



LCA of Chemicals and Chemical Products

Fantke, Peter; Ernstoff, Alexi

Published in:
Life Cycle Assessment: Theory and Practice

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1007/978-3-319-56475-3_31](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56475-3_31)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Fantke, P., & Ernstoff, A. (2018). LCA of Chemicals and Chemical Products. In *Life Cycle Assessment: Theory and Practice* (pp. 783-815). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56475-3_31

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Chapter 31

LCA of Chemicals and Chemical Products

Peter Fantke and Alexi Ernstoff

Abstract This chapter focuses on the application of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) to evaluate the environmental performance of chemicals as well as of products and processes where chemicals play a key role. The life cycle stages of chemical products, such as pharmaceuticals or pesticide active ingredients, are discussed and differentiated into extraction of abiotic and biotic raw materials, chemical synthesis and processing, material processing, product manufacturing, professional or consumer product use, and finally end-of-life treatment. LCA is put into perspective of other chemicals management frameworks and concepts including risk assessment, green and sustainable chemistry, and chemical alternatives assessment. A large number of LCA studies focuses on contrasting different feedstocks or chemical synthesis processes, thereby often conducting a cradle to (factory) gate assessment. While typically a large share of potential environmental impacts occurs during the early product life cycle stages, potential impacts related to chemicals that are found as ingredients or residues in products are dominated by the product use stage. Finally, methodological challenges in LCA studies in relation to chemicals are discussed from the choice of functional unit, over defining the system boundaries, quantifying emissions for many thousand marketed chemicals, to characterising these emissions in terms of toxicity and other impacts, and finally interpreting chemical-related LCA results. The chapter is relevant for LCA students and practitioners who wish to gain basic understanding of LCA studies of products or processes with chemicals as a key aspect.

P. Fantke (✉) · A. Ernstoff

Division for Quantitative Sustainability Assessment, Department of Management Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Kongens Lyngby, Denmark
e-mail: pefan@dtu.dk

A. Ernstoff

EPFL Innovation Park, Quantis International, Bât. D, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland



31.1 LCA and Chemicals: Introduction and Context

31.1.1 Chemicals and Their Relevance in Society

Chemicals are everywhere. Almost every second a new entry is added to the list of more than 100 million unique chemicals and substances registered in the Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS; www.cas.org), the world's authority on chemical information. Since industrialisation, the welfare of modern society largely builds on extensively mining minerals and fossil fuels including coal, petroleum and natural gas to produce large quantities of synthetic chemicals ('synthetic' simply means man-made and should not be confused with 'artificial', which implies that a chemical does not occur naturally). Consequently, the enormity and diversity of the chemical industry is astounding and poses various challenges for the management of environmental and human health impacts related to chemicals production and use. In this chapter, we outline important aspects to know about chemicals in the context of LCA.

Fundamentally, chemicals are substances composed of one or more atoms, and make up every material thing on earth—including our bodies. The atomic composition of chemicals classifies them essentially as 'organic' (chemicals with molecules built on a skeleton of interlinked carbon atoms and primarily consisting of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen) and 'inorganic' (chemicals with molecules generally lacking carbon-to-carbon bonds, but instead based on the rest of the elements, including metals). In this sense, 'organic' has nothing to do with 'organic food' or 'organic farming' or 'organic lifestyle' as these terms generally refer to promoting sustainability. The atomic composition, molecular structure and ionisation (positive/negative charge) all influence chemical reactivity and behaviour in the environment as well as in living organisms. Because of this, chemical behaviours can be predicted and tested, and chemicals can be designed by industries to fulfil biological (e.g. medical) and physical (e.g. solvent) functions.

Chemicals may also be classified according to functional groups (e.g. alcohols, amines, acids and bases), structural groups (e.g. polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), physical structure (e.g. nanotubes), feedstock sources (e.g. petrochemicals derived from fossil fuels, biochemicals derived from starch- and sugar-based feedstocks), physicochemical properties (e.g. volatile, lipophilic), use function (e.g. surfactants, warfare agents), means of creation (e.g. reaction intermediates, metabolites), main economic sector (e.g. cosmetics, agrochemicals), toxicity endpoints (e.g. carcinogens, neurotoxins, endocrine disruptors), and other aspects.

Established nomenclatures or patent names can be used to name chemicals. Most chemicals have an assigned CAS Registry Number except some metabolites of natural processes or grouped chemicals such as polychlorinated dibenzofurans. CAS numbers are the most discriminant method for chemical reference. Of the chemicals registered by CAS, more than ten thousand are currently in commercial use, some with annual production volume of millions of tonnes, while most chemicals are produced at less than thousand tonnes per year. Worldwide, the



68 production of chemicals has risen to several hundred million tonnes per year and
69 sales were valued in 2013 at 3156 billion Euro with an average annual growth of
70 10.3% between 2003 and 2012 (CEFIC 2014). China dominates world chemical
71 sales with a share of 33.2% followed by the European Union (16.7%), USA
72 (14.8%), and Japan (4.8%) in 2013.

73 Over the last decades, there has been a shift in global chemicals production. As
74 an example, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) have been replaced by chlorinated
75 paraffins in various applications. While PCBs have been primarily produced in
76 USA and Europe with a total historical production volume of 1.3 million tonnes
77 between 1930 and 1995, chlorinated paraffins are almost exclusively produced in
78 China and reach production volumes of more than one million tonnes per year
79 (Fantke et al. 2015). Databases, such as the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)
80 Registered Substances database (echa.europa.eu/information-on-chemicals), the
81 Household Product Database (householdproducts.nlm.nih.gov), Hazardous
82 Substances Data Bank through ToxNet (toxnet.nlm.nih.gov), and the Chemical and
83 Product Categories Database (actor.epa.gov/cpcat/) attempt to keep track of
84 chemicals, their uses, properties and/or toxicity, but large data gaps still remain.

85 The chemical and pharmaceutical industries are a major driver of the welfare of
86 modern society and scientific progress. These industries rely on the extraction,
87 purification and synthesis of both naturally occurring and synthetic chemicals and
88 are among the largest and most influential economic sectors at the global scale.
89 Main production segments are petrochemicals (e.g. benzene, styrene), consumer
90 chemicals (e.g. detergents, fragrances and flavours), speciality chemicals (chemicals
91 used for providing a special performance or effect, e.g. paints, dyes, adhesives),
92 basic inorganics (fertilisers, industrial gases like nitrogen and oxygen), and poly-
93 mers (e.g. plastics, synthetic rubber and fibres). One of the largest segments is the
94 production of organic chemicals with, e.g. formaldehyde, aromatics, acids, alcohols
95 and esters providing the building blocks for drugs, agrochemicals, cosmetics and
96 many other applications.

97 Along with societal advantages, the rise of chemical industries has also caused
98 various undesirable consequences. Health impacts of air pollution are increasing
99 worldwide and there is currently insufficient information to fully assess the impacts
100 of chemicals on humans and the environment. Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring*
101 published in 1962 documented the detrimental impacts of chemicals on wildlife and
102 humans, especially related to using synthetic organic pesticides, and marked a
103 major change in public awareness that eventually inspired regulation of industry
104 and for example the creation of the United States Environmental Protection
105 Agency. Since that time, a remarkable amount of research correlates and demon-
106 strates impacts on human and ecosystem health as well as the environment (e.g. the
107 ozone layer) caused by intentional and unintentional chemical releases both indoors
108 and outdoors. Some reported impacts are directly related to the chemical industry,
109 whereas other impacts are related to the use or disposal of chemicals by other
110 industries. In the following sections, we overview strategies for chemical man-
111 agement, focusing particularly on life-cycle assessments of chemicals production
112 processes and chemical products.

31.1.2 Chemicals Management in Relation to LCA

Depletion of the ozone layer by chlorofluorocarbons used as refrigerants and solvents, soil and water pollution with heavy metals from ore mining and processing, pesticide emissions and residues in food, the formation of dioxins by incomplete combustion processes, and leaching of fertilisers into groundwater are just examples of the many problems associated with chemical releases to the environment. Hence, managing human and environmental risks posed by chemicals that are potentially toxic or may lead to other impacts is a major concern of regulators, industries, consumers and other stakeholders. As a consequence, the chemicals industry is one of the most regulated industries with main focus on regulating chemicals in consumer products and minimising chemical emissions to the indoor (workplace, public buildings and household) and outdoor environments along product life cycles. In the context of chemicals management, risk is defined as the probability of a chemical to cause an adverse effect (hazard) occurring as a result of a given contact between the chemical and humans or the environment (exposure). In reality, risks associated with chemical emissions from a given product or process can arise at specific points in space and time and depend on chemical background concentrations due to all release sources. In LCA, information on emission location and time as well as information on background concentrations, e.g. from sources outside the considered product system, is usually not available. Hence, modelled impacts in LCA are not interpreted in terms of actual risk, i.e. real environmental effects, but in terms of ‘potential impacts’ (Chap. 10) used as environmental performance indicators for comparing and optimising products or systems with respect to a defined functional unit (Hauschild 2005). However, models applied in LCA can also be advanced and adapted to consider background concentrations as well as spatiotemporal resolution (e.g. daily or seasonal changes), and in such cases estimated potential impacts can be interpreted as estimates of actual risk.

Chemicals management occurs from local to global scale, from specific product–chemical combinations to entire industries and from raw material acquisition to waste handling, depending on the intended scope and purpose. The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (ozone.unep.org) and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs; www.pops.int) are examples of global chemicals management treaties, whereas the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation, and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) is a recent example of an international legislative framework for managing industrial chemicals in the European Union. At all levels and scopes, effective chemicals management relies on assessment tools and guiding principles to ensure consistency and the achievability of defined goals. There are many examples of chemicals assessment tools and guidance, such as risk assessment, green and sustainable chemistry, chemical alternatives assessment, life cycle assessment, and a market for entrepreneurs to create industry-specific interfaces and applications. In the following sections, risk assessment (Sect. 31.1.3), green and sustainable chemistry




Fig. 31.1 Conceptual relationships of main chemical management tools

155 (Sect. 31.1.4), and chemical alternatives assessment (Sect. 31.1.5) are discussed as
 156 commonly used chemical management tools that have both complementary and
 157 overlapping aspects with LCA as illustrated in Fig. 31.1.

158 31.1.3 Risk Assessment and Safety

159 Chemical risk assessment—also referred to as chemical safety assessment—is
 160 implemented in various regulatory frameworks and is one of the most widely used
 161 chemicals management tools. Risk assessment (*‘How risky is a situation?’*) as an
 162 integral part of risk management (*‘What shall we do about it, if a situation is
 163 risky?’*) essentially emerged at the start of the nineteenth century from studying
 164 hazards and risks associated with different occupations. Risk assessment mainly
 165 consists of hazard identification, dose-response assessment, exposure assessment
 166 and risk characterisation. Depending on the context, ‘risk’ and ‘safety’ have dif-
 167 ferent meanings with regulatory policy commonly seeking to minimise risk while
 168 optimising safety. In this context, risk is generally defined as the probability of
 169 harm, whereas safety is described as the absence of harm (Embry et al. 2014).

170 Chemical ‘safety’ is defined by legislators or regulators and can vary from
 171 country to country and evolves over time as science progresses. In this sense, ‘safe’

172 is not synonymous with ‘natural’ as it is often perceived. In fact, using the word
173 ‘natural’ is misleading in the context of chemical safety (and LCA) and there are
174 many naturally occurring chemicals that have very harmful properties like arsenic,
175 nicotine or radon. As a consequence, we need to acknowledge that it is not always
176 the ‘natural’ chemicals or solutions that are most ‘environmentally friendly’—a
177 common misconception in different science-policy fields and among consumers.
178 Defining safety *thresholds*, e.g. chemical concentrations in different environmental
179 media (e.g. ambient air, soil, water) or in food, is a common strategy in chemical
180 risk assessment, and generally refers to levels below which a risk is considered
181 ‘safe’ by a risk manager, meaning that any risk below threshold is regarded as
182 ‘acceptable’. As an example, chemical exposure resulting in one additional cancer
183 case or less over lifetime in a population of one million people is regarded as an
184 acceptable risk, i.e. safe, in the U.S. (van Leeuwen and Vermeire 2007). Using units
185 like ‘part per million’ (ppm) as in one cancer case in a million or ‘part per billion’ is
186 common for describing (very small) amounts of chemicals in the environment. To
187 get an impression of how much one ppm actually is, we can use 1 teaspoon of salt
188 (5.5 g) in 5.5 tonnes of potato chips corresponding to one part of salt per one
189 million parts of potato chips.

190 Thresholds are also applied when managing environmental systems and for
191 developing chemical pollution control strategies, such as allowable nutrient releases
192 from wastewater treatment plants or setting greenhouse gas emission targets, or in
193 the context of ‘planetary boundaries’ in an attempt to assess if the pressure from
194 chemical pollution (analogous to the amount of receiving environment required to
195 dilute pollution to a threshold level) exceeds a planetary boundary (analogous to the
196 amount of receiving environment available) for a ‘safe operating space’ for human
197 activities (MacLeod et al. 2014). Chemical pollution levels have recently been
198 expressed as ‘chemical footprints’ that can be compared with respective planetary
199 or other boundaries for chemical pollution (Posthuma et al. 2014) to assess how
200 companies or nations perform with respect to different chemicals management
201 issues.

202 Risk assessment approaches take a receptor perspective (Fig. 31.2, right-side
203 box), where thresholds are set in order to protect specific receptors, i.e. exposed
204 humans or ecosystem species. In a receptor perspective, all relevant sources of a
205 chemical or target chemicals are typically considered. In contrast, impact assess-
206 ment tools in LCA are generally not receptor-oriented or threshold-based. This is
207 because LCA takes a ‘producer’ (or ‘emitter’) perspective (Fig. 31.2, left-side box)
208 by comparing potential impacts relative to each other across compared products and
209 life cycle stages, aiming at minimising impacts considering various receptors (entire
210 human populations, freshwater ecosystems, marine ecosystems, etc.). Differences
211 and commonalities of risk assessment and LCA have been contrasted elsewhere
212 (e.g. Bare 2006; Pennington et al. 2006), and there are several attempts combining,
213 blending or integrating both concepts (Harder et al. 2015).

214 An increasing number of chemicals is approved for use in commerce, e.g. in
215 food contact materials, but often lacks adequate information to characterise risks
216 (Neltner et al. 2013). In response, high-throughput screening (‘first tier’




Fig. 31.2 Examples and underlying characteristics of dichotomous perspectives followed in different chemicals management approaches

217 assessments) of chemical risks has emerged as a strategy for prioritising and
 218 ranking chemicals for more in-depth study ('higher-tier' assessments). First-tier
 219 screening usually relies on ranking chemicals with respect to hazard (e.g. chemical
 220 toxicity) combined with estimates of exposure. 'High-throughput' refers to pro-
 221 cessing dozens to thousands of chemicals via resource efficient methodologies, such
 222 as robotic in vitro bioassays (instead of animal in vivo experiments) and low-tier
 223 computational models relying on databases (instead of data-intensive complex and
 224 time-consuming modelling). LCA impact assessment models have been used in
 225 high-throughput risk screening offering dual purpose and a promising area of
 226 interdisciplinary overlap to manage chemical risks (e.g. Shin et al. 2015).

227 31.1.4 Green and Sustainable Chemistry

228 'Green chemistry' is a concept that was coined by the U.S. Environmental
 229 Protection Agency in the early 1990s in response to the Pollution Prevention Act
 230 and increasing attention to chemical pollution. This concept builds upon a set of 12
 231 Principles of Green Chemistry defined by Anastas and Warner (1998) aiming at
 232 reducing or eliminating hazardous substances in the design, manufacture and ap-
 233 plication of chemical products. Thereby, 'green' refers to more environmentally
 234 benign (less hazardous) chemicals. The concept of 'sustainable chemistry' is
 235 broader than the scope of green chemistry and strives towards 'eco-efficiency'. In
 236 addition to chemical hazards, sustainable chemistry centrally focuses on optimising
 237 the use of finite resources, while reducing environmental impacts of chemical
 238 production (OECD 2012). Sustainable chemistry—sometimes also referred to as

239 sustainable chemistry and engineering—is rooted in the concept of Sustainable
240 Development established in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 at the United Nations
241 Conference on Environment and Development and are guided by 9 Principles of
242 Green Engineering postulated at the Sandestin conference (Abraham and Nguyen
243 2003).

244 Green and sustainable chemistry are concepts focusing on the technological
245 approaches aiming at the reduction of resource consumption and pollution pre-
246 vention in chemical production processes rather than focussing on the assessment of
247 chemicals in the environment. Hence, green and sustainable chemistry—often
248 relying on comparing qualitative or semi-quantitative indicator results—are pri-
249 marily applicable in the design phase of products to guide innovation and to support
250 sustainable production goals.

251 Green chemistry in relation to LCA has been discussed in more detail elsewhere
252 (e.g. Anastas and Lankey 2000). In summary, compared to green and sustainable
253 chemistry, LCA aims at fully quantifying potential impacts associated with a
254 chemical product or production system over its entire life cycle. Using LCA in early
255 stages of chemical product and process design of various sectors including
256 emerging technologies (e.g. bio- and nanotechnology) has provided insight into the
257 relationship between chemical and process parameter selection and related impacts
258 on humans and the environment (Kralisch et al. 2015). LCA results have moreover
259 demonstrated that quantitative methods are needed to assess the environmental
260 performance of ‘green’ chemicals (Tufvesson et al. 2013). This is especially rele-
261 vant as green chemistry usually focuses on optimisation of (production) processes,
262 including some specific end-of-life problems related to chemicals, which may still
263 risk sub-optimisation when a full life cycle perspective is lacking.

264 Using LCA in early product development stages, for example before a product
265 has been created and marketed, comes with methodological and practical chal-
266 lenges, such as low data availability, uncertainty related to future product appli-
267 cations, and unclear scale of production for a changing market. Therefore, LCA has
268 mostly been applied to chemical products and processes that are already well
269 established and operational at the market scale, which leads to LCA results often
270 being reactive instead of proactive.

271 ***31.1.5 Chemical Alternatives Assessment***

272 Chemical alternatives assessment (CAA) aims to identify, compare and select safer
273 alternatives to substitute (replace) harmful chemicals in materials, processes and
274 products on the basis of their hazards, performance and economic viability (Hester
275 and Harrison 2013). CAA emerged from the U.S. Environmental Protection
276 Agency’s Design for Environment (DfE) program in the late 1990s to promote less
277 hazardous chemicals in various products and applications, and to avoid unintended
278 consequences of harmful alternatives resulting in incremental improvements or
279 even ‘regrettable substitution’ situations (Fantke et al. 2015). Ideally, CAA tools

would evaluate hazard, exposure, life cycle and social impacts, economic feasibility and technical performance of alternative solutions, and consider chemicals, materials, products or technologies, and behavioural changes as viable solutions options. In reality, however, most CAA tools focus only on comparisons of hazard scores and exclusively consider chemicals as potential solutions. Several existing CAA tools have been compiled into the OECD Substitution and Alternatives Assessment Toolbox (www.oecdsaatoolbox.org).

The concept of ‘acceptable risk’ (as applied in risk assessment) is usually avoided in CAA in order to support selecting *relatively* less hazardous chemicals and materials in products (Whittaker 2015). Despite the current focus on assessing chemical hazard, including exposure, life cycle, and social considerations are lately also gaining more attention (Jacobs et al. 2016), focusing the CAA discussion around using more quantitative and chemical function-based methods and tools (Tickner et al. 2015). However, the need for rapid screening of numerous viable alternative solutions prevents CAA from simply adopting the use of LCA tools due to high complexity and data demand.

CAA is mainly used to identify and evaluate solutions to hazardous chemicals in products that have been targeted for phase-out, and to inform early product development to minimise reliance on hazardous chemicals. With that, CAA takes the ‘producer’ perspective similarly to LCA (Fig. 31.2, left-side box), focusing on the impact of chemicals and their alternatives on various receptors. The main difference between CAA and LCA is that while CAA focuses on seeking for viable alternatives to harmful chemicals, LCA considers the life cycle of whole products or processes not focusing specifically on the content of one or more chemicals that might be considered ‘hazardous’, but instead evaluating the overall product or process environmental performance.

31.2 LCA Applied to Chemicals

Chemicals play a central role in the LCA framework for different reasons. Hundreds of chemical emission (inventory) flows typically occur along the life cycle of products or systems (Fig. 31.3) and are quantified as part of the Life Cycle Inventory (LCI; see Chap. 9) phase. Chemicals are also often precursors of product materials, and input for manufacturing and disposal processes. Chemical emissions associated with energy conversion during manufacturing, transport of goods and end-of-life treatment processes often dominate overall emission profiles for many product categories resulting in potential environmental impacts that can be characterised in the Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA; see Chap. 10) phase.

Chemicals contribute to nearly all LCIA impact categories affecting human health and ecosystem quality as two main areas of protection in LCA, with resources (e.g. water) being an area that is usually not relevant for chemicals (Hauschild et al. 2013). In LCIA, chemicals contribute to global warming, stratospheric ozone depletion, formation of photochemical ozone in the troposphere, air




Fig. 31.3 Generic life cycle stages and system boundaries for chemical products or materials and LCA-related questions. In some cases, chemical processing may be followed by material production (e.g. polymers) before manufacturing a product (e.g. plastic bottles), while in other cases, chemicals (e.g. solvents) may be directly added to products or product manufacturing processes. *Underlined topics* are mostly lacking methods or not included in environmental LCA studies

321 pollution (via respiratory particles and precursors), aquatic and terrestrial acidifi-
 322 cation and eutrophication, and last but not least human toxicity and aquatic and
 323 terrestrial ecotoxicity. Only a handful of chemicals are associated with the majority
 324 of abovementioned impact categories, such as carbon dioxide, methane and other
 325 greenhouse gases contributing to global warming impacts or ammonia, nitrogen
 326 oxides, phosphate and some other nitrogen and phosphorus containing chemicals
 327 contributing to aquatic eutrophication. In contrast, thousands of chemicals can be
 328 characterised as potentially toxic to humans and/or ecosystems (Rosenbaum et al.
 329 2008). This is, however, only a small fraction of the tens of thousands of com-
 330 mercially relevant chemicals.

331 The generic life cycle stages shown in Fig. 31.3 are applicable to a chemical
 332 product (e.g. pharmaceutical or dye) or material (e.g. polymer), from raw materials
 333 extraction to product disposal, often referred to as ‘cradle to grave’ (Fig. 31.3,
 334 stages A–F). A ‘cradle to grave’ LCA study can provide valuable insight regarding
 335 which stages dominate the impacts throughout a product life cycle. Some of these



336 life cycle stages, however, may not be relevant depending on the goal (Chap. 7) and
337 scope (Chap. 8), and the product system under study. For example, the ‘material
338 processing’ stage may not be relevant in cases where a chemical is directly added
339 into a product as an ingredient, such as fragrances in cosmetics or detergents in
340 cleaning products. As another example, the ‘product application/use’ or ‘product
341 disposal’ stages may not be relevant for comparing the environmental performance
342 of chemical synthesis or production processes as long as the compared processes do
343 not influence the chemical amount used in a product or for product disposal.

344 An LCA study from raw material extraction to chemical product manufacturing,
345 i.e. without considering product use and disposal stages, is referred to as ‘cradle to
346 gate’ (Fig. 31.3, stages A–D), which refers to the ‘gate’ of the manufacturing or
347 production facility (which could be the ‘gate’ of a chemical or product ‘factory’,
348 depending on the focus of the study). In Table 31.1, different assessment scopes for
349 LCA studies focusing on chemicals in materials, products and processes are con-
350 trasted and associated with relevant chemicals management questions.

351 LCA can help identify a variety of impacts associated with chemical production,
352 use, and disposal, that are either intrinsic to a chemical (e.g. toxicity potential) or
353 related to supporting industrial chemical processes (e.g. water consumption,
354 greenhouse gas emission). The main uses of LCA for managing chemicals and
355 chemical processes are to compare impacts between products or services, or to
356 identify ‘hot spots’ within a life cycle that contributes greatly to the impacts of a
357 product or service. With respect to chemicals, LCA can be applied to various
358 combinations of the generic life cycle stages in Fig. 31.3 depending on the LCA
359 study goal and chosen system boundaries. In some cases, individual life cycle
360 stages and associated inputs or outputs may be skipped or not considered important
361 for the defined system. The chemical industry developed a guidance document to
362 support the assessment of the environmental performance of chemical products
363 based on attributional LCA, i.e. referring to process-based modelling and excluding
364 market-mediated effects (WBCSD 2014).

365 In the following sections, an overview is given of how LCA has been applied to
366 consider these various life cycle stages and the general lessons learnt from these
367 studies. Thereby, LCA can be used to compare impacts at the level of chemicals in
368 materials, products and formulations or at the level of chemical synthesis and
369 production processes.

370 **31.2.1 Chemicals in Materials, Products, and Formulations**

371 A subset of materials, products, formulations (combination or mixture of chemicals)
372 and processes are intrinsically reliant on the functionality of key chemical ingre-
373 dients. In this section, main trends are summarised in using LCA- or LCA-based
374 methodologies. This may include also partial LCA studies, e.g. methods only
375 considering a subset of life cycle stages (i.e. cradle to gate or gate to gate), with
376 focus on chemicals in materials, products and formulations.

Table 31.1 Relevant life cycle assessment scopes and life cycle stages for selected chemicals management questions and example studies

Chemicals management questions	Assessment scopes and considered life cycle stages	Example studies
What is the environmental performance of different products with respect to chemical emissions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to grave • Stages A–F (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemicals consumption and emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleaning products (Van Lieshout et al. 2015) • Textiles (Roos et al. 2015)
What are the environmental profiles of the production of different chemicals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to (factory or consumer) gate • Stages A–D or a subset of these stages (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemical manufacturing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pharmaceuticals (Wernet et al. 2010)
Which life cycle stage of a chemical product life cycle contributes most to environmental impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to grave • Hotspot analysis including stages A–F (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemicals as products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant protection products (Geisler et al. 2005)
Which chemical synthesis and/or manufacturing processes contribute most to environmental impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to (factory) gate • Hot-spot analysis including stages A–B or A–C (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemical manufacturing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pharmaceuticals (De Soete et al. 2014) • Nano-materials (Pati et al. 2014)
Which life cycle stage of a chemical in a product contributes most to human exposure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to grave • Partial LCA (only human e.g. exposure estimates) including stages A–F (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemicals in products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cosmetics (Ernstoff et al. 2016a)
Which feedstock provides the most environmentally friendly substrate for biochemical synthesis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cradle to (factory) gate • Stages A or A–B (Fig. 31.3) • Focus on chemicals and raw materials consumption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acrolein (Cespi et al. 2015) • PET (Akanuma et al. 2014)

377 LCA studies have focused on pharmaceuticals (e.g. De Soete et al. 2014),
 378 cleaning products (e.g. Van Lieshout et al. 2015) and pesticide formulation products
 379 (e.g. Geisler et al. 2005) as examples of products where chemicals provide the
 380 main product functions. Other LCA studies on chemicals with in-product functions
 381 include studies focusing on flame retardants in electronics (Jonkers et al. 2016),
 382 nano-materials used in bandages and cosmetics (Botta et al. 2011), and polymers
 383 used in food packaging (Hottle et al. 2013). Chemicals required for industrial
 384 processes have also been assessed in LCA studies, including industrial solvents
 385 (Zhang et al. 2008) and chemicals used for the production of treated water, oil and

386 gas, printing paper and dyed textiles (e.g. Alvarez-Gaitan et al. 2013; Parisi et al.
 387 2015).

388 When analysing LCA studies on chemical-based functions, a few generalisations
 389 emerge. For example, it is important to consider life cycle thinking early on in the
 390 design phase of products and processes whenever possible and it has been shown
 391 that simplified tools may help in this process (e.g. De Soete et al. 2014).
 392 Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that hybridised LCA tools or metrics can be
 393 useful to improve communication and management for specific stakeholders (e.g.
 394 Alvarez-Gaitan et al. 2013).

395 Several LCA studies indicate that being sceptical of services deemed ‘green’ or
 396 ‘sustainable’ is crucial, especially when an LCA has not yet been performed. Case
 397 studies on, e.g. ‘green’ solvents (Zhang et al. 2008) or ‘sustainable’ bio-based
 398 chemicals and materials (e.g. Hottle et al. 2013) demonstrate that materials and
 399 products guided by principles of ‘sustainability’, ‘eco-friendliness’ or ‘green
 400 chemistry’ can have significant, but often disregarded or unassessed, environmental
 401 impacts. An example is given in Fig. 31.4, where environmental life cycle impacts of
 402 petro- and bio-based polymers are contrasted based on data from Hottle et al. (2013).




Fig. 31.4 Impact scores for LCAs of two bio-based polymers (*dark bars*; PLA Poly-lactic acid, TPS Thermoplastic starch) compared to petroleum-based polymers (*light bars*; HDPE High-density polyethylene, LDPE Low-density polyethylene, PET Polyethylene terephthalate, PP Polypropylene, PS Polystyrene) per kg of produced granule, normalised for each category to the polymer with highest impacts (based on data from Hottle et al. 2013)

According to this study, bio-based polymers lead to higher impacts than petro-based polymers for several impact categories, which contradicts assumptions that bio-based automatically implies ‘green’ or ‘sustainable’ (see also Chap. 30). Higher impacts for bio-based polymers are mainly associated with feedstock-related agricultural emissions of fertilisers (eutrophication) and pesticides (human toxicity and ecotoxicity), as well as deforestation (impacts related to changes in land use). However, the relative importance (i.e. contribution to overall environmental impacts) of the different impact categories also needs to be considered when evaluating the overall environmental performance of different polymers or other chemical products and processes.

Often products are referred to as ‘green’ or ‘sustainable’ based on a single environmental issue (e.g. reducing greenhouse gas emissions), or based on following the principles of green chemistry in chemical design only. However, chemical products that are claimed to be ‘green’ or ‘sustainable’ may in fact lead to greater impacts on the environment or humans than the conventional alternatives. For example, ‘eco-friendly’ food packaging made of plant fibres may increase exposure and environmental emissions of highly hazardous fluorinated chemicals (Yuan et al. 2016), and ‘green’ solvents can have higher impacts across many impact categories when compared to conventional solvents (Zhang et al. 2008). Furthermore, the production of bio-based raw materials (such as corn, sugar cane, or soy for feedstock) may or may not be associated with lesser greenhouse gas emissions and consumptions of fossil resources, but may have *equal or greater impacts* in other impact categories (e.g. land use, toxicity related to using pesticides, eutrophication related to using fertilisers) than fossil-based materials (see Chap. 30 for further details). These phenomena are commonly referred to as burden shifting (e.g. between environmental issues or compartments). Identifying these is a fundamental application principle unique to LCA.

LCA is a tool that can be useful for comparing products and processes for identifying such burden shifting and how to minimise impacts across a variety of impact categories. However, it is important always to ensure as a practitioner that all relevant chemical emissions are inventoried and all impact pathways are characterised. These general cautions are also relevant for LCA studies focusing on chemical synthesis and production processes as discussed in the following section.

31.2.2 Chemical Synthesis and Production Processes

LCA is a useful tool for improving existing processes and designing new processes for the synthesis and production (Fig. 31.3, stages A–D) as well as for the end-of-life treatment (Fig. 31.3, stage F) of chemicals and chemical products, to inform process systems engineering decisions (Jacquemin et al. 2012). In this section, LCA case studies focusing on chemical synthesis and production processes across various economic sectors are discussed.

443 A major issue illustrated by several LCA studies is that management decisions
444 based on single indicators or criteria can lead to increasing other impacts (that were
445 not considered in the decisions), thereby indicating the strength of LCA as an
446 approach to assess multiple indicators and related trade-offs. An example is the
447 development and application of new plant protection products (pesticides) designed
448 with the intention to reduce human toxicity and ecotoxicity potentials associated
449 with emissions after application in agricultural crop protection or elsewhere (e.g.
450 household pesticides). A related LCA study revealed that the production of a new
451 and more effective plant growth regulating pesticide with less intrinsic toxicity
452 (preferable from a risk perspective) than a functionally equivalent earlier marketed
453 pesticide comes at the expense of increased impacts associated with pesticide
454 synthesis and production processes (Geisler et al. 2005). The higher impacts for the
455 new pesticide are mostly explained by the high complexity of its molecular
456 structure requiring more synthesis and processing steps. In general, impacts related
457 to the production of chemicals have been attributed to energy consumption which
458 tends to increase with increasing complexity of a chemical molecule. Highly specialised
459 chemicals, such as pharmaceuticals, can thereby be associated with higher
460 energy consumption and related impacts from synthesis and production processes
461 than other chemicals (Wernet et al. 2010).

462 Not only complexity of chemical synthesis and production processes, but also
463 the difference in raw materials used drives environmental performance profiles of
464 chemicals and chemical products. This is shown in another set of LCA studies
465 contrasting chemical production from fossil fuel-based versus renewable
466 (bio-based) resources. Synthesising and producing chemicals from biomass (e.g.
467 sugar cane) instead of from fossil fuels (e.g. petroleum or natural gas) has been
468 proposed as a 'sustainable technology' with respect to reducing reliance on fossil
469 resources and greenhouse gas emissions. However, a full sustainability analysis has
470 typically not been conducted, which is why several LCA studies have focused on
471 this claim.

472 As an example, a simplified overview of the different chemical synthesis and
473 processing steps involved in polyethylene terephthalate (PET) polymer production
474 is given in Fig. 31.5. While terephthalic acid used in the production of the chemically
475 identical PET and bio-PET is in both cases derived from petroleum, ethylene
476 glycol can be derived from natural gas as a fossil resource (for PET) or from sugar
477 cane as a biomass feedstock (for bio-PET). The process of natural gas refinement to
478 create ethylene glycol alone consists of several steps including cracking (breaking
479 down) into ethylene and other chemicals, ethylene separation and purification
480 involving several distillation processes (not shown in Fig. 31.5). Accordingly, LCA
481 studies have found that bio-based chemical production usually can lead to less
482 greenhouse gas emissions than fossil-based chemical production, mainly because
483 less refinement of fossil fuels is required. However, growing, harvesting and processing
484 bio-based feedstocks may lead to other impacts related to agriculture production
485 systems, e.g. land use (see Chaps. 29 and 30), which are highly variable
486 with respect to the type of biomass used (Tabone et al. 2010; Akanuma et al. 2014).
487 Furthermore, the type of biomass used can influence the energy required, and




Fig. 31.5 Production process steps for chemical synthesis of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) derived from fossil fuels and bio-PET (partly) derived from bio-resources (modified from Tabone et al. 2010)

488 post-processing of bio-based products and residues greatly influence the overall
 489 related environmental performance.

490 Other LCA studies have focused on specific aspects of chemical synthesis and
 491 processing, such as comparing continuous and batch reactor types (e.g. Wang et al.
 492 2013) or different catalysis and fermentation processes (e.g. Pati et al. 2014). It is
 493 further important to consider which catalysts are used in other processing steps that
 494 petro- and bio-based materials like PET have in common, such as antimony trioxide
 495 found at concentrations of 200–300 ppm in PET or other, metal-free catalysts used
 496 in the polycondensation process as part of polymerisation. Several studies have
 497 concluded that processes with higher yields have a lower impact per chemical
 498 production unit. The use of solvents has additionally been identified as an important
 499 component influencing environmental performance of chemical products (De Soete
 500 et al. 2014). Generally and specifically for chemical synthesis and processing it is
 501 important to be sceptical of processes and products labelled or deemed ‘green’ or
 502 ‘sustainable’ without performing a full LCA as shown, e.g. for ‘green’
 503 nano-materials synthesis (Pati et al. 2014). An overview of aspects that are relevant
 504 for assessing ‘green’ chemical synthesis and production processes is given by
 505 Kralisch et al. (2015).



31.3 Specific and General Methodological Issues for LCA of Chemicals

Applying LCA, specifically in the chemical and pharmaceutical sectors, and in other sectors where chemicals play a central role, comes with several methodological and practical challenges. Generally, gathering chemical inventory data, quantifying impacts, and interpreting results constitute challenges for LCA studies across sectors. In the following sections, some of the most relevant challenges focusing on chemicals in LCA are discussed in relation to the definition of the goal and scope of an LCA study, product system modelling and quantification of life cycle chemical emissions in the inventory analysis, characterisation modelling in the impact assessment, and finally interpretation of LCA results in different contexts.

31.3.1 Goal and Scope Definition

Consistently defining the goal and scope for chemical products or processes (e.g. functional unit of the considered product or service system and related reference flow(s) and system boundaries) is not trivial and needs to be critically considered by a practitioner. Examples of relevant issues when defining functional unit, reference flow(s), and system boundaries are discussed in the following.

Functional Unit (FU)

LCA (and other types of assessments) can be designed to compare functionally equivalent chemicals and chemical products as classified by *chemical function* (e.g. solvents, catalysts), *material function* (e.g. nanotubes, polymers) or *product function* (e.g. herbicides). It is hence important to define the level of ‘functionality’ based on which a study will be conducted. This functionality must be captured in the definition of the FU of an LCA study as basis for comparing products or systems.

Performing an LCA study is useful for providing valuable insight into which of two alternative, functionally equivalent chemicals or products provides the function with the lowest overall environmental impact profile, thereby focusing on avoiding burden shifting between different types of environmental impacts. To screen multiple alternatives to harmful chemicals in a particular product application, in contrast, the focus often is not mainly on environmental performance, but on a combination of regulatory compliance, economic and technical feasibility, along with considering hazard and human, environmental and social impacts. In such cases, a chemical alternatives assessment (CAA) might be the preferred approach to identify the most viable solution(s).

Chemicals and chemical products can also fulfil more than a single function and, hence, a partial definition of the functional unit could lead to inconsistent

544 comparisons if the appropriate product systems are not considered as demonstrated
 545 in Example 31.1.

547 **Example 31.1 Functional Unit (FU)** Take a cosmetic product like shampoo,
 548 where different chemical ingredients provide different functions as part of the
 549 final shampoo product, e.g. to provide clean, shiny and fragrant hair for one
 550 person over 24 h. If the **FU is defined** with respect to a single shampoo
 551 product (one-product system) that **cleans the hair of one person** (by con-
 552 taining detergents) **and makes it shiny** (by containing siloxanes) **for 24 h**, a
 553 functionally equivalent service could be also provided by applying two dis-
 554 tinct products (two-product system), one being a shampoo that only cleans
 555 hair (and does not make it shiny) and another being a conditioner that makes
 556 the hair shiny (and does not clean). However, both the one-product and
 557 two-product systems should not provide fragrance in order to be consistently
 558 compared via the same FU (underlined text above) that excludes fragrance.

559 Likewise, if the FU is defined to just clean hair for one person over 24 h,
 560 comparing LCA results of a shampoo that only provides clean hair to a
 561 shampoo that provides clean, shiny and fragrant hair could yield the mis-
 562 leading outcome that the former shampoo ‘performs better’, because the
 563 production and related impacts of additional chemicals of the latter shampoo
 564 (containing siloxanes for making the hair shiny and terpenes for making the
 565 hair fragrant) are related to functions not fulfilled by the shampoo that only
 566 cleans hair. Hence, the comparison would be biased by comparing products
 567 fulfilling distinct functions.

568
 569 Defining an appropriate FU for multi-functionality (see Chap. 8) is also
 570 important. For example, water and propylene glycol are both effective chemical
 571 solvents and, thus, both would fulfil an FU defined with respect to providing the
 572 function of a solvent in, e.g. a shampoo product. Propylene glycol, however,
 573 provides other functions that water does not provide (e.g. stabiliser, humectant,
 574 emulsifier). Therefore, a comparison of propylene glycol and water in an LCA
 575 study based on a solvent-based FU would not capture the multi-functionality of
 576 propylene glycol. Defining the FU with respect to all functionalities and then
 577 providing system expansion when necessary (e.g. water plus a stabiliser plus a
 578 humectant plus an emulsifier is functionally equivalent to propylene glycol in
 579 shampoo) can be an important consideration in any LCA on chemicals or product
 580 systems. It is, hence, important to ensure the product(s) or chemical(s) investigated
 581 in an LCA study are functionally equivalent and the FU captures this equivalency
 582 appropriately.

583 **Reference Flow**

584 The reference flows (Chap. 8) in an LCA study reflect the overall amount of goods
 585 and/or services that are required to fulfil the defined FU. Taking a no-wash
 586 (dry) shampoo versus a conventional (liquid) shampoo as examples, the reference

587 flows to fulfil an FU of cleaning the hair of one person for one day could be 10 g of
588 the liquid shampoo product plus the (hot) water used to wash the hair. The
589 reference flow for the dry, leave-in, no-wash shampoo could be simply 5 g of
590 powdered product (with no wash-water needed). Furthermore, if functionally
591 equivalent products or chemicals provide different efficiencies to fulfil a defined
592 FU, the different efficiencies need to be accounted for in the reference flow. This
593 issue also points to a problem for cradle to gate LCA studies on chemicals, where it
594 is possible that a chemical could have greater cradle to gate impacts than another
595 chemical per unit mass emitted, but far less of the former chemical is required to
596 fulfil the same FU. Here, pesticides with different efficiencies towards the same pest
597 offer a typical example.

598 *System Boundaries*

599 The system boundaries (Chap. 8) of any defined chemical product or service sys-
600 tems in an LCA study need to capture all relevant processes for the systems being
601 compared. For example, if the purpose of an LCA study is to compare bio- with
602 fossil-based chemical synthesis, the system boundaries must include and differen-
603 tiate all raw material acquisition processes, namely all refining processes for the
604 fossil-based chemical and the crop production and processing steps for the
605 bio-based chemical (see also Fig. 31.5). However, for these systems, it may not be
606 relevant to include chemical use and disposal stages in the study, whenever these
607 life cycle stages are equivalent in both cases. Such systems are referred to as ‘cradle
608 to (factory) gate’ systems and are common in LCA studies on chemical synthesis
609 and other chemical production processes (Jimenez-Gonzalez and Overcash 2014).
610 In contrast, if the purpose of the study is to compare two distinct fossil-based
611 materials fulfilling the same function, the disposal stage could be a relevant driver
612 of the difference between the compared product systems.

613 For several chemical products and production processes, consistently defining
614 system boundaries is challenging. An example is the application of plant protection
615 products containing chemical pesticide active ingredients (e.g. carbamate insecti-
616 cides) applied in agricultural crop production, where the FU could be defined to
617 provide a specified amount of crop in a season. Allocating field buffer strips (i.e.
618 non-agricultural areas that are among other functions introduced to reduce the
619 impact of applied pesticides on non-treated areas), which may be required by law,
620 to the technosphere would apparently influence the crop yield per hectare and
621 amount of pesticide used compared with an equivalent system, where the buffer
622 strips are defined as part of the environment (Rosenbaum et al. 2015). Including
623 buffer strips in the considered technosphere system or not will, hence, influence the
624 related impacts and also defines the scope of the environmental distribution pro-
625 cesses of pesticides in the LCI and LCIA phases. As a consequence, the definition
626 of the system boundaries needs to be aligned with the selected pesticide inventory
627 data and characterisation models to avoid overlaps, double counting of processes
628 and potential gaps along the pesticide impact pathways.

31.3.2 Product System Modelling and Inventory Analysis

There are several obstacles that need to be considered in the product system modelling and inventory analysis phase (Chap. 9), after the goal and scope of an LCA study have been defined.

Data Availability and Quality

All relevant chemical elementary flows from a given product system to the environment need to be quantified in the LCI phase. When using LCA software, emission quantities are often available through an LCI database, for example for processes occurring in Europe or the 'rest of the world.' LCI databases generally rely on typical or average emission inventories or an inventory taken by one industry for a given unit process, which may be outdated or tied to, e.g. a specified electricity mix. Thus, it is always preferred to gather primary data, especially for the foreground system modelling (Chap. 9), of the specific LCA case under study. This poses a particular challenge to LCA practitioners, who may or may not have access to company-specific data to resolve the nuances of a particular supply chain. While in some cases, a particular commissioner of an LCA study might provide such data, while in other cases such data have to be collected from different parties. An example is the application of plant protection products, where pesticide manufacturers will know the concentration of a pesticide active ingredient in a formulation product, but where the different farmers might know the effectively used amount that is applied on agricultural fields and this usually depends on pest-, climate-, soil- and application-specific conditions.

Emission Estimation and Modelling

Most chemical synthesis and material/product manufacturing processes involve several steps, which can yield usable by-products that have to be considered in an LCA study (see Chap. 9 for further details). As an example, harvesting sugar cane yields refined sugar, but also molasses (sugar refining by-product) and bagasse (dry leftover biomass after extracting the juice from the sugar cane). While molasses can be further used to produce biochemicals, bagasse is usually burned (for energy conversion) or used as livestock feed (Fig. 31.5). In an LCA study, usually only one of these products (sugar, biochemical, energy, livestock feed) is in focus and the other products must be accounted for through subdivision or system expansion or if it cannot be avoided through different types of allocation (see Chap. 9).

When building a product system model, different tools and software packages are available. Specifically for simulating material and energy balances of chemical production and processing, there exist several (open-source and commercial) chemical process simulators, such as Aspen HYSYS for oil and gas process simulation and Aspen Plus for chemical process optimisation (www.aspentech.com), BatchReactor and BatchColumn for chemical reactor and batch distillation columns simulation, respectively (www.prosim.net), or CHEMCAD software suite for chemical process simulation and optimisation including batch operations (www.chemstations.com). Such software packages may include proprietary data from the



671 chemical and other industries that are otherwise not accessible and may intrinsically
672 use different allocation systems. The responsibility of ensuring transparency and
673 consistency when building a product system including proper consideration of
674 co-products and by-products lies with the LCA practitioner. However, several
675 documents exist for LCA practitioners to seek guidance, and working examples of
676 co-product consideration for the chemical industry can be found elsewhere (e.g.
677 Weidema 2000; Karka et al. 2015).


678 In most LCA studies, an inventory covers hundreds of processes and emission
679 flows but not all chemical emissions are usually able to be covered. Often missing
680 from LCI databases are, e.g. emissions to the occupational and consumer envi-
681 ronments, and the ingredients (e.g. chemicals) in a product, which can be emitted
682 indoors during product use or outdoors post-use as demonstrated in Example 31.2.

684 **Example 31.2 LCI Emission Pathways** When a **consumer product** (e.g.
685 perfume) or industrial product (e.g. agricultural pesticide) is used, the
686 chemicals within the product undergo various pathways, thereby exposing for
687 example the product users and people nearby. Consider that a colleague at
688 work **applies an air freshener or perfume in the office**. Perhaps you smell
689 or even taste it in the first minutes after application (indication of exposure),
690 maybe the scent remains in the office for some days (indicating sorption and
691 desorption from indoor walls and other surfaces), and maybe you can even
692 smell it just outside the office building (indicating transport outdoors via
693 ventilation).

694
695 In some cases, a large proportion of chemicals within products can be taken in
696 by humans during and after product use, which is a major concern amongst reg-
697 ulators and researchers. In LCA, such considerations are currently largely missing,
698 but first efforts were made to include indoor fate and exposure pathways (referred to
699 as ‘near-field’) into the toxicity characterisation model USEtox 2.0 (<http://usetox.org>).
700 Without accounting for near-field fate and exposure pathways, LCA studies
701 typically may assume a fixed-fraction like 100% of product ingredients being
702 emitted to the environment. In general, assuming such emission distributions could
703 lead to an underestimation of resulting human toxicity potentials and an overesti-
704 mation of environmental or ecosystem impacts. This is illustrated in Fig. 31.6 for
705 d-limonene as commonly found chemical in a shampoo product, where assuming
706 100% of the used product being washed-off (left-side pathway in figure) instead of
707 modelling a more complex yet more realistic distribution (right-side pathway in
708 figure) yields a difference of more than three orders of magnitude for freshwater
709 ecotoxicity impacts, which is significantly beyond the uncertainty range for this
710 impact category.

711 Emissions can also occur from chemical residues in products that are related to
712 cross-contamination, i.e. such chemicals are not purposefully added to a product
713 and enter a product from using, e.g. recycled material where not all chemical
714 ingredients are known. Often, inventory data related to cross-contamination

Fig. 31.6 Illustrative example of assumptions for emission distributions of chemicals in consumer products in life cycle assessment showing a substantial decrease in the estimated potentially affected fraction (PAF) of freshwater species from the chemical ingredient d-limonene (CAS: 5989-27-5) in shampoo when accounting for indoor fate and exposure of cosmetic products. Adapted from results from Ernstoff et al. (2016a) combined with freshwater ecotoxicity characterisation factors from USEtox 2.0 (<http://usetox.org>). Air emissions were assumed to be to urban air, water emissions to continental freshwater, and soil emissions to continental natural soil



715 pathways are very limited if at all available. Using similar processes or pathways as
 716 proxy might be a possibility to address this limitation, but also introduces additional
 717 uncertainty in the emission estimates.

718 *Spatiotemporal Variability in Emissions*

719 Time (e.g. year, season or duration) and location can influence variations in
 720 emissions, referred to as 'spatiotemporal' variability. In many cases, LCI results do
 721 not capture the time of emissions from systems, e.g. agricultural practices (e.g.
 722 harvesting, applying fertilisers) can occur according to daily or seasonal cycles
 723 according to the geographic location of the farm. Likewise, emissions of landfill
 724 leachate are influenced by changes in environmental conditions (e.g. acidity and
 725 temperature) which can change through time and according to location (Bakas et al.
 726 2015).

727 *Incomplete Emission Inventories*

728 It is important to be aware of the incompleteness of some emission inventories. For
 729 example, energy conversion processes generally are well detailed in LCI which can
 730 result in high toxicity related impacts resulting from energy consumption, but other
 731 processes, e.g. related to chemical processes may have less complete inventory and,
 732 hence, related toxicity impacts might be underestimated (Laurent et al. 2012).



31.3.3 Impact Assessment

Characterising chemical emission flows resulting from the LCI in terms of their impacts on humans and the environment requires a careful consideration of study context (e.g. spatial region), number and relevance of chemicals to be characterised (in many cases, most chemicals contribute marginally to overall impacts, while only few chemicals dominate overall impact profiles). In the following, challenges and pitfalls in the impact assessment of chemical products and processes are discussed with focus on toxicity-related impacts, where special challenges exist mainly due to the countless chemicals to be characterised and the complexity of related impact pathways.

Limited Substance Coverage

USEtox, a scientific consensus model for characterising human and ecotoxicological impacts of chemicals, presently provides characterisation factors for more than 3000 chemicals, which constitutes the largest list currently available in LCIA (<http://usetox.org>). However, with tens of thousands of chemicals on the market, inventoried chemical emissions either documented in an LCI database or by a practitioner investigating a specific system or process, may in many cases not have existing characterisation factors or the data required to develop new characterisation factors (e.g. toxicity dose-response information). This limitation to substance coverage in LCIA is important when interpreting results, because a lack of data for many chemicals does not preclude their possible impacts.

Chemical Degradation Products

When a chemical does not degrade, or degrades very slowly, it is considered 'persistent.' Persistent chemicals thereby can be linked to greater impacts because they are not or very slowly removed from the system through degradation. In current LCIA methodologies, abiotic (e.g. where a chemical is transformed via interactions with sunlight) and biotic (e.g. when a chemical is metabolised by soil bacteria) degradation essentially 'removes' organic chemicals from the system and no further impacts are characterised. In reality, degradation processes transform a chemical into various degradation or transformation 'products', including other chemicals or gases, which can also impact the environment. Degradation products can have greater or lesser impacts than their parent compounds, for example aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA), which is the main degradation product of the broad-spectrum herbicide glyphosate, is more persistent and more toxic than the glyphosate parent compound. As an example, not considering AMPA in an LCA study that considers agricultural processes where this herbicide is used could underestimate the impacts of using glyphosate. Therefore, an LCA practitioner should include estimates of persistent degradation products and appropriate characterisation factors (in this case for AMPA, not glyphosate) to better capture the impacts of chemicals. While this approach will not be feasible for all chemicals (due to data limitations), it should be performed when the issue is known and data are available.

Impacts from Chemical Mixtures

Impacts towards humans or different ecosystems, related to chemical emissions, are a function of the simultaneous prevalence of other chemicals, which might have synergistic (enhancing) or antagonistic (counteracting) properties with respect to the effect of a considered chemical. Since information on the site-specific mixture of chemicals in any environmental medium or compartment is not usually available, and the impacts of such a mixture on humans or the environment are not known, synergistic or antagonistic effects are usually not considered, and instead additivity of concentrations and effects is assumed. This means that the effects of all chemicals contributing to the same impact category, e.g. freshwater aquatic ecosystem toxicity or ozone depletion, are summed up to arrive at an overall product system-related impact score. If for any LCA study the emission location and time is known and related background concentration profiles available for all relevant chemicals, this assumption could be evaluated by identifying and quantifying the synergistic or antagonistic effect potentials. However, the potentially added accuracy in an LCA context is most likely not relevant given existing uncertainty attributable to other aspects in the characterisation of chemical emissions. Besides, the large number of chemicals present and emitted into the environment yields an almost limitless amount of possible mixtures, rendering it impossible to quantify the specific effect potentials for each mixture.

Missing Fate and Exposure Processes and Pathways

In order to reduce the demand put on LCA practitioners, streamline workflows, and allow for science-based and consensus-driven solutions, LCIA often relies on predefined methodologies. However, hundreds or even thousands of chemicals might be inventoried for various processes in an LCA study, but characterisation factors or a LCIA method for a given impact at mid-point or end-point level may be missing, especially for toxicity-related impacts (see Chap. 10). Moreover, certain exposure settings (occupational, consumer) or routes (e.g. dermal exposure) or target organisms (e.g. exposures of bees) may be missing from an LCIA model. Effect factors may also be missing or inconsistent, e.g. in the case of human toxicity, effects of allergy or endocrine disruption (i.e. interaction with the hormone system) are often not included, but may be highly relevant for chemicals in consumer products. Finally, many of the methodological gaps in LCIA are also due to the reliance on simplifying assumptions. The LCA practitioner, who is constrained by resources (time, money, data access), is responsible for compiling the necessary data and for ensuring that the LCIA methodology chosen (or developed) is suitable for the defined goal and scope of an LCA study. Specifically, to characterise a chemical's impact, several assessment factors are required and must be sufficiently scrutinised within the chosen LCIA method, such as the chemical environmental fate, ecosystem and/or human exposure if relevant, and subsequent effects with respect to given impact categories. Each of the related data requirements poses its own challenges. To avoid the misleading conclusion that missing aspects of the chosen LCIA method do not cause impacts because they were not assessed, it is important to be familiar with which processes (e.g. biotransformation),

819 environmental compartments (e.g. indoor air), exposure pathways (e.g. dermal
820 uptake), and effects (e.g. endocrine disruption), may be missing from the selected
821 characterisation methods but are relevant for the system under study. In some cases
822 such missing aspects can be addressed by the practitioner by developing new
823 methods or by adapting existing methods; if not, it is important to be aware of how
824 this could influence results.

825 *Spatiotemporal Variability of Impacts*

826 LCIA methods are generally based on regional or global averages for various
827 chemical, environmental and pathway data and processes, e.g. how long it takes
828 chemicals emitted to freshwater to reach the sea (i.e. residence time), or how many
829 persons live in an urban area (i.e. population density). Studies have shown, intu-
830 itively, using a continental average instead of ‘spatially differentiated’ regionalised
831 models can yield large uncertainty in the estimated impacts (e.g. Kounina et al.
832 2014). Thus, if the location of the emissions (e.g. from a specific factory) in an LCA
833 study is known, using a model with characterisation factors specific for that region
834 can reduce uncertainty of model results. If emission locations are not known (as is
835 the case for most chemicals in typical LCA studies), characterisation results for
836 regions can be applied that are parameterised, i.e. averaged for the characteristics of
837 a particular region. The same rule applies for temporal aspects, where in LCA
838 mostly steady-state conditions and continuous emissions are assumed, which might
839 not be true for, e.g. agricultural pesticides that are applied on specific days only (i.e.
840 pulse emissions). In such cases, accounting for the dynamics of the chemicals in the
841 modelled environmental system may reduce uncertainty in characterisation results
842 (e.g. Fantke et al. 2012), but whenever temporal information on emission patterns is
843 not available, parameterised characterisation results can be applied that account for
844 the most important temporal aspects of a modelled system.

845 *Impacts Versus Benefits*

846 Life cycle *impact* assessment inherently focuses on quantifying ‘negative’ impacts
847 on humans and the environment. A stakeholder could in some cases argue that their
848 product or service offers a benefit to society that is not accounted for, meaning that
849 LCA yields misleading results. When facing such an argument as LCA practitioner,
850 it is important to go back to the fundamentals of LCA. The impact assessment phase
851 of LCA is designed to assess environmental ‘benefits’ in the form of ‘avoiding
852 environmental impacts.’ For example, a wastewater treatment plant design that also
853 decreases environmental pollution compared to another design offers a ‘benefit’ that
854 is quantifiable in an LCA context (see Chap. 34 on LCA of wastewater treatment).
855 Furthermore, when comparing functionally equivalent products or services, their
856 benefits (e.g. restoring a wetland to yield a level of biodiversity, or designing a car
857 with a certain safety rating) is often captured in the functional unit of an LCA study,
858 which defines a unit of the (beneficial) service being provided. There are special
859 cases where considering societal benefits that are not captured in the functional unit
860 or by the assessment methods can be extremely important when guiding
861 decision-making. In some cases, LCA may not be the appropriate tool to assess
862 such benefits; however, developing LCA-compatible methods to quantify societal

863 benefits (specifically positive human health outcomes) is a topic of high interest
864 when assessing human nutrition and dietary patterns, where two functionally
865 equivalent diets can have very different health impacts (Nemecek et al. 2016).

866 **31.3.4 Interpretation**

867 The interpretation of results is fundamental for the findings and reliability of every
868 LCA study and subsequent guidance provided to stakeholders, and to LCA in
869 general (see Chap. 12). Robust and transparent interpretation of results from an
870 LCA study can offer sound council for the stakeholders and when aggregating with
871 other LCA studies can elucidate generalisable findings important for sustainable
872 development. As an example of nuances of interpretation, the ‘New Plastics
873 Economy’ report (WEF 2016) cites interpretation of several LCA studies and
874 implies that a major shortcoming of LCA is its inability to identify and support
875 ‘target states’, such as moving towards increased production and use of bio-based
876 plastics. Indeed, as previously discussed, LCA studies on bio-based versus
877 fossil-based plastics have demonstrated similar, if not greater impacts (e.g. on land
878 use and toxicity potentials) for bio-based plastics due to agricultural practices (see
879 Chap. 30), which is a finding that may be unintuitive or undesirable to some (e.g.
880 stakeholders in the bioplastics industry). When interpreting such LCA results, it is
881 important to distinguish what an LCA says about ‘here and now’ versus what it
882 could mean for future sustainability goals or targets of stakeholders. For example,
883 LCA results showing bio-based plastics have ‘greater impacts’ than fossil-based
884 plastics do not discredit bio-based plastics as a sustainability goal, but they do
885 indicate that bio-based plastics face sustainability challenges given current agri-
886 cultural practices, which thus must be addressed to avoid impact trade-offs.
887 Furthermore, LCA results can help indicate which feedstock is the most
888 eco-efficient (less impacts per kilogram) to work towards a bio-based ‘target’. In
889 practice, LCA may not be able to easily identify target states often elucidated
890 according to societal values (which may include socioeconomic or political factors)
891 or intuitive/consensual sustainability goals, but LCA can be instrumental in
892 reaching goals and target states in a holistically sustainable manner and shedding
893 light on challenges faced when working towards such goals. In the following, some
894 additional challenges in interpreting LCA results are outlined.

895 **Contribution to Impact Results**

896 Especially for LCAs on chemical products or processes, it is important to trans-
897 parently report and document the contribution of different chemicals to impacts
898 related to product life cycle stages and individual processes. This can help identify
899 potential problems in the processing of LCI or LCIA results (e.g. if one chemical
900 dominates results). Interpreting LCA results might be particularly challenging if it is
901 not clear whether toxicity-related impacts are associated with chemical emissions
902 occurring along the product life cycle or, in contrast, with chemicals that are



903 product *ingredients* (Roos and Peters 2015). As an example, glass used as food
904 packaging can show higher potential toxicity impacts compared with plastic
905 packaging due to transport-related emissions of toxic chemicals from fossil fuel
906 burning (Humbert et al. 2009), which is linked to the fact that glass is usually
907 heavier than plastic. However, plastic food packaging can likely lead to greater
908 exposures to various chemicals through food than glass, but this aspect is not
909 (yet) considered in current LCIA toxicity models (Ernststoff et al. 2016b). Further, it
910 might be unclear whether worker and/or consumer exposure pathways are included
911 as these are currently beyond the scope of LCA studies focusing primarily on
912 environmental emissions. The covered pathways and exposed populations should
913 always be clarified in an LCA study to avoid possible misinterpretation of results.
914 This is of specific relevance for the comparison of chemicals and chemical products
915 and processes, where such ambiguities can cause confusion regarding the contri-
916 bution of chemicals and related impact pathways and life cycle stages are lacking.

917 ***Identification of Considered Chemicals***

918 In any of the aforementioned contexts, it must be acknowledged that most chemi-
919 cals have various common names (lindane, CAS RN: 58-89-9, is for example also
920 commonly known as HCH, hexachlorobenzene, or cyclohexane, etc.). Hence, it is
921 important to ensure that names for chemicals in the different phases of an LCA
922 study (e.g. inventory analysis and impact assessment) are consistently chosen based
923 on using CAS registry numbers or similar as chemical identifier to, e.g. avoid
924 double counting or neglecting chemicals with ambiguous names. This exercise can
925 prove to be challenging as LCA software packages often report chemical inven-
926 tories by chemical name and not by CAS number.

927 ***Quality and Uncertainty***

928 Quality checks across the large number of inventoried chemicals is usually difficult,
929 but inventory results should nevertheless be verified by, e.g. checking the mass
930 balance of only those chemicals that drive overall impact results, for examples
931 heavy metals that dominate toxicity impact profiles. Furthermore, it is essential to
932 report and discuss uncertainties of LCA data and results with respect to each impact
933 category as integral part of the analysis, and consider such uncertainties in the
934 interpretation of results and guidance provided to decision makers (see Chap. 11).

935 Particularly uncertainty associated with toxicity characterisation results is high
936 compared with other impact categories and results can furthermore differ between
937 toxicity characterisation methods, which can in some cases influence the overall
938 ranking of compared product systems. Uncertainty (lack of data or understanding)
939 and variability (data heterogeneity) are distinct concepts, but are sometimes (in-
940 correctly) aggregated. For example, often ‘high uncertainty’ is perceived negatively
941 or seen to discredit a particular LCIA method. However, such ‘uncertainty’ can be a
942 direct reflection of reality and variabilities in temporal and spatial chemical fate and
943 organism disease responses (see Chap. 11 for further details). Likewise, if an impact
944 category has low or no associated uncertainty, this is perceived as positive but
945 should in fact be a warning sign that there may be a lack of understanding of what
946 uncertainties and/or variabilities exist or that the environmental relevance (or

947 representativeness) of an indicator may be low (which introduces an uncertainty in
 948 the interpretation phase, but this is usually not quantified). To begin transparently
 949 addressing this issue, impacts should ideally be cross-compared using different
 950 LCIA characterisation methods with particular focus on identifying which chemi-
 951 cals contribute the most to impacts in each LCIA method (which are often not the
 952 same). Moreover, uncertainty ranges for toxicity-related impacts should be reported
 953 in logarithmic scale to put average uncertainties of two to three orders of magnitude
 954 into perspective of more than 15 orders of magnitude in the variability across
 955 chemicals. This is shown in Fig. 31.7 for 786 chemicals with available measured
 956 ecotoxicity effective concentrations for 50% of the exposed species (EC50; mg/L)
 957 for aquatic ecosystems. EC50 values are used to calculate effect factors as part of
 958 toxicity characterisation in LCIA (see Sect. 10.11). The relation between uncer-
 959 tainty and cross-chemical variability is not much different for toxicity impacts than
 960 for other impacts, where uncertainty in characterisation results (of usually only a
 961 handful of contributing chemicals) and related variability across contributing
 962 chemicals are both less broad. However, uncertainty ranges vary widely between
 963 chemicals, but chemical-specific uncertainty around characterisation factors is
 964 usually not available in LCA, except for specific pathways, e.g. exposure to pes-
 965 ticide residues in food crops (Fantke and Jolliet 2016), where also the underlying
 966 method to quantify chemical-specific uncertainty is outlined.

967 *Comparison with Results from Other Methods*

968 Comparing results from an LCA study with results from a different method can help
 969 identify methodological inconsistencies that require further inspection. As an
 970 example, it might be desired to compare the ranking of chemicals in terms of their
 971 potential toxicity impacts on humans and/or ecosystems in an LCA study with the
 972 ranking of chemicals based on persistence, bioaccumulation and toxicity or other
 973 criteria used, e.g. by risk regulators. In this context, it is important to acknowledge
 974 that inconsistencies can result from the primary data used in an LCA versus another




Fig. 31.7 Ranges of measured chemical-specific ecotoxicity effective concentrations (50% of exposed species affected), EC50, for aquatic ecosystems collected and indicated as reliable for 786 chemicals based on REACH (echa.europa.eu/regulations/reach)

975 method, or assumptions and cut-offs may be based on different criteria, e.g. worst
976 case versus best estimate or most sensitive species versus average ecosystem sen-
977 sitivity (Harder et al. 2015). This might lead to problems when comparing chemical
978 rankings based on different assessment methods and data sources. Chemical toxicity
979 results may furthermore differ between regions, countries or assessment methods,
980 and thereby the consideration of chemicals as, e.g. ‘non-carcinogenic’ in LCA
981 toxicity characterisation models may not be consistent with a specific regulatory
982 context, such as the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation, and Restriction of
983 Chemicals (REACH) legislation framework of the European Union.

984 31.4 Conclusions

985 Stakeholders commissioning an LCA study can drive the goal and scope, the
986 selection of inventory processes, and the selection of impact categories. In many
987 cases, this can lead to an assessment that is restricted, for example to greenhouse
988 gas emissions and a focus on climate change. The limited scope of such studies
989 must be considered in the interpretation and application of their results, whenever
990 other important impact pathways for chemical production, use, and disposal are not
991 assessed. It is always important to be critical towards LCA outcomes and under-
992 stand their limitations and scope, and respect that no tool (including LCA) can
993 answer all questions related to chemicals and sustainability.

994 Not only can the scope of an LCA study be intentionally restricted according to
995 its goal and scope, but there are several remaining challenges that also limit LCA,
996 such as partial coverage of chemical inventory data, fate modelling (e.g. regional
997 variation), exposure pathways (e.g. dermal exposure of consumers), and charac-
998 terisation of potential human and ecosystem toxicity impacts. Given that there are
999 tens of thousands of commercially used chemicals, and often little data on their
1000 properties or effects, the challenge of addressing chemical risks and impacts is not
1001 unique to LCA. Generally, the various methods for characterising risk and impacts
1002 of chemicals face similar challenges of data availability, but they also face
1003 methodological challenges and intentional differences. For example, results of an
1004 LCA addressing several impact categories and hundreds of chemicals, where often
1005 the exact emission location and timing is unknown, are difficult to cross-compare
1006 with results of a toxicity-focused risk assessment considering specific (e.g.
1007 worst-case) conditions and only one or several chemicals of concern (Harder et al.
1008 2015).

1009 Attempts of combining LCA with principles of green and sustainable chemistry,
1010 integrating LCA- and risk-based approaches, and including life cycle impacts in
1011 chemical alternatives assessment frameworks demonstrate the growing comple-
1012 mentarity and relevance of the life cycle approach in other science-policy fields
1013 (Jimenez-Gonzalez and Overcash 2014; Harder et al. 2015; Jacobs et al. 2016).
1014 Overall, the number of LCA studies focusing on chemicals or chemical products or

processes is growing; thus, increasing discourse and trust in LCA methods as well as improving existing inventory and impact characterisation approaches.

Over the past years of research, LCA has developed into a powerful tool to identify and assess trade-offs and burden shifting between different environmental issues, identify hotspots and minimise overall environmental impacts of chemicals in the life cycle of products and processes. With rising interest in creating ‘environmentally friendly’ chemicals and products, LCA is particularly important to help avoiding ‘green washing’ and unsupported claims. A common example is the comparison of products that can be developed purely from petrochemicals and also from a combination of petro- and biochemicals. Larger potential greenhouse gas emissions in the petrochemical production are confronted with often larger land use and pesticide-related toxicity impacts from agricultural crop production when serving as feedstock for biochemical production (Tabone et al. 2010; Cespi et al. 2015). Only comparing climate change impacts in this context would lead to false conclusions (i.e. that bio-based chemicals are always ‘greener’) and does not help identify how to optimise production processes and resource use when moving from petrochemicals to biochemicals in, e.g. plastics production. This is especially relevant when assessing emerging technologies, where there is a high level of optimisation potential in the years to come for upscaling lab-level processes to a commercial level.

Future research related to chemicals and LCA should focus on identifying and resolving areas of high uncertainty (such as changes through space and time), filling data gaps (for example with high-throughput exposure and toxicity modelling approaches), and addressing issues of high concern such as consumer and occupational exposure and other toxicity endpoints (e.g. toxicity to bees). Furthermore, applying LCA in case studies and analyses to address issues of existing and emerging technologies can help pinpoint and corroborate solutions towards more sustainable production and consumption of synthetic and naturally occurring chemicals.

References

- Abraham, M.A., Nguyen, N.: “Green engineering: defining the principles”—results from the Sandestin conference. *Environ. Prog.* **22**, 233–236 (2003)
- Akanuma, Y., Selke, S.E.M., Auras, R.: A preliminary LCA case study: comparison of different pathways to produce purified terephthalic acid suitable for synthesis of 100% bio-based PET. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **19**, 1238–1246 (2014)
- Alvarez-Gaitan, J.P., Peters, G.M., Rowley, H.V., Moore, S., Short, M.D.: A hybrid life cycle assessment of water treatment chemicals: an Australian experience. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **18**, 1291–1301 (2013)
- Anastas, P.T., Lankey, R.L.: Life cycle assessment and green chemistry: the yin and yang of industrial ecology. *Green Chem.* **2**, 289–295 (2000)
- Anastas, P., Warner, J.: *Green Chemistry: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, New York (1998)



- 1057 Bakas, I., Hauschild, M.Z., Astrup, T.F., Rosenbaum, R.K.: Preparing the ground for an
1058 operational handling of long-term emissions in LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **20**, 1444–1455
1059 (2015)
- 1060 Bare, J.C.: Risk assessment and Life-cycle impact assessment (LCIA) for human health cancerous
1061 and noncancerous emissions: Integrated and complementary with consistency within the
1062 USEPA. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* **12**, 493–509 (2006)
- 1063 Botta, C., Labille, J., Auffan, M., Borschneck, D., Miche, H., Cabié, M., Masion, A., Rose, J.,
1064 Bottero, J.-Y.: TiO₂-based nanoparticles released in water from commercialized sunscreens in a
1065 life-cycle perspective: structures and quantities. *Environ. Pollut.* **159**, 1543–1550 (2011)
- 1066 CEFIC: The European Chemical Industry Facts and Figures 2014, p. 54. European Chemical
1067 Industry Council, Brussels (2014)
- 1068 Cespi, D., Passarini, F., Mastragostino, G., Vassura, I., Larocca, S., Iaconi, A., Chierigato, A.,
1069 Dubois, J.L., Cavani, F.: Glycerol as feedstock in the synthesis of chemicals: a life cycle
1070 analysis for acrolein production. *Green Chem.* **17**, 343–355 (2015)
- 1071 De Soete, W., Debaveye, S., De Meester, S., Van der Vorst, G., Aelterman, W., Heirman, B.,
1072 Cappuyns, P., Dewulf, J.: Environmental sustainability assessments of pharmaceuticals: an
1073 emerging need for simplification in life cycle assessments. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **48**, 12247–
1074 12255 (2014)
- 1075 Embry, M.R., Bachman, A.N., Bell, D.R., Boobis, A.R., Cohen, S.M., Dellarco, M., Dewhurst, I.
1076 C., Doerrer, N.G., Hines, R.N., Morett, A., Pastoor, T.P., Phillips, R.D., Rowlands, J.C., Tanir,
1077 J.Y., Wol, D.C., Doe, J.E.: Risk assessment in the 21st century: roadmap and matrix. *Crit. Rev.*
1078 *Toxicol.* **44**, 6–16 (2014)
- 1079 Ernstoff, A.S., Fantke, P., Csiszar, S.A., Henderson, A.D., Chung, S., Jolliet, O.: Multi-pathway
1080 exposure modelling of chemicals in cosmetics with application to shampoo. *Environ. Int.* **92**–
1081 **93**, 87–96 (2016a)
- 1082 Ernstoff A, Muncke J, Trier X, Niero M, Fantke P (2016b) Exposure to chemicals in food
1083 packaging as a sustainability trade-off in LCA. In: 10th International Conference on LCA of
1084 Food, 19–21 Oct 2016, Dublin, Ireland, pp. 336–343
- 1085 Fantke, P., Jolliet, O.: Life cycle human health impacts of 875 pesticides. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*
1086 **21**, 722–733 (2016)
- 1087 Fantke, P., Wieland, P., Juraske, R., Shaddick, G., Itoiz, E.S., Friedrich, R., Jolliet, O.:
1088 Parameterization models for pesticide exposure via crop consumption. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
1089 **46**, 12864–12872 (2012)
- 1090 Fantke, P., Weber, R., Scheringer, M.: From incremental to fundamental substitution in chemical
1091 alternatives assessment. *Sustain. Chem. Pharm.* **1**, 1–8 (2015)
- 1092 Geisler, G., Hellweg, S., Hofstetter, T.B., Hungerbühler, K.: Life-cycle assessment in pesticide
1093 product development: methods and case study on two plant-growth regulators from different
1094 product generations. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **39**, 2406–2413 (2005)
- 1095 Harder, R., Holmquist, H., Molander, S., Svanström, M., Peters, G.M.: Review of environmental
1096 assessment case studies blending elements of risk assessment and life cycle assessment.
1097 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**, 13083–13093 (2015)
- 1098 Hauschild, M.Z.: Assessing environmental impacts in a life-cycle perspective. *Environ. Sci.*
1099 *Technol.* **39**, 81A–88A (2005)
- 1100 Hauschild, M.Z., Goedkoop, M., Guinée, J., Heijungs, R., Huijbregts, M., Jolliet, O., Margni, M.,
1101 De Schryver, A., Humbert, S., Laurent, A., Sala, S., Pant, R.: Identifying best existing practice
1102 for characterization modeling in life cycle impact assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **18**,
1103 683–697 (2013)
- 1104 Hester, R.E., Harrison, R.M.: *Chemical Alternatives Assessments*. RSC Publishing, Royal Society
1105 of Chemistry, Cambridge (2013)
- 1106 Hottle, T.A., Bilec, M.M., Landis, A.E.: Sustainability assessments of bio-based polymers. *Polym.*
1107 *Degrad. Stab.* **98**, 1898–1907 (2013)
- 1108 Humbert, S., Rossi, V., Margni, M., Jolliet, O., Loerincik, Y.: Life cycle assessment of two baby
1109 food packaging alternatives: glass jars vs. plastic pots. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **14**, 95–106
1110 (2009)

- 1111 Jacobs, M.M., Malloy, T.F., Tickner, J.A., Edwards, S.: Alternatives assessment frameworks:
1112 research needs for the informed substitution of hazardous chemicals. *Environ. Health Perspect.*
1113 **124**, 265–280 (2016)
- 1114 Jacquemin, L., Pontalier, P.-Y., Sablayrolles, C.: Life cycle assessment (LCA) applied to the
1115 process industry: a review. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **17**, 1028–1041 (2012)
- 1116 Jimenez-Gonzalez, C., Overcash, M.R.: The evolution of life cycle assessment in pharmaceutical
1117 and chemical applications—a perspective. *Green Chem.* **16**, 3392–3400 (2014)
- 1118 Jonkers, N., Krop, H., Ewijk, H., Leonards, P.E.G.: Life cycle assessment of flame retardants in an
1119 electronics application. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **21**, 146–161 (2016)
- 1120 Karka, P., Papadokonstantakis, S., Hungerbühler, K., Kokossis, A.: Life cycle assessment of
1121 biorefinery products based on different allocation approaches. *Comput. Aided Chem. Eng.* **37**,
1122 2573–2578 (2015)
- 1123 Kounina, A., Margni, M., Shaked, S., Bulle, C., Jolliet, O.: Spatial analysis of toxic emissions in
1124 LCA: a sub-continental nested USEtox model with freshwater archetypes. *Environ. Int.* **69**, 67–
1125 89 (2014)
- 1126 Kralisch, D., Ott, D., Gericke, D.: Rules and benefits of life cycle assessment in green chemical
1127 process and synthesis design: a tutorial review. *Green Chem.* **17**, 123–145 (2015)
- 1128 Laurent, A., Olsen, S.I., Hauschild, M.Z.: Limitations of carbon footprint as indicator of
1129 environmental sustainability. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **46**, 4100–4108 (2012)
- 1130 MacLeod, M., Breitholtz, M., Cousins, I.T., de Wit, C.A., Persson, L.M., Rudén, C., McLachlan,
1131 M.S.: Identifying chemicals that are planetary boundary threats. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **48**,
1132 11057–11063 (2014)
- 1133 Neltner, T.G., Alger, H.M., Leonard, J.E., Maffini, M.V.: Data gaps in toxicity testing of chemicals
1134 allowed in food in the United States. *Reprod. Toxicol.* **42**, 85–94 (2013)
- 1135 Nemecek, T., Jungbluth, N., Canals, L.M., Schenck, R.: Environmental impacts of food
1136 consumption and nutrition: where are we and what is next? *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **21**, 607–
1137 620 (2016)
- 1138 OECD (2012) *The Role of Government Policy in Supporting the Adoption of Green/Sustainable*
1139 *Chemistry Innovations*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris,
1140 p. 50
- 1141 Parisi, M.L., Fatarella, E., Spinelli, D., Pogni, R., Basosi, R.: Environmental impact assessment of
1142 an eco-efficient production for coloured textiles. *J. Clean. Prod.* **108**, 514–524 (2015)
- 1143 Pati, P., McGinnis, S., Vikesland, P.J.: Life cycle assessment of “green” nanoparticle synthesis
1144 methods. *Environ. Eng. Sci.* **31**, 410–420 (2014)
- 1145 Pennington, D.W., Margni, M., Payet, J., Jolliet, O.: Risk and regulatory hazard-based
1146 toxicological effect indicators in life-cycle assessment. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* **12**, 450–
1147 475 (2006)
- 1148 Posthuma, L., Bjørn, A., Zijp, M.C., Birkved, M., Diamond, M.L., Hauschild, M.Z., Huijbregts,
1149 M.A.J., Mulder, C., van de Meent, D.: Beyond safe operating space: finding chemical
1150 footprinting feasible. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **48**, 6057–6059 (2014)
- 1151 Roos, S., Peters, G.M.: Three methods for strategic product toxicity assessment—the case of the
1152 cotton T-shirt. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* (2015). doi:10.1007/s11367-11015-10895-11366
- 1153 Roos, S., Posner, S., Jönsson, C., Peters, G.M.: Is unbleached cotton better than bleached?
1154 Exploring the limits of life-cycle assessment in the textile sector. *Cloth. Text. Res. J.* **33**, 231–
1155 247 (2015)
- 1156 Rosenbaum, R.K., Bachmann, T.M., Gold, L.S., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Jolliet, O., Juraske, R.,
1157 Koehler, A., Larsen, H.F., MacLeod, M., Margni, M.D., McKone, T.E., Payet, J.,
1158 Schuhmacher, M., van de Meent, D., Hauschild, M.Z.: USEtox—the UNEP-SETAC toxicity
1159 model: recommended characterisation factors for human toxicity and freshwater ecotoxicity in
1160 life cycle impact assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **13**, 532–546 (2008)
- 1161 Rosenbaum, R.K., Anton, A., Bengoa, X., Bjørn, A., Brain, R., Bulle, C., Cosme, N., Dijkman, T.
1162 J., Fantke, P., Felix, M., et al.: The Glasgow consensus on the delineation between pesticide
1163 emission inventory and impact assessment for LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **20**, 765–776
1164 (2015)

- 1165 Shin, H.-M., Ernstoff, A.S., Arnot, J.A., Wetmore, B., Csiszar, S.A., Fantke, P., Zhang, X.,
1166 McKone, T.E., Jolliet, O., Bennett, D.H.: Risk-based high-throughput chemical screening and
1167 prioritization using exposure models and in vitro bioactivity assays. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**,
1168 6760–6771 (2015)
- 1169 Tabone, M.D., Cregg, J.J., Beckman, E.J., Landis, A.E.: Sustainability metrics: life cycle
1170 assessment and green design in polymers. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **44**, 8264–8269 (2010)
- 1171 Tickner, J.A., Schifano, J.N., Blake, A., Rudisill, C., Mulvihill, M.J.: Advancing safer alternatives
1172 through functional substitution. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**, 742–749 (2015)
- 1173 Tufvesson, L.M., Tufvesson, P., Woodley, J.M., Börjesson, P.: Life cycle assessment in green
1174 chemistry: overview of key parameters and methodological concerns. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*
1175 **18**, 431–444 (2013)
- 1176 van Leeuwen, C.J., Vermeire, T.G.: *Risk Assessment of Chemicals: An Introduction*, 2nd edn.
1177 Springer Press, Dordrecht (2007)
- 1178 Van Lieshout, K.G., Bayley, C., Akinlabi, S.O., von Rabenau, L., Dornfeld, D.: Leveraging life
1179 cycle assessment to evaluate environmental impacts of green cleaning products. *Procedia CIRP*
1180 **29**, 372–377 (2015)
- 1181 Wang, Q., Vural Gürsel, I., Shang, M., Hessel, V.: Life cycle assessment for the direct synthesis of
1182 adipic acid in microreactors and benchmarking to the commercial process. *Chem. Eng. J.* **234**,
1183 300–311 (2013)
- 1184 WBCSD: *Life Cycle Metrics for Chemical Products*, p. 120. World Business Council for
1185 Sustainable Development, Geneva (2014)
- 1186 WEF: *The New Plastics Economy: Rethinking the Future of Plastics*, p. 36. World Economic
1187 Forum, Geneva (2016)
- 1188 Weidema, B.: Avoiding co-product allocation in life-cycle assessment. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **4**, 11–33
1189 (2000)
- 1190 Wernet, G., Conradt, S., Isenring, H.P., Jiménez-González, C., Hungerbühler, K.: Life cycle
1191 assessment of fine chemical production: a case study of pharmaceutical synthesis. *Int. J. Life
1192 Cycle Assess.* **15**, 294–303 (2010)
- 1193 Whittaker, M.H.: Risk assessment and alternatives assessment: comparing two methodologies.
1194 *Risk Anal.* **35**, 2129–2136 (2015)
- 1195 Yuan, G., Peng, H., Huang, C., Hu, J.: Ubiquitous occurrence of fluorotelomer alcohols in
1196 eco-friendly paper-made food-contact materials and their implication for human exposure.
1197 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* (2016). doi:10.1021/acs.est.1025b03806
- 1198 Zhang, Y., Bakshi, B.R., Demessie, E.S.: Life cycle assessment of an ionic liquid versus molecular
1199 solvents and their applications. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **42**, 1724–1730 (2008)

1200 Author Biographies

1201 **Peter Fantke** develops methods for LCIA, health impact assessment and chemical alternatives
1202 assessment since 2006. Has contributed to UNEP/SETAC LCIA working groups and is USEtox
1203 Manager. Interested in quantifying and characterising chemical emissions, uncertainty analysis,
1204 consumer exposure, chemical substitution and model parameterisation.

1205 **Alexi Ernstoff** Studied various aspects of chemical fate, transport, and exposure since 2007.
1206 Recent focus is modelling human exposure to chemicals in products for LCIA. Main interest is
1207 ensuring human health impacts, mediated by using consumer and food products, is consistently
1208 considered in quantitative sustainability assessments.