

Towards an accurate accounting for carbon from biomass in the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF)

Who we are?

Biomass-derived chemicals are chemicals wholly or partly derived from renewable materials of biological origin (i.e. from plants, crops, trees, algae and biological waste). These chemicals are used in a wide range of applications, such as energy, textile, plastics, pharmaceuticals, hygiene, food and many more.

Ideally, biomass-derived chemicals are circular by nature, since they are made of renewable resources, are designed to be re-used, re- and up-cycled several times, and at the end, returned to nature through biodegradation or composting.

BioChem Europe is a Sector Group of CEFIC that gathers European leading and pioneering companies in the field of biomass-derived chemistry. It aims at promoting responsibly produced chemicals derived from sustainably sourced biomass to respond to society's growing appetite for circular products that have limited or even positive impacts on the environment and climate.

We need a fairer method to account for the footprint of biogenic carbon and allocate it to the actors along the bioeconomy value chains.

Biogenic carbon in the current PEF rules

In the currently proposed methodology of the Product Environmental Footprint rules addressing biogenic carbon, there is no recognized benefit granted to the producers of bio-based products, compared to fossil ones.

In a cradle-to-grave approach, the biogenic uptake and emissions of CO₂ from disposal are balanced. Therefore, in a cradle-to-grave approach, bio-based products will not receive any CO₂ burden when they are disposed of, while fossil products will receive a CO₂ burden. This is no problem for 100% biobased or 100% fossil-based products when assessed by cradle-to-grave LCA with final disposal of the products.

BioChem Europe

Rue Belliard 40 – Boite 15 – 1040 Brussels - Belgium

Tel: +32 2 436.94.61 - bdg@cefic.be

A sector group of Cefic 

European Chemical Industry Council - Cefic aisbl

EU Transparency Register n° 64879142323-90



However, in a cradle-to-gate life-cycle analysis using PEF methodology, biobased products will not receive any credit for the fact that CO₂ was removed from the atmosphere during photosynthesis and plant growth. Whereas in LCA (EN 15804 and other LCA standards) biobased products do receive such credits.

When the use of the product cannot be singled out - like platform chemicals which are used for a range of different other products or intermediates -, the manufacturers need to supply a cradle-to-gate LCA. Accordingly, there will be no CO₂ credit for biobased raw materials calculated at the gate of the product. It will look like there is hardly any benefit from producing biobased products if any at all, compared to fossil based.

The same “accounting” problem appears when biomass feedstock is blended with fossil feedstock, like in mass balance scenarios. There will hardly be any difference in greenhouse gas footprints as long as a cradle-to-gate assessment is used for life-cycle inventories and for full LCA where other forms of end-of life approaches than incineration are applied.

The figures (fig. 1 and 2) below illustrate this method used for an imaginary product made of both fossil- (grey) and bio-based (green) feedstock. For simplicity, we assume exactly the same CO₂ footprint in production and logistics for these two feedstocks, as well as the same manufacturing processes and the same final uses. The only difference is in the CO₂ emission at end of life, where biobased feedstock emissions are zero and fossil-based ones are substantial (= 100 in this scale). We easily see that there is no difference in cradle-to-gate LCA or for everlasting products that never will release CO₂. This is counter intuitive since we all know that CO₂ was fixed during growth of the biomass and has not yet been released again until end of life.






Fig 1. Cradle-to-gate carbon footprint - fossil feedstock




Fig 2. Cradle-to-gate carbon footprint - bio-based feedstock

Biogenic carbon in “fairer” PEF rules

Another way of assessing environmental footprint which is not in use in PEF today would be based on giving CO₂ removals credits to biomass when produced AND giving CO₂ penalty to all CO₂ (biobased and fossil) when it is actually released back to the atmosphere. In this case, the emissions and removals are shown alongside the time periods that are in the scope of the calculations. With this approach, the data can be shown in a transparent and meaningful way. In addition, this procedure follows the standard ISO 14067 which is the commonly applied standard. Furthermore, this will be much more in line with people’s perception and much easier to communicate. It should also allow for informed discussions on the different levels of the life cycle.

The figures 3 and 4 illustrate an alternative and more meaningful accounting method, based on the same imaginary product produced from fossil- (grey) and bio-based (green) feedstock. Again, for simplicity, we anticipate exactly same CO₂ footprint in production and logistics of these two feedstocks, as well as the exact same manufacturing processes and the same final uses. The only difference is in the CO₂ emission at the cradle, where biobased is negative (due to adsorption of CO₂) and fossil based is zero. With this method there is the same total carbon footprint at end of life as with method 1, but the difference also shows up at any stage during processing and use.






Fig 3. Cradle-to-gate carbon footprint - fossil feedstock




Fig 4. Cradle-to-gate carbon footprint - bio-based feedstock

Our recommendation

BioChem Europe and its members are convinced that the use of the proposed alternative methodology to account for the carbon impact of bio-based products within the Product Environmental Footprint will be more intuitive and transparent, is ISO compliant, and will show the actual difference in CO₂ footprint between biobased and fossil products at any stage of the life cycle, irrespective of the selected system boundaries linked to the functional unit of an LCA. The latter will enable customers and consumers to make an informed purchasing decision, based on the demonstrated climate benefits of bio-based solutions.

We recommend adapting the current Product Environmental Footprint accordingly, especially in the context of the forthcoming Sustainable Products and the Green Claims and Consumer Empowerment initiatives.

