

# **Cross-correlation between impact categories** in LCAs of forest biomass-based products

Matty Janssen, Magdalena Svanström & Rickard Arvidsson Environmental Systems Analysis, Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg, Sweden

# **1. Motivation**

- LCA can be used to evaluate technologies under development for the production of forest biomass-based products
- There are however many such technologies, and the number of fossil-based products that can be replaced is also very large
- There is thus a need to screen multiple product-technology combinations to identify promising alternatives, and LCIA may be simplified by selecting a number of relevant impact categories

## **3. Results**

- The most used impact categories in the selected studies were Global warming (GWP; 100%), non-renewable energy use (NREU; 94%), acidification (AP; 56%), renewable energy use (REU; 50%), eutrophication (EP; 39%) and photochemical ozone creation (POCP; 33%)
- Correlation results show that:
  - NREU strongly correlates with GWP

#### based on statistical analyses<sup>1,2</sup>

# 2. Method

- The studies used in this cross-correlation analysis of LCA impact results were selected from a review of 101 papers by Røyne et al. (2016)<sup>3</sup> and two additional papers<sup>1,4</sup>. These studies used at least 2 midpoint impact categories, and used impact categories that were applied in more than 25% of all studies.
- In total, results from 18 papers were analysed
- Results were normalized per study and per impact category:  $x_{i,j,k} - \min x_{i,j}$ 
  - $n_{i,j,k} = \frac{k}{\max x_{i,j} \min x_{i,j}}$  with: i=study, j=impact category, k=scenario
- Correlation factors were calculated using the Pearson method

- REU strongly correlates with EP, AP and POCP, and does not correlate with GWP and NREU
- EP strongly correlates with AP
- Outliers can be explained by the use of a specific technology (e.g. CCS) or product (e.g. biological fertilizer) in a system

# 4. Conclusion

- Normalization of impact results per study enabled the comparison of LCAs with different functional units
- In many cases impacts are not correlated due to system specifics
- Energy use does not explain all impacts, as suggested before<sup>5</sup>
- Other product categories and feedstocks will be included to widen the scope of the analysis

GWP [kg CO <sub>2</sub> –eq]	EP [kg PO <sub>4</sub> –eq]	AP [kg SO <sub>2</sub> –eq]	POCP [kg ethyleq]	REU [MJ–eq]	NREU [MJ–eq]	
Type of product  Chemicals						GWP
<ul> <li>Construction</li> </ul>	Corr:	Corr:	Corr:	Corr:	Corr:	[kg
<ul> <li>Energy</li> </ul>	0.688	0.625	0.454	0.186	0.78	



### References

- M. Janssen, C. Xiros and A.-M. Tillman. *Biotechnol Biofuels* 9 (2016), p. 53.
- Z. J. N. Steinmann et al. *Environ Sci Technol* 50.7 (2016), pp. 3913–3919. [2]
- F. Røyne et al. *J Clean Prod* 116 (2016), pp. 90–99. [3]
- P. Gontia and M. Janssen. J Clean Prod 131 (2016), pp. 475–484. [4]
- M. A. J. Huijbregts et al. *Environ Sci Technol* 44.6 (2010), pp. 2189–2196. [5]



