

# Nordic Environmental Footprint LCA workshop 2017-02-23

Elin Eriksson, Kristian Jelse, Karin Sanne  
IVL Swedish Environmental Institute

NEF Group



# The workshop

- Organized by Nordic Environmental Footprint group, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute and Swedish Lifecycle Center
- About 100 participants from Nordic countries and beyond
- Presentation by Commission, communication phase, beer and detergent pilots, and three parallel sessions



# Workshop themes

- ➔ Parallel sessions:
  1. Product segment structure (granularity)
  2. Impact assessment methods
  3. Weighting (valuation)
- ➔ Future use of PEF discussed by panel in plenum

# Product segment structure (granularity)

Examples of comments during the session:

- The procedure must take in stakeholder feedback and expectations (both producers and users of the information), as well as consider feasibility.
- The procedure is too theoretical and not directly usable to further development of the existing PEF framework.
- Competition law may provide guidance on how to identify market segments.
- Food items can have different functionality in different situations.
- Not everyone is an LCA expert, including SMEs. Needs to be easy understandable.



# Impact assessment methods

Examples of comments during the session:

- ➔ It is important to make the number of categories as low as possible in order to make PEF easier to communicate.
- ➔ Categories as e.g. ozone depletion can have different importance in different parts of the world.
- ➔ It is important to have the opportunity to include new impact categories when new environmental problems arise.
- ➔ Assessment of hazardous substances are important but seen as complicated. There is a need to simplify this.

# Weighting (valuation)

Examples of comments during the session:

- It was almost fully consensus among the participants that at least some kind of weighting is necessary to enable decision making.
- The decision to exclude monetarization methods was questioned. Ongoing developments of ISO standards were mentioned.
- It was discussed about the limitation of the questioned universe of “only” 6 member state countries.
- Update requirements for the weighting scores was discussed.
- Transparency was mentioned as a key issue related to weighting.

# Future use of PEF

Examples of comments during the session:

- ➔ Removing the communication chapter from PEFCR is problematic. How should then the user of the PEFCR know how to use/communicate the results?
- ➔ The current setup has low potential for product differentiation and robustness is a potential problem. It has to be possible to use in practice.
- ➔ The relationship to the UN Sustainable Development Goals was highlighted.
- ➔ Eco-labelling hope to be able to use PEF. PEF may be useful in green public procurement (GPP) according to representatives presenting.

# Reflections after the workshop

- Granularity of scope is a complex issue as it can vary from narrow to broad scope. Discussions need to continue. Consumer perspective and feasibility are important issues.
- Use of impact assessment methods are important and further work is needed (especially for hazardous substances).
- Weighting is necessary to enable decision making and should be transparent. Monetarization should be further evaluated. Transparency and robustness are challenges for panel methods. Policy decision were preferred by several participants as a base for weighting.
- Communication of PEF results in different applications will be of highest importance. More work needs to be done here.

