



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Federal Department
of Economic Affairs FDEA
Agroscope Reckenholz-Tänikon
Research Station ART

Swiss Confederation

56th LCA Discussion Forum, 09.09.2014, Zurich
ARE ENVIRONMENTAL DECLARATIONS OF PRODUCTS AND
ORGANISATIONS THE WAY TO HARMONISE LCAS?

What are the observations and expectations of the research? - Focus on database in the agri-food sector

Patrik Mouron

With contributions of Jens Lansche,
Peter Koch and Gérard Gaillard



Agenda

1. Context of the LCA research of Agroscope
2. Requirements for LCI databases
3. Suitability of PEF-Guide and ENVIFOOD protocol for EPD (Environmental Product Declaration)
4. Recommendations towards harmonisation



Context of Agroscope LCA research

1. Meets the needs of ***public and private decision makers in the agri-food sector*** on a national and international level
 - LCI Databases (DBs) need to be accepted and of high quality (e.g.ecoinvent data quality; ILCD entry-level)
 - ... and need to serve diverse scopes and goals
2. Follows a scientific approach
subject → method → tool
 - Projects structure with Advisory Board and reviewed Guidelines
 - Scientific and practice-oriented publications
 - **Different** methods and tools are used/ developed depending on different scope and goal of research subjects → **LCA, Ecodesign, EPD**



Requirements for LCI databases

Observation during the last two decades

- Ten to twenty years ago LCI databases had been mainly used for LCAs; ISO as a standard was sufficient
- Since some years LCI databases serve specific applications such as Ecodesign and EPDs
- The number of methodological standard and LCI databases is increasing

Methodological standards

non exhaustive list, from general to specific

1. ISO (14040/ 44/ 25/ 67)
2. ILCD Handbook (ILCD DN: full compliance and entry-level)
Shonan Guidance Principles
ecoinvent data quality guidelines

3. PEF Guide

4. Envifood protocol
BPX 30-323-0
PEFCRs

EPD


- per kg product
- descriptive

→ EPDs need specific guidelines; other LCAs need «flexible» guidelines (decision-related vs. accounting; micro-level vs. macro-level; interactions with other systems vs. without interact.)

Categorising LCI databases in the agri-food sector (proposal)

- The various LCI databases and LCA methods might be confusing for database developers as well as for users
- A structure to categorise LCI databases might look as follows:

Source: Lansche *et al.*, 2014



Criteria	General database	Specific database
Geographical specification	Global, multi-national	National, regional
Application addressed	Ecodesign <u>and</u> Environmental product declaration (EPD)	Ecodesign <u>or</u> Environmental product declaration (EPD)
Sectorial specification	Agriculture <u>and</u> food industry	Agriculture <u>or</u> food industry



Example

e.g. **WFLDB**
(World Food LCA
Database)

e.g. **ACYVIA** (Analyse de
Cycle de Vie dans les
Industries Agro-alimentaires)

	WFLDB General database	ACYVIA Specific database
Geographical specification	Global	National
Application addressed	Ecodesign and EPD	EPD
Sectorial specification	Agriculture and food industry	Food industry
Guidelines (order of importance)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. ISO 14040/ 442. ILCD handbook3. ENVIFOOD4. Others	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. BPX 30-323-02. ILCD entry-level3. ISO 14040/ 444. Others

→ For different food databases, different hierarchies of relevant standards apply.



Suitability of PEF-Guide and ENVIFOOD protocol for EPD in the agri-food sector

Agroscope study 2014

- Initiator: Swiss Federal office for the environment
- available at www.agroscope.ch end of Sept.2014
- Approach
 - Comparative literature analysis; PEF was compared with ENVIFOOD protocol; ISO Standard 14044; the Shonan Global Guidance Principles; and the PEF-CR Guide.
 - 423 issues were compared and documented regarding:
 - Differences, inconsistencies, requirements influencing EPD results significantly, gaps



Suitability of PEF-Guide and ENVIFOOD protocol for EPD


Main outcome of the study:

- the documents make a valuable contribution to the harmonisation (limited options compared to ISO)
- however, it is no guarantee that comparable results will be achieved for the same product. Various options still remain for:
 - allocation, data quality, biodiversity and soil quality, the weighting of impacts, governance and terminology
→ we have proposed improvements towards harmonisation



Ex.: Rapeseed oil/ cake allocation

Koch *et al.*, 2014



Options in PEF/Envifood:

- Blue: substitution (credits) rapeseed cake/ fava beans
- White: energetic alloc.
- Black: mass alloc.
- Light blue: economic alloc.

→ For EPDs the allocation method and impact methods should be fixed in PEFCR.

Research's position: focus on database | Patrik Mouron



Ex.: Impact assessment – normalisation and weighting

PEF/ Envifood:

- Normalisation is a recommended step in impact assessment, weighting is an optional step.
- We recommend refraining from normalisation and from performing a subjective weighting of impacts when developing product-category rules.
- Agroscope LCA research:
 - Selection of impact categories representing the agricultural production system; communication of results at midpoint-level
 - Machinery → GWP
 - Fertilisers → Eutrophication
 - Pesticides → Ecotoxicity

Position from a researcher's perspective

1. The initiatives are a good approach for harmonising EPDs; but still some work needs to be done.
2. EPDs need **specific** databases (data quality); tools tailored for specific goals and scopes can insure that the according principles of the standards will be taken into practice.
3. Beside EPDs diverse other goal and scope for LCAs exist → methodological **flexibility** as given by ISO meet the researcher's expectations.

Observation

It is strange that methodological guidelines and standards are published and afterwards the researchers need to proof them.

Better collaboration between research and public/ private stakeholders is needed. Researcher's role can be in:

- Consultation
- Development
- Approval
- Expertise



Questions?

Thank you for your attention

Patrik Mouron, Dr.
Agricultural Scientist

Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research EAER
Agroscope, Institute for Sustainability Sciences ISS
Research group on Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

patrik.mouron@agroscope.admin.ch
www.agroscope.ch

Research's position: focus on database | Patrik Mouron