

---

International conference on Life Cycle Assessment  
as reference methodology for assessing supply chains  
and supporting global sustainability challenges

**LCA FOR “FEEDING THE PLANET  
AND ENERGY FOR LIFE”**

Stresa, 6-7<sup>th</sup> October 2015  
Milano, Expo 2015, 8<sup>th</sup> October 2015

---

Edited by Simona Scalbi, Arianna Dominici Loprieno, Paola Sposato



MILANO 2015



Italian National Agency for New Technologies,  
Energy and Sustainable Economic Development



International conference on Life Cycle Assessment as reference methodology for assessing supply chains and supporting global sustainability challenges

LCA FOR “FEEDING THE PLANET AND ENERGY FOR LIFE”

Stresa, 06-07<sup>th</sup> October 2015 - Milano, Expo 2015, 08<sup>th</sup> October 2015

*Edited by Simona Scalbi, Arianna Dominici Loprieno, Paola Sposato*

2015 ENEA  
Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development

Lungotevere Thaon di Revel, 76  
00196 Roma

ISBN 978-88-8286-321-0

## Index

<b>Introduction - Life cycle assessment for supporting the transition towards eco-efficient agriculture and food systems .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Conference program .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Consumption trends and sustainability of future development .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Tomorrow's healthy Society: research priorities for foods and diets .....	17
Environmental Impact of the European Food Basket using LCA.....	21
Environmental Implications of Dynamic Policies on Food Consumption and Waste Handling in the European Union .....	25
How much meat can we eat to sustain a healthy life and planet? The case of Swedish meat consumption .....	29
Carbon footprint of Italian eating habits: how consumer food choices might lead to a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.....	36
<b>Product Environmental Footprint in the food sector .....</b>	<b>40</b>
Developing Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules for Olive Oil .....	41
Pesticide emissions in the Environmental Product Footprint – Lessons learnt from refined sugar from sugar beet .....	45
Five crucial complicating issues for harmonising environmental footprints of food and beverages .....	49
Environmental impacts of different dairy farming systems in the Po Valley.....	53
The Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules (PEFCR) Packed Water Pilot Testing .....	58
Identification of the most relevant impact categories with normalisation and equal weighting methods: inconsistencies found in raw milk case study .....	61
<b>Inventories and dabase for LCA and footprint of food chains.....</b>	<b>65</b>
Life Cycle Inventory database for seafood products.....	66
The World Food LCA Database: a global inventory database for the food sector .....	70
Creating coherent life cycle databases for ecodesign and product declaration of agro-industrial products: how to implement methodological choices .....	74
Wheat of today and tomorrow: an assessment of current LCI inventories .....	80
Food PEFCRs and the need for consistent secondary databases such as Agri-footprint® .....	84
<b>LCA and footprints to asses food product chains.....</b>	<b>88</b>
Energy Use in the EU Food Sector: State of Play and Opportunities for Improvement .....	89
Energy Flows and Greenhouses Gases of EU national breads using LCA approach.....	94
Life Cycle Assessment for Enhancing Environmental Sustainability of Sugarcane Biorefinery in Thailand .....	98
Life Cycle Assessment of Biogas Production from Marine Macroalgal Feedstock: Substitution of Energy Crops with Algae .....	102
Environmental assessment of wheat and maize production in an Italian farmers cooperative .....	106

Protein quality as functional unit – a methodological framework for inclusion in Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) .....	110
LCA as a decision support tool in policy making: the case study of Danish spring barley production in a changed climate .....	114
Mediterranean countries’ food supply and food sourcing profiles:.....	118
An Ecological Footprint viewpoint .....	118
Simplified modelling of environmental impacts of foods .....	122
Life Cycle Assessment of Thai Organic Rice to Evaluate the Climate Change, Water Use and Biodiversity Impacts.....	126
Comparative LCA study on environmental impact of oil production from microalgae and terrestrial oilseed crops.....	130
Liquid whey recycling within the traditional dairy chain, as a sustainable alternative for whey waste management.....	134
Quantification of life cycle energy use for a more efficient building design. ....	139
Resource footprint of Vietnamese Pangasius frozen fillets and export to the European market .....	143
Comparative LCA of bread baked in novel Low Energy Ovens and conventional ovens .....	147
Life Cycle Assessment of the production and import of Arabica Brazilian coffee.....	151
The link between CSR, EMS and LCA with coffee as an example .....	155
Sustainability and performance design of open loop recycling strategies in the production of innovative building materials .....	159
A tool for the sustainability assessment of transformation activities of buildings .....	163
LCA of clean technologies in food value chains of emerging economies .....	167
Life Cycle Assessment of Food Smoking Technologies.....	171
Low Emission Farming – a significant step forward to improve the environmental impacts of livestock production .....	175
Energy and water savings by exploiting nano-technological self cleaning textiles .....	182
Selecting an appropriate fuel mix in LCA of energy savings .....	186
Assessing the impacts of onshore wind energy by using a spatio-temporal LCA approach.....	190
Life Cycle Assessment of Palm Biodiesel Production in Thailand: Impacts from Improvement Technologies, Land Use Changes and Modelling Choices .....	194
Energy recovery from garden waste in a LCA perspective.....	198
Comparing Water Footprint impact methods: a case study on biogas production from energy crops.....	202
Environmental assessment of electricity generation from anaerobic digestion of agricultural waste.....	206
LCA and Water Footprint of biofuels used in transport sector: a review .....	232
Simplified LCA tools: selected approaches assessed for their implementation in the agri-food sector....	214
“Vernaccia di San Gimignano DOCG”: towards a sustainable wine farming .....	218
Environmental impacts of the brewing sector: Life Cycle Assessment of Italian craft and industrial beer.....	222
LCA-LCC decision tool for energy generation technologies in a food processing plant.....	226
Life Cycle Assessment of Oilseed Canola Production in Iranian Agriculture .....	230

Carbon footprint assessment of rapeseed in an intensive, conventional production system in the Wielkopolska region (Poland).....	234
The ecological footprint of products of oil palm and rubber plantations in Thailand.....	238
Comparative LCA of sunflower, rapeseed and soybean oils .....	242
Life Cycle Assessment of organic apple supply chain in the North of Italy .....	246
Environmental assessment of rice cultivation: a case study of fertilisation with urban sewage .....	250
Life Cycle Assessment of Greenhouse-Grown Tomatoes in Thailand .....	254
The evolution of LCA in milk production .....	258
Dairy products: Energy use and the associated greenhouse gas emissions.....	262
Carbon footprint analysis of mozzarella and ricotta cheese production and influence of allocation procedure .....	266
Global warming potential of Lombardy cow milk production at farm .....	270
Life cycle assessment of sugar production in Hamadan sugar mill .....	274
Sustainability in breeding farms: the case of the Maremmana beef.....	278
Carbon Footprint of tropical Amazon fruit jam from agroforestry .....	282
Life-cycle assessment of chestnut produced in the north of Portugal.....	286
<b>Life Cycle Impact Assessment: needs and challenges for assessing food supply chains .....</b>	<b>290</b>
Pesticide Substitution: Combining Food Safety with Environmental Quality.....	291
Building consensus for assessing land use impacts on biodiversity: contribution of UNEP/SETAC's Life Cycle Initiative .....	294
Coupling land use information with remotely sensed spectral heterogeneity: a new challenge for life cycle impact assessment of plant species diversity.....	298
Biodiversity impact: Case study beef production.....	302
Pollinators in LCA: towards a framework for impact assessment .....	307
Evaluating use stage exposure to food contact materials in a LCA framework.....	311
Assessing freshwater biodiversity as endpoint modeling of impacts in LCIA: case of run-of-river hydropower .....	315
Spatial and temporal assessment of GHG emissions from cocoa farming in the region of San Martin, Peru .....	319
Land use in life cycle impact assessment: a review of models at midpoint level to incorporate impacts on soil state and functioning.....	323
Marine eutrophication impacts from present and future production of spring barley.....	327
Integration of Land Use aspects in LCA: determination of land use types as a crucial factor influencing the result.....	331
Ecocentric Water Scarcity Index to address local and temporal climate variability: the case of a tomato sauce.....	335

<b>Eco-innovation and industrial symbiosis in the food sector .....</b>	<b>339</b>
Environmental assessment of Ultra-High Pressure Homogenisation for milk and fresh cheese production.....	340
Strategies for reducing food waste: Life Cycle Assessment of a pilot plant for insect-based feed products .....	344
Environmental Impact Assessment of caproic acid production from organic waste: A case study of a novel pilot-scale biorefinery in the Netherlands.....	348
Recovery of waste streams from agroindustry through industrial symbiosis in Sicilia .....	352
Environmental impact of using specialty feed ingredients in pig and broiler production: A life cycle assessment .....	356
Alternative scenarios of food-waste treatment: a comparative Life Cycle Assessment.....	360
Sustainable Management of EU Food Waste with Life Cycle Assessment.....	364
How food loss is addressed in LCA.....	368
Challenges and opportunities in using Life Cycle Assessment and Cradle to Cradle® for biodegradable bio-based polymers: a review .....	372
The Hamlet dilemma for aluminium cans in the circular economy: to be or not to be in a closed loop?..	376
<b>Sustainability assessment of food supply chains: socio-economics drivers and impacts .....</b>	<b>380</b>
In food supply chain: social LCA, what to do?.....	"381
Food redistribution in the Helsinki Metropolitan and Turku Areas .....	387
Integrating LCA within MuSIASEM approach to evaluate feasibility, viability and desirability of second generation bioethanol from <i>Arundo donax</i> feedstock for transportation energy needs of Campania (Italy). .....	389
Combining frontier analysis and Exergetic Life Cycle Assessment towards identification of economic-environmental win-win situations on dairy farms .....	392
Life cycle social sustainability assessment convenience food: Ready-made meals.....	396
LCC, S-LCA and LCSA in food and energy sectors: lessons from scientific literature .....	401
Applying Social Life Cycle Assessment in the Thai Context: Challenges from the sugar industry .....	405
Material Flow and Water Footprint Analysis of Cassava Starch Production Systems .....	409
Traditional cultivars, improved performance: reflections on the climate change intensity of traditional foods .....	413
Social LCA: a framework for social impacts assessment in Italian wine sector.....	417
Social Life Cycle Assessment in the honey industry .....	421
Environmental and social impact indicators of soil consumption.....	425
Tools to improve the energy efficiency of the institutional food system .....	430
Acknowledgements .....	435

# LCA and Water Footprint of biofuels used in transport sector: a review

Paola Masotti<sup>1</sup>, Barbara Campisi<sup>2</sup> and Paolo Bogoni<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Trento, Department of Economics and Management, via Inama 5, 38122 Trento

<sup>2</sup>University of Trieste, Department of Economic, Business, Mathematical and Statistical Sciences,  
via Valerio 6, 34127 Trieste

E-mail contact: [paola.masotti@unitn.it](mailto:paola.masotti@unitn.it)

## 1. Abstract

*Concerns over energy security and environmental impacts related to greenhouse gases emissions stimulate developments towards renewable energy. Over the last few years, there has been an intense debate about the major factors that determine the impacts of biofuels both in production and end use phase. The objective of this study is to review existing life cycle assessment (LCA) and water footprint (WF) studies on liquid biofuels used in transport sector to point out if: (i) LCA studies are adequate to evaluate the environmental impacts of biofuels; (ii) biofuels are environmentally sustainable when the WF is considered; (iii) it is possible to use both LCA and WF studies results to better assess the environmental sustainability of biofuels. Furthermore, different aspects of crops production are considered to assess the efficiency of the biofuels in the greenhouse gas emission reduction. The analysed LCA papers present quite different and at times contradictory results on biofuel environmental impacts. Variability in results is affected by crops used and geographical areas of cultivation and, consequently, the impact assessment of biofuels is consistent only at the local level. In conclusion, it can be stated that territory characteristics, weather conditions and farming methods should be considered to evaluate biofuels production.*

## 2. Introduction

Many countries have established regulatory policies to promote the production or consumption of biofuels for transport. For example, in the European Union transport sector is expected to switch from fossil fuel use to a fuel mixture with 10% fraction of biofuels by 2020. As a result, global biofuel production grew from 16 billion litres in 2000 to more than 117 billion litres (volumetric) in 2013 [1]. At the same time, biofuels have to be produced in a sustainable way to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions without adversely affecting the environment or social sustainability. Over the last few years, there has been an intense debate about the major factors that determine the impacts of biofuels both in production and end use phase. Growing crops for biofuels may have serious environmental impacts such as direct or indirect land-use changes, soil degradation, nutrient depletion, loss of biodiversity, water depletion and pollution [2]. To determine and evaluate the environmental impacts of biofuels many studies have been carried out applying the life cycle analysis (LCA) methodology [3, 4, 5, 6] but only few take into account water use/consumption [7, 8]. In recent years a number of studies investigated the issue of water consumption for crops used for the biofuels production pointing out that they have relatively high water requirements at commercial yield levels. Considering that fresh water for agriculture is becoming increasingly scarce in many countries as a result of the competition with domestic or industrial uses, the paper focuses on the impact of a larger consumption of biofuels on this vital resource.

## 2. Materials and methods

In this paper a literature survey on LCA and WF studies of liquid biofuels used in the transport sector, namely bio-ethanol and biodiesel, has been carried out covering a time period of ten years. Because of the large number of publications only review papers on LCA have been considered whereas both reviews and original research papers on WF have been examined.

## 3. Results

Nine review papers have been analysed to obtain a comprehensive knowledge of the LCA studies on the environmental impacts of biofuels in transport sector. The reviews agree in pointing out two major issues: (i) most of the analysed papers calculate or estimate the GHG emissions and the energy balance whereas only few consider other impact categories [9][10]; (ii) the wide range and uncertainty in LCA results [4][5][11] and also some contradictory results [12]. Parameters that influence the variability in results are related to the study's specificity (type of crop, agricultural practices, country of cultivation and fuel processed plants) as well as to the different assumptions and methodological choices used to model the life-cycle assessment. According to Larson [4] there are four main parameters responsible of the greatest variations and uncertainties into GHG-related LCA results: "the climate-active species included in calculation of equivalent GHG emissions, assumptions around N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, the allocation method used for co-product credits, and soil carbon dynamics". Other authors draw the same conclusion, e.g. Malça and Freire [13] state that in more recent LCA biodiesel studies, soil emissions (namely N<sub>2</sub>O and carbon emissions) "as well as different options for dealing with co-products (scenario uncertainty), have strong influence in the results" of GHG emissions.

The results of the examined reviews can be summarized as follows. As regards biodiesel, to achieve moderate GHG savings and a favourable energy balance with respect to fossil diesel, there are at least three parameters to be met. These are: high biomass yields, low fertilizers and pesticides inputs in agricultural practices, no land use change. Overall considered palm oil is recognized as the most efficient crop to produce biodiesel [14][15] if deforestation environmental impacts are not taken into account whereas biodiesel from rapeseed cultivated in East Europe accounts for the higher GHG emissions, even higher than fossil fuel diesel emissions [10].

As regards bio-ethanol, better results for GHG savings and energy balance net gain are estimated in relation to fossil fuel and biodiesel as well [16]. Bio-ethanol produced from sugarcane in tropical countries appears by far the most efficient biofuel both for climate protection and fossil fuel conservation perspective if the residues are used to run the processing plants.

Last but not least all the reviews point out the highly site-dependent results in GHG and energy balance and the great variation in methodological choices and parameter settings that lead to a wide range of results and recommend to identify guidelines or a standard methodology to carry out LCAs on biofuels.

To exceed the LCA study limits and better evaluate the environmental impacts of biofuels a further parameter has been evaluated: the water footprint (WF) that allows to calculate water requirements for crops cultivation and accounts for both direct and indirect water consumption [17]. The WF papers analysed come to very similar results, Gerbens-Leenes and co-authors [7][8] calculated the WF of different biofuels and

show that “is 70 to 400 times larger than the WF of a mix of energy from non renewable sources” and in a transition to biofuels scenario it is expected that the global annual biofuel WF will increase more than tenfold, from about 90 km<sup>3</sup>/year in 2005 to 970 km<sup>3</sup>/year in 2030 [17]. Furthermore, in a recent study on bio-ethanol WF Gerbens-Leenes and Hoekstra [18] state that producing bio-ethanol from maize is more favourable than using sugarcane, contrary to the results of LCA studies above mentioned. In a study comparing the WF of three biofuel crops (cassava, sugarcane, and oil palm) with other food crops in Thailand, Piyanon and Gheewala [19] show that a hectare of biofuel crop lands requires more water than a hectare of other food crops. Moreover is very important to assess the water consumption in relation to the hydrogeological conditions of the different regions [20].

#### 4. Conclusion

Combining results from LCA and WF studies on first generation biofuels, namely biodiesel and bio-ethanol, no conclusive results can be achieved on environmental advantages in their utilization. Major uncertainties in LCA studies derive from biomass feedstocks, energy inputs, location of crop cultivation and related yields, soil emissions and allocation procedure for co-products while in WFs papers two variables, crop water requirements and crop yields, explain the large variability of the results. Overall, this brief review shows that future studies on biofuels LCA have to take into account the WF because water scarcity may become the limiting factor for biofuel feedstock production in many regions [2].

#### 5. References

- [1] REN21 (Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century), 'Renewables 2014 Global Status Report', Available online at <http://www.ren21.net/REN21Activities/GlobalStatusReport.aspx>.
- [2] FAO, 'The state of food and agriculture. Biofuels: prospects, risks and opportunities', (FAO, Rome, 2008) 55-71. Available online at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0100e/i0100e00.htm>.
- [3] Hill, J., Nelson, E., Tilman, D., Polasky, S. and Tiffany D., 'Environmental, economic, and energetic costs and benefits of biodiesel and ethanol biofuels', *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 103 (30) (2006) 11206-11210.
- [4] Larson, E., 'A review of life-cycle analysis studies on liquid biofuel systems for the transport sector', *Energ Sust Develop* 10 (2) (2006) 109-126.
- [5] Cherubini, F. and Strømman, A. H., 'Life cycle assessment of bioenergy systems: State of the art and future challenges', *Bioresource Technol* 102 (2011) 437-451.
- [6] Elbehri A., Segerstedt A. and Liu P., 'Biofuels and the sustainability challenge: A global assessment of sustainability issues, trends and policies for biofuels and related feedstocks', (FAO, Rome, 2013).
- [7] Gerbens-Leenes, P.W., Hoekstra, A.Y. and van der Meer, Th., 'The water footprint of energy from biomass: A quantitative assessment and consequences of an increasing share of bio-energy in energy supply', *Ecol Econ* 68 (2009) 1052-1060.
- [8] Gerbens-Leenes, W., Hoekstra, A.Y. S. and van der Meer, T.H., 'The water footprint of bioenergy', *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 106 (25) (2009) 10219-10223.
- [9] Wu, M., Zhang, Z. and Chiu, Y., 'Life-cycle Water Quantity and Water Quality Implications of Biofuels', *Curr Sust Renew Energ Rep* 1 (2014) 3-10.
- [10] Menichetti, E. and Otto, M., 'Energy balance and greenhouse gas emissions of biofuels from a life-cycle perspective', in 'Biofuels: Environmental Consequences and Interactions with Changing Land Use', Proceedings of the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) International Biofuels Project Rapid Assessment, Gummertsbach, September, 2008, (R.W. Howarth and S. Bringezu, editors, 2009) 81-109.
- [11] Hoefnagels, R., Smeets, E. and Faaij, A., 'Greenhouse gas footprints of different biofuel production systems', *Renew Sust Energ Rev* 14 (2010) 1661-1694.
- [12] Gnansounou, E., Dauriat, A., Villegas, J. and Panichelli, L., 'Life cycle assessment of biofuels: Energy and greenhouse gas balances', *Bioresource Technol* 100 (2009) 4919-4930.

- [13] Malça, J. and Freire, F., 'Life-cycle studies of biodiesel in Europe: A review addressing the variability of results and modeling issues', *Renew Sust Energ Rev* 15 (2011) 338-351.
- [14] Escobar, J.C., Lora, E.S., Venturini, O.J., Yáñez E.E., Castillo, E.F. and Almazan, O., 'Biofuels: Environment, technology and food security', *Renew Sust Energ Rev* 13 (2009) 1275-1287.
- [15] Majer, S., Mueller-Langer, F., Zeller V. and Kaltschmitt, M., 'Implications of biodiesel production and utilization on global climate - A literature review', *Eur J Lipid Sci Technol* 111 (2009) 747-762.
- [16] von Blottnitz, H. and Curran, M.A., 'A review of assessments conducted on bio-ethanol as a transportation fuel from a net energy, greenhouse gas, and environmental life cycle perspective', *J Clean Prod* 15 (7) (2007) 607- 619.
- [17] Gerbens-Leenes, P.W., van Lienden, A.R., Hoekstra, A.Y. and van der Meer, Th.H., 'Biofuel scenarios in a water perspective: The global blue and green water footprint of road transport in 2030', *Global Environ Chang* 22 (2012) 764–775.
- [18] Gerbens-Leenes, W. and Hoekstra, A.Y., 'The water footprint of sweeteners and bio-ethanol', *Environ Int* 40 (2012) 202-211.
- [19] Piyanon, K. and Gheewala, S. H., 'A Review of the Water Footprint of Biofuel Crop Production in Thailand', *J. Sustain Energy Environ* 4 (2013) 45-52.
- [20] Faist Emmenegger, M., Pfister, S., Koehler, A., de Giovanetti, L., Arena, A.P., and Zah, R., 'Taking into account water use impacts in the LCA of biofuels: an Argentinean case study', *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 16 (2011) 869–877.

Published by ENEA  
Relations and Communication Unit

Lungotevere Thaon di Revel, 76  
00196 Rome  
*www.enea.it*

Editorial review: Giuliano Ghisu  
Cover design: Cristina Lanari  
On-line in October 2015