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1.1 INTRODUCTION

The agri-food chain consumes about one third of the world’s energy production with about 12% for crop production and nearly 80% for processing, distribution, retail, preparation and cooking (Fig. 1.1) (FAO, 2011b). The agri-food chain also accounts for 80–90% of total global freshwater use (Hoff, 2011) where 70% is for irrigation alone. Additionally, on a global scale, freshwater production consumes nearly 15% of the entire energy production (IEA, 2012). It can therefore be argued that making agriculture and the agri-food supply chain independent from fossil fuel use has huge potential to contribute to global food security and climate protection not only for the next decades, but also for the coming century. Provision of secure, accessible and environmentally sustainable supplies of water, energy and food must thus be a priority.

One of the major objectives of the world’s scientists, farmers, decision-makers and industrialists is to overcome the present dependence on fossil fuels in the agri-food sector. This dependency increases the volatility of food prices and affects economic access to sustenance. For example, Figure 1.2 shows the close interrelationship between the crude oil price index and the cereals price index. An increasing energy demand for cultivation is particularly important in regions

![Figure 1.1. Direct and indirect energy inputs in the food sector (FAO, 2011b).](image)
with expanding irrigated agriculture using pumped water. This translates to a food-related risk to energy security.

The development and commercialization of renewable energy sources such as solar, wind and geothermal provides great potential to reduce costs in the agri-food sector. For instance, in addition to power generation, the main uses of geothermal waters are for space heating, district heating, spas balneology, aquaculture and greenhouse heating (Lund and Boyd, 2015). However, much work remains to be done to make better use of renewable energy in the agri-food sector.

The aim of this introductory chapter is to critically review recent developments in solar, wind and geothermal energy applications in agriculture and the agri-food sector such as processing, distribution, retail, preparation and cooking.

1.2 ENERGY DEMANDS IN AGRICULTURE

1.2.1 Energy use in agriculture

Agriculture and food systems rely on a variety of energy sources, including renewable and non-renewable resources—such as fossil fuels—as well as human and animal labor. At present, fossil fuels, in their various forms, supply most of the energy required by agriculture that feeds the world (Maraseni et al., 2015). Food production is an increasingly energy-demanding sector and is needed in all stages of the agri-food chain. In many cases, energy costs may represent a significant proportion of the total agricultural production input cost, including the price of irrigation, as well as the outlay of manufacturing and transportation of various chemicals and fertilizers.

Energy is used both on-farm and off-farm. It can be further divided into direct energy used, i.e. the fuel and electricity consumed, and the indirect energy (embodied energy) involved in the manufacturing of all other inputs, such as equipment and agro-chemicals (Chen et al., 2010). Direct energy may be consumed in three major forms on farms: (i) general electricity usage for lighting, appliances, irrigation; (ii) fuel use for machinery, tractors and vehicles; and (iii) heating/cooling for industries such as dairy, horticulture, piggeries and poultry. In field crops, irrigation energy may account for up to 85% of total direct energy use (Maraseni et al., 2015). With the new technologies currently under development, Renewable Energy (RE) with its rapidly falling costs, is being increasingly employed in agriculture.

1.2.2 The energy management process

Energy audits are a crucial part of farm energy management (Chen and Baillie, 2009a). This type of audit refers to the systematic examination of a farm, facility or site, to determine whether, and to
what extent, it has used energy efficiently. An energy review determines how efficiently it is being used. It also identifies energy cost-saving opportunities and highlights potential improvements in productivity and quality. An energy check may also assess potential savings through strategies such as fuel switching, tariff negotiation and demand-side management (e.g., by changing to alternative farming systems and farm layouts). An energy assessment may be undertaken as part of a broader plan to manage production inputs on-farm (Chen and Baillie, 2009a). The objectives of energy audits include:

- Conserve energy inputs.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Achieve operational and cost efficiencies with improved productivity and profitability.

Extensive research has been conducted on both energy use and conservation in agriculture. Recent results of energy efficiency programs have shown considerable variation in energy use between different crops as well as different farms of similar production systems (Chen et al., 2015). Pellizzi et al. (1988) found that in Europe, the range of field energy consumption for wheat-like cereals varied from 2.5–4.3 GJ ha\(^{-1}\). For cotton, a study by Chen and Baillie (2009b) showed that the direct energy inputs for cotton production in Australia ranged from 3.7–15.2 GJ ha\(^{-1}\). Diesel energy inputs ranged from 95–365 L ha\(^{-1}\), with most farms using between 120–180 L ha\(^{-1}\). Dryland cotton was at the lower end of this range. The direct on-farm energy use of some nurseries may be up to 20,000 GJ ha\(^{-1}\) (Chen et al., 2015).

1.3 THE WATER-ENERGY-FOOD-CLIMATE NEXUS

Agricultural productivity largely depends on the availability of water, energy and land resources. In the past, the agriculture sector enjoyed increasing productivity and was thus able to feed the growing world population. For example, in 2016, the world cereal production was 2,526 Mt (million metric tons) compared with 2000 Mt in 2006 (FAO, 2016). However, the agriculture industry in the 21st century faces numerous challenges. It must feed a rapidly increasing population with a depleting availability of resources (FAO, 2013; Haddeland et al., 2014). At the same time it needs to adapt to a changing climate and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Kulak et al., 2013). Therefore, acclimatizing to climate transformation and the necessity to increase agricultural productivity with minimum use of these resources is a major requirement of the 21st century (Jackson et al., 2010).

It can be argued that the irrigation industry is a significant contributor to the global economy. However, the industry is currently under pressure to cut water use as an adaptation to a reduction in water availability owing to climate variability and change, and competition from other sectors including demands for environmental water (Ward et al., 2006). The conversion of less efficient flood irrigation systems to more efficient pressurized irrigation systems has been heralded as one way of increasing water use efficiency and creating water savings (Mushtaq et al., 2013). However, pressurized irrigation systems may alter patterns of on-farm energy consumption and may increase cropping intensity. More intensive land use might involve more fuel, farm machinery and agrochemicals, and the production, packaging, transportation and application of these also requires significant energy resources, leading to an increase in GHG emissions (Maraseni and Cockfield, 2011a,b; 2012; Maraseni et al., 2012a; 2012b).

This suggests that there is a potential conflict in terms of mitigation and adaptation policies, and thus warrants a comprehensive and robust investigation. There is very little research in this important policy area. Topak et al. (2005) and Baillie (2009) have compared the energy consumption of various irrigation systems, but these studies failed to provide a complete picture as they did not analyze soil carbon, GHG emissions associated with the use of primary farm inputs, or water consumption and GHG implications of more intensive cropping systems. Similarly, Maraseni et al. (2012a; 2012b) tried to assess GHGs and water saving implications of converting flood irrigation systems into pressurized irrigation systems through five case studies (three cotton,
one lettuce and one lucerne) in southern Queensland, Australia. Yet, these studies considered only one crop and did not assess all crops in a rotation. Even within the same irrigation technology, the level of farm inputs (i.e. fuels, agrochemicals, machinery) and thus the energy consumption and GHG emissions due to production, consumption and use of those farm inputs, could vary significantly between crops in a rotation. A farmer may employ more agrochemicals in a first crop with the intention to use less in the following crop. Therefore, comprehensive studies of water and energy consumption, across full cropping rotations covering a wide geographical area, are necessary.

1.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CARBON FOOTPRINT OF AGRICULTURE

1.4.1 Sources of greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture

Agriculture and food systems play an important role in climate change because of their significant energy use and also as a potential source for RE such as bio-ethanol and bio-diesel. Overall, the main sources of emissions in agricultural production are (Chen et al., 2010):

- Emissions from energy used to power various machinery and processes which may include both the on-farm and post-farm activities.
- Emissions from energy used to produce agricultural inputs such as fertilizers and pesticides (i.e. pre-farm).
- Direct soil emissions or sequestration in soil (on-farm).
- Soil nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from the application of nitrogen fertilizer and manures (on-farm).
- Methane (CH₄) emissions from prolonged water-logging or from the digestion systems of livestock (on-farm).

With current technology, burning one liter of petrol or diesel would, on average, emit 2.3 and 2.7 kg CO₂, respectively. It is also noted that for the same power output, greenhouse gas emissions from electricity would vary considerably if different fuels were used to generate it. Furthermore, it is estimated that with the current manufacturing technology, the production of one kg of nitrogen fertilizer would require the energy input equivalent to 1.5–2 kg of fuel, while 1 kg of pesticides would require the energy input equivalent to up to 5 kg of fuel.

Finally, carbon emissions & sequestration in soil, as well as soil nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from the application of nitrogen fertilizer and manure, are also more difficult and expensive to measure accurately because their annual fluxes are often small, variable and distributed over large areas. Methane and N₂O have global warming potentials 25 and 298 times that of CO₂, respectively, over a 100-year time period (IPCC, 2007).

1.4.2 Overview of global agricultural emissions

There were approximately 50.1 GtCO₂e greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from anthropogenic sources in 2010 (IPCC, 2014). Agriculture shares about 11% of these emissions (Tubiello et al., 2015. This percentage relates to direct sources only. If emissions from indirect sources are considered, a further 3–6% of global emissions (Vermuelen et al., 2012) are accounted for. Approximately 60% of all N₂O and 50% of all CH₄ emissions originate in the agricultural sector (Smith et al., 2007).

Similarly, about 38% of direct agricultural emissions are attributed to N₂O from soils, 32% to CH₄ from ruminants, 12% to biomass burning, 11% to CH₄ from rice production and 7% to manure management (Bellarby et al., 2008). There is evidence of an upsurge in GHG emissions with rising farm inputs, due to growing mechanization and modernization (Graham and Williams, 2003; Maraseni, 2007; Maraseni and Cockfield, 2011a; Mushtaq et al., 2013). For example, during the period 1990–2005, global agriculture emissions increased by 14%, an average rate of
49 MtCO2-e year\(^{-1}\) (USEPA, 2006). Therefore, meeting the proposed 2°C climate stabilization target is not possible without reducing agrarian discharges.

Agricultural emission from developing countries is much higher than that of developed nations. For example, in 2005, developing countries were responsible for 74% of global agricultural emissions, whereas developed states were accountable for only 26% (Smith et al., 2007). The proportional contribution of agricultural emissions for developing countries has been increasing faster due to rapid increases in farm inputs to feed growing populations with limited farming areas (Tubiello et al., 2015). Therefore, without developing countries shouldering responsibility, a reduction in global agricultural emissions is not possible.

FAO (2014) predicts that there will be over 9 billion people globally by 2050. In order to feed them, agricultural production should increase by 60% by 2050. About 80% of the yield rise will come from intensification (i.e. higher yields with more fertilizer, pesticide and water inputs, multiple cropping, shorter fallow periods and improved seed varieties) and another 20% will come from extensification (Johnson et al., 2014). The ratio will be 70:30 in developing countries. Both these intensification and extensification processes will increase the share of agricultural emissions. However, research by Johnson et al. (2014) showed that the selective extensification of agriculture could save some 22 GtCO2-e emissions by 2050, compared with a business-as-usual approach. Consequently, a wise land-use planning and coordinated approach between government departments is necessary for reducing agricultural emissions.

1.4.3 Life cycle assessment (LCA)

To achieve sustainable development, the first step would be to understand and identify where the environmental impacts and damages actually occur so that targeted remedy actions can be taken. To determine the carbon footprint of agricultural products, it is necessary to identify and consider the full life cycle of the products, from growing to harvesting, as well as their waste management and finally disposal or recycling of the packaging (Klöpffer, 2012). Life cycle assessment (LCA) is a cradle to grave analysis. It examines a system performance starting with the extraction of raw materials from the earth followed by the operations, until the final disposal of the material as waste. This provides the knowledge of how much energy and raw materials are used at each stage of the product life and how much different types of waste are generated. LCA thus helps to analyze the process involved, and allows the consumer more information on the choices of the product. In particular, compared with other methods LCA analysis has the advantage of being able to quantify the magnitude of the potential environmental saving in each environmental category, and to avoid the pitfall of just shifting the environmental impacts from one category to another. An LCA project should comply with the international standards ISO 14040–14044 (Klöpffer, 2012).

Generally, an LCA analysis consists of the following four steps:

- Initiation (goal and scope definition, project planning).
- Inventory analysis (data collection, identifying all relevant input and output items).
- Impact assessment (analysis, quantification and evaluation of impacts on ecosystems, human beings and resources use).
- Interpretation and improvement assessment (sensitivity study, evaluation of options to reduce environmental loads).

Overall, LCA is often a computer-based data-intensive operation. It requires time, skill, a large amount of data and software to manipulate the data. Particularly, industry and region specific Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) is essential to undertake a proper LCA project, as differences in the input data as well as project methodologies can significantly affect results and lead to highly variable conclusions. Furthermore, international standardization is likewise necessary (Roy et al., 2009). Decision support tools for best practices and most cost-effective designs and management must be developed. In addition to energy and greenhouse gas emissions, the quantification of the impacts of water and land footprints, and the effects of pesticides and biodiversity are also receiving increasing attention.
1.4.4 Comparison of environmental impact of different foods

LCA has now been widely used for process improvements and optimization, including in agriculture and in the food industry (Roy et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2010). For example, it has been estimated that to produce 1 kg of grain in Australia, overall 0.1 kg of fuel may be consumed and 0.3 kg of greenhouse gases emitted. However, the total emissions can be significantly influenced by the management and operation methods used and also the product types. Biswas et al. (2010) showed that the life cycle GHG emissions for 1 kg of wool is significantly higher than that for wheat and sheep meat. It was also identified that the on-farm stage contributed the most significant portion of total GHG emissions from the production of wheat, sheep meat and wool. It was further established that CH4 emissions from enteric methane production and from the decomposition of manure accounted for a significant portion of the total emissions from sub-clover and mixed pasture production, while N2O emissions from the soil under wheat production have been found to be the major source of GHG emissions. Use of RE may also have a significant benefit. With the advent of eco-labeling, LCA is being increasingly used as a reporting mechanism. It has been, however, argued by some, that carbon labeling may also have unintended consequences as a “green barrier” for international trade.

1.5 MERGING RENEWABLES WITH AGRICULTURE: THE SUSTAINABILITY APPROACH

A way to overcome the present dependence on fossil fuels is the integration of energy efficiency and particularly RE, the prices of which are—due to improved technologies, but especially due to increasing mass production—continuously decreasing into the agri-food chain sectors. Substituting fossil fuel energy resources with renewables becomes progressively important as agricultural intensity is always growing; i.e., increasing mechanization, expansion of irrigated land, fertilizer production and transportation require more and more energy (IRENA, 2015). Overcoming risks of future fossil fuel availability, fluctuating prices—often making them unavailable for the poor—and their contribution to global warming requires a decoupling of the agricultural sector from fossil fuels. This can be achieved by increasing energy efficiency and the introduction of Renewable Energy Sources (RES) providing mechanical energy, heat, and electricity as outlined in the FAO Energy-Smart Food Program (FAO, 2011a) (Fig. 1.3). Integration of RES, especially if they are available locally, into the food chain, i.e., integrated food-energy systems, can directly save the farmers’ money, but most importantly, it can indirectly significantly contribute to creation of local development by creating jobs, poverty reduction, improved gender equity and food security and at the same time contribute to global food security and global climate protection. Renewable energy can be used either directly (on-site), or indirectly integrating RE into the existing conventional energy supply chain (Fig. 1.4).

1.5.1 Solar photovoltaic energy applications

Solar energy in the form of photovoltaic (PV)-produced electricity can supply and/or supplement many energy requirements both on the farm and the entire agri-food chain. All that is now powered by electricity (produced from fossil fuels) can be adapted to be powered by PV modules. These can be grid-connected PV systems, which allow the farmers to sell their not-used solar power to the electricity utility, or a stand-alone system which, if electricity is continuously used for a specific process, needs a storage system as solar is an intermittent available energy source. However, many electricity-driven processes can be performed during the day when solar power is available such as water pumping, and shearing of sheep. Depending on the distance to the grid and its voltage, PV systems could be much cheaper and of less maintenance needs in remote areas, than installing power lines for connecting to the grid, which further may include the need of installing step down transformers. Solar PV applications in agriculture are comprised of: (i) remote electricity supply,
Figure 1.3. Renewable energy applications of the water supply chain (IRENA, 2015).

Figure 1.4. Directly (on-site) or indirectly integrating of renewable energy into the existing conventional energy supply chain (IRENA, 2015; based on FAO, 2011b Practical Action 2012).

electric fencing and water pumping, and (ii) general applications, which are presently powered by electricity produced from fossil fuels.

1.5.1.1 Water pumping
In agriculture and the agri-food chain in general, PV can be employed for water pumping in different applications. Pumping from groundwater and surface water bodies, is a principal energy consumer and therefore a principal target for implementing RE technologies to substitute the electricity produced from the fossil fuels and diesel fuel commonly used for water pumping.

Even though solar water pumping is no novelty—it has existed since the early 1980s—it is not until recent decades that it has been accepted as an easy-to-install sustainable solution for different scales and for being environmentally friendly. Reasons for this were technical improvements, but especially the mass production of solar panels and their respective price drop (Varardi, 2014).
Table 1.1. Global use of geothermal heat in agriculture by application category (after Lund and Boyd, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity [MWt]</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization [TJ year(^{-1})]</td>
<td>15742</td>
<td>17864</td>
<td>20661</td>
<td>23264</td>
<td>26662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity factor</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture pond heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity [MWt]</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization [TJ year(^{-1})]</td>
<td>13493</td>
<td>11733</td>
<td>10976</td>
<td>11521</td>
<td>11958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity factor</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture drying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity [MWt]</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization [TJ year(^{-1})]</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity factor</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most solar water pumps have a power between 0.15–21 kW, with lifts of up to 350 m and flow rates of up to 130 m\(^3\) h\(^{-1}\) (Varardi, 2014). PV water pumping systems are very reliable and generally the most cost-effective solution in locations where the electricity grid is non-existent or far away; in these areas, it has, when compared to diesel-powered pumps, the additional benefit of much less maintenance needs compared to the diesel option.

In Chapter 9 of this book, solar water pumping is described in more detail, and compared with diesel and grid-electricity-powered pumping in regard to its technical setup and suitability for different situations (e.g. economic, social, geographic, hydrogeological) and case studies with experiences from USA, New York state (NYSERDA, 2005), India (Casey, 2013; GIZ, 2013; IRENA, 2015) and Morocco (Lorentz GmbH, 2013; IFC, 2014) are presented.

1.5.2 Solar and geothermal direct heat applications

Since solar and geothermal heat can be generally used for the same applications, they will be discussed together. Solar and geothermal heat can be employed for: (i) heating/cooling of spaces, buildings, soil and water (including water for aquaculture), (ii) drying of crops and grains, and (iii) heating of greenhouses. The use of geothermal energy, which is a constant heat source, available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, is often underestimated. The fact that this resource is practically limitless and renewable, together with—in contrast to the solar option—its independence of changing climate and weather conditions, presents clear advantages in favor of its extended utilization. Irrespective of the obvious climate protection benefits, the direct and indirect development of these resources for heating, agriculture and horticulture, should also respect other elements of the natural environment (Tomaszewska et al., 2016). Table 1.1 shows global installed thermal capacities, thermal energy utilization and capacity factors for different applications in agriculture and the agri-food chain using geothermal resources and their change from 1995–2015. Integrated configurations for using geothermal heat for multiple use applications are presented separately in Section 1.5.5.

1.5.2.1 Heating/cooling of spaces, buildings, soil and water

Space heating (but also cooling using heat in mechanical or evaporative cooling cycles) is an important energy consumer in many applications, especially in pig and poultry production, which is mostly carried out in closed buildings and thus requires constant temperature and air quality conditions for the animals' well-being to optimize growth. Much energy is needed for replacing contaminated (moisture, gases, odor, dust, etc.) indoor air through ventilation and heating. A large part of this energy can be covered by RE using, e.g. solar or geothermal heat-driven air/space heaters/coolers/dehumidifiers.

Heating and cooling of water (but also milk and agricultural products) for use in the agri-food chain is energy-intensive and an economic burden, especially in developing countries and areas
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Figure 1.5. Thermal solar water heating costs compared to conventional heating (IEA, 2014).

which are remote from electric power plants (as many agricultural areas are) which leads to further distribution losses in the electricity grid. Locally available RES, such as solar and geothermal, are economically and environmentally sustainable energy sources that are increasingly used to replace fossil fuels through electricity or—wherever possible as it has in many cases lower cost—directly to heat water. An example of high energy demands are commercial dairy farms where solar heat is used to heat water for cleaning equipment, warming and stimulating the cows’ udders but also for cooling milk; these processes account for up to 40% of farms’ total energy demand (IRENA, 2015). Considering all applications, the global capacity of solar water heating increased from 65 GWt (gigawatts-thermal) in 2000 to 326 GWt in 2013 (REN21, 2014). Considering further technological improvements and increasing mass production will result in a further increase in many areas, including different applications in the agri-food chain where water heating is required. As Figure 1.5 shows, water heating costs derived from different applications expand over large ranges and can economically compete with those using fossil fuels, either directly or through electricity for water heating. The same can be expected from applications within the agri-food chain industries.

1.5.2.2 Drying of crops, fruits, grains and animal products

There are many options for using heat from sun and geothermal sources for drying crops and grain, ranging from very simple and cheap to sophisticated and expensive. The sun has been employed for thousands of years for drying crops directly on the field or drying fruits on or in special devices after being harvested. Today’s industrial-scale demands require generally fast and uniform drying to obtain high quality products suitable for the world market; however, for local or regional markets, in particular in developing countries, less sophisticated, cheaper drying designs are often more suitable.

Where geothermal sources are naturally available and accessible (at shallow depth, springs, etc.) geothermal drying is an excellent option. In contrast to solar, geothermal drying is also suitable in areas with little solar radiation such as colder climates. Fifteen countries report the use of geothermal energy for drying various grains, milk, vegetables and fruit crops. Examples include: seaweed (Iceland; Ragnarsson, 2015), onions (USA; Boyd et al., 2015), wheat and other cereals (Serbia; Oudech and Djokic, 2015), fruit (El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico; Montalvo and Gutierrez, 2015; Lund and Boyd, 2015; Gutierrez-Negrín et al., 2015), Lucerne or alfalfa (New Zealand; Carey et al., 2015), coconut meat (Philippines; Fronda et al., 2015), and timber
(Mexico, New Zealand and Romania; Gutiérrez-Negrín et al., 2015; Carey et al., 2015; Bendea et al., 2015). The largest uses are in China, USA and Hungary (Lund and Boyd, 2015). By the end of 2014, a total of 161 MWt and 2030 TJ year\(^{-1}\) were being utilized, which is an increase of 28.8 and 24.2\% respectively, compared to 2010. Globally, 4.5\% thermal energy is used for greenhouses and open ground heating, 2.0\% for aquaculture pond and raceway heating, 1.8\% for industrial process heating and 0.4\% for agricultural drying (Lund and Boyd, 2015). An example is Iceland, where geothermal energy has been utilized for about 35 years for drying fish. Nowadays, about 15,000 metric tons of cod heads are annually dried using geothermal heat before exporting them to Nigeria (IRENA, 2015). Furthermore, in Nigeria pyrethrum drying is still being carried out at a plant constructed in the 1920s near Ebburu estimated at 1.0 MWt and 10 TJ year\(^{-1}\). In Vietnam, the drying of bananas, coconuts and medicinal herbs occurs using 11.83 TJ year\(^{-1}\) (capacity: at 0.5 MWt) (Lund and Boyd, 2015).

Most solar dryers are small to middle scale in size. Large solar crop dryers are in the minority as the example of the USA shows; the reason seems to be the high cost of the solar collector and since—in contrast to gas dryers—drying rates cannot be controlled (IRENA, 2015). However, it should be considered that these solar collectors could be used, in the non-harvesting period for other purposes, reducing the overall costs (IRENA, 2015). However, in hot arid and semi-arid climates, smaller sized dryers may not need a sophisticated collector (just using the glazed box of the system itself), and very low-cost dryers can be constructed using simple design and low-cost materials; such systems are very suitable for drying vegetables, fruits and animal products for home use (IRENA, 2015).

1.5.2.3 Heating of greenhouses

Solar and geothermal heat can be ideal and cost-effective energy sources for heating greenhouses. The heat can be employed to heat air and soil thus replacing or adapting heaters which are powered by fossil fuels or electricity produced from non-renewable conventional energy resources. The related cost-reduction of geothermal or solar-heated greenhouses is, in particular, high in remote areas without electricity access. Hence, the geothermal or solar option allows the installation and their economic operation in remote areas and production throughout the whole year.

The leading countries in the use of annual thermal energy being: Turkey, Russia, Hungary, China and The Netherlands (Lund and Boyd, 2015). The main crops grown in greenhouses are vegetables and flowers; however, tree seedlings (USA) and fruit such as bananas (Iceland) are also grown. Despite that the numbers with reported geothermal greenhouses decreased from 34 in 2010 to 31 in 2015, the worldwide use of geothermal energy utilized for greenhouses and covered ground heating increased from 2010 to 2015 by 19\% in installed capacity and 16\% in annual thermal energy use. The installed capacity was 1830 MWt and energy use was 26,662 TJ year\(^{-1}\) (Lund and Boyd, 2015). In Turkey, greenhouse applications have reached 3 million m\(^2\) (612 MWt) due to the great success. Tomatoes are mostly grown in these greenhouses with the major markets of Russia (60\%), Europe 20\%, around 10\% elsewhere internationally, and the remaining 10\% sold domestically (Mertoglu et al., 2015, Lund and Boyd, 2015).

Integrated operation and case studies of greenhouses using RE for geothermal and solar greenhouse heating/cooling, humidification, ventilation and water desalination for irrigation will be treated separately in Section 1.5.7.1. In Chapter 5 of this book, the energy usage patterns in the nursery industry in Queensland, Australia are examined. The opportunities of adopting renewable energy are also evaluated.

1.5.3 Wind power applications

Today, wind energy applications for sole agricultural applications are of reduced importance on a global scale, whereas in the past wind power was used for groundwater pumping. However, the mechanical sensitivity and respective maintenance needs of wind wheels today make diesel or—much better where possible—solar pumping the better option. In contrast, a combination
of pumping using wind energy together with wind farming, i.e. selling energy to electricity companies or lease the land for installing their large-scale wind turbines is an increasing trend as outlined in Section 1.5.4.

1.5.4 Multi-use of agricultural land for food and electric power production

Agricultural areas can be used for multipurpose, i.e. food and energy production, where, for example, solar and wind energy are produced together with agricultural products on the same land; all in all being a winning combination by adding electricity generation—a long-term, stable, source of income—to the farmers’ incomes from agricultural production. There are different options: (i) the farmers purchase wind turbines/solar panels, (ii) the farmers form wind/solar power cooperatives, and (iii) electricity utilities/developers install/operate the equipment and make payments to the farmers according to different criteria, such as generated electricity, impact on farming activities. According to an estimate by the US Department of Energy in the USA, wind energy alone could provide 80,000 new jobs for rural areas and US$ 1.2 billion in new income for farmers by 2020 (Cassaday, 2003). In areas with good wind conditions, electricity producers may pay US$ 2,000–5,000 per year for each wind turbine installed (USA example). Hence, such multi-use of agricultural land could be very attractive for farmers (Cassaday, 2003).

The concept of coproduction of electricity and food was first developed in Japan in 2004, where solar panels were installed in such a way that they did not significantly obstruct agricultural management, such as access of crops to sunlight, or movement of agricultural machinery (IRENA, 2015). In a similar way, wind turbines can be integrated into farming and grazing areas. Another interesting application is the installation of PV panels over irrigation canals to simultaneously produce electricity and reduce evaporative water losses. In an example from India, a 1 MW solar power plant was installed over a 750 m length of a canal system. In one year it produced 1.53 GWh of electricity while at the same time hindered the evaporation of about 3,300 million of water, which can be used for irrigation (IRENA, 2015). It has been estimated that using the area of a 19,000 km canal network could save 20 billion liters of water per year (IRENA, 2015). Such multi-use of agricultural land for food and power production is becoming increasingly more common (IPCC, 2011). Multi-use could significantly increase the income for farmers as an example from Germany proves, where 11% of the installed RE capacity is in the ownership of farmers (2012).

1.5.5 Agriculture within the cascade system of geothermal direct heat utilization

When temperatures of geothermal sources are below 100°C, the warm water can be first run through a space heating installation and then cascaded to swimming pools, greenhouses and/or aquaculture pond heating, before being injected back into the aquifer. These kinds of projects maximize the use of the resource as well as improving the economics. An example of the use of geothermal energy in a cascade use is described by Bujakowski (2007). In 1993, The Mineral and Energy Economy Research Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS MEERI) in Biańska Niżna (southern Poland, Podhale Basin) built and put into operation the first geothermal plant in Poland (Bujakowski, 2007; Bujakowski and Tomaszewska, 2012). During the 1995–98 period the installation has been developed and nowadays (2016) the cascaded heat supply includes five stages of heat distribution based upon a secondary circulation loop. These are: geothermal space heating system (85–65°C), timber drying building (60°C), parapet greenhouse (45°C), thermophilus fish farm (35°C), and finally, foil tunnels with ground heating (30°C) (Fig. 1.6). This setup enables studies on the multidirectional development of geothermal energy.

Gude (2016) suggested that in many cases the cascade system of geothermal energy use can also include desalination plants (see also Section 1.5.6). Figure 1.7 presents a conceptional example for an integrated configuration to produce power, followed by desalination using both thermal and membrane processes, then for applications in food processing, refrigeration plants and district heating or cooling systems, heating of building spaces, greenhouses and soil heating, industrial process heat and agricultural drying and fish farming. As shown in Figures 1.6 and 1.7, agricultural
and aquacultural uses require the lowest temperatures, with values from 25–90°C. Space heating requires temperatures in the range of 50–100°C, with 40°C useful in some marginal cases and ground-source heat pumps extending the range down to 5°C. Cooling and industrial processing normally require temperatures over 100°C (Gude, 2016; Lund, 2010).

1.5.6 Renewables for water desalination and food security: decoupling freshwater production from fossil fuel supply

As natural availability of freshwater is limited and unevenly distributed in space and time, energy-intensive desalination technologies are playing an increasing role in providing water and food security for future generations. At present, 70 million m³ of freshwater are produced each day from the globally existing 16,000 desalination plants (IRENA, 2015). According to UN Water (2014), desalination annually consumes at least 75.2 TWh of electricity, which corresponds to about 0.4% of global electricity consumption (UN Water, 2014).

Conventional technologies for desalination of salt and brackish water are still limited since they have a high demand for energy, which is mostly provided by expensive fossil fuel, whereas less than 1% of the desalination capacity depends on renewables (IRENA, 2012). Energy costs represent as much as half of the production cost of desalination plants (Herndon, 2013). However, the upsurge in desalination capacity and the proportional energy demand rise make further use of fossil fuels increasingly economically and environmentally unsustainable. A massive shift from desalination powered by fossil fuel to RE-powered technologies will be essential to meet the growing demand for freshwater production by desalination. Decoupling freshwater production costs from the ever-increasing prices of fossil fuels is essential if freshwater is to be provided for agricultural purposes, such as irrigation where water is demanded in large quantities but at lowest possible cost.
There exist different desalination technologies which can be powered by RES (Ghaffour et al., 2015; Goosen et al., 2014). They comprise mature thermal technologies (multi-stage flash (MSF), multi-effect distillation (MED)), and mature membrane technologies (reverse osmosis (RO), electrodialysis (ED), and electrodialysis reversal (EDR)), as well as emerging technologies which are in their early stage and which require further research and development, such as membrane distillation (MD), vapor compression (VC), adsorption desalination (AD) (Ghaffour et al., 2014) and others (Figs. 1.8 and 1.9).

Significant efforts for adapting conventional desalination technologies so that they can be powered by renewable energy sources (RES) have been made in the last two decades; however, the upscaling to larger sized plants has been hampered by technological, economic and political/regulatory (e.g. subsidies for fossil fuels) challenges. In the last few years, several medium-scale RE-driven desalination plants have been installed worldwide. However, most of them are powered by electricity produced from solar PV and wind—commercial units which are available on the market (IRENA and IEA-ETSAP, 2012)—rather than solar or geothermal heat directly, which can provide more sustainable desalination processes. These electricity-powered desalination units are commonly deployed at the community level. However, they are increasingly being installed on a larger scale as the grid-connected desalination plants from Sydney and Perth demonstrate. Solar thermal desalination, which combines solar heat with desalination technologies such as MSF, MED, VC and MD, is obviously most suited for areas with high solar irradiation (e.g. northern Africa, Middle East, i.e. the MENA region, as well as parts of
Figure 1.8. Capacities for different technologies for desalination (Koschikowski, 2011).

Figure 1.9. Principal renewable energy powered desalination technologies and their development state (Papapetrou et al., 2010).

Energy requirements for desalination vary from process to process (Ghaffour et al., 2013). Thermal desalination practices require both thermal and electrical energy for evaporation, process hydraulic flow and transport of the feed and product water. Pressure-driven membrane desalination processes necessitate electrical energy to supply the mechanical energy for membrane separation and pre-treatment, and pumping in and distribution out of the plant (Gude, 2016). Gude (2016) in his review, presented the specific energy consumption for thermal and membrane desalination processes in terms of kJ of energy required for producing one unit of freshwater in kilograms (Fig. 1.10; Table 1.3).
Table 1.2. Summary of solar thermal desalination plants in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Capacity [m³ day⁻¹]</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margarita de Savoya, Italy [1]</td>
<td>50–60</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands of Cape Verde [2]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Atlantis ‘Autoflash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia [3]</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas, USA [4]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ancona, Italy [5]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Sea, Jordan [6]</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safat, Kuwait [6]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takami Island, Japan [1]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ME-16 effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi, UAE [7]</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>ME-18 effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ain, UAE [8]</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>ME-55 stages, MSF-75 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian Gulf [9]</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Azhar University, Palestine [10]</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MSF 4 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeria, Spain [11]</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>MED-TVC 14 effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berken, Germany [12]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hzag, Tunisia [6]</td>
<td>0.1–0.35</td>
<td>Distillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gran Canaria, Spain [13]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Desired Island, France [14]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ME-14 effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampedusa Island, Italy [15]</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait [1]</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz, Mexico [16]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MSF 10-stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 1.10. Specific energy consumption for thermal and membrane desalination processes and greenhouse gas emissions for unit freshwater production (after Gude, 2016).

The MSF process has the highest specific energy consumption while the seawater reverse osmosis (SWRO) process has the lowest, followed by multi-effect distillation technology. For this reason, there is an increasing trend to replace thermal technologies with membrane methods, primarily reverse osmosis (RO) in cases where no cheap waste heat is available.
Table 1.3. Typical capacity, energy demand and cost for some combinations of solar and desalination
technologies (Ghaffour et al., 2015 and references as specified).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Typical capacity [m$^3$ day$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>Energy demand [kWh m$^{-3}$]</th>
<th>Water cost [US$ m^{-3}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar still</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>Solar passive</td>
<td>1.3–6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar (MEH)</td>
<td>1–100</td>
<td>Ther: 100</td>
<td>2.6–6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar tower MSF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T: 53.7$^{2)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar/CSP MED</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>Ther: 60–70; Elec: 1.5–2$^{3)}$</td>
<td>2.3–2.8$^{3)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar tower MED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T: 42.4$^{2)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar tower RO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elec: 55.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-RO</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>Elec: BW: 0.5–1.5; SW: 4–5$^{3)}$; BW-SW: 1.2–19$^{3)}$; 3–27$^{3)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar tower RO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elec: BW: 3–4$^{3)}$</td>
<td>10.4–11.7$^{3)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-EDR</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>BW: 0.6–1$^{1)}$</td>
<td>3–16$^{1)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar MD</td>
<td>0.15–10</td>
<td>Ther: 150–200$^{3)}$; 100–600$^{1)}$; 436$^{4)}$; 180–2200$^{5)}$</td>
<td>10.4–19.5$^{3)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar AD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elec: 1.38; T: 39.8$^{6)}$</td>
<td>0.7 (electrical cost only)$^{6)}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elec: BW: Brackish water; Electrical; SW: Seawater; T: Total; Ther: Thermal.
AD: adsorption desalination; CSP: concentrated solar power; ED: electrodialysis; EDR: electrodialysis
reversal; MD: membrane distillation; MED: multi-effect distillation; MEH: multiple-effect humidification;
MSF: multi-stage flash; PV: photovoltaic; RO: reverse osmosis; VC: vapor compression.$^{1)}$Ali et al. (2011);
$^{2)}$Ahmad and Schmid (2002); $^{3)}$Paparetrou et al. (2010); $^{4)}$Kim et al. (2013); $^{5)}$Saffarini et al. (2012);
$^{6)}$Ng et al. (2013).

The range of RE desalination technologies is large and each technology has particular characteristics which
would need to be matched to a market analysis to enable investment decisions to
be made; this level of detailed analysis is still missing as already mentioned earlier (Papapetrou
et al., 2010). On average, RE-based desalination is still expensive when compared to conven-
tional desalination but numbers vary widely based on location and situation. Table 1.3 provides an
overview of energy demand and water production costs for some possible combinations of solar
and desalination technologies. A detailed assessment of the benefits of these technologies and
their limitations are discussed in Tzen et al. (2012) using wind energy, Bundschuh et al. (2015)

Tzen (2012) provided a detailed review of usage of wind energy for freshwater production, the
technology of which is mature and market available. The main problem in utilizing wind power
in desalination applications is (i) the variable nature of the resource since storage wind energy as
electricity is not sustainable at larger scale and (ii) the variable power input force to the desalination
plant which may cause operational problems. Wind-powered desalination systems can be stand-
only or grid-connected. Most of the installed plants utilize the reverse osmosis desalination
process. Their freshwater production capacity, electricity supply and year of installation are listed
in Table 1.4. Other desalination technologies comprise vapor compression distillation and wind
electrodialysis systems.

Figure 1.11 shows several possible combinations of solar and geothermal powered desalination,
the individual suitability of which depends on specific site conditions (plant scale, feed water
salinity, remoteness, electricity access or not, technical infrastructure, RES and its availability,
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Table 1.4. Wind reverse osmosis applications (modified from Tzen et al., 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>RO capacity [m³ h⁻¹]</th>
<th>Electricity supply</th>
<th>Year of installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ile du Planier, France</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4 kW W/T</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island of Suderog, Germany</td>
<td>0.25–0.37</td>
<td>6 kW W/T</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island of Helgoland, Germany</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.2 MW W/T + diesel</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuerteventura, Spain</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>225 kW W/T + 160 kVA diesel, flywheel</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozo Izquierdo, Gran Canaria, Spain, SDAWES</td>
<td>8 × 1.0</td>
<td>2 × 230 kW W/T</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therasia Island, Greece, APAS</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15 kW W/T, 440 Ah batteries</td>
<td>1995/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros Island, Greece, JOULE</td>
<td>2.5–37.5</td>
<td>500 kW W/T, stand-alone + grid-connected</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keratea, Greece, PAVET</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>900 W W/T, 4 kWₚ PV, batteries</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozo Izquierdo, Gran Canaria, Spain, AEROGEDESA</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>15 kW W/T, 190 Ah batteries</td>
<td>2003/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Univ., U.K.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5 kW, no battery</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milos Island, Greece, OCP Program</td>
<td>6 × 600</td>
<td>850 kW W/T, grid-connected</td>
<td>2007/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklia Island, Greece</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30 kW W/T, floating system, batteries</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft Univ., The Netherlands</td>
<td>0.2–0.4</td>
<td>Windmill, no battery</td>
<td>2007/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth (Kwinana Desalination Plant)</td>
<td>~140,000 extended: ~250,000</td>
<td>80 MW W/T, grid-connected</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Desalination Plant</td>
<td>~250,000 extended: ~500,000</td>
<td>140 MW W/T, grid-connected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W/T: Wind turbines; PV: Photovoltaic.

potential and exploitation cost). Table 1.5 provides an overview of the fresh water productivity for different desalination technologies per square meter of solar collector area.

Ghaffour et al. (2015) provided a critical review of the status of RE-powered desalination technologies, highlighting integrated systems and potential applications together with current technological and economic limitations and challenges. Tzen (2012) and Ghaffour et al. (2015) concluded that the matching of the desalination process with a renewable energy source (RES) is technically feasible. However the problem lies in continuous versus non-continuous operation; desalination processes are best suited to continuous operation, whereas the principal renewable energy sources such as wind and solar are non-continuous. Thus matching a desalination system with an RES source requires special design and operation which increases complexity and cost. At present, technological and economic constraints hinder large-scale applications. Despite that, renewables and desalinations as individual technologies are mature and are produced in mass.

Geothermal energy can be an attractive option if low-cost, low-enthalpy geothermal sources are available. These include geothermal resources at shallow depth, water coproduced from onshore and offshore hydrocarbon wells or from already existing deep wells, and residual heat from geothermal power plants (Bundschuh et al., 2015). Geothermal energy is accessible day and night every day of the year and can thus serve as an add-on to energy sources which are only available intermittently (Goosen et al., 2010). However, the application of geothermal energy in desalination is still a relatively unexplored technical concept (Davies and Orfi, 2014). Some experiments have been described: (i) electricity and freshwater production from geothermal brines using MSF unit (Awerbuch et al., 1976); (ii) a case study of a low-enthalpy geothermal energy-driven MED unit on Milos Island in Greece (Karytsas, 1996); and (iii) one of the latest projects from USA, the VTE Geothermal Desalination Pilot, where geothermal steam will provide the thermal energy
source for the pilot VTE distillation (vertical tube evaporation) process, as the process applied to an MED plant design with low cost (Sephton Water Technology, 2012).

Taking into account a significant increase in global electricity production (Bertani, 2015), between 2015 and 2030, rapid expansion of geothermal electricity and heat production will take place, but be limited to areas where such resources are available. Gude (2016) suggested that high-enthalpy geothermal sources can be utilized in cogeneration schemes for simultaneous power and freshwater production using MSF and MED technologies. Low temperature desalination processes
can be coupled with low-enthalpy geothermal sources. Low temperature desalination processes have lower specific energy requirements and a higher thermodynamic efficiency.

One should notice that geothermal systems not only provide a valuable RES, but can also be considered as the source and solution for freshwater production, including irrigation water being the main freshwater consumer. The desalination of geothermal waters used for energy purposes could be seen as one of the methods for securing high quality water for various purposes. In countries with warm climates it is mainly used for the irrigation of agricultural crops (Kabay et al., 2004a, 2004b, 2009; 2013; Koseoglu et al., 2010; Tomaszewska et al., 2016). Given the increasing deficit of fresh water worldwide, the possibilities for desalinating and treating geothermal waters for drinking and household purposes should be considered (Gallup 2007; Tomaszewska and Bodzek, 2013a, 2013b; Tomaszewska et al., 2014; 2016; Gude, 2016). Alternative solutions such as using cooled water directly for drinking or household purposes are advantageous ones in certain cases as confirmed by the activities of Geotermia Mazowiecka S.A. (Mszczonów, central Poland). Water with a low mineral content (ca. 0.5 g L$^{-1}$) and with an intake temperature of 42°C has been extracted since 2000 from the Mszczonów IG-1 well—from a Lower Cretaceous horizon composed of sandstone interbedded with mudstone and claystone. These are high quality Cl-HCO$_3$-Na-Ca waters that are fed to the municipal water supply network as drinking water following cooling and simple treatment. The extraction of these waters in an open system with a maximum capacity of 60 m$^3$ h$^{-1}$ (without re-injecting cooled water into the formation) has significantly improved the economic performance of the project and the utilization of cooled water as drinking water has additionally enhanced the management of ordinary water resources (Tomaszewska and Szczepański, 2014). Applications for agriculture can be similarly developed.

Freshwater production by RE-powered desalination is a technological-sound option at a small- or medium-scale and economically viable for water supply in remote areas. However, upscaling to a large size is still hindered, due to the intermittent availability of wind and solar energy, a disadvantage which geothermal does not have. This also suggests the implementation of a combined-cycle solar and geothermal powered desalination process without the need for energy storage. Also, the development and improvement of innovative desalination technologies which do not need continuous operation such as AD and MD, and which consequently are more suitable for RE use can be utilized to overcome this limitation.

Ongoing research and development of concentrated solar power (CSP) based desalination is also promising. CSP with thermal energy storage shows a large potential for powering large-scale desalination plants and simultaneously producing electricity for other purposes (Ghaffour et al., 2015; Goosen et al., 2014; IRENA, 2015). According to Trieb et al. (2011), CSP-based desalination could produce a major part of the freshwater in the MENA region amounting to about 16% of its total water production in 2030 and 22% in 2050.

1.5.7 Geothermal and solar greenhouse heating/cooling, ventilation, humidification, desalination

1.5.7.1 Solar and geothermal based greenhouse development

Several recent reviews have appeared on the state-of-the-art solar and geothermal technology in agricultural greenhouse development (Mahmoudi et al., 2010, Hassanien et al., 2016; Harjunowibowo et al., 2016; Lund and Boyd, 2016). The integration of thin film solar PV panels into the roof area of glass greenhouses was one of the advances reported by Hassanien et al. (2016). The authors noted that while there was some loss in the availability of solar radiation inside the greenhouse it was more than offset by electrical power generation (Fig. 1.12). The conversion of agricultural land into PV plants can cause friction between farmers and energy producers. By combining PV panels and crops on the same area of land the increasing competition for land between food and energy production can be alleviated.

Harjunowibowo et al. (2016) presented the latest technological developments used in greenhouses to control the microclimate by focusing on passive techniques. For example, heat can be
taken from the greenhouse during the day and deposited in a thermal storage system. This heat is then used at night in accordance with the required heat in the greenhouse (Fig. 1.13). The storage system can use, for instance, water, rocks, phase-change material and soil water collectors. Harjunowibowo et al. (2016) found that heat storage systems containing phase-change materials (PCM) could provide both heating and cooling for closed greenhouses. For greenhouses in northern climates, the authors claimed a reduction in energy demands by 80% with a potential payback of six years. In a related study by Bouadila et al. (2014) the excess heat in the greenhouse was stored in a packed bed through the daytime period and extracted at night. Additionally, Çakır and
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Sahin (2015) assessing solar greenhouses in cold climates, evaluated the optimum type according to sizing, position and location. They concluded that one of the chief operational parameters for solar energy acquisition rates of greenhouses is the roof shape. Elliptic greenhouses were preferred (at least for cold climates).

Global consumption of geothermal energy for greenhouses and covered ground heating has increased by 28% in installed capacity and 25% in annual energy use over the past decade (Lund and Boyd, 2016). As already mentioned, the leading countries in annual energy use being: Turkey, Russia, Hungary, China and The Netherlands. The authors noted that most countries do not distinguish between covered greenhouses versus uncovered ground heating, and only a few reported the actual area heated. The main crops grown in greenhouses were vegetables and flowers. However, tree seedlings (USA) and fruit such as bananas (Iceland) were also grown. Not surprisingly, developed countries experience competition from developing countries due to lower labor costs for the latter. Over a 20-year period, from 1995–2015, greenhouse heating using geothermal energy has seen about a 50% increase (Fig. 1.14).

Improved greenhouse heating by coupling of geothermal heat pumps with solar collectors has been described (Awani et al., 2015; Ghosal and Tiwari, 2004; Kondili and Kaldellis, 2006; Ozgener, 2010). In many cases modeling was employed to try and optimize the performance. Ozgener (2010), for example, reported on the use of solar-assisted geothermal heat pump and small wind turbine systems for heating agricultural and residential buildings. The main objectives of their study were to analyze thermal loads of geothermally and passively heated solar greenhouses and to investigate wind energy utilization in greenhouse heating which was modeled as a hybrid solar-assisted geothermal heat pump, and a small wind turbine system which was separately installed. The main conclusion of the investigation was that a modeled passive solar pre-heating technique, combined with a geothermal heat pump system and a small wind turbine system could be economically superior to conventional space heating/cooling systems used in agricultural and residential building heating applications if these buildings are installed in a region which has a good wind resource. Additionally, Chinese et al. (2005) developed technical and economic optimization models in order to exploit a renewable energy source represented by
The concept and application of cascade utilization of low and medium enthalpy geothermal resources have been described previously in Büjakowski (2007). It can be argued that this is a crucial idea that essentially couples different technologies and applications in order to utilize all the available geothermal heat by integrating different technologies for electricity generation, distribution and use of thermal energy, drying and dehydration processes, recreational uses, and any other direct use of geothermal heat (Fig. 1.15). For greenhouse systems geothermal cascade technology can combine electricity production for running pumps and providing lighting, along with direct heating of the greenhouse. Rubio-Maya et al. (2015) presented a comprehensive review of different regions around the world employing geothermal resources of medium and low enthalpy in a cascade manner. It is possible that the fluid temperature at the outlet of the generation process has sufficient thermodynamic quality and can be useful at a sequential process in a second or third level of temperature. Such processes or direct uses are, for instance: heating systems, hot water supply, intermediate drying processes of food or wood, and other direct uses of geothermal heat for aquaculture and greenhouses.

Figure 1.15 is presented in order to describe better the concept of cascade utilization of geothermal energy (Adapted from Rubio-Maya et al., 2015).
Table 1.6. Profitability analysis data of various applications of renewable energies in greenhouses in Crete-Greece (Vourdoubas, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of renewable energy</th>
<th>Energy generated</th>
<th>Operating period [years]</th>
<th>Initial investment [€]</th>
<th>Payback period [years]</th>
<th>NPV [€]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar PV</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13062</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.30*</td>
<td>6030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid biomass</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14864</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>53880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct heating with geothermal fluid</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>129268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal heat pumps</td>
<td>Heat (and cooling)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>122130</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>−19116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *In the case of 30% higher than current electricity prices.

Table 1.7. Environmental benefits due to renewable energy use in greenhouses (Vourdoubas, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of renewable energy used</th>
<th>Energy used initially</th>
<th>Energy generated</th>
<th>Initial CO₂ emissions [tons year⁻¹ x 10³ m²]</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions due to renewables [tons year⁻¹ x 10⁻³ m²]</th>
<th>Reduction of CO₂ emissions [tons year⁻¹ x 10⁻³ m²]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar PV</td>
<td>Grid electricity</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid biomass</td>
<td>Fuel oil</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct heating with geothermal fluid</td>
<td>Fuel oil</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal heat pumps</td>
<td>Fuel oil</td>
<td>Heat (and cooling)</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>23.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

medium and low-enthalpy, local development of communities and cities, as well as social and environmental benefits.

Lastly, economic and environmental assessments of solar-geothermal greenhouse systems are critical in their effective development and commercialization (Vourdoubas, 2015; Russo et al., 2014; Ozgener and Hepbasli, 2006). In a case study of Crete-Greece by Vourdoubas (2015), cost analysis of the use of solid biomass and geothermal energy for direct heating and cooling greenhouses showed that these investments are very profitable and attractive (Tables 1.6 and 1.7). However, the author reported that the use of geothermal heat pumps for heating and cooling them was not cost-effective. Furthermore, the use of solar photovoltaic cells for power generation was also not cost-effective, particularly when electricity generation in greenhouses was subsidized by the government. On the positive side the decrease of CO₂ emissions due to the use of renewables in the greenhouses was considered as an additional benefit.

Profitability analysis data of various applications of renewable energies in greenhouses in Crete-Greece by Vourdoubas (2015) are presented in Table 1.6. Direct heating with geothermal fluid was found to be the most profitable. The net present value (NPV) was the highest at €129,268. In finance, the NPV or net present worth (NPW) is a measurement of the profitability of an undertaking that is calculated by subtracting the present value (PV) of cash outflows (including initial cost) from the present values of cash inflows over a period of time. Similarly, the environmental benefits, due to the use of renewable energy sources in agricultural greenhouses are presented in Table 1.7. Use of the renewable energy systems for heat and power generation in greenhouses will result in a reduction of greenhouses gases emitted due to energy use in them. The reductions were estimated by Vourdoubas (2015) as the difference of the emissions due to fossil fuels use...
minus the emissions due to renewable energy use. In the case of using PV cells, CO₂ emissions were zero when using direct heating with geothermal fluids and heating with solid biomass. In the case of employing a geothermal heat pump the emissions were estimated from the consumption of grid electricity for the operation of the heat pump.

1.5.7.2 Closed seawater greenhouses for meeting water, energy and food security
In contrast to the natural environment where growing conditions may not be optimum for a given crop, glasshouses—when appropriately managed—provide optimal growth conditions and all-year-round operation since parameters such as air temperature, relative humidity, carbon dioxide concentration, soil temperature and soil moisture can be controlled (Cooper and Fuller, 1983). In particular in arid areas, closed seawater greenhouses which use only 10% of the water that open farming requires for obtaining the same yield (Masudi, 2014) provide excellent opportunities to supply food to the domestic market and to produce high-priced export products throughout the year (IRENA, 2015).

If the required solar/geothermal sources are available, it is a feasible solution for providing food, and freshwater to a large part of global inhabitants given the fact that over 70% of the population lives within a distance of less than 70 km (El-Dessouky and Ettouney, 2002), or 80% within 100 km (Ghaffour, 2009) from the seashore.

Due to high freshwater and energy demands, solar or geothermal heat can be employed for heating/cooling/humidification and for freshwater production through desalination of saline or brackish water, as well as producing PV energy for other purposes. A promising example for such a completely solar power operated greenhouse is the Sundrop System, which harnesses solar thermal energy to desalinate seawater to produce fresh water for irrigation (Saumweber, 2013). According to Saumweber (2013), the upfront costs of solar-based greenhouses are lower than the present-value annual cost of fossil fuels for traditional greenhouses in the same location (Saumweber, 2013). In Port Augusta (Australia), a pilot greenhouse was upgraded to a 20-hectare facility with a capacity of producing daily 10,000 L desalinated water, and more than 15,000 t of vegetables per year (WWF and CEEW, 2014).

Using hydroponics that utilize nutrient-laden water, no fertile soil is required and the facilities can also be installed in areas otherwise not suitable for cultivation (e.g. deserts, arctic regions). Since the nutrients can be well-dosed, and subsequently the nutrients not consumed by the crops can be reused, this eliminates the negative impacts on surface water resources such as eutrophication and contamination of land and water resources, which are disadvantages of conventional agriculture. Additionally, both, aeroponic and hydroponic systems (i) require much less space and water than conventional farming methods, and (ii) do not require pesticides to make them a true renewable and sustainable farming system. Finally, by applying vertical farming (Growing Power, 2011) and providing artificial light, space demands can be further reduced thus making them ideal horticulture systems for cities or small islands. The electricity demand of aeroponic and hydroponic cultivations can be provided from renewable energy systems.

1.5.8 The present market of renewable energy technologies
Integrating RES in agriculture and the wider agri-food chain is a key goal to assuring food security and protecting the earth’s climate. Use of RES for freshwater production is essential since crop irrigation consumes about 70% of all produced freshwater.

Renewable energy technologies, suitable for direct agricultural purposes and within the wider area of the agri-food chain, are mature technologies. Mass production has resulted in massive price drops and it can be expected that prices will further decrease as the technologies are further improved. Solar energy can provide electricity, heat and shaft energy; wind can provide electricity and shaft energy, and geothermal can provide electricity and heat energy (Fig. 1.16). For all of these RES, there exist mature technologies and mature markets.
1.6 CONCLUSIONS

Globally, the agri-food chain in the world today consumes about one-third of the total global energy production, with about 12% for crop production and nearly 80% for post-harvest related activities. Overall, agriculture and agri-food industry is often highly energy-intensive, particularly in developed countries, due to the reliance on fossil fuels that are employed, for example, for running farm equipment, generation of electricity for powering fans and pumps, and for refrigeration of food supplies. Currently, conventional fossil fuel sources, however, are being depleted at a progressively rapid rate not only due to global population growth, but also owing to the growing energy demands in the agri-food production chain in general. The highest share of on-farm energy for instance, is required for irrigation by groundwater pumping. As a solution to this problem, the use of locally available renewable energy sources, together with energy-efficient technologies, has become increasingly attractive for minimizing the impacts of rising energy costs on agri-food profitability and competitiveness as well as contributing to climate protection. Renewable energy includes solar, wind and geothermal sources. These renewable energy sources can be utilized through a number of well-proven established and new technologies, depending on the site-specific conditions and needs. Such technologies can be either integrated into existing agricultural operations or designed in the planning phase of innovative projects.

On a global scale a number of successful examples already exist where solar, wind and geothermal energy sources have been used either directly or indirectly for electricity generation in agriculture. Their economic viability and competitiveness against fossil fuels has been demonstrated. The financial benefits are highest in cases where costly electricity generation by diesel or petrol generators is replaced by renewable energy sources. Furthermore, solar or geothermal direct heat applications can be employed for heating/cooling of spaces, buildings, soil and water; drying of crops and grains; and heating/cooling during food processing; and ventilation and humidification of greenhouses. In addition, multi-use of agricultural land for food and electric power production also constitutes an attractive way for farmers as it could significantly increase their income. Another promising option is a cascade system, where solar-heated water or geothermal water is utilized stepwise for applications requiring temperature gradients. For example, from a space heating system installation the residual water is cascaded to swimming pools, to
greenhouses and/or to aquaculture ponds. This maximizes the use of the hot water resource as well as improving the economics. Finally, the use of solar, geothermal and wind energy for water desalination has also received considerable attention since it decouples freshwater production from the fossil fuel supply and therefore is an attractive alternative to guarantee future irrigation water demands and thus improve food security.

Despite these encouraging examples, it can be argued that further research is required on the impacts of renewable energy sources on the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of agricultural products. This is essential in order to profile the economic and environmental performance as well as identify the added improvement opportunities. LCA is a particularly pronounced profiling tool for finding ‘hot spots’ to prioritize action. The results of such analyses have been used by industry to validate its environmental efforts, allow for informed decisions about product diversification and change, and take advantage of emerging carbon and environmental markets. Finally, LCAs will help to identify suitable pathways, policy frameworks and convince farmers and other stakeholders of the benefits of renewable energy applications in agriculture and the entire agri-food chain. With these advancements, the global agri-food supply chain can be decoupled from its dependency on fossil fuels in order to meet future food demands.
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