



**Monthly meeting active members  
February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**Participating members:**

- Anne-Marie, CIRAIG
- Manuele, CIRAIG
- Anne Prieur, GDF
- Dominique Corbisier, GDF (Belgium)
- Christian Bouchard, Quebec
- Francesca Verones, RU Nijmegen
- Inga Klärmayer, TU Hamurg
- Jane Bare, US EPA
- Julie Clavreul, Unilever, UK
- Lorenzo Benini, JRC (first meeting)
- Masaharu Motoshita, TU Berlin/AIST
- Sebastien Worbe, Veolia
- Stephan Pfister, ETH Zurich
  
- (Kevin Harding?) Unable to connect by phone, no South African phone number

**News:**

- ISO 14046 approved. Not published yet but still it is important to have it approved.
  - **NOTE: correction post-meeting – the DIS2 was approved to the FDIS stage. This is not yet the final stage, but normally only minor correction are made at this point before it becomes a standard.**
- Logistics/Structure with 3 sub-working group seems to work well.
  - There is four meetings per month (3 sub-groups and one WULCA active member meeting)
  - Experts are invited specifically for relevant meetings or document reviews
- Lorenzo: how to join sub-working groups?
  - Interested in stress, maybe also Human health (HH) and Ecosystem Quality (EQ)

**Framework discussion**

Already a group effort is made in fall and early this year but there is still ongoing discussions.

- Reminder: In any meeting decision can be made and then it can be re-opened only for the next meeting.
- Basic framework is based on previous WULCA publications (Bayart et al, Kounina et al)
  - Compensation activities and resource endpoint have been identified as not mature enough for achieving consensus within the flagship project (for resources relevance is considered lower)
  - Idea that there is no midpoint leading to HH and EQ endpoint -> pseudo midpoint for stress
- Two main concerns:

- Jane: Compensation processes should be taken out as for now. Main concern is that if you include this on the drawing and leave it out of the impact pathway, there might be no damage in developed countries but it might come through by trade and this will not be considered in the direct impacts.
  - Anne-Marie: It does not mean that export related impacts cannot be included, this will be up to the human health working group to decide what they include and how it is modeled
- Jane: Where is the stress based "pseudo-midpoint" placed -> it might seem that no real effect is coming from this midpoint (as it does not link to endpoint). But in fact there are relevant links (also resource endpoint for future generations)
  - Manuele: It might be better that it comes out directly from inventory box
  - Jane: Jane would be fine to link it now to inventory but have it flexible for future
- Brads comment: Problem of not having a link to endpoint; then it is not a midpoint
  - To be discussed with flagship project
  - Manuele: We are trying to take a challenge which is not found in other impact pathways. In Tox nobody wanted to combine ecotox and human tox. Suggest to keep flexible at the beginning
  - Stephan agrees. Also in land use problem with focus on biodiversity and not ecosystem services (basically two separate pathways) and we can say it is two different methods: one addressing midpoint (e.g. to be used for impact category water scarcity in a LCIA method like TRACI) and one with endpoint modelling (to be used in parallel with endpoint models such as ReCiPe). If we consider it separate methods, we do not get into discussions with the mid- and end-point models. There seems no problem with ISO for this.
- Suggestion by Brad (Endpoint based midpoint (top-down approach))
  - Concern of Anne-Marie: It includes weighting which is not allowed to be reported without individual indicators information (based on ISO standards).
  - Jane: thinks that the scope of this working group does not go beyond midpoint and endpoint, so not into normalisation and weighting.
  - Lorenzo: Weighting could be a critical point
  - Stephan: Idea is to have a consistent single indicator (aggregated not midpoint) and therefore it is in competition with (an alternative to) a bottom-up stress pseudo-midpoint which might be controversial with endpoint models
  - Manuele: fully understands concerns. Weighting should be outside of characterization model (based on ISO). It can not be part of characterization  
-> suggestion to decide at a later stage  
It might not be possible to achieve endpoint method recommendation for EQ and therefore a "stress" indicator would be a must.  
Jane: Agrees and it is a communication issue for WULCA to say we have three indicators and what it means.  
Manuele: it is a main duty to clearly communicate about the meaning of each indicator. Problem with Brad's suggestion is that there is no physical meaning of the indicator and therefore difficult to explain.
- Agreement to include for now both approaches in consideration and decide along the way. Work on both endpoint indicators and the separate stress indicator
  - All agree
- Inga: are we looking at HH midpoint too or only endpoint? Anne-Marie: Yes we will also propose a midpoint CF, based on the work achieved on the endpoint model.

### **Summary sub-working group on slides.**

- Stress: Different approaches but still lots of work to be done for what should be included from EQ and HH
  - Jane: will suggest a different approach next time
  - Lorenzo: Terminology; needs and consumption are not necessarily the same thing, it should be consistent what is chosen between human „needs“ and ecosystems „needs“ -> to be improved
  - Sebastien: Who works on data and models behind to provide the data.
  - Stephan: models will be selected for input when CF are developed but it is not the goal to develop own data models
- HH: No agreement on where midpoint is supposed to be but there are three models existing and we have a good starting point. Midpoint to be agreed after endpoint model is agreed.
  - Masaharu will present his recent work next time (including trade effects)
- EQ: Framework still needs some work done: consensus, work to be done. Not fully ready to conceptualize. Big problem is coverage of methods (many are not globally available)
  - CIRAIIG is translating MSc results on framework (gaps and pathways)
  - Danielle Tendall and Francesca's most recent work will be considered

### **Other activities**

- UNEP water footprint training
  - Trainings in South Africa
- Training on water footprint at SETAC BASEL (May 11th, registration through SETAC)
  - Will be published soon on WULCA webpage
- WULCA webpage is re-designed
- There is a chair on LCA in Montpellier opened a chair (WULCA represented on March 25th)
- Press release about sponsorship in preparation
- WULCA working meeting on Thursday afternoon at SETAC (May 15th, details to come)

Next meeting:

Early April -> a doodle poll is sent around by Anne-Marie