

### ICE Database Insights: Methodological Challenges Behind the Scenes

### Case Studies of Biogenic Carbon, Allocation and Recycled Content

12<sup>th</sup> June 2025

Dr Craig Jones & Joe Rouse

circularecology.com

## Today's Webinar

- Introduction
- Overview of the ICE Database
- O Methodological Challenge 1: Biogenic Carbon
  - Linoleum: A case study on biogenic carbon
  - A look ahead to timber
- Methodological Challenge 2: Allocation Issues in Stone
- O Methodological Challenge 3: Recycled Content
  - Copper: A case study on recycled content
- O ICE v4.1 Announcement
- O Q&A Session



### **Your Presenters Today**



**Dr Craig Jones** 

#### Managing Director

- Original author ICE Database
- 20 years experience product footprints & LCA



Joe Rouse

Senior Consultant

- Project Manager on ICE
- Experience in Life Cycle Assessments and Product Carbon Footprinting





### **Background & Introduction**

# Circular Ecology – Introduction



Environmental consultancy, founded in 2013

Offer a range environmental services:

- Whole-Life Embodied Carbon Assessments for Construction Projects
- Organisational Carbon Footprints, Scope 1, 2 & 3
- Product Carbon Footprints
- Life Cycle Assessments (LCA)
- Carbon Footprint Verification & Assurance
- Net Zero Carbon Strategy
- Carbon Footprint Database (library) Development
- Online E-Learning Training Courses
- Carbon Offsetting and Tree Planting



Hosts the Inventory of Carbon & Energy (ICE) Database



### Scaling Carbon Reduction Initiative (SCRI)

Launch of our Scaling Carbon Reductions Initiative (SCRI)



Key to our purpose to release impactful work, to enable scalable carbon reductions



We will be diverting a specified amount from some of our sales into the SCRI



Funds will be used to **develop free carbon footprint data**, **tools and resources** 



Publication of an annual impact report disclosing the amount raised and use of funds

https://circularecology.com/scaling-carbon-reductions-initiative.html



### **ICE Database Supporters**





### ICE v4.0 Funders



https://circularecology.com/ice-supporters.html





### **Overview of the ICE Database**

# The Inventory of Carbon & Energy (ICE)

- An **embodied energy and carbon database** for building materials
  - First version 2005 released by Dr Craig Jones and Professor Geoff Hammond, University of Bath
- Data for over 200 materials
  - Primarily for Construction Materials
- Over 50,000 worldwide users
- BSRIA hardcopy published in January 2011
- Excel version free to download from <u>www.circularecology.com/ice-database.html</u>





## ICE Background Dataset

The digitisation of Environmental Product Declarations has allowed us to access large online libraries of EPD data, vastly expanding our available data for ICE.



 Previous iterations of the ICE Database relied on manual processes to extract data



• EPDs make up most of the ICE Background Dataset, but are **not always accurate or reliable** 



 Our approach focuses on quality-driven analysis using the best available data



### **ICE Background Dataset**



### Methodological Challenges - Overview

This session is focused on examples of specific and technical challenges we encounter that affect the accuracy and comparability of product carbon data.



**Biogenic Carbon:** How it is calculated, common inconsistencies we find, and a case study on how this impacted our Linoleum analysis



• Allocation Methods: How differences in allocation methodology across the stone category have impacted our ability to create a fair ICE category



• **Recycled Content:** A case study on how the recycled content of copper creates difficulties when producing an ICE category





### **Methodological Challenge 1**

**Biogenic Carbon** 

### What is Biogenic Carbon?

### **Biogenic Carbon:**

Biogenic carbon refers to carbon that is part of the natural carbon cycle and is absorbed, released, or stored by biomass-based materials (e.g., wood, plants, natural fibres) during their life cycle

### **Stored/Sequestered Carbon:**

Stored carbon in an EPD refers to temporarily retained carbon in the product (e.g. in wood), which may eventually be released (e.g. via combustion or decay)



### **Biogenic Carbon in EPDs**

Two units are used in EPDs: kgC and kgCO<sub>2</sub>e.

### <u>kgC</u>

### Refers to kilograms of carbon atoms

### kgCO<sub>2</sub>e

 Refers to kilograms of carbon dioxide equivalents

1 kgC is equal to 3.667 kgCO<sub>2</sub>e (molecular weight conversion:  $CO_2/C = 44/12$ )



## **Biogenic Carbon in EPDs**

#### Information on biogenic carbon content

BIOGENIC CARBON CONTENT	kgC	kgCO <sub>2</sub> e
Biogenic carbon content in product	219	802
Biogenic carbon content in packaging	0	0

Indicator	Unit	Tot.A1-A3	A4	A5	B2	C2	C3	C4	D
GWP-fossil	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	1.08E+03	5.43E+00	4.24E+01	0.00E+00	5.43E-01	3.28E+00	0.00E+00	-8.19E+02
GWP-biogenic	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	-7.74E+02	3.23E-03	1.45E+00	0.00E+00	3.23E-04	4.17E-03	8.02E+02	-2.99E-01
GWP-luluc	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	7.31E-01	1.83E-03	1.02E-01	0.00E+00	1.83E-04	1. <mark>02E-03</mark>	0.00E+00	-2.26E-01
GWP - total	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	3.02E+02	5.44E+00	4.39E+01	0.00E+00	5.44E-01	3.29E+00	8.02E+02	-8.19E+02





### Linoleum: A Case Study on Biogenic Carbon

## Linoleum

Linoleum is a durable flooring material primarily made from natural ingredients.

#### **Common Ingredients:**

- Linseed Oil
- Cork Dust
- Wood Flour
- Jute (Backing)
- Recycled Linoleum Powder
- Calcium Carbonate (Limestone)





Linoleum contains multiple biogenic carbon sources in its constituent materials. This makes it difficult to estimate the biogenic carbon content, and to verify results when it is reported.



### **Biogenic Carbon Challenges - Linoleum**



## Linoleum – Composition Challenges

- The EN 15804+A2 (2019) standard has mandatory biogenic carbon reporting
- However, the linoleum dataset is small, so needs to still use older datapoints that lack this data
- For those datapoints that do not report the stored biogenic carbon, we can **estimate this** based on the constituent materials

Table 2: Composition of Marmoleum						
			Availability	Amount		
Component	Material	Renewable	Recycled	Non- Renewable	[%]	Origin
Binder	Linseed oil	Bio based crop			20	Canada/Europe
	Gum rosin	Bio based crop			3	Indonesia
	Tall oil		Bio based waste product from paper Industry		7	USA
Filler	Wood flour		Bio based waste product from wood processing		22	Germany
	Calcium carbonate			Abundant mineral	22	Germany
	Reused & Recycled Marmoleum		Pre- and post- consumer waste		14	Internal/External
Pigment	Titanium dioxide			Limited mineral	2	Global
	Other pigments			Limited mineral	1	Global
Backing	Jute	Bio based crop			8	India/Bangladesh
Finish	Lacquer				1	Netherlands
In Marmoleum Cocoa top layer*	Cocoa husks		Bio based waste product from cocoa Industry		1.5	Netherlands

#### 2.1 Material Content of the Product

### **Estimating Linoleum Biogenic Carbon**

From those EPDs that report the constituent materials in their composition, we have estimated the sequestered biogenic carbon per kg:



### **Biogenic Carbon Challenges - Linoleum**

We have individually checked each available datapoint and extracted data such as stated sequestered carbon and product composition when available. This gives us much more context to analyse each datapoint and flag suspected errors.



 Our dataset contains EPDs over a large time span, reflecting changes in biogenic carbon accounting and thus containing discrepancies



• Some EPDs did not report the composition of the linoleum product, making it impossible to estimate or recreate (if reported) the sequestered carbon values



• Some EPDs show their products as storing unrealistic amounts of sequestered carbon



### **Cleansing the Linoleum Dataset**

# Through a manual analysis of each linoleum datapoint, we have been able to produce a 'cleansed' and comparable dataset:

Linoleum Dataset Before Cleansing





### **Cleansing the Linoleum Dataset**

# Through a manual analysis of each linoleum datapoint, we have been able to produce a 'cleansed' and comparable dataset:

2.5 × A1-A3 Embodided Carbon (kgCO2e/kg) 2.0 ×× 41 Datapoints 1.5 1.0 X \*\*\*\*<sup>\*\*</sup> ××××× 0.5 an = 0.4404\*\*\*\*\* ××××××  $\times \times \frac{\times \times \times \times}{5}$ 0.0 15 25 30 ×× 10 20 35 40 45 -0.5

**Linoleum Dataset After Cleansing** 





As we finalise analysis on the linoleum category, we can look ahead to **timber** as another major biogenic ICE category requiring an update.

#### **Some Subcategories:**

- Softwood
- Hardwood
- Chipboard
- Medium Density Fibreboard (MDF)
- Particle Board
- Orientated Strand Board
- Plywood







ICE Background Data Category Sizes

Datapoints



Category

- Timber is a much larger dataset than Linoleum, with over 1000 datapoints currently
- With a category this large, manual verification of every EPD would require **significant resource**
- Our approach therefore may focus on spotting obvious errors and inconsistencies across each subcategory combined with assumptions on missing parameters such as carbon sequestration, density and moisture content.





### **Methodological Challenge 2**

Allocation



### Allocation is the process of dividing environmental impacts among multiple products or outputs of a single manufacturing process



## Allocation

#### Why It's Needed:

- Many industrial processes **produce more than one product** (e.g. steel + slag)
- Allocation determines how emissions and resource use are shared between coproducts

#### **Common Allocation Scenarios:**

- By-products (e.g. sawdust from lumber production)
- Waste-to-resource flows (e.g. recycled content)

#### EN 15804 + A2 Allocation Guidance:

- Avoid allocation when possible and justify when used
- If allocation is necessary, physical causality allocation (mass, volume) is preferred when the difference in revenue between co-products is low
- In all other cases allocation should be based on economic values
- Sub-division often is not possible and the typical differences in revenue between coproducts means that EN 15804 often results in economic allocation



## **Types of Allocation Methods**

Method	Description	Impact on EPDs
Mass Allocation	Impacts distributed by product weight	Simple but may misrepresent value of by-products
Economic Allocation	Based on product market value	Reflects market reality, but volatile over time
Energy Content	Allocates based on calorific value	Used for fuels or energy carriers



Variance in the allocation rules used in a material category can lead to inconsistent results when comparing even similar EPDs.



### Why Allocation Matters for ICE

- **1.** Incompatible Allocation Methods = Skewed Results:
  - Using EPDs based on differing allocation methods can lead to results that are not **directly comparable**
  - Impacts may be **over- or under-represented**, especially for by-products
- 2. Product Category Rules (PCRs):
  - PCRs are the rules, requirements and guidelines that specify how to conduct a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) and exist to enable comparability across EPDs
  - Due to differences across PCRs there is **questionable comparability** across all materials
  - Even with PCRs being available there are **large differences in allocation approaches** for some materials

You cannot reliably aggregate or compare EPDs without understanding the underlying allocation logic!





### **Allocation Issues in Stone**

### Stone

Stone can include a range of natural and processed stone products. Allocation is common in stone production where quarrying yields multiple grades or types of stone.

#### **Some Possible Subcategories:**

- Granite
- Limestone
- Marble (Stone and Tile)
- Shale
- Sandstone
- Calcium Carbonate (Limestone)





In our stone dataset, we have found a range of different allocation approaches being used across each subcategory. In many cases, the allocation approach is not explicitly mentioned at all...



### Stone – Allocation Methods

#### Allocations:

The manufacturing plant where these natural stone products of granite for coverings are produced also produces other products, namely cubes, curbs and slabs. Taking it into account, an mass allocation methodology was used to define which input and output flows associated only to the production of the natural stone being studied.

#### Allocation:

The allocation is made in accordance with the provisions in EN 15804. Incoming energy, water and waste production inhouse production (A3 – manufacturing) is allocated equally among all products through mass allocation. Economic allocation is used upstream (A1 and A2) because machine blocks from the quarry are not subject for further processing. Price for machine blocks are significant lower compared with processed schist products.

Difference in material consumption, energy and waste production in the production of different products (floor tiles, slabs, roofing etc.) are considered to be marginal, as production processes are nearly the same.

#### **ALLOCATION RULES**

The allocation rules used, in accordance with the provisions of EN 15804 + A1: 2013, are specific for each material and the criteria used is that which is identified as the most relevant to the type of work performed. Allocation has been made even for the co-product, using the same criteria as that used for the finished product.

The allocation criteria used were:

- time required to perform the processing (elettricity, water);

- criterion of allocation for mass (oil, wood, plastics);

criterion of allocation for worked surface (LPG, oxygen).

### Stone – A Look at the Data

A brief look at the available data for the Stone category shows a large range in embodied carbon values across the dataset.



circular ecolo

### Stone – Data Spread Indicators

We spotted the allocation issues in stone by looking at the variability of the dataset, as part of our **Data Quality Indicator (DQI)** methods. This allows us to **compare variability, not absolute values,** across ICE categories. Examples of these measures include:

- 1. Relative Standard Deviation (median-based):
  - Standard deviation divided by the median

#### 2. Coefficient of Variation:

- Standard deviation divided by the mean
- 3. Relative Interquartile Range:
  - Compares the middle 50% spread of data to the median
  - Less sensitive to outliers

All these methods are useful for analysing the **validity and uniformity** of a potential material category.



### Stone – Data Spread Indicators

2.5 All data spread measurements show stone as having a high variance 2.0 Dimensionless 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 **Relative SD CoEff of Variation Relative IQR Data Spread Measure** 

**Data Spread of Stone and Other Select ICE Categories** 

Stone Ceramic Paint Plaster Vinyl



### Stone – Data Spread Indicators

# This chart shows the allocation approach, as described in the EPD, and A1-A3 results of each available Stone datapoints



## Improving Alignment in Stone EPDs

Our analysis on the stone dataset indicates a mis-alignment on the LCAs conducted across this category. To address this, there are key actions that EPD practitioners, publishers, and PCR writers can take to improve alignment.

#### 1. EPD Practitioners:

- Clearly state the allocation method used
- Justify the choice of method with reference to the life cycle model and coproducts

#### 2. EPD Publishers:

- Encourage a **standardised structure** for disclosing methodology
- Ensure allocation approaches are **consistent** and **flag limitations** when required

#### 3. Regulators and PCR Publishers:

- Provide **clear and explicit guidance** on appropriate allocation methods across product categories
- Add mandatory reporting of key methodological choices
- Promote alignment across PCRs





### **Methodological Challenge 3**

### **Recycled Content**

### What is meant by Recycled Content?

**Recycled content** refers to the proportion of a material that is made from **pre-consumer** or **post-consumer recycled material**, rather than virgin (newly extracted) resources.

### Ideally ICE Database wants to understand 3 scenarios:

Scenario	Material Type	Material Source
1	Virgin Metal	Ore mining + primary smelting
2	100% Recycled Content Metal	Recycled scrap recovery + remelting
3	Partial recycled content	Blend of virgin + recycled inputs





### Copper: A Case Study on Recycled Content

# Copper – Why it's Challenging

Copper is a highly recycled material. Roughly 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of global copper demand is met using recycled copper. As such, copper products often contain a mix of primary and secondary (recycled) metal.

- EPDs typically do not state the recycled content or how scrap recovery is handled at end-of-life
- And are often missing enough data to estimate it (net scrap, Mod D...etc)
- The available dataset for copper is small (<50 datapoints)</li>





The key challenge in this category, is that EPDs contain the GWP for the produced metal, but for ICE we need to unpick the relationship between GWP and recycled content



### Copper – Recycled Content

**Only 15 datapoints** analysed for copper **stated the recycled content** of the product, making it difficult to untangle the relationship between recycled content and embodied carbon:



### Copper – Tackling the Problem

Due to the small dataset , variation in recycled content accounting and ambiguity in the methodology, investigation the relationship between embodied carbon and recycled content in copper is difficult.

Our approach is:

- **1. Manually extract and analyse** each datapoint available for methodology and source of copper
- 2. Correlate embodied carbon with recycled content where possible
- 3. Flag and isolate erroneous datapoints where possible



This approach is still limited by the small sample size of the dataset and the lack of information reported in the EPDs





### **Methodological Challenges**

### **Consequences for ICE**

## **Consequences for ICE**

The examples shown today are just some of the challenges we face when compiling data for ICE. Inconsistencies and conflicts in EPD methodology and mistakes in calculations require us to ask whether datapoints are comparable?



 Lack of transparency, reporting and mistakes in biogenic material reporting requires a time-consuming analytical approach to ensure confidence and comparability



 The stone category currently cannot fairly support representative values due to the inconsistent and sometimes obscure allocation approaches highlighted



 A lack of data and transparency on recycled content and the methodology followed requires manual extraction of data and analysis to unpick



## Benefits of the ICE Approach

#### 1. Curated Data:

• We investigate and analyse methodological inconsistencies (e.g. allocation methods, biogenic carbon) to identify and remove problematic EPDs

#### 2. Cleansed & Representative Values:

• ICE values are not just averages — they reflect a systematic process of data review, filtering, and contextual understanding

#### 3. Saves Time for Practitioners:

 For those needing a quick carbon factor — without deep dives into individual EPDs — ICE provides a ready-to-use, considered option

#### 4. Free for Commercial Use:

• ICE remains free to download and free for commercial use (subject to free registration)



### Today's Webinar - Recap

- ✓ Overview of the ICE Database
- Methodological Challenge 1: Biogenic Carbon
  - ✓ Linoleum: A case study on biogenic carbon
  - ✓ A look ahead to timber
- Methodological Challenge 2: Allocation Issues in Stone
- ✓ Methodological Challenge 3: Recycled Content
  - Copper: A case study on recycled content





### Looking Forward: ICE v4.1

### ICE Database v4.1 Announcement



In the first 90 days of launching ICE v4.0 (Dec 2024), over 1,000 organisations registered for commercial use of ICE



We are now excited to announce an **ICE v4.1 update**, expected to launch in the **coming weeks** 



This update will focus on two important materials, **Bitumen and GGBS** (Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag), both have **large changes in their GWPs** (changes in allocation methods)



This has consequential impacts on **asphalt**—owing to the inclusion of bitumen—and on **cement and concrete mixes** that incorporate GGBS as a supplementary cementitious material



# Upcoming Removal of ICE v2.0 Data

We have also made the decision to soon remove all ICE v2.0 data, which is from 2011. ICE v4.1 may be the last version these materials appear in the ICE database, until we can obtain funding to update them.

Our goal is to ensure that users are working with the **most robust and up-to-date information** available.

#### Below is a list of ICE v2.0 materials that are <u>at risk of removal</u>:

- Brass
- Bronze
- Carpet
- Clay
- Copper
- Insulation (11 types)
- Iron

- Lead
- Lime
- Paper
- Paint, solventborne
- Sealants and Adhesives
- Soil
- Stone
- And many plastics (we will be updating some of the plastics, but it's a big dataset with complexities to update)

- Tin
- Titanium
- Zinc



### How You Can Support ICE



Share with your networks **how you use the ICE Database** in projects, tools and research



Contribute to our **Scaling Carbon Reductions Initiative (SCRI)** by choosing some of the Circular Ecology products which diverts revenue from sales towards ICE and other free data and tools



**Donate directly to the ICE Database** and be recognised as an ICE Supporter or Contributor



Invite us to collaborate on research grant funding applications (Innovate UK, Horizon...etc), part funded research can be an important part of updating the ICE Database

https://circularecology.com/how-to-support-ice.html



### **Next Webinars**

### The final instalment of the ICE Database Insights series

#### **1.** Appropriate Use of Generic Data - Weds 16<sup>th</sup> July

Read more and sign up at <u>circularecology.com/news/new-webinar-series-the-ice-database</u>

More webinars planned in 2025 on Organisational Footprinting, Carbon Libraries and Product Carbon Footprinting

#### Keep an eye on our networks for more information

- Website <u>circularecology.com</u>
- LinkedIn <u>linkedin.com/company/circular-ecology</u>





Q&A

### Please use the Q&A interface to ask your questions



### Thank you for watching

Sign up for more information on ICE and for future updates

https://circularecology.com/newsletter.html