JULY 24

BRIGHTWOLVES

A Comprehensive Guide to the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) Methodology

Whitepaper

Written by: **Vincent Govaers & Arthur Van Dorpe**

www.brightwolves.com

CONTENTS

LCA Whitepaper Series

Foreword

Welcome to our LCA Whitepaper Series, each dedicated to a specific aspect of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA). As a critical tool in the field of sustainability, LCA provides a comprehensive view of the environmental impacts associated with all the stages of a product'slife, from raw material extraction through materials processing, manufacture, distribution, use,repair and maintenance, and disposal or recycling. This series aims to delve into the intricateaspects of LCA, shedding light on the various methodologies, standards, and frameworks thatguide its application.

In each whitepaper, we will focus on a specific topic, be it ISO standards that govern LCA, industry-specific standards such as Global Feed LCA Institute (GFLI), various allocation methods, ReCiPe method vs. Product Environmental Footprint (PEF), and many more. Our goal is to provide a clear, comprehensive, and accessible understanding of these complex topics, enabling you to apply this knowledge in your sustainability journey.

Whether you are a seasoned professional in the field of sustainability or a newcomer lookingto understand the intricacies of LCA, these whitepapers will serve as a valuable resource. Weinvite you to join us in this exploration of LCA, as we strive to contribute to a more sustainablefuture. Hungry for more after this whitepaper? Do not hesitate to reach out to Peter-Jan Roose or Vincent Govaers or subscribe yourself or your organization to our LCA Academy!

The PEF Impact Categories

Introduction

In 2022, global emissions of CO2 equivalents reached an estimated 40 to 50 billion tons. To stay below 2°C of global warming, a reduction of 25% in greenhouse gas emissions is required by 2030, and to stay below 1.5°C, a reduction of 55% is needed. So, as an organization responsible for a couple of hundred tons of CO2 emissions, you might wonder how significant this is on a global scale, if you are on track to contribute towards global targets and how to contextualize this.

Besides, global warming is not the only pressing issue. In the same year, nearly 20 million new cancer cases and 9.7 million cancer-related deaths were reported worldwide. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) estimated that 7% to 19% of cancer cases are attributable to exposure to toxic chemicals. This raises another critical question: what should you do as a company if you can implement a solution that might reduce carbon emissions but by doing this you will increase your impact on human toxicity? How do we balance different impacts? In the 1990s, the ozone layer was a significant environmental concern. Is it still an issue today? Or what about your company’s water usage, land usage, impact on acidification, etc. The list of environmental phenomena impacting our world and health is extensive, making it a very complex challenge to understand your company’s total environmental impact.

Quantifying your impact for every product and comparing it to alternatives seems even more daunting. Luckily there are standard methodologies existing for calculating your total environmental footprint. In this paper we will discuss one of the main standards: the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) methodology. Given its complexity, especially for those without a scientific background, we aim to explain how the PEF methodology was built from the ground up, how it defines impact categories, how it is used to compare products, how it compares impact categories among each other, and how you can interpret the results. Finally, we will discuss how your company can leverage PEF for benchmarking, process improvement, and sustainability communications.

We hope this paper will help and guide you and your organization to use more scientific methodologies in day-to-day business operations and strategic decision-making.

Product Environmental Footprint (PEF)

In the rapidly evolving landscape of sustainability, businesses are increasingly held accountable for their environmental footprints. To address the need for more transparency and comparability between products, the European Commission and the Joint Research Centre have developed the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) in 2013. PEF serves as a robust framework to assess and improve the environmental performance of products throughout their life cycles.

The PEF's relevance is underscored by its comprehensive approach, which encompasses 16 environmental impact categories and provides a harmonized method for evaluating the total ecological footprint of products. These categories are shown in the figure below:

Figure 1: The PEF Impact Categories

The methodology integrates LCA principles with specific guidelines to ensure consistency and comparability of results. Advanced modeling techniques and databases have been employed to enhance the accuracy and reliability of PEF assessments. As a result, the PEF methodology has evolved into a sophisticated approach for conducting LCAs that can address the complexities of modern supply chains and production processes.

PEF’s Main Objective

The PEF methodology offers a scientific and transparent system to evaluate the environmental impact of products, benefiting both businesses and society. It helps **businesses** identify improvement opportunities and communicate their environmental performance, boosting eco-innovation and competitive advantage. For **society**, PEF enables better policymaking and consumer choices by providing reliable, comparable ecological impact data, essential for promoting sustainable consumption. We will dive deeper into the added value for businesses and society at the end of this paper.

PEF distinguishes itself from other LCA methodologies through its harmonized approach and focus on comparability. Unlike traditional LCA methods, which can vary significantly in terms of scope and metrics, the PEF provides a standardized set of rules and impact categories. This harmonization ensures that PEF results are consistent and comparable across different products and sectors, facilitating benchmarking and best practice sharing. For each sector, the EU has defined specific PEF Category Rules (PEFCR), which outline the methodology for assessing the environmental footprint of particular product groups. These regulations are applicable throughout the EU market. The establishment of uniform category rules allows companies to benchmark their environmental impact against a defined standard. Presently, there are approximately 20 product groups covered under this framework, including diverse categories such as batteries and accumulators, pasta, and pet food. Finally, the PEF incorporates the latest scientific advancements and stakeholder inputs, making it a dynamic and evolving tool that stays relevant in the face of emerging environmental challenges.

In conclusion, the PEF methodology represents a significant advancement in the field of environmental sustainability. Its comprehensive, standardized, and scientifically rigorous approach addresses the pressing need for effective environmental assessment tools in today's globalized world. By enabling businesses to improve their environmental performance and empowering consumers and policymakers with reliable information, the PEF contributes to the broader goal of achieving a sustainable and resilient future.

The PEF Impact Categories

Building the PEF Impact Categories

Impact categories provide a structured way to evaluate and compare different environmental impacts, such as climate change, resource depletion, and ecotoxicity. LCAs categorize impacts, providing insight into how different stages of a product's life cycle contribute to various environmental issues. This understanding is crucial for identifying hotspots, improving sustainability, and making informed decisions to reduce environmental harm.

The PEF methodology, developed by the European Commission and the Joint Research Centre, includes 16 specific impact categories, as shown earlier, designed to capture a wide range of environmental effects. These categories are built on scientific research and align with ISO standards 14040-44 and ISO 14025. They reflect the various ways in which products can affect the environment throughout their life cycles. We will dive deeper into some of the impact categories later.

The methodology follows a midpoint-level approach, which assesses impacts at an intermediate point in the cause-effect chain, providing a balance between detail and practicality. This approach assesses impacts before they lead to final damage or effects, focusing on specific environmental mechanisms or processes. For example, rather than measuring the final health effects of air pollution (an endpoint), the midpoint-level approach measures the concentration of pollutants in the air.

The PEF's choice of the midpoint-level approach reflects a strategic decision to balance scientific robustness, precision, and practical applicability. By focusing on well-understood environmental mechanisms, the midpoint approach facilitates standardized, comparable, and actionable environmental assessments that support both business improvements and policy development. This approach aligns with the PEF's goals of enhancing transparency, credibility, and consistency in environmental claims, ultimately promoting sustainability across industries and products.

PEF differs from other LCA methodologies, such as ReCiPe, in its harmonized and standardized approach, which ensures comparability across products and sectors. ReCiPe, for example, distinguishes between both midpoint and endpoint indicators, whereas PEF only focuses on midpoint indicators, as discussed above. ReCiPe has a broader set of midpoint indicators (18) and is more specific for some categories as we can see for example in the breakdown between agricultural land occupation and urban land occupation. Finally, we can observe a different use of characterization factors, as some ReCiPe impact categories are based on different scientific models and assumptions compared to those in PEF. If you want to read more about the differences between PEF and ReCiPe, however, make sure to check out our second LCA Whitepaper called “PEF vs. ReCiPe”.

PEF Characterization Factors

Characterization Factors (CFs) in Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) are numerical values used to convert the quantity of specific emissions or resource uses into a common unit for a particular environmental impact category. CFs play a critical role in the quantification and comparison of environmental impacts by translating diverse emissions into a standardized metric.

To illustrate this with a clear example we will use the PEF impact category for resource use of fossil fuels. This impact category is structured around the measurement of the energy content of fossil fuels consumed throughout the life cycle of a product or process. It uses characterization factors (CFs) to convert the amount of fossil fuel used into a common unit of energy, expressed in megajoules (MJ). The methodology involves several key steps:

The step of inventory analysis involves compiling a detailed inventory of all fossil fuels consumed during the life cycle of the product or process. This includes direct fuel use as well as fossil fuels used in the production of electricity and other inputs. Characterization factors are applied to convert the quantities of various fossil fuels into their energy equivalents. These CFs are based on the energy content of each type of fossil fuel. For example, 1 kg of hard coal has a CF of 27.91 MJ, and 1 kg of natural gas has a CF of 55.5 MJ.

Consider a manufacturing process that uses the following fossil fuels:

- 1,000 kg of hard coal
- 500 kg of natural gas
- 200 kg of oil

The characterization factors for these fuels are:

- Hard coal: 27.91 MJ/kg
- Natural gas: 55.5 MJ/kg
- Oil: 42.5 MJ/kg

Each quantity of fossil fuel is multiplied by its respective CF to convert it into energy equivalents:

(1,000kg * 27.91 MJ/kg) + (500kg * 55.5 MJ/kg) + (200kg * 42,5 MJ/kg) = 64,160 MJ

The importance of CFs lies in their ability to standardize measurements across different substances and impacts, facilitating consistent and comparable assessments. Derived from scientific models and data, CFs consider the pathways and mechanisms by which substances contribute to environmental impacts, ensuring that the calculations are robust and reliable. By converting all GHG emissions into a common unit, CFs enable more informed decisions regarding mitigation strategies and environmental performance improvements. They provide a clear and standardized way to communicate the environmental impacts of products to stakeholders, including consumers, regulators, and investors.

Normalization and Weighting Factors in LCAs

Normalization and weighting factors are additional steps in LCAs that help interpret the impact category results. Normalization compares the impact of a product against a reference score, such as the global or regional environmental burden. This process gives a dimensionless score that indicates the product's share of the global environmental burden for each impact category.

Weighting involves assigning relative importance to different impact categories based on societal values or policy priorities. This step helps stakeholders prioritize environmental impacts and make more informed decisions. For instance, if climate change is deemed more critical than resource depletion, it would receive a higher weighting factor. The PEF methodology relies on user-defined weighting factors, giving the practitioner more control by separating this step from the step of characterization.

By normalizing and weighting the impact results, stakeholders can better understand and prioritize environmental impacts, leading to more effective sustainability strategies. Although establishing a 100% scale with all 16 impact categories and their relevant percentages can be complex, these factors provide a structured way to assess and communicate the overall environmental performance of products.

Impact Categories	WF [%]
Climate change	21,06%
Particulate matter	8,96%
Water use	8,51%
Resource depletion, fossils	8,32%
Land use	7,94%
Resource depletion, minerals and metals	7,55%
Ozone depletion	6,31%
Acidification	6,20%
Ionizing radiation	5,01%
Photochemical ozone formation	4,78%
Eutrophication, terrestrial	3,71%
Eutrophication, marine	2,96%
Eutrophication, freshwater	2,80%
Human toxicity, cancer	2,13%
Ecotoxicity, freshwater	1,92%
Human toxicity, non-cancer	1,84%

Source: Sala S, Cerutti AK, Pant R. (2018). Development of a weighting approach for Environmental Footprint. European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. ISBN 978-92-79-68041-0.

Understanding the Impact Categories: Climate Change, Water Use and Eutrophication

As mentioned before, PEF impact categories can be cryptic and difficult to understand. In the next paragraph, we will discuss three different PEF impact categories more in depth. The goal here is to get a better understanding of how these impact categories are built, why they are (not) so relevant these days and how businesses can potentially use them when performing an LCA. We start with a very well-known one, on which companies are currently putting a lot of focus, as it is one of the more tangible ones of the impact categories: climate change. Later, we discuss the very relevant impact category of water use and the less known one of eutrophication (terrestrial).

Do you want to understand all impact categories in a similar depth? Check out our LCA Academy!

Climate Change

The PEF impact category of climate change quantifies the contribution of a product, process, or service to global warming. This category evaluates greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions based on their Global Warming Potential (GWP) over a 100-year period (GWP100), using CO_2 as the reference gas. GHGs such as carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) are converted into CO_2 equivalents to provide a consistent measure of their impact on climate change. The PEF framework specifically divides this impact category into three sub-categories: fossil, biogenic, and land use and land use change (LULUC) emissions.

Climate change is a paramount concern in today's globalized world due to its far-reaching and severe impacts on the environment, human health, and economies. The urgency to address climate change has driven companies to focus on reducing their carbon footprints. This focus is particularly evident in efforts to reduce Scope 3 emissions, which include all indirect emissions that occur in a company's value chain, such as purchased goods and services, transportation, and waste disposal. Scope 3 reductions are crucial because they often represent the largest share of a company's total GHG emissions. Moreover, accurate calculation of the Product Carbon Footprint (PCF) is essential for companies to understand and mitigate their environmental impacts effectively.

The heightened emphasis on climate change also stems from increasing regulatory pressures and consumer demand for sustainable products. Initiatives like the EU Green Deal and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) compel companies to disclose their environmental performance and align their operations with climate goals. The PEF climate change category utilizes the Global Warming Potential (GWP) as the characterization factor, which assesses the radiative forcing of different GHGs relative to CO_2 over a 100-year period. The category is broken down into three sub-indicators to provide detailed insights:

- **Fossil GHG Emissions:** These include emissions from burning fossil fuels (e.g., coal, oil, natural gas) and industrial processes. Examples include CO_2 from power generation and CH_4 from natural gas leaks.
- **Biogenic GHG Emissions:** These are emissions and removals of carbon associated with biological sources, such as the combustion or decay of biomass. For example, CO_2 emissions from burning wood are considered biogenic.
- **Land Use and Land Use Change (LULUC) Emissions:** These emissions result from changes in land use, such as deforestation, afforestation, and changes in soil carbon stocks. For instance, CO_2 emissions from deforestation are included in this sub-category.

The detailed granularity allows for more precise and actionable assessments of different types of GHG emissions, ensuring that specific sources of emissions are accurately identified and mitigated.

Consider a hypothetical agricultural product, such as soybean production. The climate change impact can be evaluated by examining the emissions from various stages of the production process:

- **Fossil Emissions**: Emissions from machinery used in planting and harvesting, which typically rely on diesel fuel, would fall under fossil emissions. For instance, 1,000 kg of CO_2 emissions from diesel combustion would be classified as fossil GHGs.
- **Biogenic Emissions:** If crop residues are left to decompose in the field, they emit biogenic CO_2 and CH_4. Suppose 200 kg of CH_4 are emitted from the decomposition process. Using the GWP100, this is to 5,960 kg CO_2-eq (200 kg CH_4 × 29.8 GWP).
- **LULUC Emissions:** If the soybean production involves deforestation, this would contribute to LULUC emissions. For example, converting 1 hectare of forest to agricultural land might release 10,000 kg of CO_2 due to the loss of biomass and soil carbon stocks.

Combining these values gives the total climate change impact of 16,960 kg CO_2-eq.

Currently, the climate change impact category is widely used by businesses to measure and report their carbon footprints. It informs corporate sustainability strategies, helps identify reduction opportunities, and supports compliance with regulations like the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS). Companies also use this impact category to communicate their environmental performance to stakeholders, enhancing transparency and accountability.

In the future, the climate change impact category can play a pivotal role in driving innovation and fostering eco-friendly practices. Enhanced integration with digital tools such as Digit Mint and big data analytics could improve the accuracy and efficiency of emissions tracking. Additionally, as global climate policies become more stringent, the detailed granularity of the PEF climate change category will help businesses meet specific regulatory requirements and achieve more ambitious carbon reduction targets.

The climate change impact category has clear spill-over effects on other environmental impact categories. For example:

- **Acidification:** GHGs such as SO_2 and NO_x contribute to both climate change and acidification. Reducing these emissions can mitigate acid rain, which harms aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.
- **Eutrophication:** Nitrous oxide (N_2O), a potent GHG, also contributes to eutrophication. Reducing N_2O emissions from agricultural practices can improve water quality and reduce the incidence of harmful algal blooms.
- **Human Toxicity:** Combustion processes that emit CO_2 also release pollutants like particulate matter (PM), which have direct health impacts. Addressing climate change by reducing fossil fuel use can simultaneously improve air quality and public health.

The PEF impact category of climate change provides a robust framework for evaluating the contributions of various GHG emissions to global warming. By focusing on detailed sub-categories of fossil, biogenic, and LULUC emissions, it offers a comprehensive and actionable approach to understanding and mitigating climate change impacts. This category's relevance is underscored by regulatory pressures, consumer demand, and its significant spill-over effects on other environmental impact categories, making it a crucial tool for driving sustainability in businesses and society.

Water Use

The PEF impact category of water use measures the potential environmental impacts associated with the consumption of freshwater resources. This category specifically evaluates the "User Deprivation Potential" (UDP), which quantifies the likelihood that water use will deprive other users, whether human or ecological. This assessment uses the Available WAter REmaining (AWARE) model, which calculates the relative amount of water remaining per area in a watershed after accounting for the needs of humans and aquatic ecosystems.

Water use is critically relevant today due to increasing water scarcity, which is driven by factors such as population growth, industrialization, and climate change. Companies place significant importance on this impact category for several reasons. Firstly, regulatory compliance is becoming stricter worldwide, compelling companies to monitor and reduce their water footprints. Secondly, businesses are adopting sustainability goals that include reducing water consumption to preserve resources and minimize environmental impacts. Additionally, water scarcity poses operational risks, particularly in water-intensive industries like agriculture, textiles, and manufacturing, and ensuring sustainable water use mitigates these risks. Lastly, consumers and investors are increasingly aware of environmental issues, and companies that demonstrate responsible water use can enhance their reputation and brand value.

The PEF water use category is built using the AWARE model, which assesses the relative available water remaining per area in a watershed after human and ecological needs are met. The primary indicator used is Water Deprivation Potential (WDP), measured in cubic meters of world-equivalent deprived water (m^3 world eq. deprived). This regionalized approach ensures that the impact of water use is assessed differently depending on local water scarcity conditions. The calculation methodology involves three key steps: inventory analysis, characterization, normalization and weighting. Inventory analysis collects data on water withdrawals throughout the product or process life cycle. Characterization then uses characterization factors from the AWARE model to translate these withdrawals into potential impacts on water scarcity. Finally, normalization and weighting further refine the results to reflect their significance relative to other impact categories and global benchmarks.

Consider the production of cotton in a semi-arid region. The water use impact can be illustrated as follows:

- **Inventory Analysis:** The production process uses 10,000 m^3 of water per hectare.
- **Characterization Using AWARE:** In a region with high water scarcity, the AWARE factor might be 0.9, indicating that 90% of the water used contributes to potential deprivation.

The Water Deprivation Potential (WDP) would be calculated as:

$$10{,}000\ m^3 * 0{,}9 = 9{,}000\ m^3\ world\ eq. deprived$$

In contrast, in a water-rich region with an AWARE factor of 0,1, the WDP would be:

$$10{,}000\ m^3 * 0{,}1 = 1{,}000\ m^3\ world\ eq. deprived$$

This example demonstrates how regional water scarcity conditions influence the impact assessment, making it a more accurate reflection of potential environmental impacts.

Currently, the water use impact category is used by companies to measure and manage their water footprints. It supports corporate sustainability reporting, compliance with water regulations, and strategic planning for water conservation. In the future, the impact category could be further integrated into digital water management systems, where advanced monitoring and data analytics improve water use efficiency and real-time tracking of water impacts. Policymakers can also use this PEF category to develop targeted regulations and incentives for water conservation. Additionally, companies can apply water use impact assessments across their supply chains to identify high-risk areas and implement mitigation strategies.

The water use impact category has clear spill-over effects on other environmental impact categories. For example:

- **Biodiversity:** Excessive water use can lead to habitat degradation and loss of biodiversity in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.
- **Human Health:** Water scarcity can affect human health by reducing access to clean water for drinking, sanitation, and agriculture, leading to food insecurity, among others.
- **Eutrophication:** Changes in water availability can influence nutrient runoff patterns, exacerbating eutrophication in freshwater and marine environments.

The PEF impact category of water use is a vital tool for evaluating and managing the environmental impacts of freshwater consumption. By using the AWARE model, it provides a regionalized and accurate assessment of water deprivation potential, helping companies and policymakers make informed decisions to promote sustainable water use. The relevance of this impact category is underscored by growing water scarcity, regulatory pressures, and the need for comprehensive sustainability strategies. Its integration with other environmental impact categories highlights the interconnected nature of ecological impacts and the importance of holistic environmental management.

Eutrophication

The PEF impact category of terrestrial eutrophication assesses the environmental impact of excess nutrient inputs, primarily nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P), on terrestrial ecosystems. This process, known as eutrophication, leads to the over-enrichment of soils, causing ecological disturbances such as decreased biodiversity and altered species composition. The PEF uses the Accumulated Exceedance (AE) method to quantify the extent to which nutrient inputs exceed the critical loads that ecosystems can tolerate without significant harmful effects. The unit of measurement is moles of nitrogen equivalent (mol N-eq).

Eutrophication is highly relevant today due to its widespread impact on terrestrial ecosystems and biodiversity. Companies place significant importance on this impact category because nutrient pollution can lead to stringent regulatory measures and operational constraints. For instance, the ongoing nitrogen crisis in Belgium and the Netherlands illustrates the severe consequences of excessive nitrogen emissions. In Belgium, regulations are tightening to reduce nitrogen pollution, impacting sectors such as agriculture and construction. Understanding and mitigating eutrophication impacts is crucial for companies to comply with environmental regulations, avoid penalties, and maintain their social license to operate.

The structure of the PEF impact category for terrestrial eutrophication is centered around the Accumulated Exceedance (AE) method. This method begins with compiling an inventory of emissions that contribute to eutrophication, primarily nitrogen oxides (NOx) and ammonia (NH3). The next step involves modeling the dispersion and deposition of these emissions onto terrestrial surfaces. This modeling considers atmospheric transport mechanisms and chemical transformations that pollutants undergo. The AE method then compares the deposited nutrient nitrogen against the critical loads for different ecosystems. Critical loads represent the maximum levels of pollutants that ecosystems can tolerate without significant harm. The exceedance is calculated as the amount by which deposition surpasses these critical loads.
Characterization Factors (CFs) are derived from these exceedance calculations. These factors translate emissions of eutrophying substances into potential impacts on ecosystems, varying geographically to reflect differences in ecosystem sensitivity and deposition patterns. For instance, the CFs account for the varying levels of vulnerability of ecosystems to nutrient inputs, which can significantly differ across regions. This geographical variability ensures that the impact assessments are accurate and reflective of local conditions, providing a more precise evaluation of the environmental impacts of nutrient emissions.

To illustrate the concept of terrestrial eutrophication, consider the current nitrogen crisis in Belgium. The country’s intensive agriculture sector, particularly livestock farming, generates substantial nitrogen emissions from manure and fertilizers. These emissions contribute to nitrogen deposition, which exceeds the critical loads for many ecosystems, leading to biodiversity loss and soil degradation.

For example, if a farm emits 1,000 kg of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and the critical load for the local ecosystem is 500 kg of nitrogen per hectare per year, the exceedance would be:

$$1{,}000kg\ NO_x - \frac{500kg\,\frac{NO_x}{ha}}{year} = 500\,\frac{kg\,\frac{NO_x}{ha}}{year}$$

Using a characterization factor specific to the region, the impact in moles of nitrogen equivalent can be calculated. Suppose the CF is 4.26 mol N-eq per kg of NO_x:

$$500kg\ *\ 4{,}26\,mol\,N - eq/kg\ =\ 2{,}130\,mol\,N - eq$$

This calculation shows the potential impact on the ecosystem due to nitrogen emissions.

Currently, the terrestrial eutrophication impact category is not really used by companies to evaluate and manage their environmental impacts. However, the impact category can show a great amount of added value, particularly in sectors like agriculture, construction, and manufacturing. It supports sustainability reporting, compliance with environmental regulations, and strategic planning for reducing nutrient emissions. For instance, companies can identify hotspots of nutrient pollution in their operations and implement measures to mitigate these impacts.

In the future, the impact category could play a pivotal role in developing more sustainable agricultural practices, optimizing fertilizer use, and advancing policies aimed at reducing nutrient emissions. Enhanced modeling techniques and better data availability could improve the precision of eutrophication assessments, leading to more effective mitigation strategies.
The impact category of eutrophication has clear spill-over effects on other environmental impact categories. For example, excessive nitrogen and phosphorus inputs can lead to:

- **Water Pollution:** Nutrients leaching into water bodies contribute to freshwater and marine eutrophication, causing algal blooms and oxygen depletion.
- **Acidification:** Nitrogen oxides (NOx) also contribute to acidification of soils and water bodies, harming aquatic life and reducing soil quality.
- **Biodiversity Loss:** Eutrophication alters species composition in both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, leading to reduced biodiversity and ecosystem resilience.

Addressing eutrophication can therefore have broad environmental benefits, enhancing overall ecosystem health and sustainability.

The PEF impact category of terrestrial eutrophication provides a comprehensive framework for assessing the ecological impacts of nutrient pollution. By using the Accumulated Exceedance method, it offers a detailed and region-specific evaluation of how nitrogen and phosphorus emissions affect terrestrial ecosystems. The relevance of this impact category is underscored by regulatory pressures and the need for sustainable resource management. Its spill-over effects on other environmental impact categories highlight the interconnected nature of ecological impacts and the importance of holistic environmental management. Through careful assessment and targeted mitigation, companies can reduce their eutrophication impacts, contributing to healthier ecosystems and more sustainable practices.

Are you inspired by the topic of LCAs or curious to know more about Digit Mint and its LCA tool? Stay tuned for our next paper of this LCA Whitepaper Series or do not hesitate to contact Peter-Jan Roose or Vincent Govaers!

References

Calvin, K., Dasgupta, D., Krinner, G., Mukherji, A., Thorne, P. W., Trisos, C., Romero, J., Aldunce, P., Barrett, K., Blanco, G., Cheung, W. W. L., Connors, S., Denton, F., Diongue-Niang, A., Dodman, D., Garschagen, M., Geden, O., Hayward, B., Jones, C., … Ha, M. (2023a). IPCC, 2023: Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland. (P. Arias, M. Bustamante, I. Elgizouli, G. Flato, M. Howden, C. Méndez-Vallejo, J. J. Pereira, R. Pichs-Madruga, S. K. Rose, Y. Saheb, R. Sánchez Rodríguez, D. Ürge-Vorsatz, C. Xiao, N. Yassaa, J. Romero, J. Kim, E. F. Haites, Y. Jung, R. Stavins, … C. Péan, Eds.). https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647

Castellani, S., Sala, V., Schau, S., Secchi, E., & Zampori, M. (2018). Supporting information to the characterisation factors of recommended EF Life Cycle Impact Assessment method New models and differences with ILCD. https://doi.org/10.2760/671368

European Commission. (2021). Product Environmental Footprint Method. https://environment.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2021-12/Annexes%201%20to%202.pdf

European Commission. Joint Research Centre. Institute for Environment and Sustainability. (2011). International reference life cycle data system (ILCD) handbook general guide for life cycle assessment: provisions and action steps. Publications Office.

European Environment Agency. (2022, July 11). National Emission Reduction Commitments Directive reporting status 2022. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/national-emission-reduction-commitments-directive-2022

European Environmental Bureau (EEB). (2018). THE EU Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) Methdology.

Koch, D., Friedl, A., & Mihalyi, B. (2023). Influence of different LCIA methods on an exemplary scenario analysis from a process development LCA case study. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 25(7), 6269–6293. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02302-w

Official Journal of the European Union. (2021). Commission Recommendation on the use of the Environmental Footprint methods to measure and communicate the life cycle environmental performance of products and organisations. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/40928/st12791-en19.pdf

Ritchie, H., Roser, M., & Rosado, P. (2020). CO_2 and greenhouse gas emissions. Our World in Data. https://ourworldindata.org/

Boulay A-M, Bare J, Benini L, et al (2018) The WULCA consensus characterization model for water scarcity footprints: assessing impacts of water consumption based on available water remaining (AWARE). Int J Life Cycle Assess 23:368–378.

BRIGHTWOLVES