conventional agriculture (see Results section), indicating that our valuation was appropriate.

There are several sources of error and uncertainty in our study. First, the unavailability or high variations of data: this occurred mainly for the indicator values that were adopted. For each indicator, we undertook a global literature study, identified the range of indicator values and set an appropriate value within the Chinese agricultural context. The soil C sequestration rate, for example, was corrected by the low proportion of organic materials cycling in organic and conventional agriculture in China (multiplied by 1/3). Second, some indicators were not included in the current study, e.g., higher labor costs in organic agriculture (Crowder and Reganold, 2012). We assumed that these higher labor costs are largely equalized by the higher incomes within an organic farm, hence there is no need to consider this indicator in the study. Some of the health benefits of organic farming, including the lower contamination of drinking water by pesticides and safer foods because of the prohibited use of chemicals, were not considered because of the complicated relationship between health and pesticide applications and the lack of appropriate methods for quantification (Tuomisto et al., 2012). This is in line with the findings of Pretty et al. (2000), that the total positive externalities leading to the environmental benefits were likely underestimated in most comparative studies, and they asked for more observations and studies in the future (Schader et al., 2012). The other uncertainty is the crop yield decrease of organic agriculture. In organic agriculture, the use of chemo-synthetic fertilizer (e.g., N) is not allowed (IFOAM, 2014). On a large scale, for instance, in the entire country of China, some farmland must be used for biological N fixation to provide the essential N for crop production

1 (De Ponti et al., 2012). Then, the decrease in crop yield for organic farming was likely much
2 higher than the 10-15% scenario set in our study. If the crop yield decrease was doubled from
3 10-15% to 20-30%, this total economic loss would increase from 6115 million RMB (1019.2
4 million USD) to 14,237 million RMB (2372.8 million USD), or from 5280 RMB (880 USD) to
5 12294 RMB (2049 USD) ha⁻¹. This means that organic agriculture has the pressure of increasing
6 crop yield, or we should shift the allocation of crops from animal feed and biofuels toward more
7 direct means of feed the human population (Emily et al., 2013).

8 9 4.2 Provision of environmental benefits by organic agriculture

10 In our study, total environmental benefits and production costs saved of organic agriculture
11 accounted for 82.3% of the total economic losses due to crop yield decrease. The environmental
12 benefits of organic agriculture were quantified at 1659 RMB (276.5 USD) ha⁻¹, approximately
13 31% of the total economic value of the crop yield decrease (5280 RMB, or 880 USD ha⁻¹). This
14 indicates that organic agriculture could substantially compensate for the economic value loss
15 caused by the crop yield decrease.

16 These environmental benefits gained by organic farming, or rather interpreted as the
17 environmental costs caused by conventional farming, could be covered with payments, from the
18 buyer/consumer, i.e., price premiums, or by fines issued to the producer/farmer (Zhang, 2011).
19 European countries have pioneered compensation for organic farmers since the 1990s (Schwarz
20 et al., 2010; Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2010; Xie and Zhou,
21 2013). Subsidy policies, introduced in European Council regulation (ECC) 797/8520, have been
22 fully operational in the Common Agricultural Policy of the EC since 1992. From 2000 to 2007,
23 the subsidy for organic farms was 72 euros per hectare. The subsidy facilitated the expansion of
24 organically managed land in EU countries and improvement of agri-environmental quality
25 (Schwarz et al., 2010). Although there are some subsidies for organic certification (Scott et al.,
26 2014) and some proposed payments for C sequestration and GHG emission reductions in China
27 (Ministry of Finance, 2015), a systematic financial package for the environmental benefits of
28 organic agriculture has not been enacted.

29 Paying for the environmental benefits through price premiums or other feasible approaches,
30 will benefit the whole of society and humans in the long term (Lu et al., 2015). The investigation
31 conducted by CNCA (2014) found that 51% of the organic farms interviewed were profitable.

1 Given the overall lower crop yields (10% to 15%) in organic agriculture, at least a similar level
2 of price premiums is needed for organic farmers to achieve similar financial rewards for those of
3 conventional farmers, assuming that the costs per unit product are similar for organic and
4 conventional farms. In practice, however, the direct production cost of organic products is higher
5 than that of conventional products (CNCA, 2014) because of the increased labor costs due to the
6 rapid industrialization process in China in recent years (Li et al., 2012). We, therefore, suggest
7 that payment for the environmental benefits of organic agriculture should be incorporated into
8 public policies, to encourage agriculture to move towards truly sustainable production systems.
9

10 4.3 Implications for conventional agriculture

11 As highlighted in section 3.3, the environmental cost of conventional agriculture in China
12 may be significantly reduced if the 1.158 million ha of arable land was organically farmed. This
13 can be also interpreted that conventional agriculture requires an improvement, e.g., ecological
14 intensification (Bommarco et al., 2013). Although organic agriculture has an untapped role in the
15 establishment of sustainable farming systems, a blend of organic and other innovative systems or
16 the ecological intensification of conventional farming provides a good option (Matson et al.,
17 1997; Cassman, 1999; Bommarco et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2015; Regaold and Wachter, 2016). In
18 China, the improvement of agriculture practices has been accepted and implemented in recent
19 decades (Chen et al., 2014; Liao et al., 2015) and will be further promoted (Political Bureau of
20 the Central Committee of the CPC, 2015). The quantitative assessment in our study would work
21 as an illustration of the potential that may be expected from a change conventional to organic
22 agriculture or optimization of conventional agriculture. As most organic operations certified in
23 China (CNCA, 2014) are stockless and fertilized with high levels of external nutrients (Oelofse
24 et al., 2014), it is essential to integrate cropping with animal husbandry for both organic and
25 conventional agriculture, to increase the nutrients and energy efficiency. This means that these
26 issues should be addressed during the quantification of change of conventional to organic
27 agriculture, and the quantification of this change is particularly challenging.

28 Among the environmental performances analyzed in this study, the reduced use of N
29 fertilizers, leading to reductions in N₂O emissions and NO₃ pollution, produced more than 84%
30 of the total environmental benefits. This finding is consistent with most studies (Tuomisto et al.,
31 2012), which concludes that the most critical agricultural environmental impacts are related to N

1 fluxes. Thus, although N fertilizers have contributed greatly to the increases in the world grain
2 supply (Erisman et al., 2008), its negative impacts can no longer be neglected. Increases in N-use
3 efficiency and decreases in N losses, particularly with the recycling of agricultural wastes within
4 agroecosystems, must be the priorities for conventional agriculture in China (Chen et al., 2014).
5 Recent studies by Steffen et al. (2015) also noted that in China, some agricultural regions need to
6 decrease the very high N application rates to simultaneously boost crop production and reduce
7 the negative environmental impacts.

8 9 5. Conclusions

10 In our understanding, this is the largest and the first national-level study to economically
11 quantify the farming performances and environmental impacts of organic agriculture. The saved
12 farming input costs and the environmental benefits of organic agriculture, when quantified as
13 monetary values per unit of land area, substantially compensated for the economic losses
14 associated with the decrease in crop yield. Most of the environmental impacts were related to the
15 N flux within agroecosystem, which is a call for the better management of N fertilizer in regions
16 or countries with low levels of N-use efficiency. This study likely underestimated the total
17 positive environmental impacts of organic agriculture because some environmental benefits,
18 such as the lower pesticide contamination of drinking water and foods, were not included in our
19 analyses. The implications of our research highlight the requirement for the ecological
20 intensification of conventional agriculture, particularly in the integration of crop production with
21 animal husbandry. This study strongly suggests more additional long-term observations and
22 studies of organic and conventional agriculture under different natural conditions and
23 management practices.

24
25 Acknowledgments: The National Key Science and Technology Project of the Ministry of
26 Science and Technology of China (Grant No. 2014BAK19B05) and the National Natural Science
27 Foundation (Grant No. 31370527) provided financial support for this study. Gratitude is also
28 extended to Prof. Tony Fuller for his discussions and valuable comments.

29

- 1 Badgley, C., Perfecto, I., 2007. Can organic agriculture feed the world? *Renewable Agriculture and Food*
2 *Systems* 22, 80-85.
- 3 Bergström, L., Kirchmann, H., Aronsson, H., Torstensson, G., Mattsson, L., 2008. Use efficiency and
4 leaching of nutrients in organic and conventional cropping systems in Sweden. In: *Organic Crop*
5 *Production – Ambitions and Limitations*. Kirchmann, H., Bergström, L., eds., Springer, Dordrecht, The
6 Netherlands. pp. 143-159.
- 7 Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., Potts, S.G., 2013. Ecological intensification: harnessing ecosystem services for
8 food security. *Trends in ecology & evolution* 28, 230-238.
- 9 Brentrup, F., Pallière, C., 2008. GHG emissions and energy efficiency in European nitrogen fertiliser
10 production and use. *Proceedings-International Fertiliser Society*. International Fertiliser Society, pp. 1-25.
- 11 Cassman, K.G., 1999. Ecological intensification of cereal production systems: yield potential, soil quality,
12 and precision agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 96, 5952-5959.
- 13 Chen, X.P., Fan, M.S., Vitousek, P., Zhao, M., Ma, W.Q., Wang, Z.L., et al., 2014. Producing more grain
14 with lower environmental costs. *Nature* 514, 486-489.
- 15 CNCA (China National Certification and Accreditation), 2014. *Organic agriculture development report*.
16 China Zhijian Publishing House, Standards Press of China, Beijing, China.
- 17 Cobb, D., Feber, R., Hopkins, A., Stockdale, L., O’Riordan, T., Clements, B., Firbank, L., Goulding, K.,
18 Jarvis, S., Macdonald, D., 1999. Integrating the environmental and economic consequences of converting
19 to organic agriculture: evidence from a case study. *Land Use Policy* 16, 207–221.
- 20 Crowder, D.W., Reganold, J.P., 2015. Financial competitiveness of organic agriculture on a global scale.
21 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, 7611-7616.
- 22 De Schutter, O. Report Submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food (United Nations, 2010).
23 Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Development, June, 2010. An analysis of the
24 EU organic sector.
25 http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/more-reports/pdf/organic_2010_en.pdf. [Accessed on
26 Feb 14, 2015].
- 27 D’Amato, D., Rekola, M., Li, N., Toppinen, A., 2016. Monetary valuation of forest ecosystem services in
28 China: A literature review and identification of future research needs. *Ecological Economics* 121, 75-84.
- 29 De Ponti, T., Rijk, B., Van Ittersum, M.K., 2012. The crop yield gap between organic and conventional
30 agriculture. *Agricultural Systems* 108, 1-9.
- 31 Du, X.G., Dong, M., Qu, Z.H., Shi, Y.Z., 2004. Organic agriculture and soil biodiversity. *Chinese*
32 *Agricultural Science Bulletin* 4, 80-83.
- 33 Ellis, E.C., Wang, S.M., 1997. Sustainable Traditional Agriculture in the Tai Lake Region of China.
34 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 61, 177-193.
- 35 Emily, S.C., Paul, C.W., James, S.G., Jonathan, A.F., 2013. Redefining agricultural yields: from tonnes to
36 people nourished per hectare. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 034015-034023.
- 37 Erisman, J.W., Sutton, M.A., Galloway, J., Klimont, Z., Winiwarter, W., 2008. How a century of
38 ammonia synthesis changed the world. *Nat Geosci* 1(10): 636-639.
- 39 Forman, J., Silverstein, J., Bhatia, J.J., Abrams, S.A., Corkins, M.R., De Ferranti, S.D., Golden, N.H.,
40 Paulson, J.A., Brock-Utne, A.C., Brumberg, H.L., 2012. Organic foods: health and environmental
41 advantages and disadvantages. *Pediatrics* 130, e1406-e1415.

- 1 Gattinger, A., Muller, A., Haeni, M., Skinner, C., Fliessbach, A., Buchmann, N., M N., P., Stolze, M.,
2 Smith, P., Scialabba, N.E.-H., 2012. Enhanced top soil carbon stocks under organic farming. Proceedings
3 of the National Academy of Sciences 109, 18226-18231.
- 4 Giovannucci, D., 2006. Evaluation of organic agriculture and poverty reduction in Asia. Evaluation of
5 organic agriculture and poverty reduction in Asia, International Fund for Agricultural Development
6 (IFAD).
- 7 Gomiero, T., Paoletti, M., Pimentel, D., 2008. Energy and environmental issues in organic and
8 conventional agriculture. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 27, 239-254.
- 9 Gomiero, T., Pimentel, D., Paoletti, M.G., 2011. Environmental impact of different agricultural
10 management practices: conventional vs. organic agriculture. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 30,
11 95-124.
- 12 Guo, H.D., Zheng, W.Q., 2011. Current situation, problems and counterpart measures of Chinese organic
13 agriculture. *Rural Economy* 11, 34-37.
- 14 Guo, J.W., Guo, W.L., 2010. Fertilization and soil nutrient content for greenhouse vegetable production.
15 *Chinese Agricultural Science Bulletin* 26, 243-246.
- 16 Guo, Q.Z., 2007. Fertilization and soil nutrients accumulation for vegetable production in Ankang City.
17 *Anhui Agricultural Science* 35, 6194-6195.
- 18 Halberg, N., 2008. Energy use and greenhouse gas emission in organic agriculture. In: International
19 conference organic agriculture and climate change, Enita of Clermont, France, April 17-18th, 2008
- 20 Hansen, B., Kristensen, E.S., Grant, R., Høgh-Jensen, H., Simmelsgaard, S.E., Olesen, J.E., 2000.
21 Nitrogen leaching from conventional versus organic farming systems - a systems modelling approach.
22 *European Journal of Agronomy* 13, 65-82.
- 23 Hao, X.N., Jiang, H., 2001. Investigation of soil nutrients and fertilization for vegetable production in
24 Xining region. *Qinghai Technology* 8, 29-31.
- 25 Huang, D.F., Qiu, X.X., Li, W.H., Wang, G., 2009. Fertilization and soil nutrient accumulation for
26 vegetable production in Fuzhou City. *Fujian Agriculture and Forestry Journal: Natural Science Edition*
27 38, 633-638.
- 28 IFOAM, 2014. The IFOAM NORMS for Organic Production and Processing. ISBN
29 978-3-944372-10-5. Germany
- 30 IPCC. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the
31 Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, UK
- 32 Jin, L., Li, Y., Gao, Q.Z., Liu, Y.T., Wan, Y.F., Qin, X.B., Shi, F. 2008. Estimate of carbon sequestration
33 under cropland management in China. *Scientia Agricultura Sinica* 3, 734-743
- 34 King, F.H., 1927. *Farmers of forty centuries*. Cape, London.
- 35 Kirchmann, H., Bergströi, L., Kätterer, T., Andrén, O., Andersson, R., 2008. Can organic crop production
36 feed the world? In: *Organic crop production - ambitions and limitations*, Kirchman, H., Bergströe, L., eds,
37 Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 39-72.
- 38 Li, H., Li, L., Wu, B., Xiong, Y., 2012. The end of cheap Chinese labor. *The Journal of Economic*
39 *Perspectives* 26, 57-74.
- 40 Liao, Y., Wu, W., Meng, F., Smith, P., Lal, R., 2015. Increase in soil organic carbon by agricultural
41 intensification in northern China. *Biogeosciences* 12, 1403-1413.

- 1 Liu, H., Jiang, G.M., Zhuang, H.Y., Wang, K.J., 2008. Distribution, utilization structure and potential of
2 biomass resources in rural China: With special references of crop residues. *Renewable and Sustainable*
3 *Energy Reviews* 12, 1402-1418.
- 4 Lu, Y., Jenkins, A., Ferrier, R.C., Bailey, M., Gordon, I.J., Song, S., Huang, J., Jia, S., Zhang, F., Liu, X.,
5 2015. Addressing China's grand challenge of achieving food security while ensuring environmental
6 sustainability. *Science Advances* 1, e1400039.
- 7 Luo, Y., Qiao, Y. H., Wu, W. L., 2011. Environment impact assessment of organic and conventional
8 soybean production with LCA method in China Northeast Plain. *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 31:7170-7178.
- 9 Lynch, D.H., 2009. Environmental impacts of organic agriculture: A Canadian perspective. *Canadian*
10 *Journal of Plant Science* 89, 621-628.
- 11 Ma, X.Z., Zhou, W., Ma, H.L., Hong, L., Wei, D.Y., He, T., Hu, K.Q., Li, J., Sun, S.J., 2015. Study on a
12 new technology in typical southern mountainous area for rural decentralized sewage treatment.
13 *Environmental Pollution and Control* 37(10), 26-30.
- 14 Ma, W.Q., Mao, D.R., Zhang, F.S., 2000. Nutrients accumulation in greenhouse vegetable production in
15 Shandong province., *Phosphorous and Compound Fertilizer* 15, 65-67.
- 16 Matson, P.A., Parton, W.J., Power, A., Swift, M., 1997. Agricultural intensification and ecosystem
17 properties. *Science* 277, 504-509.
- 18 Meier, M.S., Stoessel, F., Jungbluth, N., Juraske, R., Schader, C., Stolze, M., 2015. Environmental
19 impacts of organic and conventional agricultural products - are the differences captured by life cycle
20 assessment? *Journal of Environmental Management* 149, 193-208.
- 21 Meng, F., Olesen, J.E., Sun, X., Wu, W., 2014. Inorganic Nitrogen Leaching from Organic and
22 Conventional Rice Production on a Newly Claimed Calciustoll in Central Asia. *PloS one* 9, e98138.
- 23 Ministry of Agriculture, 2002. Agricultural sector standard for safe agricultural produce (Plant
24 production), China Standardization Press, Beijing
- 25 Ministry of Finance, 2015. Report on the implementation of the central and local budgets for 2014 and on
26 the central and local draft budgets for 2015. *China Daily*.
27 http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2015twosession/2015-03/17/content_19835875.htm. [Accessed on
28 March 25, 2015].
- 29 Mondelaers, K., Aertsens, J., Van Huylenbroeck, G., 2009. A meta-analysis of the differences in
30 environmental impacts between organic and conventional farming. *British Food Journal* 111, 1098-1119.
- 31 National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2014. Application rate of chemical fertilizers in China.
32 <http://data.stats.gov.cn/easyquery.htm?cn=C01>, accessed on Nov 18, 2014.
- 33 Ning, J.F., Xu, P.Z., Yang, S.H., Zou, X.Z., Luo, W.J., Chen, Y., et al., 2011. Effects of combined
34 application of organic and inorganic fertilizer on soil nitrogen runoff in vegetable field. *Journal of Soil*
35 *and Water Conservation* 25, 17-21.
- 36 Oelofse, M., Høgh-jensen, H., Abreu, L.S., Almeida, G.F., El-Araby, A., Qiao, Y., de Neergaard, A.,
37 2010. A comparative study of farm nutrient budgets and nutrient flows of certified organic and
38 non-organic farms in China, Brazil and Egypt. *Nutrient Cycling In Agroecosystems* 87, 455-470.
- 39 Pimentel, D., Wilson, A., 2004. World population agriculture and malnutrition. *World Watch*, 22-25.
- 40 Pizzol, M., Weidema, B., Brandao, M., Osset, P., 2015. Monetary valuation in Life Cycle Assessment: a
41 review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 86, 170-179.

1 Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPC, 2015. Report of proposal on the establishment of
2 the 13th Five-year plan on national economy and social development,
3 http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2015-11/03/content_2959560.htm. [Accessed on March 6, 2016].

4 Pretty, J.N., Brett, C., Gee, D., Hine, R.E., Mason, C.F., Morison, J.I.L., Raven, H., Rayment, M.D., van
5 der Bijl, G., 2000. An assessment of the total external costs of UK agriculture. *Agricultural Systems* 65,
6 113-136.

7 Reganold, J.P., Wachter, J.M., 2016. Organic agriculture in the twenty-first century. *Nature Plants* 2, 1-8

8 Ruan, J.Y., Wu, X., 2001. Nutrient input and fertilization effect for typical tea production region in China.
9 *Soil and Fertilizer* 5, 9-13.

10 Sandhu, H.S., Wratten, S.D., Cullen, R., 2010. The role of supporting ecosystem services in conventional
11 and organic arable farmland. *Ecological Complexity* 7, 302-310.

12 Scott, S., Si, Z., Schumilas, T., Chen, A., 2014. Contradictions in state- and civil society-driven
13 developments in China's ecological agriculture sector. *Food Policy* 45, 158-166.

14 Schader, C., Stolze, M., Gattinger, A., 2012. Environmental performance of organic farming. In: Boye,
15 I.J., Arcand, Y., (Eds.), *Green Technologies in Food Production and Processing*. Springer US, Boston,
16 MA, pp. 183-210.

17 Schwarz, G., Nieberg, H., Sanders, J., 2010. Organic Farming Support Payments in the EU. Johann
18 Heinrich von Thünen-Institut. Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz.
19 Germany.

20 Seufert, V., Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 2012. Comparing the yields of organic and conventional
21 agriculture. *Nature* 485, 229-232.

22 Skinner, C., Gattinger, A., Muller, A., M., .., P., Flie, Mul., A., Stolze, M., Ruser, R., Niggli, U., 2014.
23 Greenhouse gas fluxes from agricultural soils under organic and non-organic management *Nature* 485,
24 229-2analysis. *Science of the Total Environment* 468014. Greenhou.

25 Smith, P., Jones, M., Osborne, B., Wattenbach, M., 2010. The carbon and greenhouse gas budget of
26 European croplands. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 139, V-VI.

27 Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockstrom, J., Cornell, S.E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E.M., Biggs, R., Carpenter,
28 S.R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C.A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G.M., Persson, L.M.,
29 Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., Sorlin, S., 2015. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a
30 changing planet. *Science* 347, 1259855-65.

31 The National Academies, 2010. National Research Council *Toward Sustainable Agricultural Systems in*
32 *the 21st Century*.

33 Torstensson, G., Aronsson, H., Bergström, L., 2006. Nutrient use efficiencies and leaching of organic and
34 conventional cropping systems in Sweden. *Agronomy Journal* 98, 603-615.

35 Tuomisto, H.L., Hodge, I.D., Riordan, P., Macdonald, D.W., 2012. Does organic farming reduce
36 environmental impacts? - A meta-analysis of European research. *Journal of Environmental Management*
37 112, 309-320.

38 van Huylenbroek, G., Mondelaers, K., Aertsens, J., Mondelaers, K., Aertsens, J., Van Huylenbroeck, G.,
39 2009. A meta-analysis of the differences in environmental impacts between organic and conventional
40 farming. *British food journal* 111, 1098-1119.

41 Wang, H., Meng, F.Q., Zhuge, Y.P., Hu, G.Q., Zhu, L. 2012. Effects of organic and conventional
42 fertilizing methods on microbial biomass and enzyme activity in Brunisolic soil, *Journal of soil and water*
43 *conservation* 26, 180-183.

- 1 Wang, C.J., Pan, G.X., Tian, Y.G., Li, L.Q., Zhang, X.H., Han, X.H., Han, X.J., 2010. Soil organic
2 carbon analysis under different fertilization conditions: based on long-term experiment agro-ecosystem
3 study in China. *Scientia Sinica Vitae* 40, 650-657.
- 4 Wang, C.Y., Wang, G., Wan, S.W., Qin, P., 2007. Effects of organic and conventional farming systems
5 on farmland biodiversity. *Journal of Ecology and Rural Environment* 23, 75-80.
- 6 Williams, A.G., Audsley, E., Sandars, D.L., 2006. Determining the environmental burdens and resource
7 use in the production of agricultural and horticultural commodities. (Defra Research Project IS0205).
8 Cranfield University and Defra, Bedford, p.97.
- 9 Willer, H., Lernoud, J., 2014. *The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging Trends 2014*.
10 Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Frick and International Federation of Organic
11 Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Bonn.
- 12 Xi, Y.G., Chen, R.B., Xu, X., Wei, Q., Li, J.Y., 2010. Comparative study of runoff pollution from organic
13 and conventional paddy field. *Journal of Anhui Agricultural Science* 38, 16412-16414, 16443.
- 14 Xie, Y.M., Zhou, F.Z., 2013. Analysis on the EU organic payments policy. *Collected Essays on Finance*
15 *and Economics* 3, 26-31.
- 16 Zhang, W.F., Dou, Z.X., He, P., Ju, X.T., Powlson, D., Chadwick, D., Norse, D., Lu, Y.L., Zhang, Y.,
17 Wu, L., 2013. New technologies reduce greenhouse gas emissions from nitrogenous fertilizer in China.
18 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 8375-8380.
- 19 Zhang, X.M., 2011. Environmental benefits of organic agriculture production-cognitive based on
20 empirical analysis of rural households. *Rural Economy* 25, 92-95, 101.
- 21 Zhang, Y., Duan, H.P., Sun, A.L., Bian, X.M., 2013. Rural Sewage Treatment Techniques Mode and
22 Purifying Effect of Nitrogen and Phosphorus in Jiangsu Province, China. *Journal of Agro-Environmental*
23 *Science*. 32(1), 172-178.
- 24 Zhu, J.H., Li, Y.H., Li, M.Y., Gao, W., 2013. Impacts of N, P and K on greenhouse vegetable yield.
25 *Chinese Agricultural Science Bulletin* 29, 148-154.
- 26 Zhang, M.Q., Li, J., Kong, Q.B., Yao, B.Q., 2011. N, P, K nutrient characteristics and
27 fertilization indicators for main vegetables in Fujian Province. *Fujian Agricultural Journal* 26,
28 284-290.
- 29 Ziesemer, J., 2007. *Energy use in organic food systems*. Rome: Natural Resources
30 Management and Environmental Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the
31 United Nations (FAO).
- 32

1 Table 1 Impact indicators adopted in the comparison of organic (ORG) and conventional
 2 agriculture (CON)

Impact category	Impact indicator	Indicators adopted in this study	Rationales	Studies referred
Economic viability				
Fixed costs	Fixed costs: house, road, etc.	No	No differences between ORG and CON.	Crowder and Reganold, 2015
Variable costs	Purchased fertilizer	Yes	Manure and N fixation are recycled within ORG. Synthetic fertilizer was purchased in CON.	Meier et al., 2015; Crowder and Reganold, 2015
	Purchased pesticide and other pest control materials	Yes	In ORG, pest control materials accounted for a small proportion of the variable costs, so were not considered. Chemical pesticide was purchased in CON.	Meier et al., 2015; Tuomisto et al., 2012; Crowder and Reganold, 2015
	Energy: electric power, oil, etc.	Yes	Similar for ORG and CON.	Halberg, 2008; Crowder and Reganold, 2015
	Labor	Yes	Higher labor costs but could also provide benefits (increasing employment) to social well-being in ORG. Labor costs are also quite variable depending on social and natural conditions. Herein quantified as neutral and no difference between ORG and CON.	Halberg, 2008; Crowder and Reganold, 2015
	Seeds, etc.	No	No differences between ORG and CON.	
Productivity	Yield	Yes	Key function of agriculture.	Badgley and Perfecto, 2007; Kirchmann et al., 2008; Gomiero et al., 2011; Seufert et al., 2012
Environmental impacts	C sequestration	Yes	Higher soil C due to higher organic materials recycled or input within ORG.	Tuomisto et al., 2012; Gattinger <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	GHG emission	Yes	Less indirect N ₂ O emissions in ORG caused by no synthetic fertilizer inputs. Direct N ₂ O and	Tuomisto et al., 2012; Skinner et al.,

			CH ₄ emission were considered to be similar for ORG and CON.	2014	
	Nitrogen leaching	Yes	Nitrate leaching may cause eutrophication and resource (N) and energy waste. Less nitrate leaching in ORG due to no synthetic fertilizer inputs.	Torstensson et al., 2006; Bergström et al., 2008; Schader et al. 2012; Meier et al., 2015	
	Biodiversity	Yes	Beneficial effects on fauna and flora, landscape and ecosystem functions due to no synthetic fertilizer and pesticide applied and the use of environmental friendly farming measures (e.g., rotation).	Lynch, 2009; Mondelaers et al., 2009; Schader et al., 2012; Reganold and Wachter, 2016	
	Ammonia emissions	No	Few studies, and a study also found that it was almost equal in the two farming systems. Higher NH ₃ emissions are mostly found in organic animal production rather than in conventional animal production. Organic crop production in China has a high organic fertilizer input, a similar level to conventional crops, so the NH ₃ emissions should be similar.	Oelofse et al. 2010; Schader et al., 2012; Tuomisto et al., 2012	
	Phosphorus losses	No	Compared with N, phosphorus leaching and erosion are negligible and are even lower in the organic system. Most studies concluded that organic and conventional agricultures have similar phosphorus losses.	Mondelaers et al., 2009; Schader et al., 2012; Tuomisto et al., 2012	
	Energy use	Yes	Considered in economic viability.		
	Land use	No	Environmental impacts, productivity and inputs are assessed per area unit. Not applicable.		
	Social well-being	Social well-being	No	Lack of appropriate methodologies due to the complex relationships between farming activities and social well-being.	Pretty et al., 2000; Forman et al., 2012; Schader et al., 2012

1
2
3

1 Table 2 Reduction of pesticide use in organic agriculture

	Organic farmland	Rate of pesticide use in conventional farming†	Price of pesticide	Economic value of reduction in pesticide use in organic agriculture
	×10 ³ ha	kg ha ⁻¹	RMB kg ⁻¹	×10 ⁶ RMB
Vegetables	48	4	300	58
Fruits	211	6	300	380
Tea	53	5	300	80
Soya and other beans	236	1.5	300	106
Cereals	588	1.5	300	265
Others	22	1.5	300	10
Total	1158			899

2 † Data from the National Agricultural Standard of the Ministry of Agriculture (2002).

3

1 Table 3 Reduction of synthetic fertilizer use in organic agriculture

	Organic farmland $\times 10^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$	Rate of chemical fertilizer use in conventional agriculture			Equivalent amount of reduction in commercial fertilizer use [†]			Economic value of reduction in fertilizer use ^{††} $\times 10^6 \text{ RMB}$
		N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Urea	Diammonium phosphate	Potassium chloride	
		kg ha ⁻¹			$\times 10^3 \text{ t yr}^{-1}$			
Vegetables	48	375	235	253	32	23	22	157
Fruits	211	330	210	200	122	94	76	599
Tea	53	536	68	53	59	9	5	116
Soya and other beans	236	98	160	75	22	81	33	338
Cereals	588	213	115	114	226	145	122	983
Others	22	150	60	50	6	2	2	18
Total	1158				467	353	260	2211

2 † Nutrient contents: urea (N 45%), diammonium phosphate (N 16%, P₂O₅ 47%), and potassium
3 chloride (55%).

4 †† Prices of urea, diammonium phosphate and potassium chloride were 1350, 3000 and
5 2000 RMB t⁻¹, respectively.

6

1 Table 4 Decrease of crop production in organic agriculture

	Organic production	Decrease in organic production compared with conventional farming†	Price of organic products††	Economic value of decrease in organic production
	×10 ⁶ kg	×10 ⁶ kg	RMB kg ⁻¹	×10 ⁶ RMB
Vegetables	726	81	16	1296
Fruits	1363	151	14	2114
Tea	103	11	18	198
Soya and other beans	549	97	5	485
Cereals	3260	575	3	1725
Others	155	27	11	297
Total	6156	943		6115

2 † Compared with conventional farming; yield decrease of organic farming was set to 10% for
3 vegetables, fruits and tea and 15% for all other crops.

4 †† Data were collected from the Certification and Accreditation Administration of China
5 (CNCA) in 2014.

6
7
8

1 Table 5 C sequestration and GHG emission reduction in organic agriculture

	Reduction in fertilizer use			Direct and indirect N ₂ O reduction†	Organic farmland	Soil C sequestration††	Economic value of C sequestration and N ₂ O reduction †††
	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O				
	10 ³ t yr ⁻¹			×10 ³ t CO ₂ -eq yr ⁻¹	×10 ³ ha ⁻¹	×10 ³ t CO ₂ -eq yr ⁻¹	×10 ⁶ RMB
Vegetables	18	11	12	246	48	35	21
Fruits	70	44	42	955	211	124	81
Tea	28	4	3	367	53	31	30
Other crops	151	107	86	2064	846	124	164
Total	267	166	143	3632	1158	314	296

2 † According the IPCC Tier 1, the default emission factor, or direct emission, of N
 3 fertilizer when applied to the soil was set at 1% (100 kg N fertilizer emits 1 kg N₂O-N).
 4 The GWP effect of N₂O is 298-fold that of CO₂ for a 100-year timeframe (IPCC, 2007).
 5 The emission of GHGs during fertilizer manufacture, transportation and application
 6 (indirect) was set as 8.3 kg CO₂-eq kg⁻¹ N, 0.59 kg CO₂-eq kg⁻¹ P₂O₅ and 0.47 kg CO₂-eq
 7 kg⁻¹ K₂O (Smith et al., 2010).

8 †† The SOC sequestration rate was set as 0.20, 0.16, 0.16 and 0.04 t C ha⁻¹ for land used
 9 for vegetables, orchards, tea gardens and other crops, respectively.

10 ††† Price of GHG emission reduction was set as 75 RMB t⁻¹ CO₂-eq.

11

1 Table 6 Farmland biodiversity enhancement in organic agriculture

	Organic farmland	Unit value of increase in ecosystem services	Economic value of increase in ecosystem services
	$\times 10^3$ ha	RMB ha ⁻¹	$\times 10^6$ RMB yr ⁻¹
Vegetables	48	325	16
Fruits	53	260	14
Tea	211	260	55
Other crops	846	240	203
Total	1158		287

2

1 Table 7 Reduction of nitrate leaching in organic agriculture

	Unit reduction of nitrate leaching	Organic farmland	Total reduction of nitrate leached	Economic value†
	kg N ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹	×10 ³ ha	×10 ³ kg N yr ⁻¹	×10 ⁶ RMB yr ⁻¹
Vegetables	20	48	960	96
Fruits	15	53	795	79.5
Tea	15	211	3165	316.5
Other crops	10	846	8460	846
Total			13380	1338

2 † Price of nitrate removal from water bodies was set at 100 RMB kg⁻¹ N yr⁻¹.

3

4