

Introducing carrying capacity-based normalisation in LCA: framework and development of references at midpoint level

Bjørn, Anders; Hauschild, Michael Zwicky

Published in:
International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1007/s11367-015-0899-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-015-0899-2)

Publication date:
2015

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Bjørn, A., & Hauschild, M. Z. (2015). Introducing carrying capacity-based normalisation in LCA: framework and development of references at midpoint level. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 20(7), 1005-1018. DOI: 10.1007/s11367-015-0899-2

DTU Library

Technical Information Center of Denmark

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.

1 LIFE CYCLE SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

Introducing carrying capacity based normalisation in LCA: framework and development of references at midpoint level

Anders Bjørn • Michael Zwicky Hauschild

Received: 18 November 2014 / Accepted: 30 April 2015

© Springer-Verlag 2015

Responsible editor: Jeroen Guinée

A. Bjørn (✉) • M. Z. Hauschild

DTU Management Engineering, Quantitative Sustainability Assessment, Technical University of Denmark,
Produktionstorvet, Building 424, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

(✉) **Corresponding author:**

Anders Bjørn

e-mail: anbj@dtu.dk

1 **Abstract**

2
3 *Purpose:* There is currently a weak or no link between the indicator scores quantified in life cycle
4 assessment (LCA) and the carrying capacity of the affected ecosystems. Such a link must be established if
5 LCA is to support assessments of environmental sustainability and it may be done by developing carrying
6 capacity-based normalisation references. The purpose of this article is to present a framework for
7 normalisation against carrying capacity-based references and to develop average normalisation references
8 (NR) for Europe and the world for all those midpoint impact categories commonly included in LCA that link
9 to the area of protection Natural environment.
10

11
12
13
14
15 *Methods:* Carrying capacity was in this context defined as *the maximum sustained environmental*
16 *intervention a natural system can withstand without experiencing negative changes in structure or*
17 *functioning that are difficult or impossible to revert.* A literature review was carried out to identify
18 scientifically sound thresholds for each impact category. Carrying capacities were then calculated from
19 these thresholds and expressed in metrics identical to midpoint indicators giving priority to those
20 recommended by ILCD. NR was expressed as the carrying capacity of a reference region divided by its
21 population and thus describes the annual personal share of the carrying capacity.
22

23
24
25
26
27 *Results and discussion:* The developed references can be applied to indicator results obtained using
28 commonly applied characterisation models in LCIA. The European references are generally lower than the
29 global references, mainly due to a relatively high population density in Europe. The references were
30 compared to conventional normalisation references (NR') which represent the current level of intervention
31 for Europe or the world. For both scales the current level of intervention for climate change, photochemical
32 ozone formation and soil quality were found to exceed carrying capacities several times.
33

34
35
36
37
38 *Conclusions:* The developed carrying capacity-based normalisation references offer relevant supplementary
39 reference information to the currently applied references based on society's background interventions by
40 supporting an evaluation of the environmental sustainability of product systems on an absolute scale.
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 *Recommendations:* Challenges remain with respect to spatial variations to increase the relevance of the
52 normalisation references for impact categories that function at the local or regional scale. For complete
53 coverage of the midpoint impact categories, normalisation references based on sustainability conditions
54 should be developed for those categories that link to the areas of protection Human health and Natural
55 resources.
56

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Keywords Carrying capacity • Impact assessment • Midpoint • Normalisation • Severity • Single score • Sustainability conditions • Threshold

1 **1 Introduction**

2
3 Recent years have seen an increasing focus on environmental sustainability of products and technologies
4
5 and a growing use of LCA and life cycle thinking in industry and the public sector. Still, the state of the
6
7 environment is deteriorating globally by and large (Steffen et al. 2004; MEA 2005). This trend reflects that
8
9 increases in eco-efficiency, achieved with the aid of LCA, are generally insufficient to offset the effects of an
10
11 increasing global population that is achieving a higher material affluence. With many environmental
12
13 impacts on the rise globally, the end goal of eco-efficiency improvements becomes increasingly important,
14
15 namely that ecological impacts and resource intensities of product life cycles should be reduced to "...a
16
17 level at least in line with the Earth's estimated carrying capacity" (WBCSD 2000). This end goal can be seen
18
19 as a condition for environmental sustainability, originally defined as "...seek[ing] to improve human welfare
20
21 by protecting the sources of raw materials used for human needs and ensuring that the sinks for human
22
23 wastes are not exceeded, in order to prevent harm to humans" (Goodland 1995). Attempts to quantify
24
25 carrying capacities have been made for decades most recently at the global scale through the introduction
26
27 of the planetary boundaries concept (Rockström et al. 2009; Steffen et al. 2015).
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Carrying capacity is currently considered in some LCA indicators, for instance in the form of critical loads for
35
36 terrestrial acidification in Posch et al. (2008). In such indicators only interventions above carrying capacities
37
38 are accounted for, meaning that resource uses and emissions that push a natural system closer to carrying
39
40 capacity exceedance get a free ride. If LCA is to support a development towards environmental
41
42 sustainability, understood as the non-exceedance of carrying capacities, measures of how much
43
44 environmental intervention change the level of carrying capacity exceedance are not sufficient for decision
45
46 support. In other words the path to environmental sustainability cannot be illuminated solely by indicators
47
48 designed to measure environmental unsustainability. Existing LCA indicators must therefore be
49
50 supplemented by measures that quantify the share of carrying capacity occupied by environmental
51
52 interventions of a studied product system. Such measures can be established by using carrying capacity as
53
54 environmental sustainability reference in LCA. A first step was taken by Hauschild and Wenzel (1998) who
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 derived carrying capacity based distance-to-target weighting factors, albeit using varying definitions of
2
3 carrying capacity across life cycle impact categories. Tuomisto et al. (2012) recently attempted to adapt
4
5 initial planetary boundaries of Rockström et al. (2009) as weighting factors for 8 impact categories.
6
7 Following the suggestion of Sala et al. (2013) in the context of life cycle sustainability assessment we here
8
9 propose to use carrying capacity as consistent environmental sustainability reference in the normalisation
10
11 step of LCA to facilitate the comparison of indicator scores to sustainable levels of interventions. According
12
13 to ISO 14044, normalisation is “the calculation of the magnitude of the category indicator results relative to
14
15 some reference information. The aim of the normalisation is to understand better the relative magnitude
16
17 for each indicator result of the product system under study” (ISO 2006). In existing normalisation practice
18
19 the reference information is commonly the sum of all characterized environmental interventions taking
20
21 place in a specified year within a specified region, often scaled per capita (Laurent et al. 2011a).
22
23 Normalisation thus allows for the translation of interventions in person equivalents (or person years) and
24
25 facilitates some level of comparison across impact categories. However since common references are solely
26
27 based on activities within the technosphere they cannot be used to compare and aggregate the severity of
28
29 different types of interventions in the ecosphere. The subsequent weighting step is designed to capture the
30
31 severity of characterized interventions, but as weighting is often based on personal perspectives on the
32
33 prioritization of problems or policy goals, this expression of severity has a strong subjective element, which
34
35 is also why ISO 14044 does not allow weighting in “LCA studies intended to be used in comparative
36
37 assertions intended to be disclosed to the public” (ISO 2006). Without weighting the user of the LCA results
38
39 is left with the normalized results. When understanding carrying capacity occupation as a measure of
40
41 severity normalizing according to carrying capacity instead of total characterized interventions can improve
42
43 the representation of the severity of different interventions.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The purpose of this article is to present a framework of carrying capacity-based normalisation references in
53
54 LCA and to develop European and global carrying capacity-based normalisation references compatible with
55
56 characterised indicator scores at midpoint for impact categories that link to the area of protection Natural
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 environment. After presenting definition and framework, the concept of carrying capacity is made
2
3 operational for Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA), and European and global carrying capacity based
4
5 normalisation references for each midpoint indicator are developed. The new references are analysed by
6
7 internal comparison and comparison to traditional normalisation references and their implications are
8
9 discussed followed by an outlook.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **2 Methods**

16 17 2.1 Definition and operationalization

18
19 Carrying capacity generally refers to a certain quantity of X that some encompassing Y is able to carry
20
21 (Sayre 2008). X and Y can refer to different entities depending on the discipline in which carrying capacity is
22
23 applied.¹ In all applications carrying capacity aspires to idealism, stasis, and numerical expression (Sayre
24
25 2008). In ecology, for instance, carrying capacity describes the maximum equilibrium number of organisms
26
27 of a species (X) that a given environment (Y) in theory can support indefinitely (Odum 1971). In the
28
29 common definition of eco-efficiency (WBCSD 2000) X is impacts of unspecified environmental interventions
30
31 and Y is the planet. In this form carrying capacity thus acts as the boundary between global environmental
32
33 sustainability and unsustainability. Following this use of the term we define carrying capacity as *the*
34
35 *maximum sustained environmental intervention a natural system can withstand without experiencing*
36
37 *negative changes in structure or functioning that are difficult or impossible to revert.* Here a natural system
38
39 may refer to ecosystems or, more broadly, Earth's interacting physical, chemical, and biological processes,
40
41 which for instance make up the climate system. By considering both functioning and structure our carrying
42
43 capacity definition aims for a balanced approach: Whereas the concept of ecosystem functioning may have
44
45 an anthropocentric bias, in that it tends to focus on functions valuable to humans, the concept of
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹ Wildlife management, chemistry, medicine, economics, anthropology, engineering, and population biology are listed
59 as examples by Sayre (2008).
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 ecosystem structure is eco-centric because no judgement is made on the relative inherent value of
2
3 organisms.²
4

5 We calculated carrying capacities from science based thresholds identified in the literature. Thresholds are
6
7 numerical values of control variables, which in turn are numerical indicators of the structure and/or
8
9 functioning of natural systems (Scheffer et al. 2001; Carpenter et al. 2001; Steffen et al. 2015). In the
10
11 example of aquatic eutrophication a threshold can be expressed as a specific nutrient concentration (the
12
13 control variable), which demarcates an oligotrophic (clear water) stable state from a eutrophic (turbid
14
15 water) stable state, both characterized by distinct ecosystem structure and functioning. When thresholds
16
17 are crossed, reverting the natural system to the original state can require a considerable amount of time
18
19 with reduced interventions due to the initiation of feedback mechanisms stabilising the natural system in
20
21 the new state after the threshold crossing. Here we characterize an interaction between humans and
22
23 natural systems that does not lead to the exceeding of thresholds as environmentally sustainable.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Fig. 1a shows the impact pathway for the example of how demand for food drives a chain of events that
30
31 ultimately leads to increased risk of threshold exceedance for nutrients, which would entail significant
32
33 impacts on structure and functioning of the affected aquatic ecosystem(s). Fig. 1b shows the elements of
34
35 an LCA that are used as indicators for and mechanistic translators between the points of the impact
36
37 pathway in Fig. 1a and shows conceptual cause/effect curves for the translation between points. Here we
38
39 use “environmental interference” as a generic term for anthropogenic changes to any point in the impact
40
41 pathway. Here we expressed carrying capacity at the point in the impact pathway where the concerned
42
43 midpoint indicator expresses environmental interference. A translation from threshold to carrying capacity
44
45 therefore involved different LCA elements depending on the point of the impact pathway, marked with a
46
47 cross in Fig. 1c, where the concerned midpoint indicator is expressed (see Section 3). For instance for
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ² The concept of resilience may offer a bridge between anthropocentric and eco-centric approaches to environmental
56
57 management since studies generally show that ecosystems with high genotype- and species diversity has a high
58
59 resilience, meaning in general terms, that they are better at adapting to sudden changes in conditions than
60
61 ecosystems with lower diversity (Scheffer et al., 2001; Carpenter et al. 2001). Thus the protection of ecosystem
62
63 structure can be seen both as eco-centric and as being in the enlightened self-interest of man.
64
65

1 indicators expressed at the pressure point the translation from threshold to carrying capacity involved a
2
3 fate factor. For impact categories where LCIA models did not model the control variable for which the
4
5 science based threshold was expressed, alternative approaches were taken in translating threshold to
6
7 carrying capacity (see Section 3).
8
9

10 Our carrying capacity definition is concerned with environmental sustainability and we therefore only
11
12 derived carrying capacities for midpoint impact categories linking to the area of protection Natural
13
14 environment. References based on sustainability conditions for impact categories linking to the areas of
15
16 protection Human health and Natural resources may also be developed, but this falls outside the scope of
17
18 this article. Carrying capacities were hence quantified for the following ten midpoint categories from the EU
19
20 Commission's ILCD methodology (Hauschild et al. 2013): climate change, ozone depletion, photochemical
21
22 ozone formation, terrestrial acidification, terrestrial eutrophication, freshwater eutrophication, marine
23
24 eutrophication, ecotoxicity, land use and water depletion.³ Several LCIA models exist for calculating
25
26 indicator scores within each of these impact categories. When possible we followed the recommendations
27
28 for best existing practice by Hauschild et al. (2013) when choosing the characterisation model and factors
29
30 with which NR should be compatible. Exceptions were made when recommended models were of a
31
32 marginal nature. Marginal characterization models base translations between points in the impact pathway
33
34 on the derivative at the estimated current level of environmental interference. Because carrying capacities
35
36 should ideally be calculated without considering background interference (see below) marginal
37
38 characterization models were replaced by characterization models using a linear approach (i.e. using the
39
40 same factors to translate between points in the impact pathway no matter the current level of
41
42 interferences) when these were available. This procedure led to the replacement of ILCD recommended
43
44 models for terrestrial acidification, terrestrial eutrophication, land use and water depletion by models using
45
46 a linear approach.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ³ Ionizing radiation effects on the natural environment was excluded since the recommended LCIA model was
59 classified as interim by Hauschild et al. (2013).
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 2.2 Derivation of normalisation references

2
3 Normalisation references (NR) were calculated as the carrying capacity (CC, indicator score/year) for impact
4
5 category i in region j, divided by the population in the region (P):
6

$$NR_{i,j} = \frac{CC_{i,j}}{P_j}$$

7
8
9
10 When dividing characterised LCIA results by NR they are converted into normalized results expressed in
11
12 units of person equivalents (or person years). Here 1 person equivalent can be interpreted as a level of
13
14 environmental intervention equivalent to the annual personal share of the carrying capacity for impact
15
16 category i. This normalisation replaces the traditional normalisation, where indicator scores of a product
17
18 system is compared to those of society's background interventions (Laurent et al. 2011a). If $NR'_{i,j}$ denotes
19
20 the traditional normalisation reference, $\frac{NR'_{i,j}}{NR_{i,j}}$ can be interpreted as a distance-to-target indicator, where a
21
22 value above 1 means that the current per capita interventions exceed the carrying capacity and are hence
23
24 environmentally unsustainable (Seppälä and Hämäläinen 2001).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 2.3 Spatial and temporal concerns

34
35 The choice of reference region for the normalisation inventory depends on the spatial extent of the impact
36
37 category. Local and regional scale impact categories such as freshwater depletion and aquatic
38
39 eutrophication should ideally be related to carrying capacities of relevant local and regional territories
40
41 corresponding to the spatial information of the LCI. On the contrary global scale impact categories such as
42
43 climate change and ozone depletion should be related to a single global carrying capacity. As a first step we
44
45 here developed European (the continent, not the union) and global average carrying capacities for each
46
47 impact category. Issues related to spatial variation are further discussed in Section 4.
48
49
50

51 Carrying capacities are in practice dynamic due to: 1) Natural dynamics related to for instance the diurnal
52
53 and seasonal cycles and stochastic weather events. 2) Anthropogenic interventions that can lead to
54
55 temporary or permanent carrying capacity reductions if thresholds are exceeded. For instance if a
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 reproductive threshold for a fish stock is exceeded, its carrying capacity expressed as a maximum
2
3 sustainable yield (kg fish caught per year) will decrease temporarily. Likewise if the threshold of a natural
4
5 system has been exceeded the original carrying capacity could in theory decrease if parts of the natural
6
7 system, such as bacteria capable of metabolising pollutants, have been weakened or entirely eliminated
8
9 due to the threshold exceedance. Here we did not consider the effects on carrying capacity caused by
10
11 natural dynamics because it would involve complex dynamic modelling and because the short time scale of
12
13 some natural dynamics, often hours to months, is incompatible with the limited time information of typical
14
15 LCIs. For impact categories of a dynamic nature, such as photochemical ozone formation, we instead
16
17 expressed thresholds at a form compatible with the time constraints of relevant LCIA models. We also did
18
19 not consider dynamics in carrying capacity caused by human interventions because carrying capacities were
20
21 calculated from ideal scenarios where interactions between natural and humans systems are at a steady
22
23 state characterized by numerical values of control variables being below threshold values. In summary,
24
25 calculated carrying capacities were treated as static in this work, which is in line with the general
26
27 understanding of carrying capacity as a static concept (Sayre 2008).
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 In calculating NR we applied the populations of 2010 (6.916 billion globally and 740 million for continental
35
36 Europe (UNDESA 2012)). We do however note that NR can be considered time dependent because the
37
38 human population, the denominator of formula 1, is changing in most regions and increasing globally.
39
40 Practitioners may therefore choose a projected population for the median year of the time horizon
41
42 considered in a study. For instance an LCA of a system that will be operating from 2015 to 2035 would then
43
44 use the projected population in 2025 as P.
45
46
47
48
49

50 2.4 Choice of precaution

51
52 In our carrying capacity quantifications we adhered to the consensus within LCA modelling to aim for best
53
54 estimates. Therefore whenever an uncertainty range or confidence interval was given for an identified
55
56 threshold and parameters used to translate this threshold to a carrying capacity, the medium or average
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 value was chosen, corresponding to a medium level of precaution. A best estimate approach is suitable in
2
3 LCA where the purpose is to compare indicator scores across assessed product systems and impact
4
5 categories. A more precautionary approach to quantifying carrying capacities, as e.g. taken by Rockström et
6
7 al. (2009) and Steffen et al. (2015), may be more appropriate in other decision support contexts, e.g. the
8
9 design of emission standards in a specified jurisdiction.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **3 Results**

16
17 The following sections present the principles behind the derivations of global average carrying capacity
18
19 based normalisation references for each impact category and the choice of characterisation model in cases
20
21 where the recommendation of ILCD on best existing practice for characterisation modelling were not
22
23 followed. See Table 1 for a summary, S1 for a detailed description including derivations of European
24
25 references, which were calculated in much the same way as global references, and S2 for calculations in a
26
27 spreadsheet.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **3.1 Climate change**

35
36 There is evidence of several thresholds in the climate system expressed as average temperature increases
37
38 above pre-industrial levels. These include disintegration of the Greenland ice sheet (1-1.5 °C), widespread
39
40 bleaching of coral reefs (>1 °C), broad ecosystem impacts with limited adaptive capacity (1-2 °C), complete
41
42 melting of the Greenland ice sheet, (3 °C) and shutdown of thermohaline circulation (3 °C) (Haines-Young et
43
44 al. 2006). In comparison the current temperature increase is around 0.8 °C (IPCC 2013). The crossing of
45
46 each of these thresholds can lead to irreversible changes in the functioning of the climate system with
47
48 cascading effects on functioning and structure of various eco-systems. Here we propose one carrying
49
50 capacity based on the 2 °C target, which aims to limit global warming to 2 degrees above pre-industrial
51
52 levels, and another more precautionary carrying capacity based on reducing current radiative forcing from
53
54 greenhouse gases to 1 W/m² (corresponding to a steady state temperature increase of 1.06 degrees above
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 pre-industrial levels, see S1) as proposed by Rockström et al. (2009). The 2 °C threshold has highest
2
3 acceptance as a policy target, while the 1 W/m² threshold is most in line with our definition of carrying
4
5 capacity, since a temperature increase of 2 °C will possibly lead to irreversible changes in functioning and
6
7 structure of the climate system (Rockström et al. 2009). These thresholds were converted into carrying
8
9 capacities, expressed at the pressure point of the impact pathway as GWP100 based kg CO₂-eq/year. This
10
11 conversion was made using the GEOCARB model for CO₂ (Berner and Kothavala 2001) and the model of
12
13 Shine et al. (2005) for other greenhouse gases, from which we calculated the sustained level of emissions
14
15 that for each greenhouse gas alone would lead to a steady state concentration corresponding to each of
16
17 the two proposed thresholds.⁴ The carrying capacity was then calculated as the average of the GWP100-
18
19 based indicators of all gasses, weighted according to their contribution to the total climate change indicator
20
21 score in 2010, and this lead to a NR_{Global} of 985 kg CO₂-eq/pers/year for the 2 °C threshold and 522 kg CO₂-
22
23 eq/pers/year for the 1W/m² threshold (see S1 for details). The calculation of a weighted average was
24
25 required due to the 100 year time scale of the GWP100 indicator and high variation of atmospheric life time
26
27 of greenhouse gases. Had the time scale of the characterisation model instead been infinite, specific
28
29 carrying capacities of the different gasses would be identical. The hidden variance of gas specific carrying
30
31 capacities in the derived normalisation references is important to communicate to practitioners and
32
33 decision makers. Specifically for CO₂ (having a very long atmospheric life time) the per capita carrying
34
35 capacity is just 4-8 kg/year depending on the chosen threshold (see Electronic Supplementary Material).⁵
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 3.2 Stratospheric ozone depletion

47
48
49
50

51
52 ⁴ The reason we could not use the FF of the GWP100 model to make the conversion is that the FF calculates a time
53 integrated increase in radioactive forcing caused by an emission rather than the steady state increase in radioactive
54 forcing or temperature required to convert the two thresholds (1 W/m² and 2 °C) into carrying capacities according to
55 our definition.

56 ⁵ Note that this carrying capacity is much lower than the 2050 goal of 2 tons per capita often mentioned in the climate
57 change debate. The 2 tons per capita target was derived from the RCP2.6 reduction pathway designed to stay below
58 the 2 °C threshold by 2100 (van Vuuren et al. 2011; IPCC, 2013). In the year 2100 of the RCP2.6 reduction pathway CO₂
59 emissions are nearly zero, which is consistent with our low carrying capacity figures for CO₂.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Rockström et al. (2009) proposed a planetary boundary of 5-10 % decrease in column ozone levels for any
2
3 particular latitude with respect to 1964–1980 values. The threshold was not based on a single well-
4
5 established threshold in the climate system, but rather on the precautionary principle to acknowledge the
6
7 complexity of the system of which knowledge is currently incomplete. Stratospheric ozone provides the
8
9 regulatory function of filtering harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun. Due to the long life time of many
10
11 ozone depleting substances, ozone degradation in the stratosphere takes decades to recover. The
12
13 threshold of 7.5 % decrease in ozone levels (medium value) was converted to a carrying capacity expressed
14
15 at the pressure point of the impact pathway in ozone depletion potential (ODP) based kg CFC-11-eq/year of
16
17 Montzka and Fraser (1999). This conversion was based on the model of Velders and Daniel (2013), which
18
19 was used to calculate the sustained CFC-11-eq emissions that would lead to this decrease in ozone levels at
20
21 steady state.⁶ This resulted in a NR_{Global} of 0.078 kg CFC-11-eq/pers/year.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 3.3 Photochemical ozone formation 30

31 We could not find a globally applicable threshold for this impact category and therefore based the carrying
32
33 capacity on a time integrated ozone concentration threshold of 3 ppm*hour AOT40 for daylight hours
34
35 during May-July which is applied in European regulation. AOT40 is an effect measure calculated as the
36
37 accumulated ozone exposure during daylight hours above a threshold value of 40 ppb (EEA 1998).
38
39

40 We here outline the derivation of the European carrying capacity and refer to the Electronic Supplementary
41
42 Material for details and approximation at the global scale. The threshold, which was developed by WHO
43
44 and adopted as a policy target by the European Environmental Agency (EEA 1998), was designed to prevent
45
46 negative effects on growth and/or seed production for (semi-) natural sensitive perennial and annual
47
48 species (Umweltbundesamt 2004).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ⁶ We could not use the FF of CFC-11 of the ODP model because it is expressed relative to a reference substance (CFC-
59 11) and not as an absolute steady-state ozone response to changes in emission.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We converted the time integrated threshold into an average concentration threshold of 44ppb ozone
2
3 which applies to the 8 consecutive daily hours⁷ with the highest ozone concentrations of May-July. This
4
5 threshold was back calculated to a carrying capacity expressed at the pressure point of the impact pathway
6
7 as kg NMVOC-eq/year applying the fate factor of the recommended indicator of Van Zelm et al. (2008)
8
9 modified to calculate a change in maximum daily 8-h average ozone concentrations in Europe during May-
10
11 July as a function of a change in emission. This resulted in a NR_{Europe} of 2.5 kg NMVOC-eq/pers/year.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 3.4 Terrestrial acidification

19
20 Thresholds were here based on the critical load concept, for which acidification is defined as the highest
21
22 deposition of acidifying compounds that will not cause chemical changes leading to long-term harmful
23
24 effects on ecosystem structure and function (Umweltbundesamt 2004)⁸. Exceeding critical loads can lead to
25
26 the reductions in crop and forest yields, which can take decades to recover (Hettelingh et al. 2007). We
27
28 calculated a world average critical load of 1170 mole H^+ eq/ha/year based on Bouwman et al. (2002), who
29
30 developed a global map of critical loads based on acid buffering capacity of soils. From this critical load we
31
32 subtracted global average natural depositions of 90 mole H^+ eq/ha/year. We converted the threshold
33
34 (critical load) to a carrying capacity expressed at the state point of the impact pathway as mole H^+ eq
35
36 deposition/year to be aligned with the OT indicator of Posch et al. (2008) based on average European
37
38 conditions. This indicator was chosen instead of the indicator recommended by ILCD, Accumulated
39
40 exceedance of Posch et al. (2008), because that indicator is of a marginal nature as it accounts for the share
41
42 of emissions depositing on soils for which critical loads are modelled to be exceeded by background
43
44 depositions. For this impact category the carrying capacity was to be expressed at the same point in the
45
46 impact pathway as the threshold (the state point). Therefore the carrying capacity was simply calculated by
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ⁷ Although the number of daylight hours exceed 8 per day during May-July at all latitudes within Europe, we chose a
55
56 time frame of 8 hours per day for the translation of the time integrated concentration threshold (3 ppm*hour AOT40)
57
58 to a concentration threshold (44ppb) to be compatible with the time frame of the recommended indicator of Van
59
60 Zelm et al. (2008). Had we chosen a longer time frame, e.g. 12 hours per day, the concentration threshold would have
61
62 been only slightly lower (43ppb instead of 44ppb) and so would the resulting carrying capacity calculated.
63
64
65

1 multiplying the global average critical load with the global terrestrial area ($1.49 \cdot 10^{10}$ ha) This resulted in a
2
3 NR_{Global} of $2.3 \cdot 10^3$ mole H^+ eq/pers/year.
4
5
6
7

8 3.5 Terrestrial eutrophication 9

10 Again thresholds were based on the critical load concept, which for terrestrial eutrophication is defined as
11 the highest deposition of nitrogen as NH_x and/or NO_y below which harmful effects in ecosystem structure
12 and function do not occur according to present knowledge (Umweltbundesamt 2004). Exceeding critical
13 loads can reduce crop and forest yields and changes in species compositions (disappearance of species
14 adapted to nutrient poor conditions), which may be practically irreversible (Bobbink et al. 2010). We
15 calculated a world average critical load based on the global critical load map of Bouwman et al. (2002),
16 which was constructed by extrapolations from a study covering critical loads of natural and semi-natural
17 vegetation in Europe. From this estimate we subtracted estimated global average natural depositions which
18 gave a global threshold of 1340 mole N eq/ha/year. As for terrestrial acidification we converted the
19 threshold to a carrying capacity expressed at the state point of the impact pathway as mole N eq
20 deposition/year based on the OT indicator of Posch et al. (2008) which is based on average European
21 conditions. This indicator was chosen instead of the one recommended by ILCD for the reason given for
22 terrestrial acidification above. Again the carrying capacity was calculated by multiplying the global average
23 critical load with global terrestrial area. This resulted in a NR_{Global} of $2.7 \cdot 10^3$ mole N eq/pers/year.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 3.6 Freshwater and marine eutrophication 47

48 For freshwater and marine eutrophication a threshold demarcates oligotrophic (clear water) from
49 eutrophic (turbid water) states (Carpenter et al. 2001). Thresholds may vary spatially, depending on e.g.
50 temperature, salinity and depth. We chose 0.3 mg P_{tot} /L as a generic threshold for freshwater (usually P-
51 limited) based on Struijs et al. (2011) who stated that concentrations above this value are considered a
52 potential cause of encroachment of aquatic life due to nutrient enrichment. For marine environments
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (usually N-limited), we chose 1.75 mg N_{tot}/L as the medium of the concentration limit range proposed by de
2
3 Vries et al. (2013) in their development of planetary boundaries for nitrogen emissions. The concentration
4
5 threshold was converted to a carrying capacity expressed at the pressure point of the impact pathway as
6
7 increase in P (freshwater) and N (marine) concentrations to be compatible with the midpoint indicators of
8
9 Struijs et al. (2009) based on average European conditions. For the conversion we used FFs of P and N of
10
11 Struijs et al. (2009), which links a marginal emissions increase (kg/year) to a steady state concentration
12
13 increase (kg P or N per m³). After a linear scaling to account for global water volumes and the subtractions
14
15 of natural flows of N and P, NR_{Global} was calculated as 0.84 kg P eq/pers/yr for freshwater and 29 kg N
16
17 eq/p/yr for marine waters.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 3.7 Freshwater ecotoxicity

26
27 The carrying capacity calculation was based on the threshold HC5(NOEC), which has been adopted as a
28
29 quality target in several regulatory frameworks, such as the EU Water Framework Directive (EC 2011).
30
31 HC5(NOEC) is the concentration at which maximum 5 % of species in an ecosystem are affected and it is
32
33 derived from species sensitivity distributions, which are probabilistic models of the variation in sensitivity of
34
35 all species in a model ecosystem to a particular stressor (Posthuma et al. 2002). The HC5(NOEC) threshold
36
37 was converted to a carrying capacity expressed at the impact point of the impact pathway as
38
39 [PAF]*m³*day/year to be compatible with the spatially generic USEtox indicator (Rosenbaum et al. 2008).
40
41
42 The conversion was carried out by modifying the effect factor of USEtox from being based on the
43
44 HC50(EC50) effect level to being based on HC5(NOEC) following Bjørn et al. (2014). In accordance with
45
46 USEtox full concentration addition was assumed, i.e. if two chemicals are each present at their HC5(NOEC)
47
48 in the same freshwater volume then the carrying capacity of the compartment is assumed to be exceeded
49
50
51 by 100 %. The procedure resulted in a NR_{Global} of 1.9*10⁴ [PAF]*m³*day/pers/year.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 3.8 Land use

1 To reflect the multitude of functions and services of land we calculated carrying capacities based on
2
3 thresholds for two control variables representing different impact pathways. The first threshold concerns
4
5 erosion regulation and the second threshold regional scale biodiversity.
6

7
8 The soil erosion carrying capacity was based on Verheijen et al. (2009), who provided a threshold interval
9
10 for Europe of 0.3-1.4 ton/ha/year for 'tolerable soil erosion', defined as 'any actual soil erosion rate at
11
12 which a deterioration or loss of one or more soil functions does not occur'. The threshold range was based
13
14 on the estimated rate of natural soil formation caused by mineral weathering and dust deposition. We
15
16 chose the middle value of 0.85 ton/ha/year and converted this to a carrying capacity expressed at the state
17
18 point of the impact pathway as ton of eroded soil/(ha*year) to be compatible with global average CFs of
19
20 the indicator for erosion resistance of Saad et al. (2013). The indicator of Saad et al. (2013) was chosen
21
22 instead of the one recommended by ILCD based on soil organic matter (SOM) of Milà i Canals et al. (2007),
23
24 because that indicator is of a marginal nature as it accounts for the change in SOM compared to an
25
26 alternative land use scenario reference. As for terrestrial acidification and eutrophication the carrying
27
28 capacity was expressed at the same point in the impact pathway as the threshold, the state point.
29
30 Therefore the carrying capacity was simply calculated by multiplying the threshold with the global
31
32 terrestrial area ($1.49 \cdot 10^{10}$ ha). This gave a NR of 1.8 ton/pers/year.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The land use threshold for biodiversity was based on Noss et al. (2012), who meta-reviewed 13 studies that
40
41 reported science-based local or regional conservation targets expressed as a share of natural lands that
42
43 should be conserved, i.e. practically undisturbed by humans, to maintain sufficient levels of biodiversity in
44
45 the region in question. Such conservation targets have the inbuilt perspective that loss of local biodiversity,
46
47 due to e.g. intensive agriculture or infrastructure land use, is acceptable as long as regional biodiversity is
48
49 maintained. The relationship between land use and regional biodiversity levels show threshold behaviour
50
51 as ecosystems not directly affected by the land use (e.g. situated close to a clear-cut forest) are known to
52
53 undergo state shifts due to the effects of neighbouring land use (Barnovsky et al. 2012; Noss et al. 2012). As
54
55 a threshold we chose the median value, 31 %, of the data series of Noss et al. (2012) for the share of
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 terrestrial land that needs to be conserved as a threshold.⁹ The threshold was converted to a carrying
2
3 capacity expressed at the pressure point of the impact pathway as $\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{year}/\text{year}$ land occupation to be
4
5 directly compatible with any LCI. For reasons given above we did not align the carrying capacity with the
6
7 ILCD recommended indicator and instead chose to align it directly to any LCI since the threshold is
8
9 independent on types of land use (i.e. paved road counts as none-conserved land just as managed forest).
10
11 The conversion of the threshold to carrying capacity was carried out simply by taking 31 % of global
12
13 terrestrial land. This gave a $\text{NR}_{\text{Global}}$ of $1.5 \cdot 10^4 \text{ m}^2 \cdot \text{year}/\text{pers}/\text{year}$. In practice a set of CFs with the value 1
14
15 for all relevant elementary flows could be created in LCA software to form an indicator compatible with the
16
17
18
19
20 NR.

21
22 Note that land transformations were not considered in the derivation of the two carrying capacities
23
24 because indicators of land transformation are inherently marginal as they are based on an alternative land
25
26 use scenario reference.
27

3.9 Water depletion

31
32
33 The carrying capacity was based on the so-called environmental flow requirements for good conditions
34
35 (EFR_{good}), which is a threshold measure of the minimum water flow required to sustain rivers in a “good
36
37 ecological state” (Smakhtin et al. 2004). This threshold was supplemented by another threshold for the
38
39 minimum water flow required to sustain terrestrial ecosystems in the river catchment. In deriving a
40
41 combined threshold for aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems we followed Gerten et al. (2013), who estimated
42
43 the global accessible blue water resource ($16.300 \text{ km}^3/\text{year}$) and subtracted a global EFR_{good} quantification
44
45 of 57 % of blue water and another 30 % of blue water to avoid physical water stress of terrestrial
46
47 ecosystems. In the impact pathway of water depletion a change in pressure, expressed in m^3/year water
48
49 consumed, causes a change in control variable, expressed in m^3/year water availability, of similar
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ⁹ This number is in good agreement with recent conclusions that around 34 % of global terrestrial coverage should be
58 conserved to achieve biodiversity protection goals given patterns and effects of current land conservation (Butchart et
59 al. 2015)

1 magnitude. EFR_{good} can therefore be interpreted as a pressure based carrying capacity and no conversion
2
3 from threshold to carrying capacity was hence needed. As for the carrying capacity of land use related to
4
5 regional biodiversity the carrying capacity is aligned directly to any LCI since the EFR_{good} estimates of Gerten
6
7 et al. (2013) made no distinction between different types of blue water consumption such as lake or river
8
9 water. We deviated from the ILCD recommended water scarcity indicator of Frischknecht et al. (2008),
10
11 because this indicator is of a marginal nature as it models the scarcity created by background water
12
13 consumption. This procedure gave a NR_{Global} of 306 m³/pers/year. As for the land use impact category
14
15 (regional biodiversity) a set of CFs with the value 1 for all relevant elementary flows could be created in LCA
16
17 software to form an indicator compatible with the NR.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 3.10 Comparison with traditional normalisation references and across spatial scale

26
27 Table 1 presents an overview of the developed carrying capacity-based normalisation references (NR)
28
29 globally and for Europe and a comparison with traditional normalisation references based on characterized
30
31 global background interventions (NR'). NR'_{global} was based on Laurent et al. (2013) who calculated global
32
33 normalisation references for the ILCD methodology for the year 2010 (or 2000 for impact categories where
34
35 more recent data was unavailable). NR'_{Europe} was based on Benini et al. (2014) and Sala et al. (2015) who
36
37 calculated normalisation references for EU-27 for the ILCD methodology, also for the year 2010. When
38
39 comparing NR'_{Europe} to NR_{Europe} it should be noted that NR_{Europe} has a wider geographical coverage as it is
40
41 based on the European continent. For impact categories where our developed NR was not aligned with the
42
43 ILCD methodology NR' was calculated using the underlying inventories of Laurent et al. (2013) and Sala et
44
45 al. (2015), with the exception of water depletion for which blue water consumption could not be extracted
46
47 from the inventories of these two studies. More details can be found in the Electronic Supplementary
48
49 Material (SI1 and SI2).
50
51
52
53

54
55 NR'/NR -values above 1 mean that current levels of interventions exceed the carrying capacity and that
56
57 normalized indicator scores will become higher when a traditional normalisation reference is replaced by a
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 carrying capacity-based one. This is the case for climate change (both thresholds), photochemical ozone
2
3 formation and land use (soil erosion) both at the global and European scale, for freshwater eutrophication
4
5 at the European scale and for water depletion at the global scale. The NR'/NR ratios for the remaining
6
7 impact categories are all below 1 and normalized indicator scores of these categories thus become smaller
8
9 when replacing traditional normalisation references with carrying capacity based ones. When comparing
10
11 across scale (column 6 in Table 1) it can be seen that for all impact categories except water depletion and
12
13 marine eutrophication NR_{Europe} is smaller than NR_{Global} , which is mainly due to Europe's relatively high
14
15 population density.
16
17

18
19
20 The interpretation of results for climate change, photochemical ozone formation, land use and water
21
22 depletion is that humanity is globally unsustainable according to our carrying capacity definition. Global
23
24 degrees of unsustainability are seemingly greatest for climate change (when carrying capacity is based on
25
26 the 1 W/m^2 threshold) and photochemical ozone formation where in both cases characterized
27
28 interventions need to decrease by a factor of 15, compared to those of the year 2010 and 2000
29
30 respectively, to reach sustainable levels characterized by no exceedance of reference thresholds on
31
32 average.
33
34

35
36 For the remaining impact categories current interventions appear environmentally sustainable when
37
38 averaging over the global situation because $NR'_{\text{global}}/NR_{\text{Global}}$ is below 1. The relevance of this perspective is
39
40 discussed in the next section.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **4 Discussion and outlook**

47

48 The new normalisation references are compatible with commonly used midpoint indicators and provide
49
50 reference information of a different relevance than society's background interventions, giving better
51
52 indications of the severity of interventions compared to sustainable levels. The references can be
53
54 integrated in LCA software for the application in LCA studies. Practitioners should be aware of uncertainties
55
56 of the references discussed below and that updated references in the future may replace the ones
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 proposed here. Using the developed references in LCA serves mainly two purposes: 1) To provide absolute
2
3 references that can inform criteria for environmental sustainability of systems. 2) To provide a scientific
4
5 basis for aggregating indicator scores across impact categories in LCA.
6
7
8
9

10 4.1 Criteria for environmental sustainability 11

12 Regarding the first purpose the normalisation references offer a pedagogical expression of interventions in
13
14 environmental sustainability person equivalents, which serves to communicate how large a share of the
15
16 carrying capacity a given system or activity takes up. This can help shifting the perspective of environmental
17
18 assessments from comparing eco-efficiencies of product systems to addressing eco-efficiency
19
20 improvements required to achieve environmental sustainability at a societal scale (i.e. through the NR'/NR
21
22 ratio). Criteria for environmental sustainability of societal subsystems are inherently subjective because
23
24 they involve the allocation of carrying capacity to systems that meet different human needs (and wants).
25
26 However it may be feasible to agree upon a moral rule that carrying capacities should be shared equally
27
28 amongst people living within its geographical boundaries or an alternative rule that global carrying
29
30 capacities should be shared equally within the global population.¹⁰ Moral rules like these would not restrict
31
32 personal freedom by enforcing a specific consumption pattern. Instead they would translate into equal
33
34 personal carrying capacity budgets that could be used according to personal preferences, much like a
35
36 salary. As a supplement to the perspective of personal carrying capacity consensus on the allocation of
37
38 carrying capacity between products belonging to different sectors may be based on sector specific
39
40 reduction scenarios of e.g. IPCC, IEA or national and municipal environmental strategies.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 4.2 Aggregation of normalized indicator scores 51 52 53 54 55

56
57 ¹⁰ The difference between these two rules is not trivial. Consider the potentially large differences between per capita
58 domestic carrying capacities of Canada and Singapore for the many impact categories related to the availability of land
59 and water as source or sink.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Regarding the second purpose, the developed normalisation references allows for the aggregation of
2
3 indicator scores expressed in carrying capacity occupation across impact categories to a single score. In this
4
5 process an additional weighting step is needed as the exceeding of the considered carrying capacities are
6
7 not necessarily equally severe for all categories of impact. Factors that influence the severity of exceeding a
8
9 carrying capacity include the type of damage that is caused, the social and/or economic impact, the spatial
10
11 extent, the time required for reversion of damage, whether a threshold is characterized by a hysteresis,¹¹
12
13 and effects on other carrying capacities.¹² As an example it could be argued that carrying capacity
14
15 normalised indicator scores for climate change should have a higher weight than corresponding scores for
16
17 photochemical ozone formation, given for instance that effects of crossing climate system thresholds are
18
19 both more pervading and difficult to reverse than the effects of crossing the tropospheric ozone threshold
20
21 for vegetation used in this work.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 4.3 Uncertainties and future work 30

31
32 The introduction of the carrying capacity based normalisation reference on one hand eliminates the
33
34 inventory-related uncertainties that accompany the classical normalisation reference (NR'), and these
35
36 uncertainties are large, especially for the toxicity-related impact categories (Laurent et al. 2011b). On the
37
38 other hand additional uncertainty related to quantification of carrying capacity is introduced. A central
39
40 question is whether control variables, and thus thresholds, should be located at midpoint or endpoint¹³ in
41
42 the impact pathway. In this work control variables, often expressed in a concentration metric, were located
43
44
45

46 ¹¹ A hysteresis is a phenomenon which causes the exceedance of a threshold to be difficult to revert because the
47
48 natural system has entered a new stable state characterized by stabilizing feedback mechanisms. In practice this
49
50 means that a reduction in environmental intervention of a similar magnitude as the increase in interventions that
51
52 previously caused the threshold to be exceeded is not sufficient to bring the system back to its original state.
53
54 Hysteresis has been observed for e.g. the response of shallow lakes to changes in phosphorous loadings (Scheffer
55
56 2001).

57 ¹² For instance increased run-off due to the exceedance of the climate change carrying capacity can lead to a higher
58
59 loss of reactive nitrogen and phosphorous from fertilizer application, thereby increasing the risk of exceeding carrying
60
61 capacities for freshwater and marine eutrophication. See Steffen et al. (2015) for elaboration on this topic.

62 ¹³ Midpoint is here understood as the point at which the impact pathway of different substances converge (Hauschild
63
64 et al. 2013). Because this point of convergence varies the impact pathway location of the midpoint varies across
65
66 impact categories. In comparison the endpoint is consistently located at the of the impact pathway and typically
67
68 expressed in a metric related to the disappearance of species (Hauschild et al. 2013).

1 at midpoint. A control variables related to effects on species (e.g. potentially disappeared fraction of
2 species, PDF) at endpoint could alternatively have be chosen consistently for all impact categories, along
3 with a threshold value. Carrying capacity based normalisation references could then be calculated at either
4 midpoint or endpoint from such an overarching threshold value. This approach is expected to lead to higher
5 uncertainties than the approach taken here of calculating carrying capacities from thresholds at midpoint,
6 because it would involve a translation through more processes in the impact pathway (i.e. from driver to
7 impact in the DPSIR framework, see Fig. 1). Also, a control variable at endpoint, such as PDF, is not
8 necessarily a good indicator of ecosystem functioning (Mace et al. 2014), although it is a direct measure of
9 ecosystem structure. Yet, a consistently chosen threshold value at endpoint would lead to the calculation of
10 carrying capacities that reflect the same level of species protection across impact categories, which is
11 appealing in the comparative setting of LCA. This approach should therefore be further explored.

12 Another type of uncertainty relates to spatial variations.

13 Our derived carrying capacities reflect average conditions of Europe and the world and have been
14 developed to fit site generic characterisation factors. This is useful in LCA, where locations of environmental
15 interventions are often not known with great accuracy. However the spatially generic approach hides
16 variations emission fate and carrying capacity of receiving environments, which is problematic in cases
17 where locations of environmental interventions are in fact known and spatially derived impact assessment
18 models exist. Our spatially generic approach, combined with the fact that emission sources are rarely
19 homogenously distributed in space, is the reason that our method predicts that carrying capacities have not
20 been exceeded for the majority of impact categories (see Table 1 and Bjørn et al. (2014) for an elaboration
21 of this issue for freshwater ecotoxicity). This prediction is invalidated by observations since exceedances of
22 carrying capacities are quite frequent for many types of environmental interferences operating at the local
23 to regional scale (MEA 2005; Steffen et al. 2015). A pragmatic way of accounting for this bias is to subtract
24 the carrying capacity of remote areas, classified based on e.g. a population density threshold, from the
25 calculation of spatially aggregated carrying capacities. Thereby land, water and air in scarcely populated

1 areas would be considered unavailable as resources and for assimilating emissions, and the carrying
2
3 capacity estimates would consequently be reduced. This was done by Gerten et al. (2013), who estimated
4
5 the accessible blue water to be 40 % of global blue water resources, meaning that roughly 60 % of the
6
7 theoretical global carrying capacity for water use (i.e. total flow minus environmental flow requirements)
8
9 was considered unavailable This estimate of unavailable carrying capacity gives an impression of the extent
10
11 at which our derived carrying capacities may be overestimated, but it needs to be assessed for each impact
12
13 category since it is 0 for climate change and stratospheric ozone depletion and may be higher than 60 % for
14
15 other impact categories. Such a modification might change the ranking between the normalised indicator
16
17 scores but it would not solve the problem of spatial variability in degrees of carrying capacity occupation of
18
19 a given emission within the remaining non-remote areas where carrying capacity is judged available.
20
21 Normalisation references could be developed at finer scales than what was demonstrated in this article to
22
23 take into account spatial variation in carrying capacity and the spatial distribution of the processes making
24
25 up an LCI. However at a high resolution (e.g. 0.5°-0.5°) such references would need to take into account
26
27 trans-boundary emissions. Alternatively carrying capacity could be integrated in spatially differentiated
28
29 characterisation models rather than in the normalisation step. In this way indicator scores could be
30
31 expressed in hectare years, which could be compared to the availability of land, thus following the style of
32
33 the ecological footprint indicator (Borucke et al. 2013).

34
35 Beyond the location of control variable in the impact pathway and the handling of spatial variations
36
37 additional sources of uncertainties related to quantification of carrying capacity needs consideration: the
38
39 selection of threshold on which to base the carrying capacity in some cases involves a choice between more
40
41 alternatives. For instance we aimed to base carrying capacities on scientific consensus on threshold
42
43 reflecting the state of natural systems that should be protected to ensure their structure and functioning.
44
45 Yet, a clear scientific consensus could not be identified in all cases. For example, the threshold for
46
47 stratospheric ozone depletion (Section 3.2) was here based on the planetary boundary of Rockström et al.
48
49 (2009), which is to a larger extent a precautionary first estimate than a scientific consensus, due to the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 imperfect understanding of the relationship between control variable and structure and functioning of
2
3 natural systems. In other cases the relationship is better understood, but may not be characterized by a
4
5 single sharp threshold, but rather by a sequence of thresholds or be close to linear (Dearing et al. 2014). In
6
7 such cases value judgement on what can be considered a minimum environmentally sustainable level of
8
9 structure and functioning is required for the calculation of carrying capacities. Other sources of
10
11 uncertainties in the calculated carrying capacity based normalisation references are: 1) choice of structure
12
13 and functioning to be protected (land is, for example, associated with a multitude of functions beyond
14
15 erosion resistance and host of biodiversity (Saad et al. 2013)), 2) choice of control variable (for example,
16
17 total concentration of nitrogen may not be the best control variable for indicating structure and/or
18
19 functioning of marine ecosystems (HELCOM 2013)), 3) choice of impact pathway model to translate
20
21 threshold to carrying capacity (the translation for photochemical ozone formation in this work, for
22
23 example, involved different time frames and could be improved). Identifying all sources of uncertainties,
24
25 analysing their magnitudes and consequently managing and reducing them is an important future task that
26
27 could take point of departure in the proposal of Bjørn et al. (2015).
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 This article only provided normalisation references for midpoint impact categories that link to the area of
35
36 protection Natural environment. To increase the usefulness of the references they should be supplemented
37
38 with normalisation references based on sustainability conditions for the impact categories linking to the
39
40 areas of protection Human health and Natural resources, thus covering all midpoint impact categories of
41
42 LCA. For midpoint impact categories such as climate change and photochemical ozone formation that link
43
44 to more than one area of protection the lowest normalisation reference amongst the complete set of
45
46 references should then be used. Using sustainability conditions as references in impact assessment may
47
48 also be explored in life cycle sustainability assessment.
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 **Acknowledgements** We thank Guus Velders (RIVM), Rosalie van Zelm (Radboud University Nijmegen) and
56
57 Annie Levasseur (CIRAIG) for assisting with quantifying the carrying capacity for stratospheric ozone
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 depletion, photochemical ozone formation and climate change respectively and Tue Vissing Jensen (DTU)
2
3 for technical support.
4
5
6
7

8 **Electronic Supplementary Material** SI1 elaborates on the carrying capacity quantifications for each impact
9
10 category and SI2 contains all calculations in spread sheet format.
11
12
13
14

15 **References**

16
17 Barnosky AD, Hadly EA, Bascompte J (2012) Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere. *Nature* 486:52–
18
19 58
20
21

22 Benini L, Mancini L, Sala S, Manfredi S, Schau EM, Pant R (2014) Normalisation method and data for
23
24 Environmental Footprints. Report EUR 26842 EN. Joint Research Centre. Institute for Environment and
25
26 Sustainability. European Commission
27
28

29 Berner RA, Kothavala Z (2001) GEOCARB III: A revised model of atmospheric CO₂ over phanerozoic time.
30
31 *Am J Sci* 301:182–204
32
33

34 Bjørn A, Richardson K, Hauschild MZ (2015) Environmentally sustainable or not? Managing and reducing
35
36 indicator uncertainties. *Ecological Indicators*. Submitted.
37
38

39 Bjørn A, Diamond M, Birkved M, Hauschild MZ (2014) Chemical Footprint Method for Improved
40
41 Communication of Freshwater Ecotoxicity Impacts in the Context of Ecological Limits. *Environ Sci*
42
43 *Technol* 48:13253–13262
44
45

46 Bobbink R, Hicks K, Galloway J, Spranger T, Alkemade R, Ashmore M, Bustamante M, Cinderby S, Davidson
47
48 E, Dentener F, Emmett B, Erisman JW, Fenn M, Gilliam F, Nordin A, Pardo L, De Vries W (2010) Global
49
50 assessment of nitrogen deposition effects on terrestrial plant diversity: a synthesis. *Ecol Appl* 20:30–59
51
52

53 Borucke M, Moore D, Cranston G et al (2013) Accounting for demand and supply of the biosphere's
54
55 regenerative capacity: The National Footprint Accounts' underlying methodology and framework. *Ecol*
56
57 *Ind* 24:518–533
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Bouwman AF, Van Vuuren DP, Derwent RG, Posch M (2002) A Global Analysis of Acidification and
2
3 Eutrophication of Terrestrial Ecosystems. *Water Air Soil Pollut* 141:349–382
4
5 Butchart SHM, Clarke M, Smith RJ et al (2015) Shortfalls and Solutions for Meeting National and Global
6
7 Conservation Area Targets. *Conservation Letters*. doi: 10.1111/conl.12158.
8
9
10 Carpenter S, Walker B, Anderies JM, Abel N (2001) From Metaphor to Measurement: Resilience of What to
11
12 What? *Ecosystems* 4: 765–781
13
14
15 Dearing JA, Wang R, Zhang K, Dyke JG, Haberl H, Hossain MS et al (2014). Safe and just operating spaces for
16
17 regional social-ecological systems. *Global Environ Change* 28:227–238
18
19
20 De Vries W, Kros J, Kroeze C, Seitzinger SP (2013) Assessing planetary and regional nitrogen boundaries
21
22 related to food security and adverse environmental impacts. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
23
24 *Sustainability* 5:392–402
25
26
27 EC (2011) Common implementation strategy for the water framework directive (2000/60/EC) guidance
28
29 document. Technical guidance for deriving environmental quality standards. Off J Eur Comm.
30
31
32 EEA (1998) Tropospheric Ozone in EU - The consolidated report. Topic report no. 8/1998. European
33
34 Environmental Agency, Copenhagen <http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/TOP08-98> accessed
35
36 14.11.2014
37
38
39 EEA (1999) Environmental indicators: Typology and overview. Technical report No 25. European
40
41 Environment Agency, Copenhagen
42
43
44 Frischknecht R, Steiner R, Jungbluth N (2008) Methode der ökologischen Knappheit—Ökofaktoren 2006,
45
46 ö.b.u. und Bundesamt für Umwelt, Bern
47
48
49 Gerten D, Hoff H, Rockström J, Jägermeyr J, Kummu M, Pastor A (2013) Towards a revised planetary
50
51 boundary for consumptive freshwater use: role of environmental flow requirements. *Current Opinion*
52
53 *in Environmental Sustainability* 5:551-558
54
55
56 Goodland R (1995) The concept of environmental sustainability. *Ann Rev Ecol Syst* 26:1–24
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Haines-Young R, Potschin M, Chesire D (2006) Defining and identifying Environmental Limits for Sustainable
2
3 Development. A Scoping Study. Final Full Technical Report to Defra, 103 pp + appendix 77 pp, Project
4
5 Code NR0102
6
7
8 Hauschild MZ, Wenzel H (1998) Environmental assessment of products. Vol. 2 - Scientific background,
9
10 Chapman & Hall, United Kingdom, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Hingham, MA. USA. ISBN 0412 80810
11
12 2
13
14
15 Hauschild MZ, Goedkoop M, Guinée J, Heijungs R, Huijbregts M, Jolliet O, Margni M, De Schryver A,
16
17 Humbert S, Laurent A, Sala S, Pant R (2013) Identifying best existing practice for characterization
18
19 modeling in life cycle impact assessment. Int J Life Cycle Assess 18:683–697. HELCOM (2013a)
20
21 Approaches and methods for eutrophication target setting in the Baltic Sea region. Baltic Sea
22
23 Environment Proceedings No. 133. Helsinki Commission
24
25
26
27 Henderson AD, Hauschild MZ, Van De Meent D, Huijbregts MAJ, Larsen HF, Margni M et al (2011). USEtox
28
29 fate and ecotoxicity factors for comparative assessment of toxic emissions in life cycle analysis:
30
31 Sensitivity to key chemical properties. Int J Life Cycle Assess 16:701–709
32
33
34 Hettelingh JP, Posch M, Slootweg J, Reinds GJ, Spranger T, Tarrason L (2007) Critical Loads and Dynamic
35
36 Modelling to Assess European Areas at Risk of Acidification and Eutrophication. Water Air Soil Pollut
37
38 7:379–384
39
40
41 IPCC (2013) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change. IPCC WGI AR5. Summary for
42
43 Policymakers
44
45
46 ISO (2006) ISO 14044:2006. Environmental management – Life cycle assessment – Requirements and
47
48 guidelines. International Organization for Standardization
49
50 http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail?csnumber=38498 . Accessed 14.11.2014
51
52
53 Katragkou E, Zanis P, Tsikerdekis A, Kapsomenakis J, Melas D et al (2015) Evaluation of near surface ozone
54
55 over Europe from the MACC reanalysis. Geosci Model Dev Discuss 8:1077–1115
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Laurent A, Olsen SI, Hauschild MZ (2011a) Normalization in EDIP97 and EDIP2003: updated European
2
3 inventory for 2004 and guidance towards a consistent use in practice. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 16:401–
4
5 409
6
7
- 8 Laurent A, Lautier A, Rosenbaum RK, Olsen SI, Hauschild MZ (2011b) Normalization references for Europe
9
10 and North America for application with USEtox™ characterization factors. *Int J Life Cycle Assess*
11
12 16:728–738
13
14
- 15 Laurent A, Hauschild MZ, Golsteijn L, Simas M, Fontes J, Wood R (2013) PROSUITE Deliverable 5.2:
16
17 Normalisation factors for environmental, economic and socio-economic indicators
18
19
- 20 Mace GM, Reyers B, Alkemade R, Biggs R, Chapin FS, Cornell SE, et al. (2014). Approaches to defining a
21
22 planetary boundary for biodiversity. *Global Environ Change* 28:289–297
23
24
- 25 MEA (2005) Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-being. Synthesis. World
26
27 Resources Institute. Island Press, Washington, DC
28
29
- 30 Milà i Canals L, Romanyà J, Cowell SJ (2007) Method for assessing impacts on life support functions (LSF)
31
32 related to the use of ‘fertile land’ in life cycle assessment (LCA). *J Clean Prod* 15:1426–1440
33
34
- 35 Montzka SA, Fraser PJ (1999) Controlled substances and other source gases. Chapter 2 in scientific
36
37 assessment of ozone depletion: 1998, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project— report no. 44,
38
39 World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland
40
41
- 42 Noss RF, Dobson AP, Baldwin R et al (2012) Bolder Thinking for Conservation. *Conserv Biol* 26:1-4
43
44
- 45 Odum EP (1971) *Fundamentals of ecology*, 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA, USA: W. B. Saunders
46
47
- 48 Posch M, Seppälä J, Hettelingh JP, Johansson M, Margni M, Jolliet O (2008) The role of atmospheric
49
50 dispersion models and ecosystem sensitivity in the determination of characterisation factors for
51
52 acidifying and eutrophying emissions in LCIA. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 13:477–486
53
54
- 55 Posthuma L, Suter II GW, Traas TP (2002) Eds. *Species Sensitivity Distributions in Ecotoxicology*. CRC Press
56
57 LLC, Florida
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K et al (2009) Planetary Boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for
2
3 Humanity. *Ecol Soc* 14(2):32
4
- 5 Rosenbaum RK, Bachmann TM, Gold LS, Huijbregts MAJ, Jolliet O, Juraske R, Köhler A, Larsen HF, MacLeod
6
7 M, Margni M, McKone TE, Payet J, Schuhmacher M, van de Meent D, Hauschild MZ (2008) USEtox—
8
9 the UNEP-SETAC toxicity model: recommended characterization factors for human toxicity and
10
11 the UNEP-SETAC toxicity model: recommended characterization factors for human toxicity and
12
13 freshwater ecotoxicity in life cycle impact assessment. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 13:532–546
14
- 15 Saad R, Koellner T, Margni M (2013) Land use impacts on freshwater regulation, erosion regulation, and
16
17 water purification: a spatial approach for a global scale level. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 18:1253–1264
18
- 19 Sala S, Farioli F, Zamagni A (2013) Life cycle sustainability assessment in the context of sustainability science
20
21 progress (part 2). *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 18:1686–1697
22
- 23 Sala S, Benini L, Mancini L, Pant R (2015) Integrated assessment of environmental impact of Europe in 2010:
24
25 data sources and extrapolation strategies for calculating normalisation factors. *Int J Life Cycle Assess.*
26
27 *Submitted.*
28
29
30
- 31 Sayre NF (2008) The genesis, history, and limits of carrying capacity. *Ann Assoc Am Geogr* 98:120-134
32
- 33 Scheffer M, Carpenter S, Foley JA, Folke C, Walker B (2001) Catastrophic shifts in ecosystems. *Nature*
34
35 413:591-596
36
37
- 38 Seppälä J, Hämäläinen RP (2001) On the meaning of the distance-to-target weighting method and
39
40 normalisation in life cycle impact assessment. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 10:393-398
41
- 42 Shine KP, Fuglestvedt JS, Hailemariam K, Stuber N (2005) Alternatives to the Global Warming Potential for
43
44 Comparing Climate Impacts of Emissions of Greenhouse Gases. *Climatic Change* 68:281-302
45
46
- 47 Smakhtin V, Revenga C, Döll P (2004) A Pilot Global Assessment of Environmental Water Requirements and
48
49 Scarcity. *Water Int* 29:307–317
50
51
- 52 Steffen W et al (2004) *Global Change and the Earth System. A Planet Under Pressure. The IGBP series.*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockstrom J, Cornell SE, Fetzer I, Bennett EM et al (2015). Planetary boundaries:
2
3 Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* 347: 736
4
- 5 Struijs J, Beusen A, van Jaarsveld H, Huijbregts MAJ (2009) Aquatic eutrophication. Chapter 6. In:
6
7 GoedkoopM, Heijungs R, Huijbregts MAJ, De Schryver A, Struijs J, Van Zelm R (eds) ReCiPe 2008 A life
8
9 cycle impact assessment method which comprises harmonized category indicators at the midpoint
10
11 and the endpoint level. Report I: characterisation, first edition, 6 January 2009 [http://www.lcia-](http://www.lcia-recipe.net)
12
13 [recipe.net](http://www.lcia-recipe.net) – accessed 14.11.2014
14
15
- 16 Struijs J, Beusen A, de Zwart D, Huijbregts M (2011) Characterization factors for inland water eutrophication
17
18 at the damage level in life cycle impact assessment. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 16:59–64
19
20
- 21 Tuomisto HL, Hodge ID, Riordan P (2012). Exploring a safe operating approach to weighting in life cycle
22
23 impact assessment – a case study of organic, conventional and integrated farming systems. *J Clean*
24
25 *Prod* 37:147-153
26
27
- 28 Umweltbundesamt (2004) Manual on methodologies and criteria for Modelling and Mapping Critical Loads
29
30 & Levels and Air Pollution Effects, Risks and Trends. Mapping Manual 2004. Federal Environmental
31
32 Agency. Berlin
33
34
- 35 UNDESA (2012) World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision. Total Population - Both Sexes, United
36
37 Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs <http://esa.un.org/wpp/Excel-Data/population.htm>
38
39 accessed 14.11.2014
40
41
- 42 Van Vuuren DP, Edmonds J, Kainuma M et al (2011) The representative concentration pathways: an
43
44 overview. *Climate Change* 109:5–31
45
46
- 47 Van Zelm R, Huijbregts MAJ, Den Hollander HA, Van Jaarsveld HA, Sauter FJ, Struijs J, VanWijnen HJ, Van de
48
49 Meent D (2008) European characterization factors for human health damage of PM10 and ozone in
50
51 life cycle impact assessment. *Atmos Environ* 42:441–453
52
53
- 54 Velders GJM, Daniels JS (2013) Uncertainty analysis of projections of ozone-depleting substances: mixing
55
56 ratios, EESC, ODPs, and GWPs. *Atmos Chem Phys Discuss* 13:28017–28066
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Verheijen F, Jones R, Rickson R, Smith C (2009) Tolerable versus actual soil erosion rates in Europe. Earth-
Sci Rev 94:23-38

WBCSD (2000) Eco-efficiency – creating more value with less impact. World Business Council for
Sustainable Development

Table 1 Developed global normalisation references based on carrying capacity, comparison across scales and with traditional normalisation references. Bold values indicate that NR'/NR fractions are above 1. Italics CF references mean compatibility with characterisation methods recommended by Hauschild et al. (2013)

Impact category	NR_Global (per person year)	$\frac{NR'_{Global}}{NR_{Global}}$	NR_Europe (per person year)	$\frac{NR'_{Europe}}{NR_{Europe}}$	$\frac{NR_{Global}}{NR_{Europe}}$	CF compatibility	Threshold
Climate change	985kg CO ₂ -eq	8.2	985ton CO ₂ -eq	9.4	1	<i>GWP100 (CO₂-eq) (Forster et al. 2007)</i>	Temperature increase of 2°
	522 kg CO ₂ -eq	15	522 kg CO ₂ -eq	18			Radioactive forcing increase of 1W*m ²
Ozone depletion	0.078kg CFC-11-eq	0.53	0.078kg CFC-11-eq	0.28	1	<i>ODP (Montzka and Fraser 1999)</i>	7.5 % decrease in average ozone concentration
Photochemical ozone formation	3.8 kg NMVOC-eq	15	2.5 kg NMVOC-eq	13	1.6	<i>Tropospheric ozone concentration Increase (Van Zelm et al. 2008)</i>	Tropospheric ozone concentration of 3 ppm* hour AOT40
Terrestrial acidification	2.3*10 ³ mole H+ eq	0.34	1.4*10 ³ mole H+ eq	0.53	1.7	OT method of Posch et al. (2008)	Deposition of 1170 and 1100 mole H ⁺ eq*ha ⁻¹ *year ⁻¹ globally and for the EU
Terrestrial eutrophication	2.8*10 ³ mole N eq	0.13	1.8*10 ³ mole N eq	0.30	1.5	OT method of Posch et al. (2008)	Deposition of 1340 and 1390 mole N eq*ha ⁻¹ *year ⁻¹ globally and for the EU
Freshwater eutrophication	0.84kg P eq	0.74	0.46kg P eq	3.22	1.8	<i>P concentration increase (Struijs et al. 2009)</i>	P concentration of 0.3mg/L
Marine eutrophication	29 kg N eq	0.32	31kg N eq	0.55	0.95	<i>N concentration increase (Struijs et al. 2009)</i>	N concentration of 1.75 mg/L
Freshwater ecotoxicity	1.9*10 ⁴ [PAF]*m ³ *day	0.036	1.0*10 ⁴ [PAF]*m ³ *day	0.85	1.8	<i>CTU (Rosenbaum et al. 2008)</i>	HC5(NOEC)
Land use, soil erosion	1.8 tons eroded soil	4.9	1.2 tons	9.3	1.6	Saad et al. (2013), land occupation CFs only	Tolerable soil erosion of 0.85 tons*ha ⁻¹ *year ⁻¹)
Land use, biodiversity	1.5*10 ⁴ m ² *year	0.42	9.5*10 ³ m ² *year	0.79	1.6	LCI data, land occupation only	31 % conserved land area

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Water depletion	306 m ³	1.3	490 m ³	0.52	0.63	LCI data classified as blue water consumption	Conservation of 57 % of river flows for aquatic ecosystems and 30 % for terrestrial
-----------------	--------------------	------------	--------------------	------	------	---	---

1 **Figure caption**



2
3
4 **Fig. 1** Elements of LCA placed in the DPSIR impact pathway framework (EEA, 1999) (response category not included).
5 Fig. 1a shows the example of an impact pathway leading to aquatic eutrophication. Fig. 1b maps elements of LCA and
6 their interactions. The punctured frame around the cause/effect curve between the state and impact points indicate
7 that our adopted science based thresholds are external references to LCA for impact categories where thresholds are
8 not considered by LCIA models. Fig. 1c shows three types of midpoint indicators characterised by the point in the
9 impact pathway where interferences are modelled (arrow) and expressed (cross)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure 1




a) Example



b) LCA elements



c) 3 types of LCIA indicators



[Click here to download Supplementary Material: S1_27.04.2015.docx](#)

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: S2_resubmission.xlsx](#)