Matthias Finkbeiner Editor

Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management





Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management

Matthias Finkbeiner Editor

Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management





Editor Prof. Dr. Matthias Finkbeiner Chair of Sustainable Engineering Technische Universität Berlin Straße des 17. Juni 135 10623 Berlin Germany matthias.finkbeiner@tu-berlin.de

ISBN 978-94-007-1898-2 e-ISBN 978-94-007-1899-9 DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1899-9 Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011933605

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Table of Contents

| Pre | eface x | i |
|-----|---|---|
| Lis | t of Figuresxv | 7 |
| Lis | t of Tablesxxv | 7 |
| Lis | t of Contributorsxxx | i |
| PA | RT I: LCSM Approaches | |
| 1. | Integrating Sustainability Considerations into Product Development: A Practical Tool for Prioritising Social Sustainability Indicators and Experiences from Real Case Application | 3 |
| 2. | A Life Cycle Stakeholder Management Framework for Enhanced Collaboration Between Stakeholders with Competing Interests | 5 |
| 3. | Stakeholder Consultation: What do Decision Makers in Public Policy and Industry Want to Know Regarding Abiotic Resource Use? | 7 |
| 4. | Life Cycle Management Capability: An Alternative Approach to Sustainability Assessment | |
| 5. | The Sustainability Consortium: A Stakeholder Approach to Improve Consumer Product Sustainability | 3 |
| 6. | A Social Hotspot Database for Acquiring Greater Visibility in Product Supply Chains: Overview and Application to Orange Juice | 3 |

PART II: LCM Methods and Tools

| 7. | A Novel Weighting Method in LCIA and its Application in Chinese Policy Context | . 65 |
|-----|--|------|
| 8. | The Usefulness of an Actor's Perspective in LCA Henrikke Baumann, Johanna Berlin, Birgit Brunklaus, Mathias Lindkvist, Birger Löfgren, and Anne-Marie Tillman | . 73 |
| 9. | Review on Land Use Considerations in Life Cycle Assessment: Methodological Perspectives for Marine Ecosystems Juliette Langlois, Arnaud Hélias, Jean-Philippe Delgenès and Jean-Philippe Steyer | . 85 |
| 10. | Visual Accounting Andreas Moeller and Martina Prox | . 97 |
| 11. | International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD) Handbook: Review Schemes for Life Cycle Assessment Kirana Chomkhamsri, Marc-Andree Wolf and Rana Pant | 107 |
| 12. | Time and Life Cycle Assessment: How to Take Time into Account in the Inventory Step? Pierre Collet, Arnaud Hélias, Laurent Lardon and Jean-Philippe Steyer | 119 |
| 13. | A Method of Prospective Technological Assessment of Nanotechnological Techniques Michael Steinfeldt | 131 |
| 14. | State of the Art Study - How is Environmental Performance Measured for Buildings/Constructions? Anne Rønning and Kari-Anne Lyng | 141 |

PART III: Water Footprint

| 15. | Comparison of Water Footprint for Industrial Products in Japan, China and USA | 155 |
|-----|---|-----|
| | Sadataka Horie, Ichiro Daigo, Yasunari Matsuno and Yoshihiro Adachi | |
| 16. | Assessment of the Water Footprint of Wheat in Mexico Carole Farell, Sylvie Turpin and Nydia Suppen | 161 |
| 17. | Water Footprints in Four Selected Breweries in Nigeria Ife K. Adewumi, Oludare J. Oyebode, Kingsley C. Igbokwe and Olutobi G. Aluko | 171 |

| 18. | Development and Application of a Water Footprint Metric for Agricultural Products and the Food Industry Bradley Ridoutt | . 183 |
|-----|---|-------|
| 19. | LCA Characterisation of Freshwater Use on Human Health and Through Compensation Anne-Marie Boulay, Cecile Bulle, Louise Deschênes and Manuele Margni | . 193 |
| PA | RT IV: LCM of Processes and Organisations | |
| 20. | How to Measure and Manage the Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Impact of a Global Multinational Company Nicole Unger, Henry King and Siri Calvert | . 207 |
| 21. | Best Practice Application of LCM by Retailers to Improve Product Supply Chain Sustainability David Styles, Harald Schoenberger and José Luis Galvez-Martos | . 217 |
| 22. | Life Cycle Management Approach to the Design of Large-Scale Resorts Kristin Lee Brown, Daniel Clayton Greer and Ben Schwegler | . 229 |
| 23. | Greening Events: Waste Reduction Through the Integration of Life Cycle Management into Event Organisation at ESCi Marta Anglada Roig, Sonia Bautista Ortiz and Pere Fullana i Palmer | . 239 |
| 24. | Challenges for LCAs of Complex Systems: The Case of a Large-Scale Precious Metal Refinery Plant Anna Stamp, Christina E.M. Meskers, Markus Reimer, Patrick Wäger, Hans-Jörg Althaus and Roland W. Scholz | . 247 |
| 25. | Life Cycle Inventory of Pine and Eucalyptus Cellulose Production in Chile: Effect of Process Modifications Patricia González, Mabel Vega and Claudio Zaror | . 259 |
| 26. | Life Cycle Assessment of Integrated Solid Waste Management System of Delhi Amitabh Kumar Srivastava and Arvind Kumar Nema | . 267 |
| 27. | LCM of Rainwater Harvesting Systems in Emerging Neighbourhoods in Colombia Tito Morales-Pinzón, Sara Angrill, Joan Rieradevall, Xavier Gabarrell, Carles M. Gasol and Alejandro Josa | . 277 |

PART V: LCM in the Agriculture and Food Sectors

| 28. | Environmental Profiles of Farm Types in Switzerland Based on LCA Daniel U. Baumgartner, Johanna Mieleitner, Martina Alig and Gérard Gaillard | 291 |
|-----|---|-------|
| 29. | The Use of Models to Account for the Variability of Agricultural Data Brigitte Langevin, Laurent Lardon and Claudine Basset-Mens | . 301 |
| 30. | Modular Extrapolation Approach for Crop LCA MEXALCA: Global Warming Potential of Different Crops and its Relationship to the Yield | . 309 |
| | Thomas Nemecek, Karin Weiler, Katharina Plassmann, Julian Schnetzer, Gérard Gaillard, Donna Jefferies, Tirma García–Suárez, Henry King and Llorenç Milà i Canals | |
| 31. | Regional Assessment of Waste Flow Eco-Synergy in Food Production: Using Compost and Polluted Ground Water in Mediterranean Horticulture Crops Julia Martínez-Blanco, Pere Muñoz, Joan Rieradevall, Juan I Montero and Assumpció Antón | .319 |
| 32. | Assessing Management Influence on Environmental Impacts Under Uncertainty: A Case Study of Paddy Rice Production in Japan Kiyotada Hayashi | . 331 |
| 33. | Assessing Environmental Sustainability of Different Apple Supply Chains in Northern Italy Alessandro K. Cerutti, Daniela Galizia, Sander Bruun, Gabriella M. Mellano, Gabriele L. Beccaro and Giancarlo Bounous | . 341 |
| 34. | The Effect of CO ₂ Information Labelling for the Pork Produced with Feed Made from Food Residuals Hideaki Kurishima, Tatsuo Hishinuma and Yutaka Genchi | . 349 |
| PA | RT VI: LCM in the Packaging Sector | |
| 35. | Role of Packaging in LCA of Food Products | .359 |

| | Frans Silvenius, Juha-Matti Katajajuuri, Kaisa Grönman, Risto Soukka Heta-Kaisa Koivupuro and Yrjö Virtanen | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 36. | Packaging Legislation and Unintended Consequences: A Case Study on the Necessity of Life Cycle Management | 371 |
| | James Michael Martinez | |

| 37. | Carbon Footprint of Beverage Packaging in the United Kingdom Haruna Gujba and Adisa Azapagic | 381 |
|-----|--|-----|
| 38. | Enhanced Resource Efficiency with Packaging Steel Evelyne Frauman and Norbert Hatscher | 391 |
| 39. | Damage Assessment Model for Freshwater Consumption and a Case Study on PET Bottle Production Applied New Technology for Water Footprint Reduction Masaharu Motoshita, Norihiro Itsubo, Kiyotaka Tahara and Atsushi Inaba | 399 |

PART VII: LCM in the Energy Sector

| 40. | Sustainability Assessment of Biomass Utilisation in East Asian Countries |
|-----|---|
| 41. | Life Cycle Inventory of Physic Nut Biodiesel: Comparison Between the Manual and Mechanised Agricultural Production Systems Practiced in Brazil |
| 42. | Life Cycle Assessment of Biodiesel Production from Microalgae Oil: Effect of Algae Species and Cultivation System |
| 43. | Modelling the Inventory of Hydropower Plants |
| 44. | Life Cycle Carbon Dioxide Emission and Stock of Domestic Wood Resources using Material Flow Analysis and Life Cycle Assessment |
| 45. | Analysis on Correlation Relationship Between Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emission and Life Cycle Cost of Electricity Generation System for Energy Resources |
| 46. | Development and Application of a LCA Model for Coal Conversion Products (Coal to Y) |

PART VIII: LCM in the Electronics and ICT Sectors

| 47. | European LCA Standardisation of ICT: Equipment, Networks, and Services Anders S.G. Andrae | 483 |
|-----|--|-----|
| 48. | Product Carbon Footprint (PCF) Assessment of a Dell OptiPlex 780 Desktop – Results and Recommendations Markus Stutz | 495 |
| 49. | State of the Art in Life Cycle Assessment of Laptops and Remaining Challenges on the Component Level: The Case of Integrated Circuits Ran Liu, Siddharth Prakash, Karsten Schischke, Lutz Stobbe | 501 |
| 50. | The Concept of Monitoring of LCM Results Based on Refrigerators Case Study Przemyslaw Kurczewski and Krzysztof Koper | 513 |
| 51. | Life Cycle Management of F-Gas-Free Refrigeration Technology: The Case of F-Gases-Free Frozen Dessert Equipment Francesca Cappellaro, Grazia Barberio and Paolo Masoni | 523 |
| PA | RT IX: LCM in the Mobility Sector | |
| 52. | Assessment of the Environmental Impacts of Electric Vehicle Concepts Michael Held and Michael Baumann | 535 |
| 53. | A Consistency Analysis of LCA Based Communication and Stakeholders Needs to Improve the Dialogue on New Electric Vehicle Stephane Morel, Tatiana Reyes and Adeline Darmon | 547 |
| 54. | Design for Environment and Environmental Certificate at Mercedes-Benz Cars Klaus Ruhland, Rüdiger Hoffmann, Halil Cetiner and Bruno Stark | 557 |
| 55. | Implementing Life Cycle Engineering Efficiently into Automotive Industry Processes | 567 |
| 56. | Environmental Product Declaration of a Commuter Train Kathy Reimann, Sara Paulsson, Yannos Wikström and Saemundur Weaving | 579 |
| Ind | lex | 587 |

Preface

Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management

The global society has undergone a paradigm shift from environmental protection towards sustainability. Sustainability does not only focus on the environmental impact, it rather consists of the three dimensions "environment", "economy" and "social well-being", for which society needs to find a balance or even an optimum. Sustainability has become mainstream these days. It is accepted by all stakeholders - be it multinational companies, governments or NGOs. Unfortunately, this common understanding merely relates to the general concept rather than actions. But lip service is not enough to achieve a sustainable development of our societies. If we want to make sustainability happen as concrete reality in both public policy making and corporate strategies, sustainability cannot please everybody. To make it happen, we have to be able to discern good and evil. This requires that we are able to address the question, how sustainability performance can be measured, especially for companies, products and processes. We have to be smart enough to be able to measure it or the real and substantial implementation of the sustainability concept will remain just wishful thinking.

In order to achieve reliable and robust sustainability assessment results it is inevitable that the principles of comprehensiveness and life cycle perspective are applied. The life cycle perspective considers for products all life cycle stages and for organisations the complete supply or value chains, from raw material extraction and acquisition, through energy and material production and manufacturing, to use and end of life treatment and final disposal. Through such a systematic overview and perspective, the unintentional shifting of environmental burdens, economic benefits and social well-being between life cycle stages or individual processes can be identified and possibly avoided. Another important principle is comprehensiveness, because it considers "all" attributes or aspects of environmental, economic and social performance and interventions. By considering all attributes and aspects within one assessment in a cross-media and multidimensional perspective, potential trade-offs can be identified and assessed.

This is where life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle management (LCM) come into play. LCA is the internationally accepted method for measuring environmental performance and LCM is in a nutshell about the application of LCA or rather life cycle thinking (LCT). It is still a relatively young concept in the environmental community with pioneering work done by a Working Group of the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) at the end of the last century. At that time, my definition of LCM was "a comprehensive approach towards

product and organisation related environmental management tools that follow a life cycle perspective." The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and SETAC later launched the Life Cycle Initiative to enable users around the world to put life cycle thinking into effective practice and introduced LCM as one of their areas of work.

While the measurement of the environmental dimension of sustainability with LCA is well established, similar approaches were developed more recently for the economic (life cycle costing – LCC) and the social (social LCA – SLCA) dimensions of sustainability. This development is crucial, because it fosters the opportunity for life cycle based sustainability assessments. Walter Klöpffer put this idea into the conceptual formula:

| LCSA | = LCA + LCC + SLCA |
|------|--|
| LCSA | = Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment |
| LCA | = Environmental Life Cycle Assessment |
| LCC | = Life Cycle Costing |
| SLCA | = Social Life Cycle Assessment |

Even though there is definitely still room to improve and expand the implementation of LCA as part of an environmental LCM approach, I believe the time has come to expand the concept to include the other pillars of sustainability in a more explicit way. This is reflected in our choice of the title of this book "Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management". Life Cycle Sustainability Management or LCSM is the implementation of life cycle based sustainability assessment or LCSA into real world decision making processes, be it on the product, process or organisation level. In a nutshell, LCSM aims at maximising the triple bottom line (3BL) and is based on LCSA as one key element of a broader toolbox:

LCSM = f(LCSA) = max(3BL)

This book is a selection of the most relevant contributions to the LCM 2011 conference in Berlin. The Life Cycle Management conference series is established as one of the leading events worldwide in the field of environmental, economic and social sustainability. The unique feature of LCM is practical solutions for the implementation of life cycle approaches into strategic and operational decision-making. The 2011 conference motto "Towards Life Cycle Sustainability Management" was chosen to address and to focus on the implementation challenge of sustainability as outlined above. In total, 414 abstracts representing more than 1100 authors from 47 countries were submitted.

Because of the excellent overall quality of the contributions it was quite a challenge to select the 56 papers for this book. They are structured in nine Parts. The first four Parts focus on the more general, methodological topics. Part I

addresses general LCSM approaches that go beyond the more traditional LCM methods and tools which are covered in Part II. Part III deals with water footprinting as specific and emerging topic. LCM applications for processes and organisations are the content of Part IV. The remaining five Parts deal with the implementation of LCM approaches in relevant industrial sectors, namely the agriculture and food sectors (Part V), the packaging sector (Part VI), the energy sector (Part VII), the electronics and ICT sectors (Part VIII) and the mobility sector (Part IX).

The authors of this volume come from 29 countries including Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas. They represent the developed and the developing world as well as a variety of stakeholders from multinational companies, academia, NGOs to public policy. I am very grateful for their excellent and timely contributions.

In addition to the core contribution of the authors this book was only possible due to the efforts of many colleagues and friends. I am very grateful for the support of the co-chair of the LCM 2011 conference, Stephan Krinke, and all members of the scientific committee: Carina Alles, Emmanuelle Aoustin, Pankaj Bhatia, Clare Broadbent, Andrea Brown Smatlan, Maurizio Cellura, Roland Clift, Mary Ann Curran, Ichiro Daigo, James Fava, Jeppe Frydendal, Pere Fullana, Gerard Gaillard, Mark Goedkoop, Minako Hara, Michael Hauschild, Jens Hesselbach, Arpad Horvath, Atsushi Inaba, Allan Astrup Jensen, Anne Johnson, Juha Kaila, Gregory Keoleian, Henry King, Walter Klöpffer, Annette Koehler, Paolo Masoni, Yasunari Matsuno, Llorenc Mila i Canals, Nils Nissen, Philippa Notten, Erwin Ostermann, Rana Pant, Claus Stig Pedersen, Gerald Rebitzer, Helmut Rechberger, Klaus Ruhland, Günther Seliger, Guido Sonnemann, Nydia Suppen, Ladji Tikana, Sonia Valdivia, Paul Vaughan and Harro von Blottnitz. Their efforts in soliciting and selecting the right mix of contributions were extremely valuable.

I particularly like to thank my Sustainable Engineering group at TU Berlin for all their support. Special thanks have to go to the core editing team consisting of Annekatrin Lehmann, Laura Schneider and Marzia Traverso for their generous commitment on top of their regular duties. I also like to acknowledge the technical support of Robert Ackermann, Adrian Caesar and Martina Creutzfeldt.

Last, but not least, sincere thanks to my family for their courtesy and patience.

Berlin Prof. Dr. Matthias Finkbeiner

List of Figures

| Chapte Fig. 1: | er 2 Framework for sustainability stakeholder management in a LCSM context | 23 |
|---|--|-------------------|
| Chapte Fig. 1: | er 3 Example of a post-it used for the inventory of decision contexts | 29 |
| Chapte Fig. 1: | er 4 Example assessment questionnaire for LCM capability | 39 |
| Chapte Fig. 1: Fig. 2: | er 5 Component relationships and their users How sustainability performance drivers (SPDs) and indicators create product specific declarations | 47 48 |
| Chapte Fig. 1: Fig. 2: Fig. 3: | Flow chart for the decision maker analysis of an SKF roller bearing Environmental impacts related to different actors To left: Distribution of CO ₂ e emissions for production of one bearing unit (reformulated dominance analysis) - To right: Distribution of CO ₂ e emissions for manufacturing of one bearing unit at SKF | 75 76 |
| Fig. 4: | System boundaries when relating environmental consequences to an | . 77 |
| Fig. 5: | actor's manufacturing processes | 78 |
| Fig. 6: | Environmental impacts of actors in the buildings chain depending on their choice. | 81 |
| Chapte Fig. 1: | er 9 Representation of land use impacts due to transformation and Occupation processes | 87 |
| Chapte | er 10 | |
| Fig. 1: Fig. 2: Fig. 3: | Material flow cost accounting software prototype Visualisation of life cycle phases within the flow chart editor Charts and tables as flow chart editor elements | 102 103 103 |

| Fig. 1: | Life cycle thinking and assessment - coherence and quality-assurance support for EU SCP/SIP policies 108 |
|-------------------------|---|
| Fig. 2: | ILCD handbook guidance documents |
| Fig. 3: | Scoring system for eligible reviewers/review teams and for qualification |
| • | as a potential member of a review team |
| Fig. 4: | LCA reviewer self-registry application |
| Chapte | er 12 |
| Fig. 1: | Main steps of the introduction of time in the LCI |
| Fig. 2: | Overview of the system of biodiesel production from rapeseed. For the sake of clarity agricultural machines are not described. An example |
| D ¹ 0 | is given for the tractor |
| Fig. 3: | Selection of the couples {process, emission} |
| Chapte | er 13 |
| Fig. 1: | Comparison of the cumulative energy requirements for various carbon nanoparticle manufacturing processes [MJ-equivalents/kg material] |
| Fig. 2: | Comparison of the cumulative energy requirements for the production of various conventional and nanoscaled materials and components |
| Fig. 3: | Comparison of the global warming potential for the production of various conventional and nanoscaled materials $[CO_2e/kg \text{ product}] \dots 137$ |
| Chapte | er 14 |
| Fig. 1: | Life cycle phases of a building |
| Chapte | er 15 |
| Fig. 1: | The WF for iron and steel industry in Japan, China and the U.S |
| Fig. 2: | The WF for a passenger car in Japan, China and the U.S |
| Chapte | er 18 |
| Fig. 1: | Distribution of global freshwater withdrawals by local water stress index (WSI) |
| Fig. 2: | Comparison of water use inventory (L) and water use impact (L H_2O-e) results 185 |
| Fig 3. | Example of farm water balance model 190 |
| Fig. 4: | Proposed impact pathway relating land use to human health |

| Fig. 1: | Impact assessment of water use - for midpoint level and endpoint level | . 195 |
|----------|--|-------|
| Fig. 2: | Process and water use impacts from compensation and on human health from deprivation for the production of 1 ton of corrugated board in the region of Cape Town in South Africa. | .202 |
| Chapte | er 20 | |
| Fig. 1: | The main pillars and structure of the Unilever Sustainable Living Plan | 208 |
| Fig. 2: | Schematic flow showing the step of greenhouse gas baseline measurement process | .211 |
| Fig. 3: | Example of schematic outline of system boundaries for the food Model | 211 |
| Fig. 4: | Greenhouse gas footprint breakdown according to life cycle stages for the Unilever portfolio for 2008 measured in 14 countries, based | |
| | on approximately 1,600 representative products | .212 |
| Fig. 5: | Greenhouse gas footprint breakdown according to product category for the Unilever portfolio for 2008 measured in 14 countries, based | |
| | on approximately 1,600 representative products | .212 |
| Chante | er 21 | |
| Fig. 1: | Proposed sequence of key questions and actions representing best practice for systematic supply chain improvement, classified as prerequisites or one of two strategies | 225 |
| Fig. 2: | Retailer control points (R) for hotspots within the value chain of cotton | . 220 |
| 8 | textiles | .227 |
| Chant | | |
| Fig. 1. | Concentual process man for evaluating and implementing sustainable | |
| 1 lg. 1. | design solutions (SDS) within WDPR | 235 |
| Chapte | er 23 | |
| Fig. 1: | Number and type of one-day events held at ESCi during the academic | |
| E' 0 | years 2008–2009, 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 | .242 |
| Fig. 2: | Waste generation by person and event type | .243 |
| Chapte | er 24 | |
| Fig. 1: | The Hoboken metal refinery system | .249 |
| Fig. 2: | Schematic view on one sub-process | 253 |
| Fig. 3: | Results for material flow data from 2009. | .255 |

| Fig. 1: | Present waste flow in the study area | .269 |
|-----------------------|--|-------|
| Fig. 2: | Fluctuation of waste quantities in Delhi | 270 |
| Fig. 3: | System boundary for the present study | 273 |
| | 27 | |
| Chapte | | 202 |
| Fig. 1: | Global warming potential behaviour based on RWH | .282 |
| F1g. 2: | Relationship between storage volume and RWH. | .283 |
| F1g. 3: | Proportion of total environmental impacts and contribution of the | |
| | systems urban for 15m ⁻ built ⁻ storage volume and 11,856 m ⁻ year ⁻ | 204 |
| Ein A. | OF KWH potential | . 284 |
| F1g. 4: | Proportion of total environmental impacts and contribution of the systems unly for $85m^3$ huilt ⁻¹ storage values and $2.806m^3$ year ⁻¹ of | |
| | BWH notontial | 205 |
| Fig 5. | Relationship between storage volume and GWP (100a) of household | . 203 |
| 1 lg. <i>J</i> . | water consumption | 286 |
| | water consumption | . 280 |
| Chapte | er 28 | |
| Fig. 1: | Energy demand per ha UAA (utilised agricultural area) for different | |
| • | farm types | .295 |
| Fig. 2: | Environmental profiles for the 3 functions land management, | |
| | productive function and financial function for different farm types | . 297 |
| | 20 | |
| Chapte | er 29 | |
| F1g. 1: | Nitrogen losses and associated environmental impacts (plain lines: | 202 |
| E: 0 | direct emissions, dashed lines: indirect emissions) | . 302 |
| F1g. 2: | Distribution of NH_3 and N_2O emissions expressed as relative factors | 204 |
| Eia 2. | of band spreading emissions | 205 |
| Fig. 5: Fig. 4 : | Distribution of NIL omissions for the slurry application techniques | 206 |
| Fig. 4. | Simulated density functions and ranges of relative factors calculated | . 300 |
| rig. <i>3</i> . | from the literature review for NH ₂ and N ₂ O | 306 |
| | | . 500 |
| Chapte | er 30 | |

- Fig. 1: Worldwide means of the global warming potential per ha and growing season of 27 crops weighted by production volumes, showing the season of 27 crops weighted by production volumes, showing the contribution of the modules and the potential effects of deforestation.312

| Fig. 3: | Worldwide means of GWPs of 27 crops per ha weighted by production volumes and per kg as a function of the yield. | .314 |
|---------------------|--|-------|
| Fig. 4: | Global warming potential of wheat per ha and per kg as a function of the yield for all producing countries with a share $>0.1\%$ of the | |
| Fig. 5: | worldwide production volume. Global warming potential of pea per ha and per kg as a function of the yield for all producing countries with a share $>0.1\%$ of the worldwide production volume | .315 |
| | | . 510 |
| Chapte | er 31 | 222 |
| Fig. 1: | Nitrogen demand from the Catalan horticulture sector | . 323 |
| F1g. 2: | the first year from OFMSW composted. (b) Potential nitrogen available | 224 |
| Eig 2. | Irom ground water irrigation | . 324 |
| Fig. 3. Fig. 4: | Contribution of the three sources of nutrients to the total demand of nutrients of Catalan horticulture sector in the eco-synergy | . 323 |
| | scenario | .326 |
| Fig. 5: | Global warming savings for the eco-synergy scenario | .327 |
| Chante | er 32 | |
| Fig. 1: | Difference in mean CO ₂ emissions between direct seeding and transplanting | . 337 |
| Chapte | er 33 | |
| Fig. 1: | System boundary and modelling of the apple production phase. Dotted box refers to processes that differ according to the three scenarios | . 343 |
| Fig. 2: | Schematic description of transport channels for the considered supply | |
| | chains | . 344 |
| Fig. 3: | Hotspot analysis for the three supply chains | . 345 |
| Fig. 4: | Normalised impact assessment for 1 kg of Golden Delicious produced | |
| D ' 7 | in Piedmont, at the end of three main supply chain scenarios | . 346 |
| F1g. 5: | Weighted results (EDIP method 1997) presented as the sum of the | |
| | A, B and C | . 346 |
| C1 | | |
| Chapte Eige 1 | er 34 | 251 |
| Fig. 1: | Exemplary questionnaire sneet | 252 |
| $r_{1g. 2}$ | Fourt-or-putchase (FOF) advertising 1001 | . 333 |
| 1'1g. 5. | residuals | 355 |
| | 105144415 | . 555 |

| Fig. 1: | The carbon footprint of ham system divided in four phases: Waste management, packaging production, production chain of ham and |
|---------|---|
| | unnecessary production of ham due household waste |
| Fig. 2: | The share of package production, production chain of product loss and waste management of the carbon footprint of dark bread packaging system other parts of production chain of bread excluded 366 |
| Fig. 3: | The share of package production, production chain of product loss and waste management of the carbon footprint of ham packaging |
| | system, other parts of production chain of ham excluded |
| F1g. 4: | The product loss, package production chain and waste management in different waste management scenarios in soygurt-case |
| Chapte | er 36 |
| Fig. 1: | Energy usage required in the manufacture of 16oz. hot cups |
| Fig. 2: | Air emissions generated in the manufacture of 16oz. hot cups |
| Fig. 3: | Waterborne emissions generated in the manufacture of 16oz. hot cups 376 |
| Fig. 4: | Greenhouse gas emissions generated in the manufacture of 16oz. |
| | hot cups |
| Fig. 5: | Solid waste (by weight) for 16oz. hot cups |
| Fig. 6: | Solid waste (by volume) for 16oz. hot cups |
| Chapte | er 37 |
| Fig. 1: | System boundary for the beverage packaging |
| Fig. 2: | Carbon footprint of milk packaging |
| Fig. 3: | Carbon footprint of juice packaging |
| Fig. 4: | Carbon footprint of water packaging |
| Fig. 5: | Carbon footprint of beer and wine packaging |
| Chapte | er 38 |
| Fig. 1: | EU 27 recycling rates in 2008 for different packaging materials |
| Fig. 2: | Evolution of EU 27 recycling rates and equivalent reduction |
| U | in indice of CO ₂ emissions (from 1991 to 2008) |
| Fig. 3: | Development of weights of some standard steel packing in Europe |
| Fig. 4: | Development of CO ₂ emissions of some standard steel packing |
| • | in Europe |
| Chapte | er 39 |
| Fig. 1: | Schematic diagram of assessment flow on human health damage due |
| - | to domestic water scarcity |
| Fig. 2: | Schematic diagram of assessment flow on human health damage due |
| | to agricultural water scarcity |

| Fig. 3: | Distribution map of integrated damage factors of each country404 |
|--------------------------|--|
| Fig. 4: | The rate of damage on each endpoint for countries with the high- ranking rate of human health damage due to domestic water scarcity 404 |
| Fig. 5: | The rate of damage on each endpoint for countries with the high- |
| Fig. 6: | ranking rate of social asset damage due to agricultural water scarcity405 System boundary of the assessment |
| Fig. 7: | The input amount of freshwater in each life stage |
| Fig. 8: | The amount of consumptive water in each stage of both systems |
| Fig 9. | With advanced and conventional filling technologies |
| 8 | related to PET bottle production system with advanced filling |
| D ¹ 10 | technology in representative countries |
| F1g. 10 | Distribution map of the contribution rate of freshwater savings |
| | impact in each country |
| Chapte | er 40 |
| Fig. 1: | Location of four pilot studies with different feedstocks for biomass energy |
| ~ | |
| Chapte | er 42 Diagram of the production of hisdiagel from Nannachlopping agaitang 420 |
| Fig. 1. Fig. 2: | GHG emissions of processes for biodiesel production from Microalgae 440 |
| Fig. 3: | Energy consumption and NER values of processes for biodiesel |
| | production from microalgae |
| Chapte | er 43 |
| Fig. 1: | Comparison of MAEs for different estimators |
| Chapte | er 44 |
| Fig. 1: | Forest sector mitigation strategies need to be assessed with regard to |
| | their impacts on carbon storage in forest ecosystems on sustainable harvest rates and on net GHG emissions across all sectors 454 |
| Fig. 2: | Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission of wooden and concrete house 456 |
| Chapte | er 45 |
| Fig. 1: | Cost of electricity generation for energy resources per 1 kWh462 |
| Fig. 2: | GHG emission of electricity generation for energy resources per 1 k Wh462 |
| 1 1g. J. | resources and correlation between GHG emissions and cost |

| Fig. 1: | System limits of Coal-to-MeOH route | 474 |
|---------|--|-----|
| Fig. 2: | GHG emissions for 5 CTY products | 476 |
| Fig. 3: | Methanol from coal vs. conventional fuels | 478 |
| Chapte | er 47 | |
| Fig. 1: | Standardised result for ICT Equipment: laptops | 489 |
| Fig. 2: | Standardised result for ICT networks: FTTH | 490 |
| Fig. 3: | Standardised result for ICT Services: Video conferences | 491 |
| Chapte | er 48 | |
| Fig. 1: | Dell OptiPlex 780 desktops; Mini Tower is at far left | 496 |
| Fig. 2: | Total product carbon footprint [kg CO ₂ e] of the OptiPlex 780 Mini | 108 |
| | Tower in the 05, Europe and Australia | 490 |
| Chapte | er 49 | |
| Fig. 1: | Global warming potential (GWP) of laptops in the manufacturing stage | 502 |
| Chapte | er 50 | |
| Fig. 1: | Comparison of LCA/LCC results for different variants of the analysed refrigerator | 521 |
| Chapte | er 51 | |
| Fig. 1: | Comparative environmental impact assessment between R-404a and CO ₂ -based ice-cream machines | 529 |
| Chante | er 52 | |
| Fig 1. | Global warming potential of the production and use of EVs and CVs | 538 |
| Fig 2 | Acidification potential of the production and use of EVs and CVs | 539 |
| Fig. 3: | GWP of the production and use of EVs and CVs (scenario 2020) | 541 |
| Fig. 4: | AP of the production and use of EVs and CVs (scenario 2020) | 541 |
| Fig. 5: | GWP of a mini-class BEV in city use, low mileage | 543 |
| Fig. 6: | GWP of a mini-class BEV in city use, high mileage | 543 |
| Chapte | er 53 | |
| Fig. 1: | Mapping of countries according to the HDI and EPI (ecosystem | |

| 0 | 11 0 | e | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 2 | |
|---------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|-----|
| | vitality) indexes | | | | 549 |
| Fig. 2: | LCA communica | tion strategy wheel for each | "eco-maturity" | level | 554 |

| Fig. 1: | Process design for environment and brochure environmental certificate | . 558 |
|---------|---|-------|
| Fig. 2: | Comparison of carbon dioxide emissions - S 400 HYBRID vs. S 350 | |
| | [t/car] | 560 |
| Fig. 3: | Comparison of selected parameters for the S 400 HYBRID and S 350 | . 561 |
| Fig. 4: | Comparison of selected material and energy sources [unit/car] | 562 |
| Fig. 5: | Recycling concept of the S 400 HYBRID | 563 |
| Fig. 6: | Use of recycled materials in the S-Class | 564 |
| Fig. 7: | Use of renewable raw materials in the S-Class | 565 |

Chapter 55

| Fig. 1: | Environmental strategy Volkswagen Group | 569 |
|---------|---|-----|
| Fig. 2: | Environmental management at Volkswagen | 570 |
| Fig. 3: | Lightweight design and environmental break-even | 574 |
| Fig. 4: | Environmentally friendly lightweight design, aspects and measures . | 575 |
| Fig. 5: | Well-to-Wheel analysis of power trains and fuel options | 576 |
| - | | |

| Fig. 1: | Material composition of the studied train based on production |
|---------|--|
| | and maintenance |
| Fig. 2: | Comparison of emissions of CO2e for different modes of transport 585 |
| Fig. 3: | Contribution of life cycle phases to POCP for the studied train |

List of Tables

| Tab. 1: | Social sustainability indicators used in the case application and final scores. | 8 |
|--------------|--|-----|
| Chapte | er 3 | |
| Tab. 1: | Participants of stakeholder consultation process on the AoP resource | 28 |
| Tab. 2: | Results of decision contexts | 29 |
| Chapte | er 4 | |
| Tab. 1: | Results for literature search on key words (number of citations) | 36 |
| Tab. 2: | LCM capability maturity model | 37 |
| Chapte | er 6 | |
| Tab. 1: | Top ten sectors by worker hours (WH) for total, skilled, and unskilled workforce for the production of orange juice (OJ) in the United States | - |
| T 1 0 | (XAC = South Central Africa Region) | 58 |
| Tab. 2: | Highest exporting countries for the materials used in orange juice production | 59 |
| Tab. 3: | Country-specific sectors (CSS) most at risk for social hotspots to be present based on the supply chain of orange juice | 60 |
| Chapte | er 7 | |
| Tab. 1: | Original political targets and the comparable targets after adjustment | 67 |
| Tab. 2: | Primary dataset of three processes and data sources | 68 |
| Tab. 3: | LCI/LCIA results and ECER score | 69 |
| Tab. 4: | Contribution analysis of three processes in terms of ECER score | 69 |
| Tab. 5: | Normalised weighting factors of the three methods for Chinese ECER targets | 71 |
| Chapte | er 9 | |
| Tab. 1: | Impacts of marine activities on marine ecosystem layers | 92 |
| Chapte | er 10 | |
| Tab. 1: | Dictionary within the meta data repository | 101 |

| Tab. 1: | Example for minimum review requirements of each LCA work for ILCD system based on stakeholder involvement, and technical |
|----------|--|
| | knowledge of the audience |
| Tab. 2: | Draft overview of methods used for review |
| Chapte | r 12 |
| Tab. 1: | Time scales associated with the impacts |
| Tab. 2: | Materials fluxes required to construct the agricultural machines |
| Tab. 3: | Results |
| Chapte | r 13 |
| Tab. 1: | Overview of studies of published LCAs of the manufacture of nanoparticles and nanocomponents |
| Chapte | r 15 |
| Tab. 1: | Comparison of data sources and estimation methods in the three countries |
| Tab. 2: | The WF for crude steel and the amount of crude steel production in Japan and China |
| Tab. 3: | Total amount of water withdrawal for upstream life cycle until producing crude steel in Japan and China |
| Chapte | r 16 |
| Tab. 1: | Water footprint of irrigated wheat in Mexico (period: 2004-2009) 166 |
| Tab. 2: | Studies on water footprint of wheat in Mexico |
| Chapte | r 17 |
| Tab. 1: | Water footprint in Lagos and Ilesa breweries |
| Tab. 2: | Water footprint in Ama and Ibadan Plants of Nigeria Breweries Plc 175 |
| Tab. 3: | Beer losses during production in Lagos NB Plc and Ilesa Breweries |
| | Plc |
| Tab. 4: | Beer losses during production in Ama and Ibadan NB Breweries Plc 177 |
| Tab. 5: | Potential economic savings at Lagos and Ilesa breweries |
| Tab. 6: | Potential economic savings at Ama and Ibadan breweries |
| Tab. 7: | The average water, electricity and black oil consumption in the breweries179 |
| Chante | r 18 |
| Tab. 1 | Water balance (kg per day) for a 1 year-old steer in Bathurst (33°25' S |
| - 40. 1. | 149°34' E) in July (winter) compared to Walgett (30°1' S, 148°7' E) in January (summer) |
| Tab 2. | Variation in area of rice and cotton under irritation in Australia |
| 1 av. 2. | (000 ba) 100 |
| | (000 lia) |

| Tab. 1: | Water category sample | . 195 |
|----------|---|-------|
| Tab. 2: | Midpoint indexes $(m^3 - eq./m^3)$ water withdrawn/released) and resulting | |
| | water stress indicators (WSI, in m ³ -eq) for a process withdrawing | |
| | 100 m ³ of water type S2a and releasing 80m ³ of water S3. in | |
| | different regions | .201 |
| | | |
| Chapte | er 21 | |
| Tab. 1: | Proposed classification of widely recognised third party environment- | |
| | related standards commonly applied to products | .220 |
| Tab. 2: | Front-runner retailer performance across priority food product | |
| | groups | .222 |
| Tab. 3: | Front-runner retailer performance across priority non-food product | |
| | groups | . 224 |
| Chante | ar 73 | |
| Tab 1. | Assumptions and empirical data collected per event type | 242 |
| 140.1. | Assumptions and empirical data concerca per event type | . 272 |
| Chapte | er 24 | |
| Tab. 1: | Metals processed at Hoboken and grade of the product leaving the | |
| | plant | .250 |
| ~ | | |
| Chapte | er 25 | • |
| Tab. 1: | Main chemical loads associated to BK cellulose production in Chile | .264 |
| Tab. 2: | Main environmental loads of BK cellulose production in Chile | .265 |
| Chante | or 26 | |
| Tab. 1: | Source wise generation of the MSW (tonnes/day) in Delhi | .270 |
| Tab. 2: | Solid waste composition of Delhi (in %) | .270 |
| Tab. 3: | Details of existing composting plants in Delhi | .271 |
| Tab. 4: | Emissions for ISWM | .274 |
| | | |
| Chapte | er 27 | |
| Tab. 1: | Population, domestic water consumption and general climatic data | |
| | for the selected urban areas | .279 |
| Tab. 2: | Estimated parameters of exponential model for each urban area | .282 |
| Tab. 3: | Potential environmental impacts of the RWH system in each urban | |
| | area and storage volume of 85m ³ | . 284 |
| Tab. 4: | Tap water potential environmental impacts avoid | . 284 |
| Chart | Ser 29 | |
| Tab 1. | Cr 20 | 202 |
| Tab. 1: | Identified subgroups of action for the different form times. | 293 |
| 1 au. 2. | identified spheres of action for the different farm types | . 270 |

| Chapter 30 Tab. 1: Overview of the modules of MEXALCA | 311 | |
|---|------------|--|
| Chapter 32 Tab. 1: Example sources of uncertainty in the simplified LCA of rice | 334 335 | |
| Tab. 5: Differences between differe | 337 | |
| Chapter 34 Tab. 1: Attributes and standards of conjoint analysis | 352 354 | |
| Chapter 35 Tab. 1: The packaging alternatives of the case studies | 362 363 | |
| of system (incl. variation between different WM scenarios). 3 Chapter 36 Tab. 1: Summary comparison of environmental effects of 16oz, hot cups. 3 | 365 | |
| Chapter 37 Tab. 1: Chamatoriation of mills markeding | | |
| Tab. 2: Characteristics of juice packaging | 384 | |
| Tab. 3: Characteristics of water packaging 3 Tab. 4: Characteristics of hear and wing packaging 3 | 384 | |
| Tab. 4. Characteristics of beer and wine packaging | 383 | |
| Chapter 38 Tab. 1: EU 27 recycling rates | 394 | |
| Chapter 40 Tab. 1: Calculation of HDI4 | 419 | |
| Chapter 41 Tab. 1: Main environmental aspects of the life-cycle inventory for the production of physic nut grains – inputs | 433 435 | |

| Tab. 1: System characteristics 44 | -5 |
|--|-----|
| Tab. 2: Properties of the kriging estimator 44 | 15 |
| 1 00 | |
| Chanton 15 | |
| | |
| Tab. 1: Summary of life cycle GHG emissions (g CO_2e/kWh) for electricity | |
| generation for energy resources | 53 |
| Tab 2: Summary of life cycle cost (US cent/kWh) for electricity generation | |
| for onergy resources | 2 |
| 101 energy resources |)3 |
| | |
| Chapter 46 | |
| Tab 1: CTY products LHVs and main applications 47 | 13 |
| Tab 2: Fresh water and primary energy consumption for 5 CTV products | 17 |
| Tab. 2. Thesh water and primary energy consumption for 5 CTT products47 | |
| Tab. 3: Preliminary ranking system | 1 |
| | |
| Chanter 47 | |
| Tab. 1: Example of LCA results for two lentons (49) | 6 |
| Tab. 1. Example of ECA festilis for two rapids | 50 |
| Tab. 2: Example of LCA results for two FTTH networks | 57 |
| Tab. 3: Example of LCA results for three video conference LCAs | 38 |
| • | |
| Chantor 10 | |
| | |
| 1ab. 1: Silicon wafer, front-end and back-end production per region |)4 |
| Tab. 2: Direct energy and material inputs and output of front-end process | |
| referring to 1 cm^2 good die out |)6 |
| Tab 3: Overview on the energy demand of back and process in different | |
| rab. 5. Overview on the energy demand of back-end process in different | ~ |
| sources |)/ |
| Tab. 4: Advantage and disadvantage of different reference units |)9 |
| | |
| Chapter 50 | |
| | 7 |
| 1 ab. 1: LCM results presentation matrix | . / |
| Tab. 2: LCA results of analysed refrigerator variants | .9 |
| Tab. 3: LCC results of analysed refrigerator variants | 9 |
| Tab 4: Life cycle analysis results for variant 2 51 | 0 |
| Tab. 4. Ene cycle analysis results for variant 2 | |
| | |
| Tab. 5: Life cycle analysis results for variant 3 | 20 |
| Tab. 6: Life cycle analysis results for variant 4 | 20 |
| | |
| Chanton 51 | |
| | |
| Lab. I: Global warming potential and ozone depletion potential of main | |
| refrigerants | 24 |
| Tab 2. Applicability of natural refrigerants to refrigerating and freezing | |
| aquinmente | 6 |
| equipinents | .0 |
| | |