

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

enquiries@ceh.ac.uk WWW.Ceh.ac.uk

Phosphorus: why do we care?

Inefficient use of P threatens global food security and the provision of clean water, because P rock reserves used for the production of P fertilizers are relatively scarce, while P losses pollute the aquatic environment, respectively.





To date, efforts to address this have **focussed on** increasing P use efficiency in agriculture (i.e. mitigation of the symptom). Based on analysis of the key flows, we argue that these advances should be viewed as partial components of the whole system, but not as a global panacea. Alone, they are insufficient to achieve P sustainability, as the primary motor currently driving this cycle is food consumption by humans.



Managing our Human Phosphorus Footprint: The Greatest **Phosphorus Sustainability Issue?** Will Brownlie, Bryan Spears, Ester Carmen, Mark Sutton

¹ Centre of Ecology and Hydrology, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.

(P), dashed lines represent recycling of. Figures in boxes represent estimates of P flows in million tons (MT) year⁻¹ (*estimated P reserves in MT). Superscripts correspond to the data source for each P flow estimate: a) Liu et al. 2008, b) Villalba et al. 2008, c) Cordell et al. 2009, d) Gilbert 2009 e) Pierrou 1976 f) Bennett *et al* (2001)



Intended flows **Recycling P flows** Natural fluxes

What societal changes are needed?

Demand adaptation via societal change has been overlooked in favour of mitigation (i.e. increasing fertiliser use efficiency) in order to reduce societies P requirements.

Although both strategies are necessary and naturally compliment each other, societal adaptation could potentially have a much greater impact on reducing the global cycle of P, than current mitigation strategies used increase agricultural nutrient use efficiency (although manure P, and animal-derived P residues (i.e. bone P) are large P sources that are currently not recycled and used efficiently).

By reducing the consumption of foods with high P footprints (e.g. meat), use of P additives in foods that are present in many processed foods and the use of P containing detergents, it is possible to affect a change that will cascade through the global P cycle resulting in a much greater reduction in global P cycling. This would also contribute to increasing 'economy wide' nutrient use efficiency.

How do we make a change

The per capita P footprint increased 38% between 1961-2007, with considerable variation between countries (i.e. China increased by 400% whilst Canada decreased); meat consumption accounted for 72% of the global average footprint (Metson et al 2012)







Human vs Environmental Health

Reducing dietary P consumption also offers societal co-benefits through reducing health risks associated with high serum phosphate concentrations, which can cause tissue damage, cardiovascular disease, renal impairment and bone loss (Calvo et al 2013, Uribarri and Calvo 2014).,

Although it is highlighted that a high P diet, (which can harm the individual), may not be the same as a diet which has a high P footprint, (which can harm the planet).



Communication is key



The many benefits of eating less meat are well documented $(\downarrow C, \downarrow GHG's, \downarrow N, water footprints, \uparrow human health)$. But aspirational goals must be achievable. It is not about not eating meat, it is about eating less meat. Meat free Mondays, the demitarian approach, flexitarianism, reducetarian are all examples of this maxim.

public in activating change.

Whilst a variety of strategies have been used to address regional or global scale environmental issues, few attempt to reduce use of P by changing societal behaviour. Yet this is in many cases the most effective and sustainable long term solution. A continued focus on technical mitigation strategies is not sufficient to achieve P sustainability. If overlooked, the combination of environmental impacts and food security risks associated with access to limited P reserves, can be expected to result in growing trans-boundary geo-political tensions.

Conclusions

Communication of this message must be multi-directional, recognising the importance of both policy makers and the

SCIENCE OF THE