

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE WATER FOOTPRINT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN
NEW ZEALAND: THE IMPACT OF PRIMARY PRODUCTION
ON WATER RESOURCES**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in

Soil and Environmental Sciences

Institute of Agriculture and Environment



Palmerston North, New Zealand

Indika Kaumudini Herath

2013

ABSTRACT

Protecting and sustaining global water resources are one of the most challenging issues facing the world. Future food security is threatened by the continued increase in demand for water. Agriculture is, by far, the largest consumer of global freshwater, with irrigation accounting for more than 70% of water withdrawals. As the dominant land use in New Zealand, agriculture has the most widespread impacts on freshwater quality and quantity. The water footprint (WF) is a metric that quantifies the environmental impacts related to water use. The WF is likely to form the basis of eco-verification or environmental product declarations related to water use, thereby communicating water use impacts associated with the production of goods and services to a range of stakeholders, including consumers. While the international standards for water footprinting are still being developed, a number of protocols have already been proposed for quantifying the WFs of a range of agricultural products. If New Zealand is to remain competitive within an increasingly discriminating market place, it will need to be able to demonstrate the impacts of resource use.

The objectives of this thesis are to quantify the impacts of the production of two of New Zealand's economically important agricultural products on water resources. These are wine-grape (*Vitis vinifera*), the top horticultural export product, and potatoes (*Solanum tuberosum*), the largest vegetable crop in terms of area under cultivation in New Zealand. In order to meet this objective, a new method, which is based on a full hydrological assessment, was developed. A further objective is to compare this method with three other WF methods, in relation to their usefulness to stakeholders. This study also aims to identify potential management options, which can be implemented to reduce the water-related impacts of these products.

Electricity is a major input into the supply chains of most primary products and, because hydropower is the major component of New Zealand's electricity mix, it was first decided to determine the WF of hydro-electricity. This WF value of electricity was then used in subsequent assessments of the WF of wine and potatoes. The hydrological water balance method has been used here to quantify the WF of wine production in Marlborough and Gisborne, which are two hydrologically different regions in New

Zealand. This assessment considered approximately 12,600 ha under grapes and 36 wineries across both the regions: and the vineyards were on 29 different soil types spread across 19 climatic regions. The functional unit (FU) is a 750-mL bottle of wine at the winery gate. The hydrological water balance method considers water inflows and outflows into and out of the system and it identifies two main water resources; namely, soil water (the green water resource), and groundwater (the blue water resource). The net uses of these two resources were quantified as the green and blue water WFs. The impact of wine production on water quality, the grey WF, was assessed by considering the average nitrate nitrogen ($\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$) concentration and the load of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ reaching groundwater. Subsequently, the WFs of the same wines were evaluated, by using three other WF methods: the 'consumptive water use method' of the Water Footprint Network (WFN); the stress-weighted WF; and a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) based method that considers freshwater ecosystem impact and freshwater depletion. All these methods were evaluated for their ability to indicate local impacts on the water resources and their usefulness to key stakeholders. The hydrological water balance method was also used to assess the WF of a potato crop grown in the Manawatu region. This evaluation was supported by field measurements of the soil water content, drainage and leaching of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ below the root zone. Finally, the WF of a kilogram of potatoes at the packhouse gate was quantified, by using mechanistic modelling, which was robustly supported by these field measurements.

There was large variation in the WF of wine, both within and across the Marlborough and Gisborne regions. This variation reflects the large variability in regional rainfall and the large differences in local soil properties. At the grape-growing stage, the average blue-WFs were -81 L/FU and -415 L/FU for Marlborough and Gisborne, respectively. These negative values indicate that these water resources are being recharged on an annual timescale. The green-WFs were negligible, because the soils are returned to field capacity every year during winter. The average grey-WFs, that is, the water required to dilute the $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ leached in the vineyard phase, were 40 and 188 L/FU for Marlborough and Gisborne, respectively. However, the average concentration of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ in the leachate was smaller than the New Zealand drinking water standard of 11.3mg /L. The comparison of different WF methods showed that the WFN method for the blue and

green footprints does not represent impacts on the local water resources. The ability of the stress-weighted WF and the LCA based method to indicate the local impacts is limited due to the spatial constraints of the characterisation factors that have to be used. The hydrological water-balance method can indicate local impacts on water resources, and it does provide useful information to growers and resource regulators, which will enable them to set measurable targets, in order to reduce the WF.

In the potato study, high spatial and temporal variability in field measurements proved to be very challenging. Therefore, it was considered to be more accurate to account for the whole crop sequence and long term weather data, through mechanistic modelling. The average blue-WF of the potato growing phase was -72 L/kg, thus indicating that the rain-fed potato production system has no deleterious impacts on blue water quantity in the region. This indicates that, for every kilogram of potatoes harvested, 72 litres of water recharges the local aquifer. The average grey-WF was 61 L/kg, of which 56 L/kg is from the cropping phase. The use of the absolute value of the grey WF, in order to understand the impact on water quality, is not straightforward. This point notwithstanding, the average concentrations and loading of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ from the cultivation phase indicate that current practices are having some impact on water quality. The average concentration of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ leaching below the root zone was at 11.3 mg /L, which is just at the drinking water standard. The average loading rate of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ was 27.8 kg /ha/y. The potential to reduce the grey-WF was investigated by modelling three different nitrogen fertiliser application scenarios related to split applications and different timings. All three scenarios reduced the $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations and loads from the production system. The simulated $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations were reduced from 11.3 to 9.5 mg /L, and the loading rates were reduced from 27.8 to 24.3kg /ha/y, depending on the scenario. The WF is a useful tool to understand the impact of agricultural systems on water resources and also to derive improvement options. However, the robustness of current WF protocols for quantifying the impact of the product life cycle on water quality is dubious. These methods require further improvements, so that water footprinting can provide reasonable and rational metrics of the sustainable use of our water resources. The research described in this thesis has provided some new steps within this improvement process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, my huge thanks go to Dr Brent Clothier for his excellent guidance, support and encouragement throughout my study. I am especially grateful to him for providing me with the opportunity to work with his team at Plant & Food Research. It was an exciting journey, a challenge, and a great pleasure for me. It has been a privilege to work with him and his team and I will be forever grateful for his wonderful role as a supervisor and also his kindness.

My sincere thanks are due to Dr David Horne, my supervisor, for his support and encouragement since my enrolment at Massey until the completion of PhD research. I am very thankful to Dr Ranvir Singh, my co-supervisor, for his continuous support, valuable comments and encouragement.

I am especially thankful to Dr Steve Green for his extremely valuable inputs during this study, which made me excited, puzzled and sometimes terrified, but finally he exposed me to wonderful and well-worthy experiences. His wealth of experience and knowledge has been a huge help and led to the success of this study.

I am grateful to Dr Loganathan for his valuable support and advice on my enrolment at Massey University and his initial support with my arrival in New Zealand. I am thankful to Dr David Scotter for his support and valuable suggestions during this study. I appreciate the support from the staff of Soil Science Group, Institute of Agriculture and Environment. I am also thankful to Dr Markus Deurer for his valuable input and suggestions at the beginning of my study. I appreciate the support from Carlo van den Dijssel, Paramsothy Jeyakumar and Siva Sivakumaran, during the field and laboratory work.

I am very thankful to Penny Clothier for her support, kindness and company. My special thanks to Sharron, Kim and Josh Bergeson for their lovely company and help in very needy situations during my study period. I am also very indebted to our family members in New Zealand: Swarna and Ranjith Gamage, Malka and Rowan Danbar for their love, support and caring. The support from Saman Bowatta, Sally van der Zijpp, Alan Buchanan, Richard Burgess, Peter Davidson, Irwin Matthew, Duncan Hedderley, Chris Dunlop, James Robertson and Kerry Hughes is also gratefully appreciated.

My special thanks to the International Student Support Team and the NZ AID scholarship for financially supporting me during my PhD research. I am thankful to the Coconut Research Institute, Sri Lanka, for allowing me to undertake this study.

I am very thankful to my friends and colleagues, Sharini, Jeyamalar, Uttara, Malkanthi, Saman Herath and Thao Wang for their friendship and support.

I greatly appreciate the support and encouragement from my family. Huge thanks go to Praveen, my son for being so lovely and sharing all my ups and downs at such a young age. You are wonderful. Most importantly, I thank Saman Kumara, my husband, for his continuous encouragement, care and support. I thank my mother, Banadara Menike, my father, Dingiri Banda and my family for their love and support. I am grateful for the faith you have shown in me and the moral support you have given me when it was really needed.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER 1 General Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Justification	1
1.2 Research objectives.....	3
1.3 Thesis structure.....	4
1.4 Highlights of this thesis	7
1.5 References.....	7
CHAPTER 2 Review of Literature	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Freshwater resource and its availability	9
2.3 Agriculture and water-use impacts.....	10
2.4 Freshwater availability and demand in New Zealand	12
2.4.1 Water scarcity in New Zealand	12
2.4.2 Water demand in New Zealand	12
2.4.3 Water quality of New Zealand’s water resources.....	13
2.5 Measuring water use and assessing its impacts in agricultural systems	14
2.6 Indicators of measuring water use and environmental impact of water use in production systems.....	15
2.6.1 The concept of virtual water and water footprint given by Hoekstra et al. (2009)	15
2.6.2 Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) based water footprinting methods.....	20
2.6.2.1 <i>The LCA method proposed by Canals and others (2009, 2010)</i>	20
2.6.2.2 <i>The LCA method of Pfister et al. (2009)</i>	22
2.6.2.3 <i>The Ridoutt and Pfister (2010) LCA method</i>	23

2.7 Use of different methods and data availability in New Zealand.....	25
2.8 Summary	26
2.8.1 Summary and highlights.....	26
2.8.2 Focus for the study.....	27
2.9 References.....	28
CHAPTER 3 The water footprint of hydroelectricity: A methodological comparison from a case study in New Zealand	32
3.1 Abstract	32
3.2 Introduction	33
3.3. Methodology.....	36
3.3.1 Description of New Zealand hydroelectric power plants.....	36
3.3.2 Three methods to quantify the water footprint of hydroelectricity.....	37
3.3.2.1 WF_1 : Consumptive water use	37
3.3.2.2 WF_2 : Net consumptive use.....	38
3.3.2.3 WF_3 : Net water balance.....	38
3.3.3 Data collection	39
3.4 Results and Discussion	41
3.4.1 Effect of hydroelectricity generation on freshwater resource availability	41
3.4.2 Impact of local climate and structural specifics on the water footprint.....	45
3.4.3 The water footprint of a unit of New Zealand hydroelectricity	46
3.4.4 Ecosystem service or dis-service?	47
3.4.5 Gaps in the methods	48
3.4.6 Looking to the future	49
3.5 Conclusions	49
3.6 References.....	51
CHAPTER 4 Water footprinting of agricultural products: A hydrological assessment for the water footprint of New Zealand’s wines.....	53
4.1 Abstract	54
4.2 Introduction	54
4.3 Methodology.....	56
4.3.1 Data and assumptions.....	57

4.3.2 Area considered, regional dynamics, climate and soil variability	58
4.3.3 Water consumption and use along the wine supply chain	59
4.3.4 Water footprint assessment using water-balance approach: The water footprint as the impact of production on water resources	60
4.3.4.1 Impact on water quantity: The blue and green water footprints	60
4.3.4.2 Impact on water quality: The grey-water footprint	62
4.3.5 Modeling water and solute dynamics of vineyards	63
4.4 Results and Discussion	64
4.4.1 Water consumption in wine production supply chain	64
4.4.2 The water footprints as indicators of impacts of water use on water resources	67
4.4.2.1 Viticultural phase - The foreground system	67
4.4.2.2 Viticultural phase: The background system	73
4.4.3 Winery phase	73
4.4.4 Impacts of water use and emissions of wine production supply-chain: Summary.....	76
4.4.5 Practical implication of the results.....	77
4.5 Gaps and limitations.....	78
4.6 Conclusions	79
4.7 References.....	80
CHAPTER 5 Water footprinting of agricultural products: Evaluation of different protocols using a case study of New Zealand wine	83
5.1 Abstract	83
5.2. Introduction	85
5.3. Different water footprinting protocols and their estimation methods	87
5.3.1 Method of Water Footprint Network (WFN method)	88
5.3.2 LCA-based water footprinting methods.....	89
5.3.2.1 Stress-weighted water footprint: The Ridoutt and Pfister (2010) method	89
5.3.2.2 The method of Canals et al. (2009)	90
5.3.3 Hydrological water-balance approach of water footprinting	92
5.4. Results and Discussion	93
5.4.1 Consumptive-based volumetric water footprint (WFN method)	93
5.4.2 Stress-weighted water footprint: The Ridoutt and Pfister (2010) method	96
5.4.3 The method of Canals et al., (2009)	98

5.4.4 Hydrological water-balance approach of water footprinting	101
5.4.4.1 How the results of the hydrological method can be useful to the stakeholders ..	104
5.5 Conclusions	105
5.6 References.....	107
CHAPTER 6 Measuring water and nutrient dynamics to quantify and reduce the water footprint of potato cultivation	110
6.1 Abstract	110
6.2 Introduction	111
6.3 Methodology.....	114
6.3.1 Measuring the impact of crop cultivation on the quantity of water resources: the blue and green water footprints.....	114
6.3.2 Measuring the impact of crop cultivation on the quality of water resources	117
6.3.2.1 Approach 1: the grey water footprint	118
6.3.2.2 Approach 2: The grey water impact fraction	118
6.3.2.3 Measuring plant N uptake to understand nitrogen dynamics to reduce leaching losses	119
6.4 Results and Discussion	119
6.4.1 The impact of crop production on quantity of water resources.....	120
6.4.1.1 The net use of groundwater (blue-WF)	120
6.4.1.2 The net use of soil water (green-WF)	122
6.4.2 The impact on water quality	123
6.4.2.1 Approach 1: The grey-water footprint	123
6.4.2.2 Approach 2: The Impact fraction.....	124
6.5 Improvement options to reduce the water footprints	125
6.6 Practical limitations and focus for future work.....	128
6.7 Conclusions	129
6.8 References.....	130
CHAPTER 7 The water footprint of potato production: A hydrological assessment using measurements and modelling.....	133
7.1 Abstract	133
7.2 Introduction	135
7.3 Methodology.....	136

7.3.1 The crop production phase	136
7.3.1.1 Quantifying water and nutrient dynamics	137
7.3.1.2 Quantifying blue, green and grey water footprints	137
7.3.2 Seed potato production	139
7.3.3 Packhouse phase	140
7.3.4 Improvement options to reduce the water footprint	140
7.4 Results and Discussion	141
7.4.1 The crop production phase: water use and impacts.....	141
7.4.1.1 Green water footprint: the net use of soil-stored water	141
7.4.1.2 The blue water footprint: the net use of groundwater resource.....	142
7.4.1.3 The grey water footprint: the nitrate concentrations and loads.....	143
7.4.2 Seed potato production	145
7.4.3 Packhouse phase.....	146
7.5 Summary results of the analysis	147
7.6 Improvement options to reduce the impact on water quality	148
7.7 Conclusions	149
7.8 References.....	150
CHAPTER 8 Overall Summary and Future Research Imperatives.....	152
8.1 Summary	152
8.2 Implications and suggestions for future work	157
APPENDIX – A Assessing Freshwater Scarcity in New Zealand.....	159
A.1 Introduction	159
A.2 Data and Methodology	159
A.3 Results and Discussion	160
A.3.1 Water Availability per Capita/ Falkenmark Index.....	160
A.3.2 Water Scarcity Index.....	161
A.3.3 Water Stress Indicator	162
A.4 Conclusions	163
A.5 References	163
APPENDIX- B Publications by the candidate during the PhD programme.....	165

APPENDIX- C Research related activities the candidate attended during the doctoral programme	169
APPENDIX- D Statements of contribution for publications.....	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	The water footprint of hydropower generated in the stations in the South Island of New Zealand	42
Table 3.2	The water footprint of hydropower generated in the stations in the North Island of New Zealand	42
Table 3.3	Summary of the regression analysis: Effect of local climate and reservoir surface area on the variability of the water footprint of New Zealand’s hydropower	45
Table 3.4	Average water footprint of hydroelectricity generated in New Zealand, calculated using three different methods	47
Table 4.1	Water consumption (green and blue), plus direct and indirect use (blue) in the wine supply chain for the two regions of Gisborne and Marlborough (Units: L/FU, where the FU is a 750-mL bottle of wine at the winery gate)	66
Table 4.2	The water footprint values for energy carriers used in a vineyard and winery in New Zealand. The values for the consumptive water use and the hydrological water balance approach are given separately	73
Table 4.3	The impacts of water use in wine production on quantity (blue-WF) and quality (grey-WF) of the water resources in two regions of New Zealand (Units: L/FU, where the FU is a 750-mL bottle of wine at the winery gate)	76
Table 5.1	Water footprints calculated using the Water Footprint Network (WFN) method. Direct and indirect water use in the winery and vineyards are given separately. The units are in litres of water per functional unit (FU), where the FU is a bottle of wine at the winery gate	94
Table 5.2	The blue-water use in different life cycle stages along the wine supply chain and the impact of water use as indicated by the stress-weighted water footprint (WF). The percentage contributions from each phase are given in parentheses.	97
Table 5.3	The impact of blue-water consumption along the wine supply chain of the two regions as indicated by Freshwater Ecosystem Impact (FEI). The percentage contributions from each phase are given in parentheses	99
Table 5.4	The impact of groundwater consumption along the wine supply-chain of the two regions as indicated by Freshwater Depletion (FD). The ADP is the Abiotic Depletion Potential for groundwater which is the characterization factor for FD	99
Table 5.5	The impact of water consumption along the wine supply-chain on the water resources, according to the hydrological water-balance method. The impact on water quality was estimated by considering the contamination of groundwater through nitrate leaching	102
Table 6.1	Rainfall received during the 2011/12 crop season and the average rainfall for a 40-year period of 1972 to 2012	120

Table 7.1	The blue and grey water footprints of the different generations of seed potato production process. The symbol G_2 is for the glasshouse, while G_3 - G_6 are the field multiplications	146
Table 7.2	The contribution from different inputs to the total blue water footprint of the packhouse phase	146
Table 7.3	The impacts of water use in potato production on the quantity (blue-WF) and the quality (grey-WF) of water resources in the Manawatu region of New Zealand (Units: L/kg of potato at the packhouse gate)	147
Table 8.1	Summary results of the water footprint analyses of wine and potato. The results are presented for the cultivation phase, in terms of kilogram of grapes and potatoes	154
Table A.1	The Water Scarcity Index and Water Stress Indicator for the regions of New Zealand	161

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	World map indicating the degree of water scarcity (CAWMA, 2007). The red colours indicate scarcity and the blue reflect greater water availability	10
Figure 2.2	Consented irrigated areas (ha) by region in New Zealand. Source: MfE (2010)	13
Figure 2.3	Schematic representations of the components of a consumptive water footprint. Source: (Hoekstra et al., 2009a)	16
Figure 2.4	Inventory requirements and impact pathways resulting from different type of water use as proposed by Canals et al. (2009). Source: Berger and Finkbeiner (2010)	21
Figure 2.5	The method of calculating product water footprints incorporating water stress characterisation factors. Source: Ridoutt and Pfister (2010)	23
Figure 3.1	New Zealand's electricity generation by fuel type: for past 34 years (left) for 2009 (right) Source: New Zealand Energy Data File, 2010	35
Figure 3.2	Locations of hydropower plants and NIWA weather stations considered in the study	36
Figure 3.3	Schematic diagram showing different hydrological components and landscape features before (left) and after (right) a hydroelectric dam Through flow is ignored.	37
Figure 3.4	Annual average (2000-2009) rainfall, open water evaporation and calculated evapotranspiration at selected NIWA weather stations	40
Figure 4.1	Flowchart for the wine production system studied. Shaded area marked with dashed line indicates the foreground system. Square boxes with rounded corners represent activities that are included and round shapes show the activities excluded	57
Figure 4.2	A map of New Zealand showing the two regions considered in the study	59
Figure 4.3	Components of the full hydrological assessment of the water balance of irrigated wine grapes where precipitation (P) is considered, as is the hydrological connectedness of surface runoff (R) and drainage (D) with the blue-water (groundwater) resource	61
Figure 4.4	Components of the full hydrological assessment of the water balance of vineyards under rain-fed conditions. The effective precipitation (P- Pi) is the inflow for the soil moisture store, and Er (evaporation), Tr (transpiration), Dr (drainage) and Rr (runoff) are the outflow components	62
Figure 4.5	Green and blue water consumption through evapotranspiration (ET) from vineyards (normalized to grape yield) categorized by different soil types in the Marlborough region. The bars indicate the variability that is mainly due	65

	to local climatic differences.	
Figure 4.6	Green-water consumption through evapotranspiration (ET) from vineyards (normalized to grape yield) categorized by different soil types in Gisborne region. The bars reflect the variation found by modeling over the 38-year period of simulation (from 1972 to 2010)	66
Figure 4.7	Net usage of groundwater resource (blue-WF) and soil-water store (green-WF) (normalized to grape yield) below the vineyards across the different climatic locations in the Marlborough region, as ranked by soil types. The green-WF is barely perceptible in the figure since it is near-zero as described in the text. The bars reflect the variability, mainly induced by the local climatic differences	68
Figure 4.8	Net usage of groundwater resource (blue-WF) and soil-water store (green-WF) (normalized to grape yield) below the vineyards in different climatic locations in the Marlborough region, as ranked by annual rainfall. The green-WF is barely perceptible in the figure since it is near-zero as described in the text. The bars reflect the variability, mainly due to the differences in soil types.	69
Figure 4.9	Grey-water footprint as calculated by considering the freshwater required to dilute the leached nitrate down to the New Zealand drinking water standard of 11.3 mgNO ₃ -N/L under the different soil types and local weather zones of the Marlborough region. The bars reflect the variability, mainly induced by the local climatic differences	71
Figure 4.10	Grey-water footprint as calculated by considering the freshwater required to dilute the leached nitrate down to the New Zealand drinking water standard of 11.3 mgNO ₃ -N/L under the different soil types and local weather zones of the Gisborne region. The bars reflect the variability due to local climate	72
Figure 5.1	A scatter plot showing the relationship of the blue-water footprint calculated from the hydrological approach across the local climatic regions of vineyards within Marlborough, referenced to the local annual rainfall rates	103
Figure 6.1	A schematic diagram showing the tension fluxmeters installed under the ridge (right) and furrow (left) in the potato field. There were three sites with these paired fluxmeter set-ups	116
Figure 6.2	Extraction of drainage from the fluxmeters by connecting the tube to a vacuum pump. Each fluxmeter has two tubes to the surface: the white one to collect the water and the red for air entry and escape	117
Figure 6.3	Cumulative drainage measured from six fluxmeters over the 2011/2012 potato-growing season (03 October 2011 to 15 April 2012). The 'R' and 'F' indicate the fluxmeters located in the ridge and furrow, respectively	121
Figure 6.4	Monthly rainfall (P) and the mean drainage (D) measured from six fluxmeters over the 2011/2012 potato-growing season (3 October 2011 to 15 April 2012). The bar graph indicates precipitation (rainfall) and the line graph shows the drainage. The errors bars of the line graph indicate standard error of the mean drainage	122

Figure 6.5	Seasonal dynamics of soil water content measured using Time Domain Reflectometer (TDR) probes at different soil depths over the growing season of potatoes through to harvest. The potatoes were planted on 3 October 2011 and harvested on 15 April 2012. The break in the data was due to battery failure in data loggers	123
Figure 6.6	Monthly pattern of nitrate load leached during potato cropping 2011/2012. The bars indicate the standard errors of the mean	126
Figure 6.7	Total nitrogen (N) content of the different plant parts during potato crop development	127
Figure 6.8	The predicted change in error of drainage measurements when using increasing number of fluxmeters	129
Figure 7.1	The seed potato production process starting from tissue-cultured plantlets through to the seed potatoes used in the cultivation of ware potatoes. The seed potatoes undergo 5 generations (G 1-5) of multiplication at different rates in each generation (left)	139
Figure 7.2	The dynamics of the soil water stored in the top 90 cm of the soil profile in Manawatu sandy loam soil (Dystric Fluventic Eutrochrept) under ware-potato cultivation (2011/2012 season) as measured using the mean of eight Time Domain Reflectometry (TDR) probes (red) along with the prediction using SPASMO model (blue). Irrigation was not used	141
Figure 7.3	Monthly drainage over a year modelled for an average year (blue) and the year 2011/2012 (red) compared with the measured drainage (green). The error bars of measurements are standard errors of the mean of measurements from six fluxmeters, while bars of the average year (blue line) are standard deviation of the monthly averages over 40 years (1972-2012)	142
Figure 7.4	Images showing the surface-vented cracks, connected to the plant stems, in the soil just above one of the fluxmeters under the ridge at 12 weeks after planting	143
Figure 7.5	The modelled NO ₃ -N concentration in the drainage at 60cm for the long-term average (dashed line), and the predicted concentration over the season of 2011/12 (blue line) along with the fertilizer application spikes (red line). The measured concentrations in the drainage from the 6 fluxmeters measured over the 2011/12 growing season are shown as green dots	144
Figure 7.6	The modelled monthly NO ₃ -N load for the study year of 2011/12, and for the average year computed from the record of 40 years. The bars indicate the monthly standard error of the mean	145
Figure 7.7	The effect of different fertilizer scenarios on the grey-WF. For all scenarios, the amount of fertilizer used was 120kg-N/ha. Early application is at the time of planting, Splitx2 is half applied at planting and the rest is at ridging 28 days after planting (DAP). Splitx3 is each 1/3 of fertilizer applied at planting, 28 days and at mounding at 55 DAP. Late application is once at 55 DAP	148

Figure 7.8 The effect of different fertilizer application practices on the loads and the concentrations of nitrate leaving the root zone of ware potatoes. For all scenarios, the amount of fertilizer used was 120kg-N/ha. Early application is at the time of planting, Splitx2 is half applied at planting and the rest is at ridging 28 days after planting (DAP). Splitx3 is each 1/3 of fertilizer applied at planting, 28 DAP and mounding at 55 DAP. Late application is once at 55 DAP

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
WF	Water Footprint
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
WFN	Water Footprint Network
FU	Functional Unit
CF	Characterization Factor
FEI	Freshwater Ecosystem Impact
FD	Freshwater Depletion
ADP	Abiotic Depletion Potential
WSI	Water Stress Index
WTA	Withdrawal to Availability
ET	Evapotranspiration
GIS	Geographic Information System
SPASMO	Soil Plant Atmosphere System Model
TDR	Time Domain Reflectometer