#### **GreenDelta** sustainability consulting + software

### Approaches to simplify footprint assessment

Andreas Ciroth GreenDelta GmbH Berlin

Environmental Risk Assessment of Chemicals, Mainz, October 3 2013

#### Approaches to simplify footprint assessments

- **1** Introduction
  - a) footprint assessments
  - **b**) why simplification
- **2** The challenge of smart simplification
- **3** Simplification options
- 4 How, and when, simplify? Guidelines for simplification
- 5 Summary & outlook



# 1 Introduction

#### 1 Introduction, footprint assessments

# A broad variety of assessment methods are called footprints:

- Ecological Footprint (Wackernagel et al. 1996)
- Carbon Footprint (e.g. Wiedmann and Minx, 2008, ISO 14067)
- Water Footprint (e.g. Hoekstra et al., 2011)
- Product Environmental Footprint, Organisational Environmental Footprint (European Commission, JRC, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/product\_footprint.htm, 2013)
- Different company-specific footprint assessments
- •

. . .

• See e.g. Fang, K., Heijungs, R. and De Snoo, G.R. (2014) Theoretical exploration for the combination of the ecological, energy, carbon, and water footprints: Overview of a footprint family, *Ecological Indicators*, 36: 508-518. GreenDeLTA

#### 1 Introduction, footprint assessments

→ Methods that try to assess the environmental impacts of products (sometimes also organisations), typically over the life cycle (resource extraction, production, use, disposal)

### 1 Introduction, why simplification

Footprint assessments are inherently complicated and ,,difficult":

- High data demands
- Detailed modeling steps
- Difficult-to-communicate details
- Technically challenging (some; e.g. water footprint requires region-specific information and assessment)

#### 1 Introduction, why simplification

Footprint assessments are inherently complicated

- $\rightarrow$  It is interesting to look for
- Cost reductions
- Time reductions (also: for use in product design, or for a mass of products, very short study time is mandatory)
- And for ways to make them just easier...

# 2 The challenge of smart simplification Footprint simplification is easy $\rightarrow$

Just leave out difficult-to-get data and simplify the modeling.



- Just leave out difficult-to-get data and simplify the modeling. One example:
- Prosuite approach for assessing qualitative social indicators over the life cycle:
- "the assessment of the qualitative indicators [over the
  - life cycle] is made by use of expert elicitation"
  - Prosuite Handbook on a novel methodology for the sustainability impact assessment of new technologies, 2013, p 25, http://prosuite.org/web/guest/the-prosuite-framework



- $\rightarrow$  Footprint simplification is easy, but gets difficult when you want to maintain a method that is
- credible
- correct and consistent
- able to create new insights



- $\rightarrow$  Footprint simplification is easy, but gets difficult when you want to maintain a method that is
- credible
- correct and consistent
- able to create new insights, and
- <u>still valid.</u>

→ Smart simplification makes footprint faster, less complicated, less costly, and preserves at the same time those aspects in the approach that are desirable.

("method efficiency")



- Reduce data collection
- Reduce the number of indicators
- Simplify the modeling
- Use efficient software



- Reduce data collection
- Reduce the number of indicators
- Simplify the modeling
- Use efficient software



GreenDelta

- Reduce data collection  $\rightarrow$  use generic databases
- Reduce the number of indicators → especially those that require different data, different modeling, different communication
  - Water footprint in addition to carbon footprint
  - Soil organic matter in addition to carbon footprint
  - Risk information in addition to carbon footpint
- Simplify the modeling → linear models instead of nonlinear response models
- Use efficient software → generic software reduces need for training and explanation; specific software may be better suited to the approach and to the company

# 4 How, and when, simplify?

#### How, and when, simplify?

- A difficult question.
- For example, Product Environmental Footprint, JRC:
  - Draft method:
    - Described in pilot draft report
    - 14 indicators
    - Some not supported by (all main) generic databases (Soil Organic Matter, e.g.)
    - Default ,,standard" approach for all products
    - $\rightarrow$ ,,one size fits all" approach, hence inefficencies
    - $\rightarrow$  Benefits due to a unified, generic approach
    - $\rightarrow$  LONG coordination activities

Approaches to simplify footprint assessment, Environmental Risk Assessment of Chemicals 2013

e	
Objectives and target audience	
Process and Results	
Relationship to the Organisation Environmental Footprint Guide	Droduct Hnuronmontol
Terminology: shall, should and mark	
1.1 Approach and examples for potential applications	
1 2 How to Use this Guide	
1 3 Principles for Product Environmental Enotorint Studies	$\mathbf{F}_{1}$ = 4 m m m 4 m $\mathbf{F}_{1}$ = 1 m $\mathbf{f}_{1}$ = -41 m m
1.4 Phases of a Droduct Environmental Footprint study	Footprint' Final dratt olifline
1.4 Phases of a Product Environmental Footprint Study	i ootprint. I mai draft outilite
	L
2.1 General	
2.2 Role of PEFCKs and relation with existing product Category Rules (PCKs)	
2.3 PEFCR structure based on the classification of Products by Activity (CPA)	
3. Defining the Goal(s) of the Product Environmental Footprint Study	
	• 6. 6.1 Windowse Characterization and Characterization
🖕 🖺 4. Defining the Scope of the Product Environmental Footprint Study	- The off of the second s
	6.1.1 Classification of Product Environmental Footprint Hows
	6.1.2 Characterisation of Environmental Footprint Hows
4.3 System boundaries for Product Environmental Footprint Studies	🖆 🎬 6.2 Optional Steps: Normalisation and Weighting
📲 4.4 Selecting Environmental Footprint Impact Categories and Assessment Methods	6.2.1 Normalisation of Environmental Footprint Impact Assessment Results
4.5 Selecting additional environmental information to be included in the PEF	6.2.2 Weighting of Environmental Footprint Impact Assessment Results
4.6 Assumptions/limitations	🚊 🏰 7. Interpretation of Product Environmental Footprint results
5. Compiling and Recording the Resource Use and Emissions Profile	
5.1 General	7.2 Assessment of the robustness of the Product Environmental Footprint model
5.2 Screening step (recommended)	
1.2 Second group (recommended) 1.5 3 Data management plan (antional)	7.4 Estimation of Uncertainty
	7.5 Conclusions, Recommendations and Limitations
5.4 (Boulde Use and Emissions Frome Data	B Product Environmental Enotorint Reports
5.4.1 Kaw Material Acquisition and Pre-processing (Claule-to- Gate)	
5.4.2 Capital goods	R 2 Reporting elements
5.4.4 Product Distribution and Storage68	• 0.2.1 First element. Summary
5.4.5 Use stage68	
5.4.6 Modelling logistics for the analysed product	8.2.3 Third element: Annex
5.4.7 End-of-Life	8.2.4 Fourth element: Confidential Report
5.4.8 Accounting for Electricity Use (including Use of Renewable Energy)	e
5.4.9 Additional considerations for compiling the resource use and emissions profile	🦳 💾 9.1 General
- 🕒 5.5 Nomenclature for the Resource Use and Emissions Profile	9.2 Review Type
📲 5.6 Data quality requirements	9.3 Reviewer Qualification
📲 5.7 Specific data collection	- 10. Acronyms and Abbreviations
📲 5.8 Generic data collection	II. Glossary
📲 5.9 Dealing with remaining unit process data gaps / missing data	12. References
5.10 Handling multi-functional processes	Annex I: Summary of Key Mandatory Requirements for Product Environmental Footprint and for Developing
5.11 Data gathering related to the next methodological phases in a PEF study	Annex II: Data Management Plan (adapted from GHG Protocol Initiative )
B. Environmental Footprint Impact Assessment	Annex III: Data collection checklist
6.1 Mandatory Steps: Classification and Characterisation	Annex IV: Identifying Appropriate Nomenclature and Properties for Specific Flows
6.1.1 Classification of Product Environmental Footprint Flows	Raw material Input: Crude of (Rules 2, 4, 5)
6.1.2 Characterisation of Environmental Footprint Flows	Finiscion output: Example: Cathon Divide (Pulse 2, 4, 9)
	Entropy of the second sec
C 2 1 Normalization of Environmental Engineering	Ploduct now, Example, I-still (Nulls 10-17)     Power of the state of the stat
6.2.2 Weighting of Environmental Ecotorist Impact Assessment Results	The Annex V: Dealing with Multi-functionality in Recycling Studions
OLZ.2 Weighting of Environmental Poliphic Impact Assessment Results	Annex VI: Guidance on the calculation of Direct Land Use Change emissions relevant for climate change
The product Environmental FOOtprint results	Annex VII: Example for a PEFCRs for intermediate paper products - Data quality requirements
	Annex VIII: Mapping of terminology used in this PEF Guide with ISO terminology
1.2 Assessment of the robustness of the Product Environmental Footprint model	Annex IX: PEF Guide and ILCD Handbook: major deviations
7.3 Identification of Hotspots	Annex X: Comparison of the key requirements of the PEF Guide with other methods

Rule 1: Precisely describe what you want to do

"Goal and scope of the approach"

- $\rightarrow$  Questions to be answered;
- → Related solutions existing already (i.e., other established approaches, or the approach that you want to simplify)
- $\rightarrow$  Product types, ,,other things" that will be investigated
- $\rightarrow$  Adressees of the answers (B2B, NGOs, policy, ...)
- $\rightarrow$  Who is performing the footprint
- → How is the approach involved in other activities (of yourself, of other parties)
- $\rightarrow$  Time and effort foreseen per analysis

Rule 2: Take other existing approaches and solutions as far as possible

"Standing on the shoulders of giants"

- Even applying always 14 indicators and a unified approach can lead to an overall simplification
   (→,,economies of scale").
- Establishing an own method really requires effort and stamina
- Especially critical: Indicator sets, "metrics", since they require exchange and communciation

Rule 3: Make it as simple as possible, but don't simplify further. Avoid model jargon and model artefacts

This seems obvious, but is often violated.



# Simplification rule 3: [...] avoid model artefacts Instructional example, ecoinvent 3:

Idea: Market modeling.

All products are not directly delivered by a production process, but the production process delivers to a market, which in turn delivers to other processes

 $\rightarrow$  this allows a more flexible connection of processes.



# Ecoinvent 2.2, airport is used as infrastructure input for airfreight transport

(screenshot from openLCA, www.openlca.org)

GreenDelta



#### Ecoinvent 3, airport is used as input into ,,market for airport", which is used as input for airfreight transport (screenshot from openLCA, www.openlca.org)

GreenDelta

#### Process: market for airport

#### Inputs

#### 🕑 💢 1.23

Category	Flow prop	Unit	Amount	Uncertainty	Default pr	Pedigree u
4210:Constructio	Number o	Item(s)	0.2678767	none	airport co	
4210:Constructio	Number o	Item(s)	0.7321232	none	airport co	
	Category 4210:Constructio 4210:Constructio	Category Flow prop 4210:Constructio Number o 4210:Constructio Number o	Category     Flow prop     Unit       4210:Constructio     Number o     Item(s)       4210:Constructio     Number o     Item(s)	CategoryFlow propUnitAmount4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.26787674210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.73212324210:ConstructioAmountItem(s)0.7321232	CategoryFlow propUnitAmountUncertainty4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.2678767none4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.7321232none	CategoryFlow propUnitAmountUncertaintyDefault pr4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.2678767noneairport co4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.7321232noneairport co4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.7321232noneairport co4210:ConstructioNumber oItem(s)0.7321232noneairport co4210:ConstructioAutor oAutor oAutor oAutor oAutor o4210:ConstructioAutor oAutor oAutor o<

#### Outputs

#### 🕑 💢 1.23

Flow	Category	Flow prop	Unit	Amount	Uncertainty	Avoided pr	Pedigree u	
🌣 airport - GLO	4210:Constructio	Number o	Item(s)	1.0	none			

#### Ecoinvent 3, market for airport, details

(screenshot from openLCA, www.openlca.org)



Ecoinvent 3, banana production, global  $\rightarrow$  > 100 market inputs, including irrigation market Germany (screenshot from openLCA, www.openlca.org)

GreenDelta

								<b>V</b>		
Flow	Category	Flow property	Unit	Amount	Uncertainty	Default provider	Pedigree uncertainty			
🌣 <sup>e</sup> ammonium nitrate, as N - GLO	2012:Manufacture of fertilizers and	Mass	kg	0.00682	lognormal: gmean=6.82E-3 gsigma	market for ammoniu				
electricity, low voltage - ASCC	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	5.20722103663224E-6	lognormal: gmean=5.21E-6 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - AT	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.76097681768024E-5	lognormal: gmean=4.76E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🕸 electricity, low voltage - AU	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.75438080011033E-4	lognormal: gmean=1.75E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
💠 electricity, low voltage - BA	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	6.61814031165116E-6	lognormal: gmean=6.62E-6 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - BE	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	6.69070826791834E-5	lognormal: gmean=6.69E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - BG	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.41901145878967E-5	lognormal: gmean=2.42E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - BR	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.35405058997836E-4	lognormal: gmean=3.35E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-AB	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.471072457083E-5	lognormal: gmean=2.47E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-BC	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	5.45543982648933E-5	lognormal: gmean=5.46E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-MB	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.16343626122342E-5	lognormal: gmean=3.16E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
💠 electricity, low voltage - CA-NB	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.8503109825568E-5	lognormal: gmean=1.85E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-NF	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.72449454768247E-5	lognormal: gmean=3.72E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-NS	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.26812227302949E-5	lognormal: gmean=2.27E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-NT	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.48584144437091E-7	lognormal: gmean=3.49E-7 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-NU	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.45639828112804E-7	lognormal: gmean=1.46E-7 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🔅 electricity, low voltage - CA-ON	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.373180342047E-4	lognormal: gmean=1.37E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🕸 <sup>®</sup> electricity, low voltage - CA-PE	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.31249438044228E-8	lognormal: gmean=4.31E-8 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-SK	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	9.40680395991667E-6	lognormal: gmean=9.41E-6 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CA-YK	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.33062365311172E-7	lognormal: gmean=3.33E-7 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 electricity, low voltage - CH	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.54266052185716E-5	lognormal: gmean=4.54E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CL	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.27934873542696E-5	lognormal: gmean=4.28E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🔅 electricity, low voltage - CN	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	0.00233614551384779	lognormal: gmean=2.34E-3 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - CZ	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.75068232668793E-5	lognormal: gmean=4.75E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🕫 electricity, low voltage - DE	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.21846757455138E-4	lognormal: gmean=4.22E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 electricity, low voltage - DK	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.68961628139909E-5	lognormal: gmean=2.69E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 <sup>©</sup> electricity, low voltage - ES	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.12059736743727E-4	lognormal: gmean=2.12E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 electricity, low voltage - FI	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	6.49730911353692E-5	lognormal: gmean=6.50E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 electricity, low voltage - FR	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	3.62592615760253E-4	lognormal: gmean=3.63E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - FRCC	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.59532899887423E-4	lognormal: gmean=1.60E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🜣 <sup>©</sup> electricity, low voltage - GB	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	2.75880175199292E-4	lognormal: gmean=2.76E-4 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
electricity, low voltage - GR	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	4.63135525137179E-5	lognormal: gmean=4.63E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🜣 <sup>©</sup> electricity, low voltage - HICC	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	8.25166072172749E-6	lognormal: gmean=8.25E-6 gsigma	market for electricity, I				
🐡 electricity, low voltage - HR	3510:Electric power generation, tran	Energy	kWh	1.30930308330068E-5	lognormal: gmean=1.31E-5 gsigma	market for electricity, I				

Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri Ø<sup>o</sup> electri

Tonute

Ecoinvent 3, banana production, global  $\rightarrow$  > 100 electricity inputs, also from Germany, Denmark (screenshot from openLCA, www.openlca.org)

GreenDelta

a 🖌 ...

Rule 4: Select software tools that fit to your approach. Keep them in shape. Analyse and improve the workflow for creating the footprint

E.g. BASF: Eco-Efficiency Analysis, > 15 years of experience, meanwhile 30 sustainability experts in different teams worldwide;

→ project to move from single-user, stand-alone LCA tool to super-fast web-tool with detailed analysis options, integrated into the companies' LDAP system, with detailed user rights management

(developed by GreenDelta, 2011-2013)

Rule 4: Select software tools that fit to your approach. Keep them in shape. Analyse and improve the workflow for creating the footprint

- → flexible, open, scalable tools are better than locked, single purpose tools
- $\rightarrow$  And also: standard tools are better than specific tools

Rule 4: Select software tools that fit to your approach. Keep them in shape. Analyse and improve the workflow for creating the footprint

- → flexible, open, scalable tools are better than locked, single purpose tools
- $\rightarrow$  And also: standard tools are better than specific tools
- → And further: most standard tools are locked tools that don't scale

# 5 Summary & outlook

### 5 Summary

Simplifying footprint approaches is often discussed and desired, and yet difficult.

I tried to identify four guiding principles for simplification, which are:

- Precisely describe what you want to do
- Take other existing approaches and solutions as far as possible
- Make it as simple as possible, but don't simplify further. Avoid model jargon and model artefacts
- "have an eye" on software tools and workflow.

#### 5 Outlook

- a) Let's hope that in future, software tools, databases, and users are more flexible than today, and better able to deal with different application contexts, and adapt the footprint approaches accordingly.
- b) Probably, a more unified approach will become predominant, which is more complex than carbon footprint today

# Greendelta

sustainability consulting + software

## Thank you..

Contact:

Dr. Andreas Ciroth GreenDelta GmbH Müllerstrasse 135, D-13349 Berlin <u>ciroth@greendelta.com</u> www.greendelta.com