THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ^{0059/5} LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT

Editor-in-Chief: Walter Klöpffer

Official Organ of JLCA (Life Cycle Assessment Society of Japan),
ISLCA (Indian Society for Life Cycle Assessment) and KSLCA (Korean Society for Life Cycle Assessment)

ecommed
publishers

Vol.5 No.2 2000

Experience

LCA with the **new**

TEAM™ 3.0

Tools for Environmental Analysis and Management

and its **associated services**

Build any system easily
regardless of its complexity

Organise your Life Cycle Assessments
in accordance with ISO 14040 with
the new workspace facility

Benefit from a comprehensive
database over 300 modules with
worldwide coverage

Spécific training sessions
and data modules

Consulting services
more than 400 case studies conducted
by the Ecobilan Group using TEAM™

Web site forum & TEAM™ user
meetings share your experience

* **New Price**
over 60%
price reduction!

* **TEAM™ Discovery**
Available
free of charge

* **New**
user-friendly
interface and
features

▼ **TEAM™3.0 includes:**

38 impact assessment methods

Ability to create user-defined impact assessment methods

Sensitivity analyses and simulations in an automated fashion

▼ **Contact us:**

by mail to **info@ecobilan.com**
Web site **www.ecobilan.com**

LCA Case Studies and Discussions

Economic Allocation in LCA: A Case Study About Aluminium Window Frames

Frank Werner, Klaus Richter

Swiss Federal Institute for Materials Testing and Research (EMPA), Dübendorf, Switzerland

Corresponding author: Frank Werner, EMPA, Dübendorf, Überlandstrasse 129, CH-8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland;
e-mail: frank.werner@empa.ch

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1065/lca199912.008>

Abstract. A traditional problem in LCA is how to deal with processes where recycled material is used as an input or where the output of a process is further used as raw material in another product system (open-loop recycling). Allocation is needed to partition the responsibility for the environmental impacts caused by the raw material extraction, the recycling and the final disposal of a material over different product systems in some proportional shares. The norm ISO/DIS 14'041: 1998 now explicitly allows the use of an economic value as a basis for the allocation of open-loop product systems, where material is recycled into other product systems while undergoing a change in its inherent properties.

In a case study for aluminium window frames, an economic allocation procedure for aluminium is developed based on different market prices for secondary materials with different alloy content. Market prices are assumed to reflect the functionality of a material quality within a techno-economic system. Therefore, market prices permit the qualitative description of the degradation of a material over a product system. Based on this qualitative degradation, a 'relative resource consumption' can be defined. This relative resource consumption is used to allocate the environmental impacts related to recycled material entering or leaving the product system under study.

The results of the new allocation principle are compared to results of a former study on window frames out of various materials, elaborated by EMPA in 1996. The conclusions underline the importance of the recycling of aluminium with a high quality and give some criteria for a more ecological design of aluminium windows. Finally, methodological advantages and obstacles of the presented economic allocation procedure are pointed out.

Keywords: Allocation; aluminium; case studies; economic allocation; functionality; LCA; material quality; open-loop recycling; window frames

1 Introduction

A current problem in LCA is how to deal with material and energy flows which affect other processes or product life cycles not included in the analysed system. If not avoidable, allocation is needed to partition the responsibility of the environmental impacts in some proportional shares. Allocation is especially required in open-loop recycling:

- When recycled material or energy from the life cycle studied is used outside the analysed system,

- when recycled material or energy produced outside the analysed system is used in the life cycle studied,
- when recycled material or energy from the life cycle studied is used outside the analysed system as an input to the following systems of a cascade.

In product systems where recyclable material is involved, possibly all of these three examples will be found for the same material.

During the last years, several allocation rules for multi-input/output-processes as well as for cascade systems have been proposed (Nordic, 1995). For recycling processes, these rules are only applicable to a certain extent since in-product systems including recycled materials and recycling processes are combined in both allocation situations (→ Fig. 1).

Fig. 1: Product systems with recyclable materials: A combination of multi-input/output processes in cascade use including changes of the inherent properties of the material over the life cycle

The norm ISO/DIN 14'041:1998 describes a three step procedure on how to deal with situations where an allocation is necessary. As a first step, wherever possible, allocation should be avoided. Especially for the ecological evaluation of products and for the application of LCAs in product design, the expansion of the system is often not desirable. It implies a greater effort for data collection, evaluation and interpretation without focusing on the scope of the study.

As a second step, the inputs and outputs of a system should be partitioned in such a way that reflects the underlying physical relationship between them. First of all, it can be

argued that material flows are mainly determined by the underlying economic system and not by physical relationships (HUPPES, 1992; FRISCHKNECHT, 1998). Secondly, in the case of open-loop recycling, the change in the physical or chemical properties of a material cannot be described consistently using only one parameter to make its choice arbitrary.

With the approval of ISO/DIN 14'041:1998, as third step, a new possibility for allocation has become accepted: The norm now explicitly allows the use of the economic value as a basis for the allocation of the open-loop product systems:

"Where physical relationship alone cannot be established or used as the basis for allocation, the inputs should be allocated between the products and functions in a manner which reflects other relationships between them. For example, environmental input and output data might be allocated between co-products in proportion to the economic value of the products" (ISO/DIN 14'041:1998, chap. 6.4.2, para. 3),

and under the point on 'Allocation procedures for recycling' (ISO/DIN 14'041:1998, chap. 6.4.3, par. 2):

"An open loop allocation procedure applies to open-loop product systems where the material is recycled into other product systems and the material undergoes a change to its inherent properties. The allocation procedures for the shared unit processes mentioned above should use:

- *physical properties*
- *economic value (e.g. scrap value in relation to primary value), or*
- *the number of subsequent uses of the recycled material (e.g. rubber used in a tire to rubber in the shoe sole to energy recovery from rubber incineration)*

as the basis for allocation".

In the following, an economic allocation procedure is developed for the aluminium of window frames which is based on different prices for secondary qualities of aluminium scrap with different alloy content. The results of the new allocation principle are compared to results of a former study on window frames out of various materials (RICHTER, 1996a).

2 Allocation in the Former EMPA-Window Study

In (RICHTER, 1996a), the environmental burdens of the primary and secondary materials, as well as the outputs, were allocated according to the following principles:

- Primary material as input: The environmental burden of the raw material extraction and processing is included entirely in the system studied
- Recycled material as input: The environmental effects of collecting, processing and reintegrating the material are included in the system
- Recyclable materials such as output: Any environmental effects of collecting and recycling are excluded (as a burden for the next product system)
- Non-recyclable wastes: The effects of disposing non-recyclable wastes are included in the system

In Fig. 2, these principles are illustrated:

Fig. 2: System boundaries and material flows

This 'conservative' allocation procedure allows one to estimate the relative importance of a chosen allocation and is therefore proposed as a first step in cases where allocation is unavoidable (Nordic, 1995).

The easy-to-use-advantage of this procedure implies some disadvantages:

- The use of secondary material is favoured due to the fact that no environmental burden of the primary material production for the secondary material is implied and due to the frequent lack of complete data on the recycling processes.
- No emphasis is given to the quality of the secondary material at the end of the life cycle.

3 Economic Allocation Procedure

The economic allocation procedure corresponds to ISO/DIN 14'041 and is based on the following key assumptions:

From primary use to final disposal, materials run through a cascade of various product systems. Within each product system, the inherent properties of the material – the "quality" – is changed (SIRKIN et al., 1994). Based on the change in material quality, a relative "resource consumption" can be defined for a product system. Using this relative "resource consumption" as a criterion, the environmental effects of recycled material (its extraction as a primary material, its final disposal, the recycling steps) can be allocated to the product system under study.

The market price is considered an expression of the functionality of a certain material quality within a techno-economic system. Relative market prices are therefore a useful parameter to describe the "qualitative" gradation of a material.

It has to be stressed that this price-functionality-quality-relation is only assumed *for different grades of secondary material*. Scrap prices explicitly do not enter into the allocation procedure (in contrast to the example given in chapter 6.4.3, para. 2 of the norm ISO 14'041:1998). All in all, the aluminium scrap flows in Central Europe have to be considered very dynamic depending much on regional and technological developments. Therefore – in spite of depending indirectly on the price of primary material and on the functionality of the future secondary material – the scrap prices may strongly be influenced by other price relevant factors such as homogeneity or dirtiness.

Mathematically, the environmental burdens of the inputs (primary and secondary material) are weighted according

to their price in relation to the primary material (relative price = 1), the relative prices of the *recycled* output are used as the weighting factor to give credit in accordance to the remaining usable quality of the output material. For the system shown in Fig. 1, the "total" environmental burden is calculated as follows:

+		P^*	[Primary material production]	}	Input
+	x^*	R_1^*	[Primary material production]		
+		R_2^*	[Recycling process]	}	Recycling
+		R_3^*	[Recycling process]		
-	y^*	R_2^*	[Primary material production]	}	Credit for the quality of the recycled material
-	z^*	R_3^*	[Primary material production]		
+		P^*	[Final disposal]	}	Relative contribution to final disposal
+	x^*	R_1^*	[Final disposal]		
-	y^*	R_2^*	[Final disposal]		
-	z^*	R_3^*	[Final disposal]		
TOTAL		[Material and energy flows]			
with:					
P: Quantity of primary material					
R_1 : Quantity of secondary material as input					
R_2 : Quantity of secondary material as output with equal inherent properties as primary material					
R_3 : Quantity of secondary material as output with changed inherent properties					
X: Relative price of R_1 compared to P (relative price = 1)					
Y: Relative price of R_2 compared to P					
Z: Relative price of R_3 compared to P					

A precondition for this allocation procedure is a stable price relation of primary and secondary material: the ratio of the LME-index for primary and secondary aluminium can be considered constant over the last years (1995 – 1998).

4 Comparison of Allocation Procedures: A Case Study on Aluminium Window Frames

To study the two allocation procedures, LCAs have been calculated for three alternative scenarios of an aluminium window including a Low-E glazing¹ (RICHTER, 1996b), altering the relation of primary and secondary material, as well as the allocation procedures (→ Table 1). The functional unit and the calculations for the scenarios 'SZFF 65/35 old' and 'SZFF 15/85 old' have been taken from (RICHTER, 1996a). To improve the inventory data for the aluminium recycling step for the window 'SZFF 100/0 new', data has been collected in German recycling plants.

The window 'SZFF 65/35 old' reflects the actual situation concerning the material composition of aluminium window frames in Switzerland, whereas a (future) closed loop-recy-

cling situation is assumed in 'SZFF 15/85 old'. The material composition in scenario 'SZFF 100/0 new' is a hypothetical one to easily study the influence of the economic allocation procedure (→ Table 1).

For the calculation, a service life of 30 years is assumed. Heat losses through the window frame and the glazing are compensated by a LowNO_x gas heating.

The inventory data of the three scenarios is assessed by the Effect-Oriented Classification (CML, 1992). Additionally, some waste parameters are calculated based upon Swiss legislation. The following graphs give some representative examples of the results. For graphic reasons, the material credit is subtracted from the frame material (→ Fig. 3 to Fig. 6, p. 82).

The final disposal step of aluminium has not been included into the calculation, because corresponding technology has not been developed on a industrial scale in view of a growing global aluminium pool of 3.6% per year.

The credit given in the economic allocation procedure based on the remaining quality of the secondary aluminium (output) equals 80% of the frame and fittings material input. The remaining 20% represent the change of the inherent properties ('the loss of material quality') of aluminium and the aluminium losses during the recycling processes.

Table 1: Scenarios calculated for the aluminium window 'SZFF'

	SZFF 65/35 old	SZFF 100/0 new	SZFF 15/85 old
Composition input	65% primary material 35% secondary material	100% primary material	15% primary material 85% secondary material
Allocation procedure	Traditional allocation	Economic allocation	Traditional allocation
Recycling processes	BUWAL 133	– own data/EAA – detailed modelling	BUWAL 133

¹ Specifications: measures 1650 x 1300 mm, $k_f = 1.9 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$, $k_g = 1.6 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$

Fig. 3 to 6: A selection of representative effect categories and waste parameters

Compared to the scenario 'SZFF 65/35 old', the scenario with the economic allocation 'SZFF 100/0 new' shows an up to 30% better ecological profile in all the energy-related effect categories like 'Greenhouse Effect', 'Acidification', 'Ozone Depletion', etc. Due to the great influence of the Low-E glazing on all effect categories dealing with toxicity (e.g. 'Human Toxicity'), the effect of the allocation procedure for aluminium is not significant.

The environmental effects of 'SZFF 100/0 new' are in the same range as the 'future scenario' 'SZFF 15/85 old' in (RICHTER, 1996a).

As a consequence of the better data for recycling processes, the amount of the different wastes discussed is generally higher for the economic allocation scenario (e.g. 'Inert Waste into Landfill').

The material flows for recyclable aluminium have resulted in being very variable, depending much on the site-specific

situation of the companies involved. Nonetheless, aluminium per se keeps its inherent properties during the recycling processes not depending on the further use of it. Asking for an explicit closed-loop recycling for aluminium windows (as assumed in 'SZFF 15/85 old' has been proved not to be sensible, in either economic or ecological terms.

5 Discussion

In this study, the price difference between different Al-alloys is taken as a criterion for their value as a material for the allocation of the environmental burdens. This type of allocation is definitely preferable to that in which the environmental relevance of a material is directly related to a price, e.g. by estimating the environmental relevance of the recycling step by the price difference between primary material and scrap.

The results of the economic allocation no longer stress the importance of an explicit closed-loop recycling for window

frames and the use of a high percentage of recycled material. More realistically, emphasis is laid on a frame construction suitable for recycling aiming to maintain the inherent properties of aluminium at the highest possible level over the life cycle. Therefore, the highest possible separability of the metals in the window scrap is one of the key conditions to optimise the ecological profile of aluminium frames. This already has to be focused during the design of an aluminium window: the renunciation of Zinc die-cast parts and a construction where the fitting bars easily slide out after cutting the corner plates as well as the handle during demolition.

It has to be underlined that an economic allocation is only applied for aluminium as the quantitatively most relevant material. Due to limited time and money, all other materials (in small quantities) have been treated according to the old allocation procedure resulting in different allocation procedures within the same study.

In summary, this economic allocation procedure raises two key questions: "What happens to the materials of a product after its use" and "how can the recyclability of a product be optimised" into the focus of an ecological product design.

To substantiate the assumed relation 'market price – functionality within a techno-economic system – quality' based on several economic disciplines, is subject to further investigation.

References

- CML, 1992 HEIJUNGS, R.; GUINÉE, J.B. et al. (1992): Environmental Life Cycle Assessment of Products. Background and Guide. Leiden
- FRISCHKNECHT, 1998 FRISCHKNECHT, R. (1998): Life Cycle Inventory Analysis for Decision-Making, Scope-dependent Inventory System Models and Context-specific Joint Product Allocation. Diss ETH Nr. 12599, ETH Zürich, Zürich
- HUPPES, 1992 HUPPES, G. (1992): Allocating Impacts of Multiple Economic Processes in LCA. In: Various 1992
- Nordic, 1995 LINDFORS, L.G. et al. (1995): LCA-Nordic Guidelines on Life-Cycle Assessment. Nordic Council 1995, Nord 1995:20, Copenhagen
- RICHTER, 1996a RICHTER, K.; KÜNNIGER, T.; BRUNNER, K. (1996): Ökologische Bewertung von Fensterkonstruktionen verschiedener Rahmenmaterialien (ohne Verglasung). EMPA-SZFF-Forschungsbericht, Dietikon
- RICHTER, 1996b RICHTER, K.; BRUNNER, K. et al. (1996): Ökologische Bewertung von Wärmeschutzglas, Integraler Vergleich verschiedener Verglasungsvarianten. EMPA Dübendorf, Dübendorf
- SIRKIN et al., 1994 SIRKIN, T.; TEN HOUTEN, M. (1994): The Cascade Chain. A Theory and Tool for Achieving Resource Sustainability with Applications for Product Design. Resource, Conservation and Recycling, 10 (1994) 213-277
- Various, 1992 Various (1992): Life-Cycle Assessment. Workshop Report on Life Cycle Assessment, Inventory, Classification, Valuation, Data Bases. SETAC -Europe, Brussels

Received: April 14th, 1999

Accepted: November 26th, 1999

Online Publication: December 16th, 1999

Call for Comments

1. The first author is interested in other case studies where market prices are used to allocate the environmental impacts of open-loop recycling materials.
2. The allocation problem related with recycled materials in an open loop can be tackled: a) bottom up, looking only at the recycling process itself or b) top-down, modelling the whole material cascade. The methodology presented in this paper is focusing c) on the product system itself, providing a complete, flexible and scope-oriented approach. Are there any conceptual or methodological restrictions for this "intermediate" approach?
3. The methodological approach is based on the key assumption that looking from the demand side, market prices of *primary and secondary raw materials* (not scrap!) reflect the functionality of a material quality within a techno-economic system. Comments on this assumption are welcome.
4. Not considering qualitative aspects of open-loop recycled materials in the allocation procedure can result in misleading conclusions for ecological product design. Have any practical experiences related to this been made? Have other methodological shortcomings been detected with regard to open-loop recycled materials using LCA for ecological product design?

Comments on these questions or any aspect of this article are welcome at: frank.werner@empa.ch

JLCA Corner

Launch of the Damage Function Sub-Committee in the National LCA Project of Japan

Norihiro Itsubo

JEMAI (Japan Environmental Management Association for Industry), Ueno 1-17-6, Taito-ku, Tokyo 110-8535, Japan; phone: +81-3-3832-0515, (fax:-2774); e-mail: itsubo@jemai.or.jp; website: <http://www.jemai.or.jp>

1 Objective

LCIA (Life Cycle Impact Assessment) aims at examining the product system from an environmental perspective using impact categories and resource issues for one or more product systems (ISO/FDIS14042, 1999). In characterization phase, we have to select characterization factors to convert the assigned LCI results to common units. In most cases, these characterization factors relate LCI with the category midpoints such as infrared radiative forcing and proton release, but not with category endpoints like the decrease of forest.

These indicators are useful to evaluate the potential impacts of corresponding impact category. However, a lot of category endpoints are involved in one impact category like greenhouse effects. Comparing between category midpoints may prove to be more inconvenient than between category endpoints because of the lack of the depth of assessment if we consider the comparison across an impact category like weighting. Several approaches have been developed with the consideration of priority between safeguarding subjects such as Eco-indicator'99 (GOODKOOP, 1999), EPS (STEEN, 1996) and ExternE (MAYERHOVER, 1997). One of the most important and difficult problems to improve these methodologies is to establish the quantifying damage of category endpoints through the emission of environmental loading substances with a high quality based on natural sciences, a feature which we call 'damage function'. Results of these studies may provide useful information and contribute to an improvement in most of the damage-oriented impact assessment methodologies.

The national LCA project of Japan gathered the specialists of the impact assessment at every impact category and launched the damage function sub-committee under the impact assessment committee to relate LCI with the damage of category endpoints.

2 Approach for the Investigation

Step 1: Establishment of a Cause-Effect Chain

To obtain the reliable damage functions, it is essential to make clear the mechanism of environmental problems. As a first step of this sub-committee, we consider identifying the cause-effect chain in each impact category that addresses the relationships between the emission of environmental loading substances, midpoints and category endpoints in detail. These relationships will be a basis for investigations of the definition of category endpoints and the procedure for the consideration of damage functions.

Step 2: Determination of category endpoints for assessment

There are a lot of category endpoints for every individual impact category. It is impossible to quantify the damage for all of the category

endpoints, so that we must prioritize the category endpoints and select those which should be investigated based on a cause-effect chain.

Step 3: Quantified characterization of the relationships between each midpoint

From the cause-effect chain, we can describe the mechanism of environmental problems for assessment. In this step, we consider characterizing the relationships between the midpoints using knowledge of the natural sciences.

Step 4: Establishment of damage function

Through the integration of the relationships between midpoints in former processes, our goal is to develop the damage functions which demonstrate the relationship of the emission from the inventory table with the damage of category endpoints.

3 Organization and Members

The damage function sub-committee is composed of specialists in impact assessment for every environmental problem and contributors from LCIA. This fiscal year, we will be handling greenhouse effects, acidification, eutrophication, photochemical oxidant formation, human toxicity and eco-toxicity. The members of this sub-committee are listed below.

4 Periods

From April 1999 to March 2000: Investigation of basic data for the development of damage functions (previous step), Establishment of a cause-effect chain (step 1), Preliminary establishment of damage functions for several category endpoints (parts of step 2-4)

From April 2000 to March 2001: Establishment of damage functions and consideration of reliability and uncertainty of them (step 2-4)

Several results of this fiscal year will be published in the 4th international conference on Ecobalance in Tsukuba, Japan.

References

- GOODKOOP, M.; SPIENSMA, R. (1999): The Eco-indicator 99: A damage oriented method for Life Cycle Impact Assessment. Methodology Report ISO/FDIS14042 (1999): Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Life cycle impact assessment
- MAYERHOVER, P.; KREWITT, W.; FRIEDRICH, R. (1997): ExternE: Core project. Extension of the Accounting Framework. Final Report, The European Commission
- STEEN, B. (1996): EPS-Default Valuation of Environmental Impacts from Emission and Use of Resources, Version 1996

Name	Affiliation	Field
Atsushi INABA (chair-person)	National Institute for Resource and Environment	LCIA
Yasunari MATSUNO	National Institute for Resource and Environment	LCIA
Toshio FURUTA	Toho University	Eutrophication
Masanori OKAZAKI	Tokyo University of Agriculture & Technology	Acidification
Hiroshi SEINO	National Institute of Agro-Environmental Sciences	Greenhouse effects
Toshimasa OHARA	Shizuoka University	Photochemical oxidant formation
Kikuo YOSHIDA	Mitsubishi chemical safety institute ltd.	Human toxicity, Eco-toxicity
Norihiro ITSUBO	Japan Environmental Management Association for Industry	LCIA

GaBi3 v2 gets you up to date

A new dimension of efficiency

- Increased performance
- Intuitive database management
- Automatic updating of objects
- html-Documentation for data objects
- New examples

GaBi3 is already in use in more than 30 countries all over the world

GaBi3 is an innovative software for Life Cycle Engineering of systems and processes. It is a development by the Institute for Polymer Testing and Polymer Science (IKP) at the University of Stuttgart in collaboration with PE Product Engineering GmbH at Dettingen/Teck.

With GaBi 3 ten years of developing work from science and industry are made available to serve our customers.

Development partners GaBi

UNIVERSITÄT
IKP
STUTTGART

Free service contract!
If you order SimaPro 4.0 now, you receive a one year service contract -worth up to 1,000 Euro- for free! That means: free software updates, supplements to the database, including the new Eco-Indicator 99 methodology and unlimited access to the SimaPro helpdesk.

Look how easily you can get to the essence

Results-oriented. User-friendly operation. Two essential requirements when choosing LCA software. It's precisely these requirements that are the essence of SimaPro. Results-oriented, because this market has devoted an enormous amount of attention to devising a transparent interface for SimaPro, enabling you to carry out calculations quickly and to trace the origins of all your results with a mouse click. Download a demo version of SimaPro from www.pre.nl and in a few minutes you'll know how easily you get to the essence of LCA!

SimaPro from PRé. The essence of LCA.

For more information or to request a demo CD-ROM, please contact us or one of our dealers: U.S.A.: Sylvatika Mr. G.A. Norris e-mail: norris@sylvatika.com • Spain: Randa Ms. M. Vallès e-mail: randav@arrakis.es • Switzerland: Oekoscience Mr. M. Chudacoff e-mail: chudacoff@oekoscience.ch • France: A.C.V. Conseil Mr. K. Khalifa e-mail: khalifa@acv-conseil.com • Australia: RMIT Centre for Design Mr. T. Grant e-mail: simapro@rmit.edu.au • Italy: Take Care Mr. V. d'Incognito e-mail: takecare@tin.it

PRé Consultants has been working in the field of Life Cycle Assessment since 1990. Our consultant team has many years of hands-on experience in LCA for a wide range of applications. Apart from innovative LCA software development, PRé Consultants is actively involved in improving LCA methodology. This has resulted in highly appreciated methods and tools that are actively used all over the world.

PRé

product ecology consultants

PRé Consultants B.V., The Netherlands
phone: +31 33 455 50 22 • fax: +31 33 455 50 24
e-mail: info@pre.nl • web site: www.pre.nl