

Minutes WULCA-ecosystem sub working group

Participants: <stephan.pfister@ifu.baug.ethz.ch>, <Bare.Jane@epa.gov>, <inga.klemmayer@tuhh.de>, <montse.nunez-pineda@irstea.fr>, <mlathuilliere@gmail.com>, manuele.margni@polymtl.ca

<francesca.verones@ntnu.no>, <stephan.pfister@ifu.baug.ethz.ch>, <Bare.Jane@epa.gov>, <inga.klemmayer@tuhh.de>, <montse.nunez-pineda@irstea.fr>, <cecile.bulle@polymtl.ca>, <mlathuilliere@gmail.com>, <jsguest@illinois.edu>, <Christian.Bouchard@gci.ulaval.ca>, <anne-marie.boulay@polymtl.ca>, manuele.margni@polymtl.ca

Date : 19.11.2014, 9am EDT

Agenda :

1. Brief reminder of the objectives and activities of the ecosystem subgroup
2. Discussion on the framework linking water use to ecosystem quality

Meeting:

1. Brief reminder of the objectives and activities of the ecosystem subgroup:

- The project of Mike Lathuillere has been added in the list "who is doing what" (see .ppt)

2. Discussion on the framework:

The discussion has been held around the power point prepared by Christian and Montse.

1. Impact pathways coverage:

The overall structure seems to make sense, but a detailed discussion on the coverage and relevance of impact pathways is postponed to allow the subgroup members to read the preliminary outcomes of the side work lead by Christian and co-authors on the analysis of existing methods.

Action (Christian): Distribute the draft paper analyzing existing impact pathways (obj. a.) to the whole group as soon as it is ready (in the coming days)

Note: The paper lead by Christian is an analysis paper that provides a starting point for the discussion within this group in order to propose the framework that will represent the vision of this subgroup

Action (all): Provide inputs on the current scheme to Montse – complete missing impact pathways, suggest modification in the structure, etc.

2. Structure of the characterization factor:

The term “stressor” is used as an inventory flow in other contexts (Jane). See for example the following reference:

Hertwich, Edgar G., and James K. Hammitt. "A decision-analytic framework for impact assessment part I: LCA and decision analysis." *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 6.1 (2001): 5-12.

Action (Christian): Check if it is an appropriate term to be used in within our framework and/or alternative terminology is available

3. Fate modeling:

Christian highly recommend to read the following reference to grasp the concept pulse vs. steady-state modeling

Heijungs R (1995). Harmonization of methods for impact assessment. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.* 2:217–24

Add a discussion on temporal variability for the framework (Montse)

4. Effect modeling:

-

Scoping of the framework paper:

The framework paper should make a distinction between what is nice to have and is needed to have. It should not aim to provide an operational solution beyond the framework itself, but a discussion on the different issues and options to model cause-effect chain in a relevant and robust manner and provide recommendations.

The meeting finished at 9:50 EDT