A combined simulation and linear programming method for scheduling organic fertiliser application

(Article begins on next page)

29 November 2024

A combined simulation and linear programming method for scheduling organic fertiliser application

Efthymios Rodias[1,*], Alessandro Sopegno[1], Remigio Berruto[1], Dionysis Bochtis[2], Eugenio

Cavallo[3], Patrizia Busato[1]

[1]University of Turin, Faculty of Agriculture, DISAFA Department Via Leonardo da Vinci 44,

10095, Grugliasco, Turin, Italy;

[2]Institute for Bio-economy and Agri-Technology (IBO), Centre for Research & Technology -

Hellas (CERTH), 6th km Charilaou-Thermi Rd, 57001, Thessaloniki, Greece;

[3]Institute for Agricultural and Earth Moving Machines (IMAMOTER), Italian National Research

Council (CNR), Strada delle Cacce, 73, 10135 Torino (TO), Italy

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +306972315071. E-mail address: efthymios.rodias@unito.it

Abstract

Logistics have been used to analyse agricultural operations, such as chemical application,

mineral or organic fertilisation and harvesting-handling operations. Recently, due to national

or European commitments concerning livestock waste management, this waste is being

applied in many crops instead of other mineral fertilisers. The organic fertiliser produced has

a high availability although most of the crops it is applied to have strict timeliness issues

concerning its application. Here, organic fertilizer (as liquid manure) distribution logistic

system is modelled by using a combined simulation and linear programming method. The

method applies in certain crops and field areas taking into account specific agronomical,

legislation and other constraints with the objective of minimising the optimal annual cost.

Given their direct connection with the organic fertiliser distribution, the operations of

cultivation and seeding were included. In a basic scenario, the optimal cost was assessed for both crops in total cultivated area of 120 ha. Three modified scenarios are presented. The first regards one more tractor as being available and provides a reduction of 3.8% in the total annual cost in comparison with the basic scenario. In the second and third modified scenarios fields having high nitrogen demand next to the farm are considered with one or two tractors and savings of 2.5% and 6.1%, respectively, compared to the basic scenario are implied. Finally, it was concluded that the effect of distance from the manure production to the location of the fields could reduce costs by 6.5%.

Keywords: liquid manure distribution, logistics, field machinery, operations planning.

Nomenclature			
LP	Linear programming	d	Number of distances
DP	Dynamic programming	r	Number of dosages
IP	Integer programming	minD	Minimum distance
MIP	Mixed-integer programming	maxD	Maximum distance
LOF	Liquid organic fertilizer	D	Nitrogen dosage
c	Number of crops		
w	Number of weeks		

1   Introduction

Over the last few decades there has been significant progress in agricultural production, on many levels. Computer-based planning, simulation and scheduling of operations in parallel with advances in agricultural machinery management are only some of them (Bochtis, Sørensen, Busato, 2014).

40 In order to manage and evaluate the agricultural operations, many different simulation

41 methods and tools have been developed and demonstrated (Berruto, Busato, Bochtis,

42 Sørensen, 2010; Berruto, Busato, Bochtis, Sørensen, 2013; Busato et al., 2013; Sørensen &

43 Bochtis, 2010; Sørensen, 2003). In many cases, the analysis involves the optimisation of a

44 system of operations with the objective of minimising, for example, cost or energy

45 consumption. To this end, optimisation techniques such as linear programming (LP), dynamic

46 programming (DP), integer programming (IP), mixed-integer programming (MIP), or various

47 approximate methods (e.g. genetic algorithms) have been used for modelling and solving such

48 optimisation problems (Berruto, Tortia, Gay, 2006; Butterworth, 1985; Kim, Realff, Lee,

49 Whittaker, Furtner, 2011; van Dyken, Bakken, Skjelbred, 2010). LP has been applied in

50 agricultural production planning in both primary and secondary sectors, in various ways, such

51 as in land-to-crop allocation problems, modelling land-use planning targeting on sustainable

52 development, planning sustainable agri-food supply chains, and the economic and

53 environmental evaluation of sustainable farming practices (Wankhade, 2012; Zander and

54 Kächele, 1999; Accorsi, Cholette, Manzini, Pini, Penazzi, 2016; Meyer-Aurich, 2005).

55 Scheduling tasks in agricultural operations can be of vital importance given the sensitivity of

56 indirect (timeliness) and direct (lost profit) costs that are connected to them. Researchers

57 have been working on scheduling of various field operations including both energy crops and

58 agri-food crops (Bochtis et al., 2013; Bochtis, Sørensen, Green, Bartzanas, Fountas, 2010;

59 Edwards, Sørensen, Bochtis, Munkholm, 2015; Orfanou et al., 2013). Furthermore, in the

60 secondary sector, scheduling plays a significant role in handling or standardisation of primary

61 products (Berruto et al., 2006).

62 One of the most important operations that requires scheduling efforts is the application of

63 liquid organic fertiliser (LOF) application in the form manure to different types of fields and

64 crops (Boland, Foster, Preckel, Jones, Joern, 1999; Keplinger and Hauck, 2006). Generally,

65 chemical fertilisers come from mineral extraction and they are enriched with nutrients in a

66 concentrated form that make them more easily available to plants. On the other hand, organic

67 fertilisers are made from natural materials composition such as animal or plant materials and

68 mined minerals, with almost no processing. In this case, nutrients are released slowly

69 compared to chemical fertilisers by natural biological processes and they have relatively low

70 concentrations. There are various methods used to apply LOF to a field area. They include;

71 disk injectors that formulates a furrow where the fertilizer is set by a hose, chisel injectors

72 that haul a C-shape shank into the soil where a hose injects the fertiliser and by surface

73 banding of organic fertiliser that is implemented by, for example, by drag hoses.

74 LOF application contributes mainly to environmental degradation given that the nutrients

75 incorporated in this type of fertiliser are often higher than the recommended amounts needed

76 to satisfy crop requirements (Ogg, 1999). In this case, the excess amount of nitrogen may drain

77 to the groundwater, and as a consequence, this may cause problems. In parallel,

78 eutrophication of fresh waters may be caused by phosphorus runoff (Sharpley and

79 Rekolainen, 1997). The European Union with national and regional laws and regulations

80 (Nitrates directive - 91/676/EEC) has established timeline restrictions that determine the best

81 possible period for LOF application, and has set limits on the applied quantity of nitrogen to

82 be distributed per certain field area (ha). The European directive along with national and

83 regional laws determines time limitation for application, and they set limits for nitrogen

84 application coming from organic sources (170 kg [N] ha^{-1} for vulnerable zones and up to 340

85 kg [N] ha^{-1} for non-vulnerable zones). It is important to know the concentration of nitrogen in

86 the LOF to be applied. Time availability of the LOF and time limitation of nitrogen are

87 connected given that the LOF is produced throughout the whole year, and it should be

88 available in the right volume for the period that nitrogen can be applied on a specific crop

89 given the agronomic and legal restrictions that apply.

90 The objective of this study is to develop a method that can be used for scheduling the problem

91 of LOF (here refering to liquid manure) distribution, based on the combined use of a

92 simulation model and a linear programming (LP) model, under specific agronomic and

93 technical regulations, and timeliness restrictions. Also, this study focuses on the assessment

94 of the usability of this method by an application on various crops under different scenarios

95 (combining various configurations of field areas and nitrogen dosages). It focuses on the

96 analysis of the effect of the distances between the LOF production facilities and the field areas

97 on the total operational minimum cost.

98 The structure of the present work is as follows: initially, the design of methodology for the LP

99 model is introduced given the specific problem; this is followed by the results section, where

100 a case study regarding two different crops is provided together with the extracted solutions

101 according to the LP model; three modified scenarios and the effect of distance on the optimal

102 cost are discussed, and the work is wrapped up with the discussion of the results and

103 conclusions.

104

105 2 Materials and Methods

106 2.1 Problem description

107 The current study includes the distribution of liquid organic fertilizer (LOF) in specific field

108 areas in connection with the cultivation and seeding operation on the same areas. This was

109 followed given the particular feature of the LOF to lose much of its chemical composition if it

110 is not incorporated directly into the soil of the field. Regarding LOF distribution, the current

111 study was based on the simulation model of Berruto et al. (2013) regarding operational time

112 (h ha^{-1}), and distribution costs (€ ha^{-1}). The simulation was related to assessing the distribution

113 cost of LOF to the field located from 1-10 km distance from the plant, with field areas varying

114   from 2-6 ha , and nitrogen applications ranging from 50-340 kg [N] ha^{-1}. As for field cultivation

115   , and seeding operation, inputs concerning operational time and cost were based on the

116   results of Sopegno et al. (2016). The tool allows calculating operation cost based on field areas

117   and field distance. Based on these results and under specific constraints (e.g. maximum

118   working hours per week, area to be operated, seeding penalty cost etc.), the current study

119   includes the description of the design of the LP model , and its application on the case study

120   of LOF distribution with the objective of the minimising cost.

121

122   2.2   LP model formulation

123   2.2.1   Variables

124   The primary objective of the problem is the optimal distribution of LOF according to specific

125   agricultural, technical and legislative constraints as described below. For this reason, the main

126   factors described in the LP model are crops, time (weeks), distances (from field-to-LOF

127   production location) and nitrogen dosages (higher nitrogen dosages imply larger volume of

128   manure to be applied to the field). These factors ((1) – (3)) are connected with the main

129   decision variables and presented below:

XX_{ijkl} LOF application area (ha) for crop $C_i \; where \; i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, week   (1)

$W_j \; where \; j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD, \dots, maxD\}$, and dosage

$l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$

CC_{ijkl} Cultivated field area (ha) for crop $C_i \; where \; i \in \{1,2,\dots,\}$, week   (2)

$W_j \; where \; j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD, \dots, maxD\}$, and dosage

$l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$

SS_{ijkl} Seeded field area (ha) for crop C_i $where$ $i \in \{1,2,...,m\}$, week   (3)

W_j $where$ $j \in \{1,2,...,w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD,...,maxD\}$, and dosage

$l \in \{D_1, D_2, ...\}$

130   These three decision variables drive all the other variables in the LP model as they are

131   presented below:

$HaFarm_{ijk}$	Field area (ha) to be operated for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$, and dosage $k \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$
$SlProd_i$	Produced LOF (m³) on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$
$SeWT_{ij}$	Seeding working time (h·ha⁻¹) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$ and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
$CuWT_{ij}$	Cultivating working time (h·ha⁻¹) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$ and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
$SlWT_{ij}$	Fertilizing working time (h·ha⁻¹) for dosage $i \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$, and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
$SlLogC_{ij}$	Fertilizing logistics cost (€·ha⁻¹) at dosage $i \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$, and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
CuC_{ij}	Cultivating cost (€·ha⁻¹) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$ and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
SeC_{ij}	Seeding cost (€·ha⁻¹) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$ and distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$
UC_i	Lost profit from undone field area (€) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$
$SlNC_j$	Nitrogen content of LOF on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$
$SeP_j = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$	- If seeding is performed on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$ - otherwise
$CuP_j = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$	- If cultivating is performed on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$ - otherwise
$SlPC_j = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$	- If LOF is applied on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$ on corn - otherwise
$SlPW_j = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$	- If LOF is applied on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$ on wheat - otherwise
$MaxTH_j$	Maximum workability of tractor (h) on week W_j where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, w\}$

Pen_{ij}	Penalty if the operation is held on the right time crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$
Se_{ijkl}	Total seeded field area (ha) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$, and dosage $l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$
Cu_{ijkl}	Total cultivated field area (ha) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$, and dosage $l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$
Sl_{ijkl}	Total field area applied with LOF (ha) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$, distance $k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$, and dosage $l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$
T_j	Level of total LOF (m³) in the farm at week W_j where $j \in \{0,1,\dots,w\}$
TSe_j	Tractor hours on seeding at week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$
TCu_j	Tractor hours on cultivating at week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$
TSl_j	Tractor hours on LOF application at week W_j where $j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$
$HaUndo_{ijk}$	Undone field area (ha) for crop C_i where $i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}$, distance $j \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}$, and dosage $k \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$

132

2.2.2 Objective function and constraints

134 To optimise the operations connected in the model with the application of LOF, cultivation

135 and seeding, the selected approach was to minimise the cost of the operations. The objective

136 function of the optimisation problem refers to the cost of the three operations (application of

137 LOF, cultivation and seeding) and the cost related to the area that due to binding constraints

138 is not treated ($HaUndo_{ijk}$) and corresponds to the lost profit of the cultivated crop.

139 In addition, the objective function considers a percentage of lost profit per each week before

140 or after the optimal operational period. The specific presentences used here are those defined

141 in ASAE (2011).

142 Based on the above, the objective function of the LP program is written as:

$$minimise \quad \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r}(CC_{ijkl} * CuC_{ik} + SS_{ijkl} * SeC_{ik})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}(HaUndo_{ijk} * UC_i)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r}(XX_{ijkl} * SlLogC_{lk}) \qquad (4)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r}(SS_{ijkl} * UC_i * Pen_{ij})$$

$$subject\ to \quad Se_{ijkl} = 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{0,1,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$
$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 0 \qquad (5)$$

$$Cu_{ijkl} = 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{0,1,\dots,w\}, \forall k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l$$
$$\in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 0 \qquad (6)$$

$$Sl_{ijkl} = 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{0,1,\dots,w\}, \forall k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l$$
$$\in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 0 \qquad (7)$$

$$Se_{ijkl} = Se_{ij-1kl} + SS_{ijkl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2\dots,w\}, \forall k$$
$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\} \qquad (8)$$

$$Cu_{ijkl} = Cu_{ij-1kl} + CC_{ijkl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$
$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\} \qquad (9)$$

$$Sl_{ijkl} = Sl_{ij-1kl} + XX_{ijkl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$
$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\} \qquad (10)$$

$$T_j = T_{j-1} + SlProd_j - \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r} XX_{ijkl} * \frac{l}{SlNC_j} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j$$

$$\in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(11)

143 Constraints (5) - (7) reset to zero the inventory for seeding operation, field cultivation and LOF

144 application, respectively at the beginning of the simulation period. The accumulated inventory

145 for seeding operation, field cultivating and LOF application for the rest of the weeks of the

146 simulation are expressed by constraints (8) - (10), respectively. In parallel, constraint (11)

147 regards on the progressive amount of LOF in the tank at the farm location, in order to proceed

148 with LOF application only when there is sufficient LOF stored in the farm.

$$Se_{ijkl} \leq Cu_{ij-1kl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l$$

$$\in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(12)

$$Cu_{ijkl} \leq Sl_{ij-1kl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k \in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l$$

$$\in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(13)

$$Se_{ijkl} + HaUndo_{ikl} \geq HaFarm_{ikl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 52$$

(14)

$$Cu_{ijkl} + HaUndo_{ikl} \geq HaFarm_{ikl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 52$$

(15)

$$Sl_{ijkl} + HaUndo_{ikl} \geq HaFarm_{ikl} \quad \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}, j = 52$$

(16)

149 The total seeded area at a specific week should coincident with the total cultivated area of

150 the previous week. This is ensured by inequality (12). In the same way, the total cultivated

151 area at a specific week should be the same as the total area where LOF has been applied

152 during the precursory week (inequality (13)). Inequalities (14) - (16) describes the condition

153 that all areas should have been seeded, cultivated and fertilised, including also the field areas

154 that are not operated, due to some binding constraints.

155

$$TSe_j = \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r} SS_{ijkl} * SeWT_{ik} \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(17)

$$TCu_j = \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r} CC_{ijkl} * CuWT_{ik} \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(18)

$$TSl_j = \sum_{i=1}^{c}\sum_{j=1}^{w}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{l=1}^{r} XX_{ijkl} * SlWT_{lk} \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,c\}, \forall j \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}, \forall k$$

$$\in \{minD,\dots,maxD\}, \forall l \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

(19)

$$TSe_i \leq MaxTH_i * SeP_i \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$$

(20)

$$TCu_i \leq MaxTH_i * CuP_i \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$$

(21)

$$TSl_i \leq MaxTH_i * SlPC_i + MaxTH_i * SlPW_i \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$$

(22)

$$TSe_i + TCu_i + TSl_i \leq MaxTH_i \ \forall i \in \{1,2,\dots,w\}$$

(23)

156 Equations (17) - (19) give the summation of the working hours that the tractor is engaged in

157 seeding operations, field cultivations and LOF applications, respectively. The tractor working

158 hours are subject to the operation readiness – if an operation can be performed on a certain

159 week or not. This restriction applies to seeding operation, field cultivation and LOF application,

160 respectively (inequalities (20) – (22)). Finally, inequality (23) regard on the restriction that the

161 total hours of the tractor in all field operations should not exceed the maximum workability

162 per week as presented in Table 2.

3   Results and Discussion

163

164 In order to execute the MIP model the IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimisation Studio® (IBM, New York,

165 United States of America, Version 12.7.1.0) software was used. The basic characteristics of the

166 portable computer that was used were: Intel Core i7 processor at 2.5 GHz, 16 GB RAM running

167 at 64-bit with Windows 10 software. The processing time for the MIP model in the basic

168 scenario was app. 5 s.

3.1   Case Study Description

170 In order to evaluate the current scheduling problem, results from our earlier published work

171 regarding the comparison of distribution systems for biogas plant residual were included

172 (Berruto, Busato, Bochtis, Sørensen, 2013).This work focused on the design of the logistics and

173 the estimation of the costs of different transport scenarios for the application of organic

174 fertiliser on fields. Within the available time window for each operation, a combination of the

175 abovementioned results (presented also below in Table 4 and Table 6) from simulation and a

176 configuration of the above described LP model were used to generate the optimal solution of

177 the stated scheduling problem. The calculation was carried out according to certain timeliness

178 and legal restrictions. The time unit implemented in the LP model was a period of one week.

179 It was assumed that the LOF was produced by a pig farm unit. The LOF was assumed to be

180 applied on specific crops, namely corn and wheat. The testing period for both crops was

181 considered to be from January to December of a current year (52 weeks).

182 The simulation experiments regard a total area of 120 ha, where the operations of LOF

183 application, cultivation and seeding take place. The selected crops shared equally the total

184 field area (60 ha each). As presented in Table 1, 36 ha of the 60 ha allocated to corn was

185 considered an area of nitrogen-sensitive soil where a low dosage of 170 kg [N] ha^{-1} has to be

186 applied, while the rest 24 ha was considered as a non-nitrogen-sensitive soil area where a high

187 dosage of 340 kg [N] ha^{-1} has to be applied. For the case of wheat, for the total allocated field

188 area (60 ha) was considered a low dose of 170 kg [N] ha^{-1} to be applied according to crop

189 cultivation needs and efficiency of distribution.

190 **Table 1**: Field areas (ha) per crop and nitrogen dosage for different farm-to-field distances.

13

Nitrogen dosage (kg [N] ha^{-1})	Crop	Distance (km)				
		1	2	3	4	5
170	Corn	12	12	12	-	-
	Wheat	12	12	12	12	12
340	Corn	-	-	-	12	12

191

192 Also, other constraints were taken into account on a weekly basis. These are connected to the

193 workability of each operation as it is shown in the Gantt chart of Fig. 1. Moreover, there was

194 a penalty factor regarding the period that a crop can be seeded. This penalty is presented in

195 Fig. 1 as two different coloured lines on a scale from 0 (no penalty) up to 1 (high penalty) on

196 a monthly basis for each crop. It is based on operational and weather constraints, and it was

197 adjusted according to specific values of ASABE Standards regarding the timeliness of field

198 operations. This penalty factor is connected to a timeliness coefficient that is a factor that

199 permits computation of timeliness costs (ASAE, 2011). This factor assumes linear timeliness

200 costs with calendar days and is expressed as a decimal of maximum value of the crop per unit

201 area per day either before or after the optimum day. In our case study, this factor was

202 evaluated as the average value in a weekly basis and presented in a monthly basis (Fig. 1).

203

Fig. 1: Field operations (bars) and seeding penalty (lines) in monthly basis

204

Finally, specific assumptions were taken into account:

205

- The maximum operating hours of the tractor are defined for each week and were
206

  assumed to be the same for each week.
207

- There is initial LOF storage at the beginning of the testing period (Table 2) in a volume
208

  that is not limiting the operation.
209

- The LOF quantity produced at the farm is the same each week.
210

- The total volume of LOF is distributed through a single pass and regards the upper
211

  nitrogen bound per field area and crop.
212

3.2   Inputs
213

Table 2 lists the group of inputs that are connected to machinery use, LOF application and
214

other parameters that were incorporated in the LP model.
215

Table 2: Machinery and other inputs included in the LP model
216

Machinery Inputs	Other Inputs

Crops	Maximum Workability (h week^{-1})	Tank Capacity (l)	Nitrogen Content in the LOF (kg m^{-3})	Reserved LOF in the farm (m^3)	LOF production on the farm (m^3 week^{-1})	Lost Profit (€ ha^{-1})
Maize						639
	40	15,000	4.5	2300	71.9	
Wheat						532

217

218 The operational working times (h ha^{-1}) for both cultivation (including ploughing, mineral

219 fertilising and seedbed preparation) and seeding operations were adjusted to those reported

220 in Sopegno et al. (2016), and they were connected to the linear programming model as an

221 input. Table 3 presents the operating working times for both seeding and cultivation

222 operations for distances 1-5 km. Similarly, the fertilisation working times (h ha^{-1}) were

223 adopted by the simulation model used in Berruto et al. (2013) for three different nitrogen

224 dosages and different distances, and they were used as an input in the LP model (Table 4).

225   **Table 3**: Operational working time (h ha^{-1}) for various distances (km) in both crops*

Distance (km)		1	2	3	4	5
Seeding	Maize	0.83	0.87	0.91	0.96	1.00
	Wheat	1.39	1.43	1.47	1.52	1.56
Cultivation	Maize	3.73	3.77	3.81	3.86	3.90
	Wheat	2.81	2.85	2.89	2.94	2.98

226   *Adopted from Sopegno et al. (2016)

227 Table 4: Fertilising working time (h ha^{-1}) in various distances (km) and dosages (kg [N] ha^{-1})*

Nitrogen Dosage (kg [N] ha^{-1})	Distance (km)				
	1	2	3	4	5

170	1.05	1.24	1.37	1.48	1.61
250	1.52	1.81	2.00	2.18	2.38
340	1.95	2.33	2.58	2.81	3.07

Given the operational working time for field cultivation and seeding, the corresponding operational costs (€ ha^{-1}) were calculated and presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Operational cost (€ ha^{-1}) for various distances in both crops*

Distance (km)		1	2	3	4	5
Seeding	Maize	27.00	28.35	29.69	31.03	32.37
	Wheat	53.40	54.98	56.57	58.15	59.74
Cultivation	Maize	126.91	128.32	129.72	131.13	132.53
	Wheat	97.56	99.00	100.43	101.86	103.30

The fertilising logistics cost (€ ha^{-1}) was calculated according to the distribution cost of Berruto et al. (2013), and it is presented in Table 6 for variable nitrogen dosages and distances.

Table 6: Fertilizing logistics cost (€·ha^{-1}) in various distances (km) and dosages (kg [N] ha^{-1})*

Nitrogen dosage (kg [N] ha^{-1})	Distance (km)				
	1	2	3	4	5
170	109.23	129.44	142.61	154.13	167.83
250	158.53	189.17	209.08	227.40	248.35
340	203.52	243.00	269.15	292.63	319.88

3.3   LP Model Results

3.3.1   The basic scenario

240   The LP model generates results for every field operation (i.e. LOF application, cultivation and

241   seeding) for each specific week and crop in specific field areas. In the basic scenario the

242   optimal solution, i.e. the minimum cost, for the execution of these field operations was

243   estimated to €43,586. According to the results of the model, there is a field area equal to 1.88

244   ha of wheat total field area that was not cultivated. The non-cultivated area derived from the

245   fact that only one tractor was available to carry all field operations, and it was too costly (for

246   both penalty and distance reasons) to cultivate this area.

247   Hereafter, the results regarding the optimal exploitation period (in weeks) for maize and

248   wheat as they extracted from the LP model, are presented in Table 7 and Table 8 for corn and

249   wheat, respectively.

250   **Table 7**: Results per operation on a weekly basis for corn field areas

Week A/N	Stored LOF (m³)	Distributed LOF (m³)	Fert. area (ha)	Cult. area (ha)	Seeded area (ha)	Tractor Fert. Use (h)	Tractor Cult. Use (h)	Tractor Seed Use (h)
8	2,731	-	13.57	-	-	40.00	-	-
9	2,803	-	5.64	6.20	-	15.85	24.15	-
10	1,850	1,025	12	6.49	-	14.91	25.09	-
11	1,496	426	-	10.60	-	-	40.00	-
12	1,114	453	10.87	6.52	-	14.88	25.12	-
13	1,186	-	6.52	8.60	-	7.19	32.81	-
14	847	411	6.61	8.79	-	6.93	33.07	-
15	673	246	-	8.01	10.22	-	29.94	10.06
16	495	250	-	-	44.99	-	-	40.00
17	567	-	4.79	-	-	14.70	-	-
18	639	-	-	4.79	-	-	18.66	-
19	349	362	-	-	4.79	-	-	4.77
TOTAL	14,750	3,173	60	60	60	114.46	228.84	54.83

251

252   **Table 8**: Results per operation in a weekly basis for wheat field areas

Week A/N	Stored LOF (m³)	Distributed LOF (m³)	Fertilized area (ha)	Cult. area (ha)	Seeded area (ha)	Tractor Fert. Use (h)	Tractor Cult. Use (h)	Tractor Seed Use (h)
38	634	1,225	32.41		-	40.00	-	-
39	495	211	5.59	11.42	-	6.94	33.06	-
40	567	-	-	14.05	-	-	40.00	-
41	639	-	-	9.95	8.46	-	27.97	12.03
42	676	35	0.93	-	26.96	1.31	-	38.69
43	23	725	19.18	3.52	-	29.71	10.29	-
44	95	-	-	11.78	3.52	-	34.70	5.30
45	166	-	-	7.40	11.78	-	22.03	17.97
46	238	-	-	-	7.40	-	-	11.52
TOTAL	3,533	2,196	58.11	58.12	58.12	77.96	168.05	85.51

253

3.3.2 Scenario 1

255 The first scenario was connected to the introduction of a second tractor to execute the total

256 field area in both crops without having any hectare not operated. The addition of one tractor

257 had an effect on the results of the LP model and, of course, in the optimal solution that was

258 equal to €41,904. In this scenario, the LOF was applied in all of the field areas. The extracted

259 results of Scenario 1 are presented in Fig. 2 for maize (left group) and wheat (right group) field

260 areas. For both groups the LOF quantity, the field area and the tractor use per operation are

261 depicted for the corresponding weeks of each crop. The seeding is completed three weeks in

262 advance compared to the basic scenario. The addition of one more tractor allows more tractor

263 hours available per week. Given an example, in Week 11 there is 40 h for cultivation and 17.81

264 h for LOF distribution. In the same week of the baseline scenario had 40 h in total, for

265 cultivation operation only.

Fig. 2: Results for maize (left group) and wheat (right group) in Scenario 1

3.3.3 Scenario 2

To illustrate the possible application of the method, a second scenario assesses the optimal scheduling for a minimum cost under a different field areas' configuration regarding maize only, given that wheat does not allow to apply high nitrogen dosages due to agronomic

273　reasons. The configuration followed in the Scenario 2 is presented in Table 9, and it was tested

274　considering the implement of only one tractor for all operations.

275　　　　　　　　　**Table 9**: Alternative configuration of field areas per crop and distance

Nitrogen dosage (kg [N] ha^{-1})	Crop	Distance (km)				
		1	2	3	4	5
170	Maize	-	-	12	12	12
	Wheat	12	12	12	12	12
340	Maize	12	12	-	-	-

276

277　In the case of one tractor, the optimal solution of the problem of operation scheduling was

278　€42,474 without applying LOF at 1.8 ha of wheat (~ 2% of total cost). The main percentages

279　per operation for both crops are presented in Fig. 3.

2%
32%
45%
21%

■ Cultivation Cost　■ Seeding Cost　■ Fertilizing Cost　■ Undone Cost

280

281　　　　　　　　　**Fig. 3**: Cost per operation (%) for both crops in Scenario 2

282

283 ### 3.3.4 Scenario 3

284 Scenario 3 keeps the same field area configuration shown in Table 9 for Scenario 2 but two

285 tractors are implemented for the operations execution instead of a single tractor. By

286 implementing two tractors for the execution of the LOF application, field cultivation and

287 seeding in the given field areas, the minimum cost was €40,912 for the total field area

288 operations in both crops. In this scenario, the total field area is operated. In Fig. 4, the

289 allocation of operational cost percentages are presented for both crops.

290

291 **Fig. 4**: Cost per operation (%) for both crops in Scenario 3

292

293 ## 3.4 Comparison of the four scenarios

294 In order to evaluate better the four scenarios, they are presented graphically in Fig. 5 as a

295 comparison in optimal minimum cost (€ y^{-1}) between the basic and the modified scenarios

296 with one or two tractors is presented.

22

297

298   **Fig. 5**: Optimal cost (€ y^{-1}) for both baseline scenarios (basic and Scenario 1) and modified

299   scenarios (Scenario 2 and 3)

300

301   ## 3.5   The effect of distance on the total cost

302   For a more thorough analysis, the effect of distance on the optimal annual cost was

303   performed. For this reason, it was assumed that the whole field area (60 ha) of both crops

304   require a LOF dosage of 170 kg [N] ha^{-1} in distances varying from 1 to 10 km. The LP model

305   operated this analysis by using either one or two tractors. The extracted results regarding the

306   minimum optimal cost (€ y^{-1}) is presented in Fig. 6. The unit operational cost (not presented

307   in the figure) is about 249 € ha^{-1} at 1 km vs about 452 € ha^{-1} at 10 km, with an increase of 81%.

308   As is shown from Fig. 6, by using two tractors instead of one, there is a significant difference

309   in the optimal cost varying from 681 € y^{-1} (at 1 km) up to 3,546 €·y^{-1} (at 10 km). In this case,

310   the unit cost is about 243 € ha^{-1} at 1 km vs about 422 € ha^{-1} at 10 km, with an increase of 73%.

311

23

312

**Fig. 6**: The optimal total cost (€ y^{-1}) in various farm-to-field distances (km) by using one or

314   two tractors

315

4   Conclusions

A combination of simulation and linear programming method was developed to optimise the

time schedule for LOF application in connection with cultivation and seeding operations. A

number of constraints were included given not only specific agronomical and technical

regulations but also timeliness restrictions. To evaluate the usability of this method, different

scenarios were assessed in two selected crops, namely maize and wheat. The basic scenario

was connected to the execution of all field operations by a single tractor, and the optimal

minimum cost was equal to €43,585 for the tested period (year). A second scenario (Scenario

1) was also assessed in the same field areas' configuration as the basic scenario but by using

two tractors for the field operations. As a result, there is 3.85% less annual cost in the Scenario

1 compared to the basic scenario.

A modified scenario (Scenario 2) was considered, also, including a different configuration of

field areas and nitrogen dosages resulting in 2.55% less annual cost compared to the basic

329 scenario. In addition, in Scenario 3, a reduction equal to 6.13% compared to the basic scenario

330 is presented. Finally, the effect of distance in the total minimum cost is presented by using

331 one or two tractors. The analysis pointed out reduced optimal cost (in the case of two tractors)

332 varying from 2.3% (in 1 km) up to 6.5% (in 10 km) increasing almost proportionally the savings

333 in distances above 10 km.

334 There are specific national and European regulations regarding the amount and density of LOF

335 that can be applied in each field crop for vulnerable and non-vulnerable soils. Further research

336 include the implementation of weather data which highly affect the optimal cost given that

337 on specific periods and regions the tractor workability may be quite low because of weather

338 conditions. In this case, a decision-making model could select either to apply LOF out of the

339 optimal period incurring penalties or leave the field areas without being applied with LOF

340 including the lost profit. Taking into account that by using a reasonably modern computer the

341 computational time is very low (~ 5 sec), this work has the potential to be transformed to an

342 online tool that could include real time data and extract results close to real time. For further

343 research, the present work can be expanded to the implementation of machinery workability

344 measures for all the field operations annually (including harvesting operations) under the

345 objective of minimising cost and the best scheduling of field operations.

346

350

351 ## References

352 Accorsi, R., Cholette, S., Manzini, R., Pini, C., & Penazzi, S. (2016). The land-network problem:

353   Ecosystem carbon balance in planning sustainable agro-food supply chains. *Journal of*

354   *Cleaner Production*, *112*, 158–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.06.082

355   American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers. (2011). ASAE D497.7 MAR2011

356   Agricultural Machinery Management Data. *Test*, 9.

357   Berruto, R., Busato, P., Bochtis, D. D., & Sørensen, C. G. (2010). Sustainability evaluation of

358   manure distribution with dynamicsimulation model. In *American Society of Agricultural and*

359   *Biological Engineers Annual International Meeting 2010, ASABE 2010* (Vol. 1, pp. 85–97).

360   Berruto, R., Busato, P., Bochtis, D. D., & Sørensen, C. G. (2013). Comparison of distribution

361   systems for biogas plant residual. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, *52*, 139–150.

362   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.02.030

363   Berruto, R., Tortia, C., & Gay, P. (2006). Wine bottling scheduling optimization. *Transactions*

364   *of the ASABE*, *49*(1), 291–295.

365   Bochtis, D. D., Dogoulis, P., Busato, P., Sørensen, C. G., Berruto, R., & Gemtos, T. (2013). A

366   flow-shop problem formulation of biomass handling operations scheduling. *Computers and*

367   *Electronics in Agriculture*, *91*, 49–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2012.11.015

368   Bochtis, D. D., Sørensen, C. G. C., & Busato, P. (2014). Advances in agricultural machinery

369   management: A review. *Biosystems Engineering*.

370   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2014.07.012

371   Bochtis, D. D., Sørensen, C. G., Green, O., Bartzanas, T., & Fountas, S. (2010). Feasibility of a

372   modelling suite for the optimised biomass harvest scheduling. *Biosystems Engineering*,

373   *107*(4), 283–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2010.05.005

374   Boland, M. A., Foster, K. A., Preckel, P. V, Jones, D. D., & Joern, B. C. (1999). Using linear

375   programming to minimize manure storage and application costs in pork production. *Journal*

376   *of Production Agriculture*, *12*(3), 405–408.

377   Busato, P., Sørensen, C. G., Pavlou, D., Bochtis, D. D., Berruto, R., & Orfanou, A. (2013). DSS

378   tool for the implementation and operation of an umbilical system applying organic fertiliser.

379   *Biosystems Engineering*, *114*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2012.08.012

380   Butterworth, K. (1985). Practical Application of Linear/Integer Programming in Agriculture.

381   *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, *36*(2), 99–107.

382   https://doi.org/10.2307/2582501

383   Campbell, J. C., Radke, J., Gless, J. T., & Wirtshafter, R. M. (1992). An application of linear

384   programming and geographic information systems: cropland allocation in Antigua.

385   *Environment and Planning A*, *24*(4), 535–549. https://doi.org/10.1068/a240535

386   Edwards, G., Sørensen, C. G., Bochtis, D. D., & Munkholm, L. J. (2015). Optimised schedules

387   for sequential agricultural operations using a Tabu Search method. *Computers and*

388   *Electronics in Agriculture*, *117*, 102–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2015.07.007

389   Keplinger, K. O., & Hauck, L. M. (2006). The economics of manure utilization: Model and

390   application. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*.

391   https://doi.org/10.2307/40987326

392   Kim, J., Realff, M. J., Lee, J. H., Whittaker, C., & Furtner, L. (2011). Design of biomass

393   processing network for biofuel production using an MILP model. *Biomass and Bioenergy*,

394   *35*(2), 853–871. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.11.008

395   Meyer-Aurich, A. (2005). Economic and environmental analysis of sustainable farming

396   practices - A Bavarian case study. *Agricultural Systems*, *86*(2), 190–206.

397   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2004.09.007

398   Morken, J., & Sakshaug, S. (1998). Direct ground injection of livestock waste slurry to avoid

399   ammonia emission. In *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* (Vol. 51, pp. 59–63).

400   https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009756927750

401   Ogg, C. (1999). Benefits from managing farm produced nutrients. *JOURNAL OF THE*

402   *AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION*, *35*(5), 1015–1021.

403   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1999.tb04190.x

404   Orfanou, A., Busato, P., Bochtis, D. D., Edwards, G., Pavlou, D., Sørensen, C. G., & Berruto, R.

405   (2013). Scheduling for machinery fleets in biomass multiple-field operations. *Computers and*

406   *Electronics in Agriculture*, *94*, 12–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2013.03.002

407   Sharpley, A. N., & Rekolainen, S. (1997). Phosphorus in Agriculture and Its Environmental

408   Implications. In *Phosphorus loss from soil to water. Proceedings of a workshop, Wexford,*

409   *Irish Replublic, 29-31 September 1995* (pp. 1–53).

410   Sopegno, A., Busato, P., Berruto, R., & Romanelli, T. L. (2016). A cost prediction model for

411   machine operation in multi-field production systems. *Scientia Agricola*, *73*(5), 397–405.

412   https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-9016-2015-0304

413   Sørensen, C. G., & Bochtis, D. D. (2010). Conceptual model of fleet management in

414   agriculture. *Biosystems Engineering*, *105*(1), 41–50.

415   Sørensen, C. G. G. (2003). A Model of Field Machinery Capability and Logistics: the case of

416   Manure Application. *Agricultural Engineering International: The CIGR Journal of Scientific*

417   *Research and Development*, *V*(October), Manuscript PM 03 004, pages 20.

418   van Dyken, S., Bakken, B. H., & Skjelbred, H. I. (2010). Linear mixed-integer models for

419   biomass supply chains with transport, storage and processing. *Energy*, *35*(3), 1338–1350.

420   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2009.11.017

421   Wankhade M. O, L. H. S. (2012). Allocation of Agricultural Land to The Major Crops of Saline

422   Track By Linear Programming Approach: A Case Study. *International Journal of Scintific and*

423   *Technology Research*, *1*(9), 5.

424   Zander, P., & Kächele, H. (1999). Modelling multiple objectives of land use for sustainable

425   development. *Agricultural Systems*, *59*(3), 311–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-

426   521X(99)00017-7

427