Agri Articles
(e-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 06, Issue: 01 (JAN-FEB, 2026)
Available online at http://www.agriarticles.com

Carbon Footprint Assessment of Organic vs Conventional Farming Systems

*G Sri Krishna[1], Palupunuri Vidyasree[2], Rachapally Prashanth[3] and Dr. Chandrakant M.H[4]
[1]SMS (Horticulture), Krishi Vigyan Kendra Ranga Reddy District, ICAR- CRIDA
[2]PhD Scholar, Dept. of Floriculture and Landscaping, Sri Kondalaxaman Telangana Horticultural University, Telangana
[3]PhD Scholar, Dept. of Fruit science and Landscaping, Sri Kondalaxaman Telangana Horticultural University, Telangana
[4]Senior Scientist and Head, Krishi Vigyan Kendra Ranga Reddy, ICAR- CRIDA, Hyderabad, Telangana, India
*Corresponding Author's email: srikrishna12@gmail.com

Through the use of fossil fuels, fertilizer production, enteric fermentation, manure management, and emissions connected to soil, agriculture plays a major role in the world's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Assessing the carbon footprint of various agricultural systems has become crucial as mitigating the effects of climate change becomes a worldwide concern. Because organic farming relies on biological nutrient cycling, uses less synthetic inputs, and prioritizes soil health, it is often marketed as a climate-friendly alternative to conventional agriculture. Direct comparisons are made more difficult by variations in production, land-use needs, and nutrient management techniques. Using life cycle assessment (LCA) techniques, this research objectively evaluates the carbon footprint indicators of conventional and organic agricultural systems. It assesses energy inputs, livestock systems, soil carbon dynamics, and emissions from crop production. The research emphasizes the significance of management approaches, soil carbon sequestration capability, and trade-offs between emissions per unit area and emissions per unit yield. When evaluated per unit of production, yield gaps may cancel out the climate advantages of organic systems, even if they often show reduced energy-related emissions and improved soil carbon absorption. Climate-resilient agriculture requires a systems-level strategy that integrates resource efficiency, carbon sequestration, and production.

Keywords: Carbon footprint, Organic farming, Conventional agriculture, Greenhouse gas emissions, Life cycle assessment, Soil carbon sequestration, Climate change mitigation

Introduction

Agriculture accounts for approximately 20–30% of total anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions when land-use change is included. Major agricultural emissions include:

- **Carbon dioxide (CO_2)** from fossil fuel combustion and land-use change
- **Nitrous oxide (N_2O)** from nitrogen fertilizers and manure
- **Methane (CH_4)** from enteric fermentation and flooded rice fields

Interest in agricultural practices that lower carbon emissions while preserving production is rising as the world's food need rises. Closed nutrient cycles, biodiversity, and ecological processes are highlighted in organic farming. Soil fertility is preserved by crop rotation, compost, manure, and biological nitrogen fixation, while synthetic fertilizers and pesticides are avoided. On the other hand, in order to enhance productivity, conventional farming mostly uses chemical pesticides, synthetic fertilizers, and mechanical techniques.

Carbon footprint comparisons between these systems are complex because results depend on:

- Functional unit (per hectare vs per kilogram yield)
- Crop type
- Soil type
- Climate
- Management practices

This review synthesizes evidence from life cycle assessments and field studies comparing organic and conventional systems.

Methodological Framework for Carbon Footprint Assessment

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

Carbon footprint studies commonly use Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), which evaluates emissions across production stages:

1. Input manufacturing (fertilizers, pesticides, feed)
2. On-farm energy use
3. Soil emissions (N_2O, CO_2)
4. Livestock emissions (CH_4)
5. Post-harvest processes (optional boundary)

Two main functional units are used:

- **Per hectare (area-based assessment)**
- **Per kilogram of product (yield-based assessment)**

These units often produce contrasting conclusions.

Emission Sources in Agriculture

Key emission contributors include:

- Nitrogen fertilizer production (high energy intensity)
- Soil nitrous oxide emissions
- Livestock methane emissions
- Fuel use for machinery

Carbon Footprint of Conventional Farming Systems

Synthetic Fertilizer Production

Additionally, nitrogen fertilizers contribute to soil N_2O emissions, a greenhouse gas around 298 times more powerful than CO_2 over a 100-year period, and the Haber–Bosch process for nitrogen fertilizer manufacture is very energy demanding and contributes to significant CO_2 emissions.

High Yield Advantage

Conventional systems often achieve higher yields due to optimized nutrient supply and pest control. When emissions are expressed per kilogram of product, higher yields can dilute per-unit emissions.

Soil Carbon Dynamics

Intensive tillage and monocropping may reduce soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks over time, potentially increasing net emissions.

Carbon Footprint of Organic Farming Systems

Reduced Synthetic Input Emissions

Organic systems eliminate emissions associated with synthetic fertilizer production. Nutrients are supplied via compost, manure, and biological nitrogen fixation, lowering upstream carbon emissions.

Soil Carbon Sequestration

Organic farming often enhances soil organic carbon through:

- Cover cropping
- Crop rotations

- Organic amendments

Yield Gap Considerations

Depending on the crop and location, meta-analyses indicate that organic yields are often 10–25% lower than conventional yields. Despite reduced emissions per hectare, decreased productivity may result in higher emissions per unit of production.

Comparative Analysis: Organic vs Conventional Systems

Area-Based Emissions (Per Hectare)

Many studies report lower total GHG emissions per hectare in organic systems due to:

- Absence of synthetic nitrogen
- Lower fossil fuel use
- Enhanced soil carbon storage

Yield-Based Emissions (Per Kilogram Product)

When emissions are expressed per kilogram of crop:

- Conventional systems often show lower carbon intensity due to higher yields.
- Organic systems may have higher carbon footprint per unit output if yield gap is substantial.

Soil Carbon Sequestration Impact

Comparative results are greatly influenced by the inclusion of soil carbon sequestration. The yearly accumulation of organic systems may range from 200 to 450 kg C ha^{-1}, dependent on climate and management. Organic systems have the ability to mitigate climate change on par with or even better than conventional systems if soil carbon sequestration is taken into consideration.

Livestock Systems Comparison

Organic Livestock

Organic livestock systems:

- Emphasize pasture-based feeding
- Reduce synthetic feed inputs
- Often exhibit slower growth rates

Methane emissions per animal may be similar or higher due to longer production cycles.

Conventional Livestock

Conventional systems:

- Use concentrated feed
- Achieve faster growth
- Potentially reduce methane per kilogram of meat

Trade-Offs and System-Level Considerations

Land Use Change

Organic systems with lower yields could need more land to produce the same amounts of food, which might lead to an increase in emissions from land-use change if expansion takes place.

Nutrient Management Efficiency

Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) is generally higher in conventional systems due to precise fertilizer application. Organic systems rely on slower nutrient release from manure and compost.

Energy Use

Organic systems generally consume less fossil energy due to absence of synthetic input manufacturing.

Meta-Analysis Evidence

Several global meta-analyses report:

- Organic systems emit 10–20% less GHG per hectare.
- Conventional systems often emit less per kilogram of product.
- Soil carbon sequestration may reduce net emissions in organic systems by 3–8%.

Policy Implications

Carbon footprint assessments suggest:

- Climate-smart agriculture should integrate both systems' strengths.
- Improving nitrogen efficiency in conventional systems can reduce N_2O emissions.
- Enhancing productivity in organic systems can narrow yield gaps.
- Incentives for soil carbon sequestration should be incorporated into climate policies.

Future Research Directions

Future assessments should:

- Incorporate long-term soil carbon data.
- Use standardized LCA methodologies.
- Consider biodiversity and ecosystem services.
- Integrate carbon footprint with water and energy footprints.

Conclusion

Comparisons of the carbon footprints of conventional and organic agricultural methods vary depending on the situation. While conventional systems often produce lower emissions per unit of output owing to better yields, organic systems typically exhibit lower emissions per hectare and greater soil carbon absorption potential. In terms of mitigating climate change, neither approach is inherently better. To reduce agricultural greenhouse gas emissions while maintaining food security, a hybrid strategy that combines better fertilizer management, soil carbon augmentation, and yield optimization is necessary. Future agricultural sustainability hinges on management strategies that improve ecological resilience and carbon efficiency rather than just system labeling.

References

1. Balmford, A., Amano, T., Bartlett, H., et al. (2018). The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming. *Nature Sustainability*, 1, 477–485. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5
2. Clark, M., & Tilman, D. (2017). Comparative analysis of environmental impacts of agricultural production systems, agricultural input efficiency, and food choice. *Environmental Research Letters*, 12(6), 064016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6cd5
3. Gattinger, A., Muller, A., Haeni, M., et al. (2012). Enhanced top soil carbon stocks under organic farming. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)*, 109(44), 18226–18231. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1209429109
4. Meier, M. S., Stoessel, F., Jungbluth, N., et al. (2015). Environmental impacts of organic and conventional agricultural products – Are the differences captured by life cycle assessment? *Journal of Environmental Management*, 149, 193–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.10.006
5. Muller, A., Schader, C., El-Hage Scialabba, N., et al. (2017). Strategies for feeding the world more sustainably with organic agriculture. *Nature Communications*, 8, 1290. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01410-w
6. Nemecek, T., Dubois, D., Huguenin-Elie, O., & Gaillard, G. (2011). Life cycle assessment of Swiss farming systems: I. Integrated and organic farming. *Agricultural Systems*, 104(3), 217–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2010.10.002
7. Pimentel, D., Hepperly, P., Hanson, J., et al. (2005). Environmental, energetic, and economic comparisons of organic and conventional farming systems. *BioScience*, 55(7), 573–582. https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0573:EEAECO]2.0.CO;2
8. Ponisio, L. C., M'Gonigle, L. K., Mace, K. C., et al. (2015). Diversification practices reduce organic to conventional yield gap. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 282, 20141396. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1396
9. Reganold, J. P., & Wachter, J. M. (2016). Organic agriculture in the twenty-first century. *Nature Plants*, 2, 15221. https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2015.221

10. Seufert, V., Ramankutty, N., & Foley, J. A. (2012). Comparing the yields of organic and conventional agriculture. *Nature*, 485, 229–232. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11069
11. Skinner, C., Gattinger, A., Krauss, M., et al. (2014). The impact of long-term organic farming on soil-derived greenhouse gas emissions. *Scientific Reports*, 4, 4621. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep04621
12. Smith, P., Martino, D., Cai, Z., et al. (2008). Greenhouse gas mitigation in agriculture. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 363, 789–813. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.2184
13. Tuomisto, H. L., Hodge, I. D., Riordan, P., & Macdonald, D. W. (2012). Does organic farming reduce environmental impacts? A meta-analysis of European research. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 112, 309–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.08.018