LETTER • OPEN ACCESS

Quantifying the global cropland footprint of the European Union's non-food bioeconomy

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

Environmental Research Letters

LETTER

Quantifying the global cropland footprint of the European Union's non-food bioeconomy

Martin Bruckner[1] , Tiina Häyhä[2,3], Stefan Giljum[1] , Victor Maus[1,3] , Günther Fischer[3],
Sylvia Tramberend[3] and Jan Börner[4]

[1]   Institute for Ecological Economics, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna, Austria
[2]   Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Sweden
[3]   International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria
[4]   Institute for Food and Resource Economics, and Center for Development Research, University of Bonn, Germany

E-mail: martin.bruckner@wu.ac.at

Abstract

A rapidly growing share of global agricultural areas is devoted to the production of biomass for non-food purposes. The expanding non-food bioeconomy can have far-reaching social and ecological implications; yet, the non-food sector has attained little attention in land footprint studies. This paper provides the first assessment of the global cropland footprint of non-food products of the European Union (EU), a globally important region regarding its expanding bio-based economy. We apply a novel hybrid land flow accounting model, combining the biophysical trade model LANDFLOW with the multi-regional input–output model EXIOBASE. The developed hybrid approach improves the level of product and country detail, while comprehensively covering all global supply chains from agricultural production to final consumption, including highly processed products, such as many non-food products. The results highlight the EU's role as a major processing and the biggest consuming region of cropland-based non-food products, while at the same time relying heavily on imports. Two thirds of the cropland required to satisfy the EU's non-food biomass consumption are located in other world regions, particularly in China, the US and Indonesia, giving rise to potential impacts on distant ecosystems. With almost 39% in 2010, oilseeds used to produce for example biofuels, detergents and polymers represented the dominant share of the EU's non-food cropland demand. Traditional non-food biomass uses, such as fibre crops for textiles and animal hides and skins for leather products, also contributed notably (22%). Our findings suggest that if the EU Bioeconomy Strategy is to support global sustainable development, a detailed monitoring of land use displacement and spillover effects is decisive for targeted and effective EU policy making.

1. Introduction

Over the past 15 years, many governments and international organizations have developed strategies and initiatives to design and foster an economy that increasingly uses bio-based materials, chemicals, and renewable energy sources (OECD 2009, White House 2012, European Commission 2012a, Staffas *et al* 2013, Meyer 2017). These efforts are driven by the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel dependence, with the expectation that a bio-based

economic transformation will contribute to economic development and employment both in urban and rural regions (McCormick and Kautto 2013).

The European Union (EU) is particularly active in promoting bio-based transformations and seeks to respond to global social-environmental challenges through its Bioeconomy Strategy (European Commission 2012a). The bioeconomy has been envisioned as an important component for smart and green growth while simultaneously achieving the EU's climate and other environmental targets and the 2030

Agenda (McCormick and Kautto 2013, Scarlat *et al* 2015, Bell *et al* 2018). EU action towards increasing bio-based resource use, bioenergy in particular, has earlier roots, however. In 2003, it established the Bio-fuel Directive (2003/96/EC) to promote the use of biofuels and other renewable fuels for transport. The Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) followed in 2009 and provided the policy framework for the production and use of domestically produced and imported energy from renewable sources in the EU, including an EU-wide 20% renewable energy target as well as a 10% renewable transport fuel target for individual member countries by 2020.

The sustainability of the EU's expanding bioeconomy has also been questioned (Pfau *et al* 2014, O'Brien *et al* 2015, O'Brien *et al* 2017, Ramcilovic-Suominen and Pülzl 2018). Evidence is rising that an expanding industrial bioeconomy, for example, causes direct and indirect land use change, thereby generating greenhouse gas emissions (Searchinger *et al* 2008), and has implications for water quality and quantity (Thomas *et al* 2009). Imports of feedstock for the EU bioeconomy can thus have negative consequences for ecosystems in distant places (Deininger 2013). Based on a systematic review, Pfau *et al* (2014) found that bioeconomy should not be considered as self-evidently sustainable. They concluded that further research and policy development should pay attention to how the bioeconomy could contribute to sustainable development. Ramcilovic-Suominen and Pülzl (2018) argued that sustainability is not a core motivation of the EU Bioeconomy Strategy, in which the main emphasis is on biotechnology, eco-efficiency, competitiveness, innovation, economic output and industry, while the strategy is ambiguous about how it will contribute to sustainability. O'Brien *et al* (2017) also stressed that the sustainability of the EU's bioeconomy depends on how it is being implemented, with a particular risk being increased global land use requirements of the economy. This risk is illustrated by the fact that Europe stands out as the only world region that is a net-importer of the four major natural resource categories: materials, water, carbon and land (Tukker *et al* 2016, Häyhä *et al* 2018). With around 3000 m^2 per capita in 2010, the EU-28 had a per capita cropland footprint that was more than 40% above the global average (Tramberend *et al* 2019).

Various EU policy documents acknowledge that European production and consumption patterns cause land use-related impacts beyond Europe's borders. For example, in its Resource Efficiency Roadmap (European Commission 2011), the EU states that 'by 2020, EU policies take into account their direct and indirect impact on land use in the EU and globally' (p 15). In its 7th Environmental Action Programme (European Commission 2012b), the EU also committed to support a 'land degradation neutral world in the context of sustainable development' (p 3) and calls for targets to be set to limit land take. Directive (EU)

2015/1513 targets indirect land use change of biofuels production, aiming at a drastic reduction of unintended consequences of the EU's biofuel use on the Earth's climate (Council Directive 2015/1513/EU). Despite these policy objectives, the EU's Bioeconomy Strategy does not explicitly address resource use displacement. Moreover, the EU has so far not agreed on a common methodology to assess distant land use-related impacts of EU policies. Key indicator systems with high relevance for land, such as the Resource Efficiency Scoreboard (EUROSTAT 2015) thus focus on territorial indicators only and fail to take into account the international teleconnections (Yu *et al* 2013).

The importance of footprinting approaches has been widely acknowledged in national and regional sustainability assessments to account for possible land use displacement and leakage effects (O'Brien *et al* 2015, Liu *et al* 2018, Wiedmann and Lenzen 2018). Research so far focused on the land footprint of food consumption and of different dietary patterns (Kastner *et al* 2011, Kastner *et al* 2012, Meier and Christen 2012, Giljum *et al* 2013, Meier *et al* 2014, FoEE 2016). Some assessments of the overall land footprint of countries were also presented (Bringezu *et al* 2012, Weinzettel *et al* 2013, Yu *et al* 2013, O'Brien *et al* 2015).

However, existing studies do not further distinguish food from non-food uses and are therefore unable to assess this important part of the bioeconomy transformation. In this paper, we fill this research gap for the EU by analysing its role in the global non-food bioeconomy with a novel hybrid method, linking biophysical and monetary accounting models for assessing the non-food sector's land requirements. We include both products from plant and animal sources and apply three perspectives to assess the EU's non-food cropland footprint between 1995–2010: (1) the land use perspective (cropland use for non-food purposes), (2) the industry perspective (cropland embodied in agricultural products used in non-food manufacturing industries) and (3) the consumer perspective (cropland embodied in final consumption of non-food products).

The scope of this study is confined on the cropland footprint and thus excludes land areas related to the production of wood and wood products. Although timber is a key resource in the bioeconomy context, the calculation of land demand related to timber consumption is challenged by limited data availability regarding actual harvested forest areas—in contrast to overall forest areas (Bruckner *et al* 2015, Fischer *et al* 2017).

2. Methods: hybrid land flow accounting

Land footprint studies either use biophysical or monetary accounting models applying top-down or bottom-up methods to attribute land use to final

consumers (for a detailed review see Bruckner *et al* 2015). The present study implements a hybrid top-down accounting approach to track the demand for cropland embodied in biomass flows along global supply chains by linking the biophysical LANDFLOW model (European Commission 2013, Tramberend *et al* 2019) with the multi-regional input–output (MRIO) model EXIOBASE 3 (Stadler *et al* 2018). This hybrid method was described in detail and applied previously by Tramberend *et al* (2019).

Hybrid models are argued to 'provide more accurate results than the standard MRIO method' (Weinzettel *et al* 2014, p 115). Using the physical accounting model LANDFLOW in combination with an MRIO model substantially increases the product detail of the results, while ensuring the comprehensive coverage of all economic activities worldwide. A particular strength of the LANDFLOW model is that it specifies non-food uses of each agricultural product, which was a prerequisite for this study. By linking EXIOBASE to a biophysical accounting model, non-food flows can be traced to the final consumer, instead of being truncated and allocated to those countries, where the industrial processing takes place.

To grant full access and foster transparency, all data, R scripts, and supplementary files to reproduce this study as well as all presented maps and figures can be found on GitHub: https://github.com/fineprint-global/eu_bioeconomy_footprint/.

2.1. The applied models: LANDFLOW and EXIOBASE

LANDFLOW is a global physical biomass trade accounting model based on data from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAOSTAT 2017). It follows the approach of Kastner *et al* (2014) and uses detailed and comprehensive agricultural supply and use data (covering production, stock changes, international trade and utilization) measured in physical volumes (i.e. tons) from the FAOSTAT's Commodity Balance Sheets to set up a global tree structure for all commodity flows and tracks embodied cropland along these supply chains. For example, land used to produce soybeans is tracked from harvest via processing to final utilization. In the case of co-production, such as soybean oil and cake, land areas are split and allocated to the derived products in relation to their economic value, i.e. using price allocation.

The method not only covers crops and derived crop products, but also animal products such as milk, meat, fats and hides, among others (table S.1 in the supplementary material is available online at stacks.iop.org/ERL/14/045011/mmedia). Feed balances are estimated for ruminants and monogastrics respectively and available feed crops are allocated according to dietary and energy requirements of the two livestock groups. Once cropland areas are allocated to the two livestock groups, embodied land areas are attributed to multiple derived products (e.g. milk, meat and hides from ruminant livestock) using value shares as described for the case of soybean oil and cake.

The land embodied in products is tracked to final utilization, differentiated into food, seed, waste and other uses. The category of other uses comprises all non-food uses, including, for example, the quantities of vegetable oils used for the production of detergents, polymers and biodiesel, and meat and offal processed into pet food and pharmaceutical products (FAO 2001). In contrast to food use, the category of other uses, however, does not formally describe a final use but rather an industry use. LANDFLOW analysis thus tracks the supply chains of raw materials to the destination of industrial use but cannot track the further trade of highly processed industrial commodities. For instance, once vegetable oils enter the industrial sector to produce detergents, or cotton enters the textile industry, the further trade of detergents or textiles is not recorded in the FAO data.

Therefore, we allocated the results of the LANDFLOW model for the category of other uses, representing the land embodied in agricultural commodities when entering non-food manufacturing industries, to the respective industries of the MRIO model EXIOBASE 3 (Stadler *et al* 2018). This allowed further tracing upstream flows of non-food biomass commodities from processing industries through the global economy along monetary supply chains to the final consumers. EXIOBASE is an environmentally extended MRIO database ranging from 1995–2011 for 44 countries and five continental rest regions. Its symmetric product-by-product MRIO tables reflect the input structure for the production of 9800 products (200 products per country) and their domestic and bilateral interlinkages. MRIO models, and particularly EXIOBASE, are widely used in footprinting (see, for example, Moran and Wood 2014, Giljum *et al* 2016, Tukker *et al* 2016, Tisserant *et al* 2017, Wiedmann and Lenzen 2018). In this study, the MRIO model was used to complement the limited information on non-food supply chains in the LANDFLOW model, in order to identify the final consumer of crop-based products manufactured in industrial processes.

2.2. Linking LANDFLOW and EXIOBASE

The decisive step in linking the two models was the mapping of the non-food commodity supply from the LANDFLOW model to the using industries in the EXIOBASE MRIO model. We defined a corresponding EXIOBASE sector for each LANDFLOW commodity, e.g. the EXIOBASE sector 'Products of vegetable oils and fats' corresponds to the LANDFLOW commodity 'vegetable oils'. We then masked the uses of the outputs of this sector in the MRIO entering (domestic and foreign) non-food manufacturing industries, i.e. by removing any uses by the food industry or the service sectors. The resulting

correspondence table then delivered the monetary value of the vegetable oil uses by non-food industry (see table S.3 for a summarized representation of the correspondence tables). Based on this information, we derived industry shares and allocate the land inputs proportionally. As a result, we obtained a land use matrix **P**, with elements p_{ij} containing information on the land embodied in each agricultural product i further processed for non-food purposes by manufacturing industry j. For more details see Tramberend *et al* (2019).

The consumption footprint of cropland embodied in non-food products **F** was then calculated straight-forward by using the environmentally extended demand-driven Leontief model (Miller and Blair 2009) defined by the equation $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{E} * (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} * \mathbf{Y}$, where $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ is the Leontief inverse and **Y** is the final demand matrix showing the final demand for each product in each region. The environmental extension matrix **E** for the MRIO model was derived by dividing absolute input quantities by the respective output value of each industry: $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{P}\,\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}$.

2.3. Limitations of the methodology

There are some important limitations of the presented data and methods. Even though the data available from FAOSTAT provide full country detail for all UN member states, we run the LANDFLOW model at a more aggregated level (see table S.2). Geographical detail should therefore be improved for assessing region-specific impacts from agricultural production. Some authors even argue that an accurate assessment of impact footprints requires a trade model operating at the subnational level, particularly for big and diverse countries such as Brazil (Flach *et al* 2016, Godar *et al* 2016).

Moreover, the model currently does not allow separately reporting of final bio-based products such as biofuels, cosmetics, detergents, lubricants or biopolymers, but rather aggregated product groups such as vegetable oils, covering all products derived thereof.

2.4. Grid cell level results

We downscaled the national results for some major crops to the level of 5 arcminute grid cells (around 10 km × 10 km at the equator) using the spatial distribution of 42 crops provided by the Spatial Production Allocation Model (SPAM) v3.2 (IFPRI and IIASA 2015). In the first step, we aggregated the SPAM maps to three crop groups: (1) maize and sugarcane, (2) oil crops, and (3) fibre crops. We then allocated the EU footprint in each region to the geographically corresponding cells within that region, using the harvested area reported by SPAM to weight the allocation of the EU footprint into the SPAM grid cells. The weight ω_i^g to allocate a crop group g to a cell i is given by $\omega_i^g = a_i^g / s_r^g$, where a_i^g is the harvested area

of the crop group g in the grid cell i and s_r^g is the sum of the harvested area of the crop group g for all cells within region r. The weight in a region sums up to one. This approach does not consider subnational differences in the export shares and structure, which obviously biases the results. The downscaled results presented in this article thus should be interpreted as a probability distribution of the EU's footprint, rather than an exact localization. The detailed R codes and data used for this downscaling approach can be found in the previously indicated GitHub repository.

3. Results: EU's non-food cropland footprint

We analysed global patterns of raw material producers, processors and consumers of bio-based non-food products. Here we describe the results for the development of the EU's cropland footprint of non-food products between 1995–2010 as well as its geographical and product composition. Further results and illustrations, illustrating for example changes over time, can be found in the supplementary material, including the global cropland requirements for non-food products in different world regions (table S.4 and figure S.2) and the changes over time of the non-food cropland footprint of the EU (figure S.1) and other world regions (figure S.3).

3.1. Global flows of embodied non-food cropland

The primary production perspective on the left side of figure 1 shows the land areas used for production of crops and livestock for non-food purposes. The harvested biomass is then further processed by industries, such as the chemical, the rubber or the textile industries. These processing steps may be located in the same country, or may import feedstock from other countries. The processing phase can have many steps. Figure 1 shows the amounts of embodied cropland requirements when the products first enter the processing phase in non-food manufacturing industries. Finally, the end-products are consumed by individuals or governments, or are put on stock for use in the following years. Again, consumers may be located in the country of production or processing, or the final products may be exported to be consumed in other world regions. Note that the aggregated totals of embodied land are identical in all three parts of the Sankey diagram.

The EU-28 is a major processor and the biggest consumer region of non-food cropland, but ranks only fifth among the largest crop producing regions. Consequently, the EU is a major net-importer of embodied cropland (figure S.4).

The cropland area within the EU used for non-food purposes increased from 10.4–14.6 Mha between 1995–2010 (table S.4). The latter accounted for about

Figure 1. Global flows of embodied cropland associated with the international trade with non-food products in 2010. The left hand side of the Sankey diagram shows the cropland use in each region for the cultivation of crops later on used for non-food purposes. In the middle, we see the land embodied in crops and derived products used in industrial manufacturing processes. Finally, the right hand side of the graph depicts the land embodied in the final consumption of non-food products such as textiles or biofuels in each region.

8% of the global non-food agricultural area in 2010. Oil crops were the most dominant crop type (43%), with rapeseed and sunflower being the most dominant plants. Animal products, such as hides and skins, also played a notable role reaching 31% of total non-food cropland area in the EU in 2010.

The EU also has a significant processing industry with around a quarter of the required raw materials and related land use being imported from other world regions. In particular, vegetable oils for biofuel, polymer and detergent production were imported from Indonesia and other Asian countries. In 2010, the EU's processing industry required 19.8 Mha of cropland. Most of the processing output served consumption within the EU itself. In addition, processed products were imported from all other world regions, including China (4.4 Mha; primarily embodied in oleochemical products), Rest of Asia-Pacific (3 Mha; vegetable oils and rubber) and the USA (1.6 Mha; primarily maize and ethanol).

The EU was the largest consuming region in absolute terms with 28.2 Mha in 2010 followed by China (27.7 Mha). In relation to population, Australia leads the ranking (1199 m^2/capita) followed by the USA (828 m^2/capita), Canada (807 m^2/capita), the EU (562 m^2/capita) and Brazil (468 m^2/capita). In comparison, the average non-food cropland demand in India was only 75 m^2/capita (see figure S.2 and table S.6). From 1995 to 2010, the overall cropland footprint of the EU's consumption of non-food products increased by 23% from around 23–28 Mha, after

reaching a peak in the year 2007 with 31.5 Mha (see figure S.3).

3.2. Non-food cropland footprint of the EU

While the vast majority (86%) of cropland embodied in the EU's food consumption in 2010 stemmed from the EU itself (Fischer *et al* 2017), for the case of non-food products only 35% (9.9 Mha) were based on domestic land resources (table S.5). The remaining 65% of the cropland (18.3 Mha) was imported from outside the EU-28 (figure 2). Large amounts of embodied land (7.3 Mha) were also imported to serve manufacturing processes in the EU.

With 2.7 Mha of embodied land, China was a major supplying country for the EU, accounting for almost 10% of the EU's non-food cropland footprint, mainly in the form of oil crops, maize, and fibre crops, or products derived therefrom (figure 2 and table S.5). Indonesia, with 2 Mha, also provided large areas, largely related to palm and coconut oil. The group Rest of Asia-Pacific, including Malaysia, Bangladesh, the Philippines and Thailand, among others, supplied Europe particularly with vegetable oils, rubber, fibre crops and non-food alcohol. Northern America also played an important role as an exporter of maize for industrial uses (e.g. in the form of starch or ethanol).

In 2010, more than one third of the EU's cropland footprint for non-food products was related to vegetable oils and oil crops, which are mainly consumed in the form of biofuels, detergents, lubricants and

Figure 2. Global cropland footprint of the EU's *consumption of non-food products* in 2010, by producing region and commodity, *x*-label in million hectares, *y*-label in percentage shares, values inside the figure in thousand hectares. EU-28 = European Union, EUR = Rest of Europe, AFR = Africa, NAM = Northern America, LAM = Latin America, ASI = Asia.

polymers (FNR 2014). This is more than double the embodied land of this category in 1995. Increasing consumption of vegetable oils was a main determinant for the overall growth of the EU non-food cropland footprint.

3.3. Spatially explicit footprint maps
Figure 3 provides a probability distribution of the EU's footprint over a 5 arcminute grid for selected crops: (a) maize and sugarcane, which together represent more than 90% of the global ethanol feedstock and in addition are used for material purposes e.g. in the production of adhesives or bioplastics; (b) oil crops, which is the biggest crop category in the EU's non-food cropland footprint; and (c) fibre crops, mainly represented by cotton used in the textile industry.

Spatially explicit footprint maps allow identifying regional hotspots, such as the maize plantations in the Great Plains of the US, sugarcane in south-central Brazil, or cotton in the big river basins of Pakistan. Consistent spatially explicit supply chain and footprint assessments are essential to fully capture the spatio-temporal heterogeneity of biomass production and related impacts, such as deforestation, biodiversity loss or water scarcity, which differ greatly between production regions.

Another noticeable aspect is the change in composition of the EU non-food cropland footprint between 1995–2010 (figure S.1). While in 1995, crop products contributed 63% to the overall land footprint of the EU bioeconomy, this share increased to 80% in 2010. This includes increasing quantities of cereals, non-food alcohol (mainly from maize and sugarcane) and vegetable oils for fuel and material use. In contrast, the cropland area related to the consumption of animal products, such as hides and skins, showed a declining trend.

4. Discussion

4.1. Social and environmental implications
Our results emphasize that particular attention should be given to the non-food sector, as it is the main driver of growing biomass demand, in recent years particularly due to increasing vegetable oil demand for fuel use. The EU's high external non-food land footprint indicates that a big part of the environmental impacts related with the EU's consumption occur in other world regions. Our findings show that the EU increasingly sources non-food biomass feedstocks from tropical regions, which have been identified as hotspots of both deforestation and biodiversity loss (Sodhi *et al* 2004, Koh and Wilcove 2008).

While the production-based approach measures territorial land use, the consumption perspective brings in the global socio-economic dynamics. Literature indicates that the EU's consumption-based

Figure 3. EU's non-food related cropland use outside the EU in hectares per grid cell for (a) maize and sugarcane, (b) oil crops, and (c) fibre crops. The colour scale indicates the number of hectares of cropland used by the EU in each grid cell (5 arcminutes).

cropland use is already beyond a globally equitable limit (Bringezu *et al* 2012, O'Brien *et al* 2015, O'Neill 2015, Tukker *et al* 2016, Häyhä *et al* 2018). Anthropogenic land modification, in particular deforestation, has already transgressed the planetary boundary for land system change, causing increasing pressure on climate and biodiversity (Steffen *et al* 2015, Campbell *et al* 2017). Many global energy and land use scenarios envision that the systemic change towards a bio-based economy will be more heavily

reliant on terrestrial ecosystems and land resources (e.g. Lotze-Campen *et al* 2010; Popp *et al* 2014, Schipfer *et al* 2017, Di Fulvio *et al* 2019). The expanding bioeconomy will then add to the already high land demand for food supply, resulting in growing pressure on planetary boundaries. This relates closely to issues of global justice when it comes to a fair distribution of biophysical resources (Häyhä *et al* 2016).

Assessments of social and environmental impacts related to the consumption of bio-based commodities are

usually focussing on certain products or regions. Only few studies conducted comprehensive consumption-based assessments of certain impacts with global coverage of all traded products. The model approach presented in this article facilitates the analysis of impacts from a consumption perspective. Potential environmental impacts to be studied include, for example, increased water scarcity (Mekonnen and Hoekstra 2016) and nutrient pollution (Zhang *et al* 2014), but also potential negative climate impacts, in particular due to deforestation in tropical regions (Achard *et al* 2014; Lawrence and Vandecar 2015), driven by a growing demand for raw materials for the bioeconomy (Sheppard *et al* 2011). Social impacts may arise due to the dislocation of vulnerable socio-demographic groups in developing countries, such as subsistence farmers with unclear land access rights (McMichael 2012), and the commodification of land and food crops (Birch *et al* 2010).

There is a need to analyse pathways for reducing negative impacts of the bioeconomy, for example by optimizing feedstock composition or sourcing from world regions with favourable social and environmental production conditions, including the partial substitution of globally sourced biomass by local or regionally produced alternatives (Kpdonou and Barbier 2012, Priefer *et al* 2017). However, as responsible consumers pull out of producer regions with questionable impacts, voids will eventually be filled by others, if incentives prevail.

4.2. Economic implications

At the current level of the model's geographical aggregation, most countries and world regions are net-exporters of biomass for non-food use and related land areas between the steps of primary production and processing, implying that a part of the involved manufacturing processes (and related value added) does not take place in the producer country of the raw material. For example, in 2010, Brazil produced crops destined for non-food uses on around 11.7 Mha. However, Brazilian industries only processed crops equivalent to around 9.2 Mha. This means that products equivalent to an area of around 2.5 Mha were exported to processing industries in other countries and regions. This pattern is even more pronounced in Indonesia, where the domestic industry processed only around half of the primary products produced within Indonesia (7.8 Mha compared to 14 Mha). Indonesia is a major exporter of palm oil and other non-food products, most notably to the EU and the region 'Rest of Asia-Pacific'. These results have implications for ongoing debates about the economic benefits of developing and emerging economies engaging in global value chains (GVCs). Studies have illustrated that participation of these countries in GVCs can have positive economic impacts, e.g. through dissemination and uptake of new technologies, but results are particularly positive when combined with an upgrading of exports (UNCTAD 2013).

The adoption of bioeconomy strategies in an increasing number of countries, including import-dependent regions, such as the EU, offers new options for value creation in developing countries (Dietz *et al* 2018). However, the key challenge will be to ensure that value addition through processing will take place in the countries of production (Virchow *et al* 2016). The results illustrated above suggest that—from the perspective of biomass producer countries—there is still significant room for increasing domestic upgrading of biomass exports and develop a biomass export portfolio oriented towards higher value added products.

The mismatch between domestic production on the one hand and industry demand for crops for material and energy uses on the other hand will likely grow in the future. The industry perspective can be expected to further gain importance, considering the fact that the share of agriculture on the value added of food supply chains is decreasing while the share of processing industries continues growing, as documented by the European Commission (2009). The economic (and environmental) benefits and costs of a global bioeconomy transformation will therefore likely be geographically unevenly distributed as countries have largely varying competitive advantages for the production and processing of bio-based materials.

Besides socio-ecological considerations, the vulnerability of export crop production to climate change in some major supplying countries (Vörösmarty *et al* 2005, McGregor *et al* 2016) also puts highly import-dependent economies at risk of supply constraints.

4.3. Methodological considerations

Given the far-reaching global implications of an expanding European bioeconomy, robust methods and indicators need to be developed and applied, to comprehensively assess Europe's resource use as well as the related environmental and social impacts.

This paper contributes to advancing land footprint accounting and demonstrates a hybrid approach integrating the biophysical accounting method with the EXIOBASE MRIO model. As discussed extensively in the earlier literature (Vringer *et al* 2010, Liang and Zhang 2013, Schoer *et al* 2013, Weinzettel *et al* 2014, Bruckner *et al* 2015), a hybrid footprint model allows to increase product and country detail, and (partially) avoids the assumption of unique sector prices. At the same time, the model keeps a comprehensive coverage of the entire economy including all manufacturing industries and service sectors, and considers non-market commodity flows. To exploit the full potential of hybrid methods, the highest possible level of country and commodity detail provided by FAO statistics should be used. Adding more spatial and product detail will be an important task for future modelling, as yields and environmental impacts may differ largely within product and country groups, thus introducing an avoidable aggregation error.

Moreover, there is still significant room and need to expand the presented method by including other biomass commodities of key importance (e.g. timber and forest areas). Furthermore, current statistics from the FAO and EXIOBASE do not allow to explicitly separate bioenergy (e.g. biodiesel and ethanol) from biomaterial uses (e.g. detergents, adhesives, polymers). Industry data could help refine the model for addressing more detailed research questions.

Alternative accounting approaches based on economy-wide material flow analysis (ew-MFA) can reach far greater level of product detail than the present study. O'Brien *et al* (2015), for example, calculate the land footprint of the EU accounting for a list of 991 commodities, including both food and non-food products. The ew-MFA method basically accounts for imports and exports of all commodities and, in the case of the land footprint, converts them into land equivalents, i.e. the area required for their production. For this conversion, data from Life Cycle Assessment studies and process analyses are used to derive land use coefficients in hectares per ton of product. While being the most detailed method in terms of products, the regional resolution of ew-MFA studies is very limited, as it is not possible to specify the country of origin of the raw materials, consequently not being able to consider differences in yields or local environmental impacts.

Finally, cropland footprints are only a part of a much larger puzzle that involves the quantification and equitable sharing of the costs and benefits associated with the production and consumption of biomass-based commodities. Footprinting methods thus need to be downscaled from national to local levels to account for regional differences and dynamics in the socio-environmental conditions that determine biomass production and its impacts in producer regions (Godar *et al* 2015, Flach *et al* 2016, Godar *et al* 2016, Kanemoto *et al* 2016, Moran and Kanemoto 2016, 2017).

4.4. Governance implications

Our results clearly indicate a growing demand for non-food bio-based products. This means that cropland demand is increasingly driven by other than traditional food value chains, including more complex or completely new value chains that emerge in response to new biomass applications (Philp *et al* 2013). Moreover, biomass production may gradually shift from traditional sources in the Americas and South East Asia to new agricultural frontiers with lower governance capacities in Africa (Gasparri *et al* 2016). Hence, better information and transparency about the socio-economic and environmental benefits and costs associated with globally traded biomass will become key to inform the increasing number of value-chain based governance initiatives (Gardner *et al* 2018). Key governance challenges include substitution

effects between value chains with heterogeneous levels of regulation or regulatory enforcement that can lead to environmentally costly indirect land use change (Arima *et al* 2011). Hybrid footprinting approaches with high spatial and temporal resolution can help to address this challenge by serving as early warning systems, when biomass sourcing patterns shift to regions or value chains that exhibit severe governance gaps.

5. Conclusions

To date the literature on land footprints has not separated food and non-food applications of crops and derived products. In this paper, we assessed, for the first time, global patterns of land demand for non-food products from a production, processing and consumption perspective, with a focus on Europe's role in the global non-food biomass trade. The analysis highlighted the increasing importance of non-food products, being the fastest growing source of direct and indirect demand for agricultural land in the EU, as well as globally. The dependence of EU consumption on foreign land areas for the non-food sector is striking. While 86% of the land used to satisfy European food demand is located in Europe, only 35% of the land providing non-food products to the region is cultivated within the EU, resulting in net imports of up to 18 Mha yr^{-1}. The expanding European bioeconomy is thus highly dependent on agricultural areas in other world regions, most notably in Asia.

From the methodological perspective, this paper builds on the ongoing discussion about the robustness of land footprints and potentials for further improving the currently used accounting methods. With the novel hybrid model, we were able to trace the non-food flows until the final consumer, without truncating these flows, as done in biophysical accounting models. Moreover, it allowed us to increase the level of product detail and to avoid the assumption of homogeneous prices as implicit in monetary MRIO models. At current data availability, only the hybrid accounting method is capable of combining high product detail with comprehensiveness of economic supply chains, particularly when it comes to manufacturing industries and service sectors. Therefore, we suggest that future studies aiming at quantifying land use-related footprints, such as the biodiversity footprint, should use a hybrid accounting approach.

We argued that the EU's bioeconomy should be assessed not only territorially but from a global consumption-based perspective. Our findings showed that the non-food sector is attaining a growing importance in the EU's bioeconomy—as well as globally. Europe plays a crucial role in determining global developments as it is the biggest consuming region of non-food biomass products (measured in cropland area) and also the largest

net-importer. If the European bioeconomy were to promote sustainable development at global scale, tools need to be in place that monitor trade-induced land use spillover and displacement effects that emanate from the region's energy, agricultural, and bioeconomy policy programs.

Environmental footprint measures, such as the land footprint, together with global environmental targets, can guide the EU in its process of implementing the Sustainable Development Goals, and provide the data basis to monitor and review progress.

Acknowledgments

ORCID iDs

Martin Bruckner ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1405-7951
Tiina Häyhä ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9462-0408
Stefan Giljum ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4719-5867
Victor Maus ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7385-4723
Jan Börner ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3034-5360

References

Achard F *et al* 2014 Determination of tropical deforestation rates and related carbon losses from 1990 to 2010 *Glob. Change Biol.* **20** 2540–54

Arima E Y *et al* 2011 Statistical confirmation of indirect land use change in the brazilian amazon *Environ. Res. Lett.* **6** 024010

Bell J *et al* 2018 EU ambition to build the world's leading bioeconomy—uncertain times demand innovative and sustainable solutions *New Biotechnol.* **40** 25–30

Birch K *et al* 2010 Sustainable capital? The neoliberalization of nature and knowledge in the European 'knowledge-based bio-economy' *Sustainability* **2** 2898

Bringezu S *et al* 2012 Beyond biofuels: assessing global land use for domestic consumption of biomass: a conceptual and empirical contribution to sustainable management of global resources *Land Use Policy* **29** 224–32

Bruckner M *et al* 2015 Measuring telecouplings in the global land system: a review and comparative evaluation of land footprint accounting methods *Ecol. Econ.* **114** 11–21

Campbell B M *et al* 2017 Agriculture production as a major driver of the Earth system exceeding planetary boundaries *Ecol. Soc.* **22** art 8

Deininger K 2013 Global land investments in the bio-economy: evidence and policy implications *Agric. Econ.* **44** 115–27

Dietz T *et al* 2018 Governance of the bioeconomy: a global comparative study of national bioeconomy strategies *Sustainability* **10** 3190

Di Fulvio F *et al* 2019 Spatially explicit LCA analysis of biodiversity losses due to different bioenergy policies in the European Union *Sci. Total Environ.* **651** 1505–16

European Commission 2009 *A Better Functioning Food Supply Chain in Europe* (Brussels: European Commission) vol SEC (2009) 1445

European Commission 2011 *Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe* (Brussels: European Commission)

European Commission 2012a *Innovating for Sustainable Growth: A Bioeconomy for Europe* (Brussels: DG Research and Innovation) vol COM(2012) 60

European Commission 2012b Living well, within the limits of our planet *7th EAP—The new general Union Environment Action Programme to 2020* ( ) (Brussels)

European Commission 2013 The impact of EU consumption on deforestation: Comprehensive analysis of the impact of EU consumption on deforestation *DG ENV Technical Report* 2013-063 European Commission, Brussels

European Council 2015 Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 September 2015 amending Directive 98/70/EC relating to the quality of petrol and diesel fuels and amending Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources 2015/1513/EU The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union, Brussels

EUROSTAT 2015 *EU Resource Efficiency Scoreboard 2015* (Luxembourg: Statistical Office of the European Communities)

FAO 2001 *Food Balance Sheets. A Handbook* (Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations)

FAOSTAT 2017 *FAO Statistical Databases: Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, Nutrition* (Rome: Statistics Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (http://faostat.fao.org/)

Fischer G *et al* 2017 *Quantifying the Land Footprint of Germany and the EU Using a Hybrid Accounting Model* (Dessau: German Federal Environment Agency) UBA-FB-002497/2

Flach R *et al* 2016 Towards more spatially explicit assessments of virtual water flows: linking local water use and scarcity to global demand of Brazilian farming commodities *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 075003

FNR 2014 Marktanalyse Nachwachsende Rohstoffe *Schriftenreihe Nachwachsende Rohstoffe 34* Fachagentur Nachwachsende Rohstoffe (FNR) (http://fnr.de/marktanalyse/marktanalyse.pdf)

FoEE 2016 *The True Costs of Consumption. The EU's Land Footprint* (Brussels: Friends of the Earth Europe)

Gardner T A *et al* 2018 Transparency and sustainability in global commodity supply chains *World Dev.* accepted (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.05.025)

Gasparri N I *et al* 2016 The emerging soybean production frontier in Southern Africa: conservation challenges and the role of South-South telecouplings *Conservation Lett.* **9** 21–31

Giljum S *et al* 2013 *Land Footprint Scenarios. A literature Review and Scenario Analysis on the Land Use Related to Changes in Europe's Consumption Patterns.* (Brussels: Friends of the Earth Europe)

Giljum S *et al* 2016 Identifying priority areas for European resource policies: a MRIO-based material footprint assessment *J. Econ. Struct.* **5** art 17

Godar J *et al* 2015 Towards more accurate and policy relevant footprint analyses: tracing fine-scale socio-environmental impacts of production to consumption *Ecol. Econ.* **112** 25–35

Godar J *et al* 2016 Balancing detail and scale in assessing transparency to improve the governance of agricultural commodity supply chains *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 035015

Häyhä T *et al* 2016 From planetary boundaries to national fair shares of the global safe operating space—how can the scales be bridged? *Glob. Environ. Change* **40** 60–72

Häyhä T 2018 Operationalizing the concept of a safe operating space at the EU level—first steps and explorations *Stockholm Resilience Centre Technical Report* July 2018 Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency and Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Sweden

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) 2015 Global Spatially-Disaggregated Crop Production Statistics Data for 2005 Version 3.2, Harvard Dataverse, V9 (https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DHXBJX)

Kanemoto K *et al* 2016 Mapping the carbon footprint of nations *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **50** 10512–7

Kastner T *et al* 2011 Tracing distant environmental impacts of agricultural products from a consumer perspective *Ecol. Econ.* **70** 1032–40

Kastner T *et al* 2012 Global changes in diets and the consequences for land requirements for food *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **109** 6868–72

Kastner T *et al* 2014 Rapid growth in agricultural trade: effects on global area efficiency and the role of management *Environ. Res. Lett.* **9** 034015

Koh L P and Wilcove D S 2008 Is oil palm agriculture really destroying tropical biodiversity? *Conservation Lett.* **1** 60–4

Kpdonou R and Barbier B 2012 The world towards bioeconomy, and Africa towards a reserve for biobased feedstock *The political economy of the bio-economy: biotechnology and biofuel The 16th Int. Consortium on Applied Bioeconomy Research Conf., 128th European Association of Agricultural Economists Seminar (Ravello, Italy, 24–27 June 2012)*

Lawrence D and Vandecar K 2015 Effects of tropical deforestation on climate and agriculture *Nat. Clim. Change* **5** 27–36

Liang S and Zhang T 2013 Investigating reasons for differences in the results of environmental, physical, and hybrid input–output models *J. Ind. Ecol.* **17** 432–9

Liu J *et al* 2018 Spillover systems in a telecoupled anthropocene: typology, methods, and governance for global sustainability *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **33** 58–69

Lotze-Campen H *et al* 2010 Scenarios of global bioenergy production: The trade-offs between agricultural expansion, intensification and trade *Ecol. Modelling* **221** 2188–96

McCormick K and Kautto N 2013 The bioeconomy in Europe: an overview *Sustainability* **5** 2589–608

McGregor A *et al* 2016 Vulnerability of export commodities to climate change ed M Taylor *et al Vulnerability of Pacific Island Agriculture and Forestry to Climate Change* (Auckland: Secretariat of the Pacific Community, SPC) pp 239–93

McMichael P 2012 The land grab and corporate food regime restructuring *J. Peasant Stud.* **39** 681–701

Meier T and Christen O 2012 Environmental Impacts of dietary recommendations and dietary styles: Germany as an example *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **47** 877–88

Meier T *et al* 2014 Balancing virtual land imports by a shift in the diet. using a land balance approach to assess the sustainability of food consumption. Germany as an example *Appetite* **74** 20–34

Mekonnen M M and Hoekstra A Y 2016 Four billion people facing severe water scarcity *Sci. Adv.* **2** e1500323

Meyer R 2017 Bioeconomy strategies: contexts, visions, guiding implementation principles and resulting debates *Sustainability* **9** 1031

Miller R E and Blair P D 2009 *Input–Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Moran D and Kanemoto K 2016 Tracing global supply chains to air pollution hotspots *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 094017

Moran D and Kanemoto K 2017 Identifying species threat hotspots from global supply chains *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1** 0023

Moran D and Wood R 2014 Convergence between the Eora, WIOD, EXIOBASE, and OpenEU's consumption-based carbon accounts *Econ. Syst. Res.* **26** 245–61

O'Brien M *et al* 2015 The land footprint of the EU bioeconomy: monitoring tools, gaps and needs *Land Use Policy* **47** 235–46

O'Brien M *et al* 2017 Toward a systemic monitoring of the European bioeconomy: gaps, needs and the integration of sustainability indicators and targets for global land use *Land Use Policy* **66** 162–71

OECD 2009 *The Bioeconomy to 2030: Designing a Policy Agenda, Main Findings* (Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development)

O'Neill D W 2015 The proximity of nations to a socially sustainable steady-state economy *J. Cleaner Prod.* **108** 1213–31

Pfau S *et al* 2014 Visions of sustainability in bioeconomy research *Sustainability* **6** 1222–49

Philp J C *et al* 2013 Biobased chemicals: the convergence of green chemistry with industrial biotechnology *Trends Biotechnol.* **31** 219–22

Popp A *et al* 2014 Land-use transition for bioenergy and climate stabilization: model comparison of drivers, impacts and interactions with other land use based mitigation options *Clim. Change* **123** 495–509

Priefer C *et al* 2017 Pathways to shape the bioeconomy *Resources* **6** art 10

Ramcilovic-Suominen S and Pülzl H 2018 Sustainable development —a 'selling point' of the emerging EU bioeconomy policy framework? *J. Cleaner Prod.* **172** 4170–80

Scarlat N *et al* 2015 The role of biomass and bioenergy in a future bioeconomy: policies and facts *Environ. Dev.* **15** 3–34

Schipfer F *et al* 2017 Advanced biomaterials scenarios for the EU28 up to 2050 and their respective biomass demand *Biomass Bioenergy* **96** 19–27

Schoer K *et al* 2013 Estimating raw material equivalents on a macro-level: comparison of multi-regional input–output analysis and hybrid LCI-IO *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **47** 14282–9

Searchinger T *et al* 2008 Use of US croplands for biofuels increases greenhouse gases through emissions from land-use change *Science* **319** 1238–40

Sheppard A W *et al* 2011 Biosecurity and sustainability within the growing global bioeconomy *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **3** 4–10

Sodhi N S *et al* 2004 Southeast Asian biodiversity: an impending disaster *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **19** 654–60

Stadler K *et al* 2018 EXIOBASE 3: developing a time series of detailed environmentally extended multi-regional input–output tables *J. Ind. Ecol.* **22** 502–15

Staffas L *et al* 2013 Strategies and policies for the bioeconomy and bio-based economy: an analysis of official national approaches *Sustainability* **5** 2751–69

Steffen W *et al* 2015 Planetary boundaries: guiding human development on a changing planet *Science* **347** 1259855

Thomas M A *et al* 2009 Water quality impacts of corn production to meet biofuel demands *J. Environ. Eng.* **135** 1123–35

Tisserant A *et al* 2017 Solid waste and the circular economy: a global analysis of waste treatment and waste footprints *J. Ind. Ecol.* **21** 628–40

Tramberend S *et al* 2019 Our common cropland: quantifying global agricultural land use from a consumption perspective *Ecol. Econ.* **157** 332–41

Tukker A *et al* 2016 Environmental and resource footprints in a global context: Europe's structural deficit in resource endowments *Glob. Environ. Change* **40** 171–81

UNCTAD 2013 Global value chains and development *Investment And Value Added Trade in the Global Economy* (Geneva: UNCTAD)

Virchow D *et al* 2016 Biomass-based value webs: a novel perspective for emerging bioeconomies in Sub-Saharan Africa *Technological and Institutional Innovations for Marginalized Smallholders in Agricultural Development* (Berlin: Springer) pp 225–38

Vörösmarty C J *et al* 2005 Geospatial indicators of emerging water stress: an application to Africa *AMBIO: J. Hum. Environ.* **34** 230–6

Vringer K *et al* 2010 A hybrid multi-region method (HMR) for assessing the environmental impact of private consumption *Ecol. Econ.* **69** 2510–6

Weinzettel J *et al* 2013 Affluence drives the global displacement of land use *Glob. Environ. Change* **23** 433–8

Weinzettel J *et al* 2014 Ecological footprint of nations: comparison of process analysis, and standard and hybrid multiregional input–output analysis *Ecol. Econ.* **101** 115–26

White House 2012 *National Bioeconomy Blueprint* (Washington, DC: White House)

Wiedmann T and Lenzen M 2018 Environmental and social footprints of international trade *Nat. Geosci.* **11** 314–21

Yu Y *et al* 2013 Tele-connecting local consumption to global land use *Glob. Environ. Change* **23** 1178–86

Zhang Y *et al* 2014 Tracing nitrate pollution sources and transformation in surface- and ground-waters using environmental isotopes *Sci. Total Environ.* **490** 213–22