



HAL
open science

A multimedia hydrological fate modelling framework to assess water consumption impacts in Life Cycle Assessment

M. Nunez, R Rosenbaum, S. Karimpour, A.M. Boulay, M.J. Lathuillère, M.
Margni, L. Scherer, F Verones, S. Pfister

► To cite this version:

M. Nunez, R Rosenbaum, S. Karimpour, A.M. Boulay, M.J. Lathuillère, et al.. A multimedia hydrological fate modelling framework to assess water consumption impacts in Life Cycle Assessment. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 2018, 52 (8), pp.4658-4667. 10.1021/acs.est.7b05207 . hal-01900513

HAL Id: hal-01900513

<https://hal.science/hal-01900513>

Submitted on 22 Oct 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 A multimedia hydrological fate modelling
2 framework to assess water consumption impacts in
3 Life Cycle Assessment

4 *Montserrat Núñez^{(*)#}, Ralph K. Rosenbaum[#], Shooka Karimpour⁺, Anne-Marie Boulay^{‡,P},*
5 *Michael J. Lathuillière[§], Manuele Margni[‡], Laura Scherer[∞], Francesca Veronesi^φ, Stephan*
6 *Pfister[‡]*

7 [#]ITAP, Irstea, Montpellier SupAgro, Univ Montpellier, ELSA Research group and ELSA-PACT
8 Industrial Chair, Montpellier, France

9 ⁺CIRAIG, Ecole des Sciences de la Gestion, Université du Québec A Montreal, Montreal, QC,
10 Canada

11 [‡]CIRAIG, Polytechnique Montréal, Montreal, QC, Canada

12 ^PLIRIDE- Sherbrooke University, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada

13 [§]Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability, University of British Columbia, 2202
14 Main Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4, Canada


15 [∞]Institute of Environmental Sciences (CML), Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

16 ^φIndustrial Ecology Programme, Department for Energy and Process Engineering, NTNU, 7491
17 Trondheim, Norway

18 [‡]ETH Zurich, Institute of Environmental Engineering, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland

19 **Abstract.** Many new methods have recently been developed to address environmental
20 consequences of water consumption in life cycle assessment (LCA). However, such methods can
21 only partially be compared and combined, since their modelling structure and metrics are
22 inconsistent. Moreover, they focus on specific water sources (e.g. river) and miss description of
23 transport flows between water compartments (e.g. from river to atmosphere via evaporation) and
24 regions (e.g. atmospheric advection). Consequently, they provide a partial regard of the local and
25 global hydrological cycle and derived impacts on the environment. This paper proposes
26 consensus-based guidelines for a harmonised development of the next generation of water
27 consumption LCA indicators, with a focus on consequences of water consumption on ecosystem
28 quality. To include the consideration of the multimedia water fate between compartments of the
29 water cycle, we provide spatial regionalisation and temporal specification guidance. The
30 principles and recommendations of the paper are applied to an illustrative case study. The
31 guidelines set the basis of a more accurate, novel way of modelling water consumption impacts
32 in LCA. Environmental relevance of this LCA impact category will improve. Yet, much research
33 is needed to make the guidelines operational.

34 TOC



35

36 **1. Introduction**

37 The impact category describing impacts of (fresh-)water use and consumption in life cycle
 38 assessment (LCA) has been subject to large advancements in the last decade. The current water
 39 footprint principles, requirements and guidelines described in ISO 14046¹ build on the
 40 framework described by Bayart et al.,² and define freshwater consumption as any use of
 41 freshwater that changes water availability in a watershed through evapo(transpi)ration, product
 42 integration, direct release to the sea, and inter-basin transfers.

43 Available freshwater consumption-related indicators are based on either a volumetric approach
 44 of the water consumed³ (what we call first generation of indicators) or on scarcity indices^{4,5}
 45 (what we call second generation of indicators, see further details on both generations of
 46 indicators in section S1 of the Supporting Information, SI). The first generation of indicators

47 only performs an inventory and thus not a footprint assessment according to ISO 14046¹, while
48 the second generation of indicators shows limitations in describing the consequences of a lack of
49 water on areas of protection (AoP), such as ecosystem quality. They assume that there are
50 smaller or no impacts in areas of low water scarcity and greater impacts in areas of high water
51 scarcity. However, it is possible that water rich areas may contain ecosystems that are
52 accustomed to abundant water availability and may thus be more vulnerable than those in areas
53 that are water stressed. To date, no LCA method comprehensively distinguishes water masses
54 (e.g. surface water and ground water) and their transport flows (e.g. from river to atmosphere)
55 within the boundaries of a watershed and beyond (e.g. air advection), thus overlooking details in
56 hydrological processes that affect the environmental relevance of the assessment. In addition, a
57 recent analysis⁶ concluded that a structured life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) framework for
58 assessing impacts of water consumption on ecosystems is currently lacking, as can be observed
59 by the scattered and often incompatible developments of water impact assessment models
60 published in recent years.⁷⁻¹⁰ These models are all valuable contributions in themselves, but
61 impossible to combine to an integrated, global characterisation model that makes such
62 developments consistently operational in LCA.

63 Building on the recommendations by Núñez et al.⁶ this paper aims to set a novel framework
64 and methodological guidelines to support the consistent development of impact indicators for
65 water consumption in LCA (third generation of indicators), with a focus on ecosystem quality,
66 including comprehensive illustration of impact pathways that should be covered. The framework
67 is applied to a hypothetical but realistic illustrative case study that represents water consumption
68 in a generic coastal zone with a non-exhaustive number of phenomena represented.

69 The study contributes to the current WULCA (Water Use in LCA, a global expert task force of
70 the UN Environment Life Cycle Initiative) activity, whose overall objective is to develop
71 consensus-based indicators for water use impact assessment as part of the global guidance LCIA
72 project.¹¹ Consensus-based indicators for human health and for a generic scarcity-based indicator
73 have already been developed and recommended.¹² This paper focuses on the third set of target
74 indicators, namely ecosystem quality (or biodiversity), and does not consider aspects of water
75 quality and consequences on ecosystems due to water quality degradation (see section S2 in SI).

76 **2. Materials and methods**

77 **2.1. Methodological guidelines for water consumption impact assessment**

78 Prior to introducing the guidelines, all the relevant environmental interventions and pathways,
79 which may be associated with water consumption, are described (see section S2 in SI for further
80 details). This step is necessary to identify to which causality chains the methodological
81 guidelines of the article apply. We identified three types of environmental interventions that may
82 lead to changes in water availability in one or more water compartments: consumptive use of
83 water; land use and land use change; and water stream use and management. In addition, direct
84 and indirect emissions to water, including degradative water use, are considered outside the
85 scope of these guidelines since emissions do not lead to changes in purely physical water
86 availability or water consumption. In the analysis, we introduced the consideration of
87 hydrological stocks, which is going to redefine the environmental interventions and impact
88 pathways that up to now have been associated with water consumption. Bayart et al.² describe
89 the watershed as being the most relevant hydrological unit to consider for water consumption in
90 LCA, as a first step on integrating regionalisation in LCIA. However, each watershed hosts a
91 series of hydrological stocks (e.g. soil, aquifers) and flows (e.g. evaporation, percolation) that

92 vary in space and time due to meteorological, environmental and biophysical conditions. We
93 introduce the “water compartment” term defined as any water body where water is temporarily
94 stored and between which water flows may take place, thereby affecting its water availability.

95 **2.2. A mechanistic characterisation factor structure**

96 Assessing the environmental impacts of water consumption on ecosystem quality implies the
97 modelling of cause-effect pathways linking water consumption (i.e. life cycle inventory (LCI)
98 data) to potential habitat modifications and biodiversity damages through characterisation
99 models, as shown in Figure S1 to Figure S3. According to ISO 14040,¹³ characterisation models
100 “*should be based upon an identifiable environmental cause-effect mechanism and/or*
101 *reproducible empirical observation*”. Mechanistic characterisation factors (CFs) capture this
102 recommendation well, since they translate the environmental intervention to its impact in the
103 selected category indicator stepwise, based on a sequence of interconnected sub-factors, further
104 described in Equation 1. Mechanistic models for use in LCA were first formally proposed by
105 Udo de Haes et al.¹⁴ and are today widely used to characterise the impact of emissions^{15,16} in
106 LCA. Mechanistic models for emissions link the pollutant emission (LCI) to the mass in
107 different environmental compartments (fate factor, FF), to the intake by ecosystems or humans
108 due to direct and indirect exposure through e.g. ingestion (exposure factor, XF), and to the
109 potential effects on target organisms at the midpoint (effect factor, EF) or endpoint level
110 (damage factor or severity factor, DF).^{17,18} The CF is the product of these sub-factors. Some
111 emission models (e.g. terrestrial acidification) use a sensitivity factor (SF) to distinguish between
112 the buffering capacity of different regional receiving environments instead of the XF.¹⁹ This
113 terminology accommodates well to the nature of ecosystems impacts due to change in water

114 availability. Therefore, the term SF is used in the article from here on. Equation 1 shows the
115 generic formulation of a mechanistic CF.

$$\text{CF} = \text{FF} \times \text{SF} \times \text{EF} \times \text{DF} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

116 In LCA, the use of matrix algebra to assess environmental loads in different media (freshwater,
117 air, etc.) is common practice in the emission-related impact categories (e.g. by the toxicity
118 models like USES-LCA,²⁰ IMPACT 2002+²¹ and USEtox²²). In contrast, impacts of water
119 consumption are today typically calculated analytically, by multiplying in sequence the water
120 consumption of every unit process with a CF that neither distinguishes different water
121 compartments nor flows between them. Matrices are more intuitive, more flexible and more
122 transparent to model water fate and transport between compartments and its related impacts. The
123 benefits of adopting matrices to calculate mechanistic CFs for water consumption are further
124 discussed in section S3 in the SI. Due to matrix algebra convention, the calculation of (CF) (i.e.
125 CF matrix) is done by reversing the order of the sub-factors of the CF in Equation 1, as shown in
126 Equation 2.

$$(\text{CF}) = (\text{DF}) \times (\text{EF}) \times (\text{SF}) \times (\text{FF}) \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

127 Although Equation 1 has already been applied in a few water consumption LCIA
128 models,^{8,10,23} there is no general recommendation for adopting such a modelling principle for
129 water consumption impact assessment. We suggest here extending the recommendation of using
130 mechanistic CFs, which so far has only been applied to emissions,¹⁴ to model the impacts of
131 resource consumption as well. Specifically, we propose adopting the mechanistic CF structure
132 for assessing the impacts of freshwater consumption on ecosystems, based on the reasoning
133 explained in section S4 in the SI.

134 We propose the below definitions of fate, sensitivity, effect and damage factors in a
135 mechanistic CF representing freshwater consumption impacts on ecosystem quality.

136 **Fate factor (FF)**. The FF models the propagation of water consumption between water
137 compartments of the hydrological cycle, which results in a duration and magnitude of the effect
138 in every affected compartment. It represents the mass balance in the system, which depends on
139 momentum and energy, which accelerate mass transfer, as well as on environmental resistance,
140 which are processes decelerating mass transfer between compartments. The sum of the factors
141 representing these forces and processes (represented in rate constants (k values) in the article),
142 regulates the exchange and movement of water between compartments and spatial units. Further
143 details on k values and the k matrix are given in section S5 in SI. These calculations show how
144 much and how long the withdrawal (and the release) of water from one storage compartment
145 (e.g. groundwater withdrawal) affects water availability in other compartments (e.g. the
146 withdrawal of groundwater reduces base flow towards rivers downstream and final discharge
147 into the sea). The propagation effect can be measured at specific time steps (e.g. daily, monthly,
148 and annually) or a time-independent, steady-state solution ($t \rightarrow \infty$) may be calculated (see below
149 and S8 in SI). The result after applying the FF is interpreted as the change of mass or volume of
150 water in each compartment (e.g. kg or m^3) as a function of the water withdrawal or release rate in
151 this compartment or other connected compartments (e.g. kg/day or m^3 /day). Alternatively, it can
152 also be interpreted as residence time of water in a compartment for a water release and as
153 duration of the absence of water in a compartment for a water withdrawal. The dimension of the
154 FF is time (since the volumes stated above cancel out), with units of, for instance, days. FFs
155 populate their respective cells of the fate matrix, where a column denotes the water withdrawal
156 or release compartment i and a row denotes the affected compartment j to which a withdrawal or
157 release of water is propagated. The size of the FF matrix is determined by the number of
158 environmental compartments n_i considered and is always square ($n_i \times n_i$), since every affected

159 compartment can also be a withdrawal/release compartment (see (FF) in the illustrative
160 example).

161 **Sensitivity factor (SF).** SF models any ecosystem response as a result of a change in water
162 quantity in a compartment in order to prevent the dependent ecosystem to be affected by the
163 change in water availability. In other words, it reflects whether the change of available water in
164 an affected compartment will be compensated for or will create a water deficit, similarly as
165 defined in the adaptation capacity of the exposure factor by Boulay et al.²⁴ to model the human
166 population affected by the change in water quantity. The result after applying the SF (i.e. $FF \times SF$)
167 can be interpreted as the time fraction of water availability change in a compartment affecting
168 ecosystems. SFs can be defined at any ecosystem quality indicator level (e.g. species, guilds) and
169 for any attribute of the ecosystem level selected (e.g. composition, function).²⁵ For instance, a SF
170 based on functional properties of habitats can measure the physical stability of a habitat (e.g.
171 river's resilience) against hydrological changes.²⁶ A SF based on species responses to habitat
172 structure can assess the capacity of a species to access alternative freshwater resources.²³ In this
173 latter case, the longer the distance to alternative freshwater resources, the lower the capacity of
174 the species to compensate for the reduced water availability. The sensitivity of an ecosystem can
175 also be considered as resilience and included in the effect factor, instead of in the sensitivity
176 factor. To calculate SFs, the distinction between terrestrial, aerial and purely aquatic biodiversity
177 can be important, since the capacity of each biodiversity type to withstand to changes in water
178 availability varies. On the one hand, sessile organisms (e.g. terrestrial plants) and generally also
179 aquatic species (e.g. fish) may often not be able to offset reduced water availability (except if
180 water is added in the affected compartment, whose physical effects on the water balance are
181 already accounted for in the FF). On the other hand, aerial and mobile terrestrial organisms may

182 travel a certain distance in search of an alternative source of water to satisfy their vital needs.
183 However, this can lead to additional competition between the native and the new species for the
184 alternative resource, ultimately increasing water scarcity and leading to new impacts through a
185 rebound phenomenon. To facilitate applicability, SFs calculated at detailed ecosystem levels
186 (e.g. species) can be aggregated across taxonomic groups or ecosystem types (e.g. biodiversity of
187 river ecosystems, biodiversity of lake ecosystems). A possible dimension for the SF is the
188 distance that a species or community is able to travel to reach another waterbody in the region,
189 which can be expressed with units of e.g. km or it can be dimensionless as the percentage in
190 relation to a full compensation. Dispersal distances of taxa and species can be used for this
191 purpose and are available in the literature.^{27,28} The sensitivity factor matrix (SF) contains SF with
192 a column denoting an affected compartment and a row denoting an ecosystem or one of its
193 components. The size of (SF) is determined by the number of environmental compartments n_i
194 considered and the number of ecosystems or ecosystem components considered and is thus (n_{ecs}
195 $\times n_i$) (see (SF) of the illustrative example).

196 **Effect factor (EF).** The EF accounts for any kind of ecological changes in habitats and
197 biodiversity that cannot offset changes in water availability in the compartment. For instance, an
198 EF can measure a change in ecosystem productivity (e.g. in terms of net primary productivity)
199 due to changes in water availability in the soil profile,⁴ a change in a river habitat as a result of
200 the habitat sensitivity to a change in river discharge,²⁶ and the species affected due to a change in
201 habitat. The EF can also cover effects a species suffers when it cannot fully compensate for
202 insufficient water availability and it needs to access other water resources. EFs should
203 differentiate between aquatic, aerial and terrestrial ecosystems and between taxonomic groups,
204 since water volume-to-effect response curves are very specific to each life form.⁹ In nature, an

205 environmental shift from baseline conditions can result in a community turnover determined by
206 species-specific adaptation strategies (e.g. generalist, opportunistic, specialist taxa). Spatially-
207 explicit curves and vulnerability statuses of the affected species can provide relevant information
208 to capture regional biodiversity specificities and biodiversity damages.²³ For example, different
209 species in terms of taxon, endemism, life traits and Red List status, dwelling in different habitats,
210 will likely be affected differently by a change in water availability. The EF may be expressed in
211 loss of habitat (e.g. in m^2 or m^3) or, when closer to the endpoint or damage, it can provide
212 information on the effective influence of physical habitat change on target species, which results
213 in an indicator expressed in terms of species affected (e.g. potentially affected fraction, PAF) per
214 reduced water availability in each time. The effect factor matrix (EF) contains EF in its diagonal
215 elements with each column and row denoting an ecosystem or ecosystem component and all off-
216 diagonal elements being zero. The size of (EF) is determined by the number of ecosystem
217 components n_{ecs} considered in all spatial units and thus it is always square ($n_{ecs} \times n_{ecs}$) (see (EF)
218 of the illustrative example).

219 **Damage factor (DF).** The DF distinguishes the severity of effects. It converts the midpoint
220 metric into an endpoint metric expressing an ecosystem quality loss, usually in terms of species
221 disappearance (e.g. potentially disappeared fraction, PDF) per reduced water availability in each
222 time, following the recommendation of the UN Environment Life Cycle Initiative.²⁹ As for the
223 EF, it is important to distinguish between impacts taking place on a regional level (e.g. watershed
224 level, representing a local loss of ecosystem functionality) or impacts happening at a global scale
225 (global extinction of a species). This means specially that the vulnerability of species or
226 ecosystems towards human interventions need to be taken into account. Although there are
227 examples in the literature for aquatic ecosystems,^{9,23} there is so far no consensus on the approach

228 and no harmonisation across impact categories. This representation of vulnerability is currently
229 investigated as part of phase 3 of the Global Guidance on LCIA Indicators project by the Life
230 Cycle Initiative for ensuring a compatible approach among ecosystems (terrestrial, aquatic, and
231 marine) and impact categories. Similar to the EF matrix (EF), the damage factor matrix (DF)
232 contains DF in its diagonal elements with each column and row denoting an ecosystem or
233 ecosystem component and all off-diagonal elements being zero. The size of (DF) is determined
234 by the number of ecosystem components n_{ecs} considered in all spatial units and thus it is always
235 square ($n_{ecs} \times n_{ecs}$).

236 A list and detailed analysis of the FF, SF, EF, and DF that have been used in the literature to
237 model water use impacts on ecosystem quality up to the year 2014 is provided by Núñez et al.⁶

238 **2.3. Fate factor**

239 **Spatial modelling aspects: multimedia water consumption setup.** As shown in Figure 1, the
240 FF multimedia model has two types of spatial components in a given spatial unit:

- 241 • Water compartments: individual building blocks of the hydrological cycle where water is
242 temporally stored, for example the atmosphere
- 243 • Water flows: fluxes (displayed as arrows) into and out of every water compartment that
244 together constitute the hydrological cycle, such as evaporation and precipitation

245 The water compartments and spatial units need to have variable sizes to account for local and
246 global aspects to model the flows. Therefore, the model setup needs to apply techniques that
247 simulate the flows across water compartments with optimal computational costs. Adaptive mesh
248 refinement is a technique in high-performance scientific computing, which is applied in different
249 contexts, such as hydrodynamic modelling and climate modelling,³⁰ with the purpose to adapt
250 the mesh size to the resolution and detail required to represent the important features of the

251 simulation in different scales and domains. We propose the same hierarchical structure used by
252 many adaptive mesh refinement methods³¹ to be used in the formulation of FFs, which can be
253 stored both in raster and vector formats (see further information in section S6 in the SI).


254 The model setup extends over different nested spatial units (local, regional, and rest of the
255 world, see below). There are different structural solutions in terms of number of spatial units and
256 its resolution (see section S6 in SI). The three nested spatial scales of the model are the
257 following:

- 258 • Local scale: any open water system nested in a region and in the world that can be
259 considered a basic unit of the landscape and of the water cycle in the context of LCA. It is
260 commonly a sub-watershed or a watershed, but depending on the modelling option
261 applied, it may also be any other smaller (e.g. a farm or a grid cell with multiple layers)
262 or bigger (e.g. a country) system. The local scale is the most refined spatial scale of the
263 FF model. Within its boundaries, all existing (or at least relevant) water compartments
264 and flows are differentiated (Figure 1) to the best possible extent.
- 265 • Regional scale: open water system nested in the globe, consisting of the connection of the
266 local entity with its surrounding. The regional scale allows for the accounting of the
267 effects that water consumption in the local scale has beyond its boundaries. For instance,
268 it allows assessment of the cascade effect downstream the point of consumption in a
269 watershed when associating sub-watersheds, and the assessment of the effects on a
270 country's water availability when connecting evaporative recycling flows between
271 watersheds. Some spatial configurations (e.g. Figure S7) do not need a regional scale. In
272 terms of water compartments, the regional scale may be represented with different levels

273 of detail from fully detailed to a simplified version depending on data availability,
274 software capabilities, and the specific objectives of the LCIA model.

- 275 • Rest of the world (ROW) scale: closed water system within which the local and regional
276 entities are nested. The sum of the water in the local, regional and ROW scales amount to
277 the water in the globe. Since the objective of ROW is the conservation of a constant water
278 mass balance on Earth, rather than the detail of its water stocks and flows, it can be
279 represented by a single generic water compartment.

280 The proposed FF multimedia model follows the principle of parsimony (i.e. as simple as
281 possible, as complex as necessary) successfully applied e.g. in USEtox.²² Furthermore, it is based
282 on the general architecture (compartments and flows) of global hydrological models and
283 literature on land-surface-subsurface and climate interactions (see references in Table S1). The
284 conceptual model is depicted in Figure 1, with what we consider to be the simplest, yet relevant,
285 water cycle to model impacts of water consumption in a LCA context. This model is only a
286 guideline for future method developers, who may add or remove components (i.e. compartments
287 and flows) and adapt the configuration of the spatial scales depending on their model
288 requirements (see further details in section S6 in SI). Definitions of the water compartments and
289 water flows entering and leaving each compartment in Figure 1 are presented in Table S1.



301 **Figure 1.** Multimedia hydrological fate model: a) the three nested spatial scales. Note that the
 302 use of squares is only a way of representing the spatial information, which can be encoded in the
 303 model both in raster and vector formats; b) the water compartments and flows in a local unit.
 304 White arrows represent natural flows, yellow arrows represent human interventions and red
 305 arrows are for exchanges between local and adjacent entities. Numbers in brackets identify the
 306 flows in and out displayed in Table S1.

307 Since the aim of most LCA studies is the comparative assessment of marginal changes in the
308 environment, the reference state of our FF model represents a contemporary water balance under
309 anthropogenic influence. This representation explains why artificial water bodies such as
310 reservoirs are included in the surface water compartment, and modelled as part of the
311 environment. Further FF models representing alternative hydrological cycles for different LCA
312 purposes can also be developed. For instance, a pristine water balance under pristine land use
313 (without e.g. agriculture) or a contemporary water balance without human withdrawals may be
314 modelled. These two options may be used as possible reference states (baseline scenarios) to
315 assess current water consumption-related impacts against historical changes in the water cycle
316 for non-marginal uses of LCA. For example, to assess non-marginal deforestation impacts on the
317 water cycle in the Amazon, one could compare current versus past, less human-modified land-
318 use scenarios. Such baselines are also needed for deriving average CFs or normalisation factors
319 in LCIA.^{32,33}

320 **Temporal modelling aspects: steady-state and dynamic system solutions.** For a FF, the
321 magnitude of the effect that a volume of water withdrawal (or release) has on a water
322 compartment depends on the time frame of the assessment, as shown in Equation 3:

$$FF_{r,s} = \frac{\int_{t=0}^{\theta} MPS_s dt}{\Delta \text{Environmental Intervention}_r} \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

323 where r denotes the compartment where the environmental intervention (i.e. water withdrawal
324 or release) occurs and s denotes the compartment where the midpoint stressor (MPS, i.e. change
325 in mass, or volume, of water after the environmental intervention) is modelled.⁶

326 Hence, FFs can be estimated following two different temporal approaches: 1) Steady-state (i.e.
327 time-independent solution predicting change in mass (or volume) of water per water

328 compartment with the system at steady-state, $\theta = \infty$); and 2) dynamic (synonymous with
329 transient, where t is set to specific time frames, $\theta = a$). An in-depth discussion of both options
330 and their implications can be found in section S8 of SI.

331 3. Results

332 **Illustrative example - system's description.** In order to demonstrate the principles described
333 in the article, we employed a hypothetical but realistic illustrative example that represents water
334 consumption in a generic coastal zone (Figure S9) with a non-exhaustive number of phenomena
335 represented. The zone consists of a local spatial unit with six compartments (atmospheric
336 moisture or air (a), soil (s), ground water (gw), fossil ground water (fw), surface water (sw), and
337 vegetation (v)), nested in two regional units (region 1 and region 2) with respectively five (air,
338 soil, ground water, fossil ground water, and surface water) and four (air, soil, surface water,
339 ground water) compartments, and the rest of the world unit aggregated into one single water
340 mass (ROW) exchanging with the local and regional units. In the example, region 1 and region 2
341 are located downstream and upstream the local unit. The type of spatial setup represented in the
342 example is a nested configuration of high spatial local detail, but other structural solutions could
343 also have been applied, as explained in section S6. Every spatial unit has five ecosystem
344 components: river (r-ecs), lake (l-ecs), aerial (a-ecs), sessile terrestrial (ster-ecs) and mobile
345 terrestrial (mter-ecs) ecosystems. The environmental intervention assessed is the withdrawal of 2
346 $\text{m}^3/\text{functional unit (FU)}$ of freshwater from ground water in the local unit. The release is of
347 $1\text{m}^3/\text{FU}$ to the air in the local unit and of $1\text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$ to surface water in region 1. Temporal
348 dynamics of the hydrological flows are not considered (i.e. steady-state solution), which
349 translates in only one set of FFs, instead of having different sets of FFs adapted to the granularity
350 of every time step.

351 The definition and interpretation of each sub-factor of the CF are provided above. The matrices
352 described below are collated in the excel file of the SI, and a hypothetical CF solution and LCA
353 score have been calculated for the purpose of showing the type of results obtained and their
354 interpretation.

355 **The k and the FF matrices.** Environmental compartments in the illustrative example are
356 exchanging water flows within a single spatial unit, but also beyond it (e.g. surface water of the
357 local unit receives water from surface water from region 2 via river flow). All these exchange
358 flows are quantified in the k values (see section S5). The off-diagonal elements of (k) represent
359 transport of water between compartments within a spatial unit or beyond, going from
360 compartment *i* (column) to compartment *j* (row). The diagonal elements reflect the difference
361 between water gain (i.e. water generation) and water loss (i.e. sum of the off-diagonal elements
362 in column *i*) in a specific compartment. Water generation refers to water that has been confined
363 in the distant past in a compartment which today is disconnected to the rest of the water cycle
364 (i.e. fossil water).

365 The fate matrix (FF) is a function of the inverse of the k matrix (k) for systems in steady-state
366 conditions, which is the case in the example. (FF) for the local unit and the complete (FF)
367 representing exchanges between compartments and units are collated in section S9. Matrix
368 algebra determines that even though direct exchanges between two compartments are 0 (i.e. k-
369 value = 0), FFs are positive, since they account for all direct and indirect (i.e. via third
370 compartments) water exchanges.

371 **The SF matrix.** The SF can be quantified either for each spatial unit specifically (e.g. if the
372 capacity of ecosystems to offset a change in water availability varies spatially, which is the case
373 in the illustrative example, see Equation S3) or it can be one value per ecosystem component and

374 affected compartment, which is the same for all spatial units. If the SF varies spatially, its matrix
375 (SF) is populated similarly to (FF) in Equation S2, with the respective matrices for each spatial
376 unit on the diagonal positions and in the same order as in (FF). The elements in the off-diagonal
377 matrices in (SF) are then all zero. The size of (SF) in the example is (20×18) .

378 **The EF and the DF matrices.** As in the SF, the ecosystem component may also be spatially
379 variable and respond differently to a change in water availability. In the illustrative example,
380 however, we assume that every ecosystem component reacts always similarly, hence (EF) has
381 the same value per ecosystem component for all spatial units. The damage matrix is similar to
382 (EF) but contains DF instead. In the illustrative example both matrices ((EF) and (DF)) are of $(20$
383 $\times 20)$ (see the matrices in S9 and in the SI excel file).


384 **The CF matrix.** The CF matrix contains the characterisation factors for each spatial unit (see
385 section S9). Due to the propagation of water movement between compartments and spatial units,
386 CFs vary spatially. Units of the CF in the illustrative example are in $\text{PDFm}^3\text{day}/\text{m}^3$ water
387 consumption.

388 **The LCI vector and the LCA score.** The LCI vector of water consumption (\overline{WC}) contains the
389 information on the water elementary flows per FU of the processes under study. Water
390 withdrawals are identified with a positive sign [$+\text{m}^3$] and water releases are identified with a
391 negative sign [$-\text{m}^3$]. The size of the LCI vector is determined by the total amount of water
392 compartments in all spatial units (18 in the example, see the excel file).

393 The LCI vector times the regionalised CF matrix results in the LCA matrix with units of
394 PDFm^3day , which estimates the environmental consequences on ecosystems due to the water
395 consumption of the LCI. Since the LCI vector contains negative and positive flows, LCA scores

396 are also negative (associated with potential environmental benefits) and positive (associated with
397 potential environmental impacts). Intermediate results can also be calculated by multiplying the
398 LCI vector to the FF matrix (meaning absence of water in each compartment due to the
399 consumption of the LCI), and by multiplying the LCI vector to the FF×SF matrix (meaning the
400 time effectively affecting each component of the ecosystem).

401 **Comparison with the former generations of indicators.** Figure 2 shows the application of
402 the guidelines to the illustrative example and how the assessment compares to the use of the
403 previous generations of indicators. The third generation (Figure 2 C) performs a characterisation
404 of the environmental consequences of each LCI inflow ($2 \text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$ from GW, local) and outflow (-
405 $1 \text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$ to air, local; $-1 \text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$ to surface water, region1) on the water compartments of the local
406 unit and beyond. The second generation of indicators (Figure 2 B) characterises only the impacts
407 (in terms of intensity of competition to access total available water resources) after water
408 consumption in the whole watershed (i.e. $1 \text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$, which is the difference between the inflows
409 and the outflows in the local unit of the LCI in the example). Whereas, the first generation
410 (Figure 2 A) would just inform of the consumption of $1 \text{ m}^3/\text{FU}$ within the local unit, with no
411 further characterisation of impacts. The figure highlights the significant differences in scope of
412 the environmental processes described by each generation of indicators.



413 **Figure 2.** Assessment of the illustrative example with the A) first generation of indicators; B)

414 second generation of indicators; and C) third generation of indicators.

415 4. Discussion

416 **Environmental relevance.** The above set of guidelines serves to support the development of a
417 third generation of impact indicators for water consumption in LCA. Its operationalisation will
418 bring multiple benefits. First, it will allow for harmonisation and, to the possible extent,
419 combination of existing water consumption impact assessment methods under a unique
420 framework, including soil moisture consumption and effects of land use and land use change on
421 the hydrological cycle. Second, it will ensure consistency of future methodological
422 developments. Third, it will improve the relevance of the impact characterisation with respect to
423 the local/regional and global hydrological cycles. All in all, the operationalisation of the
424 guidelines will bring the characterisation of water consumption impacts to the same level of
425 environmental relevance as the characterisation of emissions in LCA, thus increasing overall
426 consistency and coherence between LCA impact categories. The latter effect is particularly
427 important when indicator results are aggregated or compared to each other across impact
428 categories, which is common and frequent practice.

429 The regionalised FF multimedia model allows for differentiation of impacts from consuming
430 water from different sources in different environments. Moreover, since it captures the
431 interrelation between water compartments, the distinction between impacts due to soil moisture
432 consumption (also called green water in the literature³) and consumption from surface and
433 ground water bodies (called blue water³) is no longer needed. This solves the debate about the
434 consideration of green water in LCA.^{34,35} Fossil water is also regarded in the FF model and,
435 although its consumption does not lead to ecosystem quality damage, stress inflicted on available
436 resources can already be measured in terms of renewal time. From this point in the causality
437 chain, an indicator that links to the resources AoP could be developed. Overall, since fate factors

438 only model the physical movement of water on Earth, they can also be used in the human health
439 causality chain, which would then bring harmonisation of whole water consumption impact
440 indicators. The type of midpoint indicator that we would obtain by applying the guidelines of this
441 article is on the impact pathway for ecosystem quality, which the UN Environment Life Cycle
442 Initiative encourages above the use of proxy midpoint indicators (e.g. water scarcity indicators)
443 which are not defined along the cause-effect chain.²⁹ Furthermore, the guidelines could also be
444 useful in other impact categories, both emission-based (e.g. toxicity models would benefit from
445 modelling regionalised interactions of water flows) and resource-based (e.g. applying similar
446 principles to the fate of soil loss due to erosion).

447 LCA scores obtained are both positive (associated with potential environmental impacts due to
448 water withdrawal) and negative (associated with potential benefits due to water release) (see the
449 illustrative example in SI). Negative scores are debatable, since they assume that when an
450 ecosystem benefits from additional water, it responds by comparable proportion as it responds
451 when facing a water drop. While this may be true for the FF since it is no more than a water
452 balance, it is less certain for the sub-factors that reflect ecosystems' behaviour to water
453 availability change. For the sake of transparency of LCA results and following ISO 14040,¹ we
454 recommend reporting and interpretation of positive and negative scores separately instead of
455 aggregating them assuming compensation.

456 **LCI data requirements.** To carry out an LCA study following the guidelines, the LCI shall
457 record the following information: (a) freshwater balance of inflows (water withdrawal from the
458 ecosphere) and outflows (water release to the ecosphere) expressed in mass or volume of water
459 per functional unit (i.e. m³/FU or kg/FU), and not as a continuous flow (i.e. m³/y or kg/y), since
460 the inventory flows must be scaled to the FU, (b) the geographical location of each exchange (c)

461 the water compartment of each exchange, (d) temporal specification of each exchange if the FF
462 (or any other CF sub-factor) reflects time dependency. For unit processes where the source
463 compartment is unknown, the water supply mix³⁶ with regionalized statistics about the use of
464 water sources per sector of activity can be used. Return flows to the technosphere may be
465 considered sector-dependent, with for instance agricultural uses contributing to replenishing soil
466 and groundwater, whereas domestic and industry users may most likely release to surface
467 water.³⁷

468 **Uncertainty.** The main objective of having a detailed spatial model is to (a) reduce uncertainty
469 of the model and due to spatial variability and to (b) better reflect mechanistic relations in the
470 cause-effect chain/impact pathway. Recent research resulted in more detailed datasets useful to
471 improve the characterisation modelling at high spatial detail. Remote sensing products are
472 increasingly allowing models to work with distributed data as inputs and not just interpolated
473 parameters. Thus, parameter uncertainty can be considered and eventually reduced, which was
474 highly limiting detailed modelling in the past. This means that the optima between parameter and
475 model uncertainty³⁸ can be shifted towards more complex models. However, in order to find
476 such optima for specific applications, uncertainty information of underlying models (e.g.
477 hydrological models) needs to be assessed and propagated through the whole impact assessment
478 model. The following uncertainty aspects should be differentiated and quantified:¹² (1)
479 variability induced uncertainty; (2) Parameter uncertainty; (3) Model uncertainty; (4) Value
480 choices; and (5) Scenario uncertainty.

481 Furthermore, all uncertainty results should be documented (including a description of the
482 uncertainty method) and made publicly available for further research. Provision and analysis of
483 uncertainty information is a key element of developing the models and allows prioritizing future

484 research needs. Finally, these results facilitate proper uncertainty assessment in LCA, including
485 impact assessment.

486 **Towards practical implementation.** The guidelines set the basis of a more accurate, novel
487 way of modelling water consumption impacts in LCA. Operationalisation will therefore need
488 much research, both in LCA and also for the development of hydrological models and datasets
489 that LCA relies on. To start with, efforts may be directed towards:

- 490 • Performing simple, but real case studies similar to the illustrative example to serve as
491 proofs of concept, like Verones et al.,⁷ who modelled effects on wetland biodiversity in a
492 coastal area in Peru prior to developing global CFs.^{23,39} The case studies should ideally be
493 located in contrasted local climatic conditions. A sensitivity analysis to figure out the
494 appropriate temporal detail of the FFs should be conducted. The simulation may be
495 performed in a system comprised of a few water compartments, where the comparison
496 should focus on detecting the details of the system's dynamic that steady-state solutions
497 or large time steps would miss. Usually, steady-state solutions and large time steps bring
498 along larger computational error.
- 499 • Adapting water flow exchanges between compartments and regions modelled in existing
500 methods³⁹⁻⁴¹ to the harmonised framework.
- 501 • Developing new, coarse FFs at the global scale following both the spatial and temporal
502 recommendations of the paper and considering lessons learned from the two points
503 above, with the aim of identifying major modelling challenges and data gaps to overcome
504 for further refinement. This base of FFs may also serve as starting point for further
505 development, enhancing their quality and robustness. To help with operationalisation,
506 Table S1 in the SI collects guidance on specific attributes to consider and bibliographic

507 references per water compartment of the FF model. Some of the tools and strategies that
508 are listed in Table S1 include hydrological models,^{42,43} flow equations,⁴⁴ numerical and
509 modelling techniques,⁴⁵ geographic information systems data,^{46,47} and sensitivity analysis
510 platforms.⁴⁸ Depending on the complexity and numbers of compartments and spatial
511 units, few or all of these tools might be used.

512 • Analysing temporal dynamics of the sensitivity of ecosystems to water consumption and
513 availability, since environmental water requirements vary a lot throughout the year. For
514 that, and as done similarly with the FF, a sensitivity analysis comparing monthly or
515 seasonal SFs to annual average SFs can be performed.

516 **Associated content**

517 **Supporting information.** The following files are available free of charge: i) further details on
518 the scope of the guidelines, spatial and temporal FF modelling aspects, and a representation of
519 matrices of the illustrative example (pdf file); ii) detailed matrices of the illustrative example
520 (excel file).

521 **Author information**

522 (*) Corresponding author e-mail: montserrat.nunez@tu-berlin.de.

523 Present address: Sustainable Engineering, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany;
524 phone: +49 (0)30/ 314 - 26713.

525 **Author contributions**

526 The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given
527 approval to the final version of the manuscript.

528 **Acknowledgements**

529 The authors are grateful for the contributions of other members of the Ecosystem Quality sub-
530 group of WULCA (Jane Bare, Cécile Bulle, Mattia Damiani, Paula Quinteiro and Philippe Roux)
531 and for the individual contributions of Christian Bouchard, Peter Fantke and Inga Klemmayer.
532 M. Núñez and R.K. Rosenbaum acknowledge ANR, the Occitanie Region, ONEMA and the
533 industrial partners (BRL, SCP, SUEZ, VINADEIS, Compagnie Fruitière) for the financial
534 support of the Industrial Chair for Environmental and Social Sustainability Assessment “ELSA-
535 PACT” (grant no. 13-CHIN-0005-01). The Sponsors of WULCA for the 2016-2018 period are
536 also acknowledged for their financial contribution: Hydro-Quebec, Cotton inc, Veolia
537 environment, L’Oréal, Danone, Engie.

538 **References**

- 539 (1) ISO. *ISO 14046 Environmental Management Water Footprint - Principles, Requirements*
540 *and Guidelines*; 2014; p 48.
- 541 (2) Bayart, J.-B.; Bulle, C.; Deschênes, L.; Margni, M.; Pfister, S.; Vince, F.; Koehler, A. A
542 Framework for Assessing off-Stream Freshwater Use in LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*
543 **2010**, *15* (5), 439–453.
- 544 (3) Hoekstra, A. Y.; Chapagain, A. K.; Aldaya, M. M.; Mekonnen, M. M. *The Water*
545 *Footprint Assessment Manual. Setting the Global Standard*; earthscan: London, 2011.
- 546 (4) Pfister, S.; Koehler, A.; Hellweg, S. Assessing the Environmental Impacts of Freshwater
547 Consumption in LCA. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43* (11), 4098–4104.
- 548 (5) Boulay, A.-M.; Bare, J.; Benini, L.; Berger, M.; Lathuillière, M. J.; Manzardo, A.; Margni,
549 M.; Motoshita, M.; Núñez, M.; Pastor, A. V.; Ridoutt, B.; Oki, T.; Worbe, S.; Pfister, S.
550 The WULCA Consensus Characterization Model for Water Scarcity Footprints: Assessing
551 Impacts of Water Consumption Based on Available Water Remaining (AWARE). *Int. J.*

- 552 *Life Cycle Assess.* **2018**, *23* (2), 368–378.
- 553 (6) Núñez, M.; Bouchard, C.; Bulle, C.; Boulay, A.-M.; Margni, M. Critical Analysis of Life
554 Cycle Impact Assessment Methods Addressing Consequences of Freshwater Use on
555 Ecosystems and Recommendations for Future Method Development. *Int. J. Life Cycle*
556 *Assess.* **2016**, *21* (12), 1799–1815.
- 557 (7) Verones, F.; Bartl, K.; Pfister, S.; Jiménez Vilchez, R.; Hellweg, S. Modeling the Local
558 Biodiversity Impacts of Agricultural Water Use: Case Study of a Wetland in the Coastal
559 Arid Area of Peru. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *46* (9), 4966–4974.
- 560 (8) van Zelm, R.; Schipper, A. M.; Rombouts, M.; Snepvangers, J.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.
561 Implementing Groundwater Extraction in Life Cycle Impact Assessment: Characterization
562 Factors Based on Plant Species Richness for The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
563 **2011**, *45* (2), 629–635.
- 564 (9) Tendall, D. M.; Hellweg, S.; Pfister, S.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Gaillard, G. Impacts of River
565 Water Consumption on Aquatic Biodiversity in Life Cycle Assessment - A Proposed
566 Method, and a Case Study for Europe. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *48* (6), 3236–3244.
- 567 (10) Lathuillière, M. J.; Bulle, C.; Johnson, M. S. Land Use in LCA: Including Regionally
568 Altered Precipitation to Quantify Ecosystem Damage. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *50*
569 (21), 11769–11778.
- 570 (11) Jolliet, O.; Frischknecht, R.; Bare, J.; Boulay, A.-M.; Bulle, C.; Fantke, P.; Gheewala, S.;
571 Hauschild, M.; Itsubo, N.; Margni, M.; McKone, T. E.; Milà y Canals, L.; Postuma, L.;
572 Prado-Lopez, V.; Ridoutt, B.; Sonnemann, G.; Rosenbaum, R. K.; Seager, T.; Struijs, J.;
573 van Zelm, R.; Vigon, B.; Weisbrod, A.; with contributions of the other workshop
574 participants. Global Guidance on Environmental Life Cycle Impact Assessment

- 575 Indicators: Findings of the Scoping Phase. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2014**, *19* (4), 962–
576 967.
- 577 (12) Frischknecht, R.; Jolliet, O.; Eds. *Global Guidance for Life Cycle Impact Assessment*
578 *Indicators : Volume I*; 2016.
- 579 (13) ISO. *ISO 14040. Environmental Management — Life Cycle Assessment — Principles and*
580 *Framework*; 2006; Vol. 2006.
- 581 (14) Udo de Haes, H.; Finnveden, G.; Goedkoop, M.; Hauschild, M.; Hertwich, E.; Hofstetter,
582 P.; Jolliet, O.; Klöpffer, W.; Krewitt, W.; Lindeijer, E.; Müller-Wenk, R.; Olsen, S.;
583 Pennington, D.; Potting, J.; Steen, B. *Life-Cycle Impact Assessment: Striving Towards*
584 *Best Practice*; Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC), 2002.
- 585 (15) Margni, M.; Gloria, T.; Bare, J.; Seppälä, J.; Steen, B.; Struijs, J.; Toffoletto, L.; Jolliet, O.
586 *Guidance on How to Move from Current Practice to Recommended Practice in Life Cycle*
587 *Impact Assessment*; 2008.
- 588 (16) Hauschild, M.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Eds. *LCA Compendium - The Complete World of Life*
589 *Cycle Assessment. Life Cycle Impact Assessment*; Springer, 2015.
- 590 (17) Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Rombouts, L. J. A.; Ragas, A. M. J.; van de Meent, D. Human-
591 Toxicological Effect and Damage Factors of Carcinogenic and Noncarcinogenic
592 Chemicals for Life Cycle Impact Assessment Human-Toxicological Effect and Damage
593 Factors of Carcinogenic and Noncarcinogenic Chemicals for Life Cycle Impact
594 Assessment. *Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag.* **2005**, *1* (3), 181–244.
- 595 (18) Rosenbaum, R. K.; Margni, M.; Jolliet, O. A Flexible Matrix Algebra Framework for the
596 Multimedia Multipathway Modeling of Emission to Impacts. *Environ. Int.* **2007**, *33* (5),
597 624–634.

- 598 (19) Roy, P.; Desche, L.; Margni, M. Life Cycle Impact Assessment of Terrestrial
599 Acidification: Modeling Spatially Explicit Soil Sensitivity at the Global Scale. *Environ.*
600 *Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *46*, 8270–8278.
- 601 (20) Huijbregts, M. A. J. Priority Assessment of Toxic Substances in the Frame of LCA -
602 Development and Application of the Multi-Media Fate, Exposure and Effect Model
603 USES-LCAIVAM, University of Amsterdam, 1999.
- 604 (21) Pennington, D.; Margni, M.; Ammann, C.; Jolliet, O. Multimedia Fate and Human Intake
605 Modeling: Spatial versus Non-Spatial Insights for Chemical Emissions in Western
606 Europe. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39* (4), 1119–1128.
- 607 (22) Rosenbaum, R. K.; Bachmann, T. M.; Gold, L. S.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Jolliet, O.;
608 Juraske, R.; Koehler, A.; Larsen, H. F.; MacLeod, M.; Margni, M.; McKone, T. E.; Payet,
609 J.; Schuhmacher, M.; Meent, D.; Hauschild, M. Z. USEtox—the UNEP-SETAC Toxicity
610 Model: Recommended Characterisation Factors for Human Toxicity and Freshwater
611 Ecotoxicity in Life Cycle Impact Assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2008**, *13* (7), 532–
612 546.
- 613 (23) Verones, F.; Saner, D.; Pfister, S.; Baisero, D.; Rondinini, C.; Hellweg, S. Effects of
614 Consumptive Water Use on Biodiversity in Wetlands of International Importance.
615 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *47* (21), 12248–12257.
- 616 (24) Boulay, A.; Bayart, J.; Desch, L.; Margni, M. Regional Characterization of Freshwater
617 Use in LCA : Modeling Direct Impacts on Human Health. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**,
618 *45*, 8948–8957.
- 619 (25) Curran, M.; de Baan, L.; De Schryver, A. M.; Van Zelm, R.; Hellweg, S.; Koellner, T.;
620 Sonnemann, G.; Huijbregts, M. A. J. Toward Meaningful End Points of Biodiversity in

- 621 Life Cycle Assessment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *45* (1), 70–79.
- 622 (26) Damiani, M.; Loiseau, E.; Núñez, M.; Roux, P.; Rosenbaum, R. K. Habitat Suitability:
623 Water Use Impact Assessment for Ecosystems beyond Counting Species. In *SETAC*
624 *Europe 26th Annual Meeting*; Nantes, France, 2016.
- 625 (27) Kharouba, H. M.; McCune, J. L.; Thuiller, W.; Huntley, B. Do Ecological Differences
626 between Taxonomic Groups Influence the Relationship between Species' Distributions
627 and Climate? A Global Meta-Analysis Using Species Distribution Models. *Ecography*
628 *(Cop.)*. **2012**, *36*, 001–008.
- 629 (28) Santini, L.; Marco, M.; Visconti, P.; Baisero, D.; Boitani, L.; Rondinini, C. Ecological
630 Correlates of Dispersal Distance in Terrestrial Mammals. *Hystrix, Ital. J. Mammal.* **2013**,
631 *24* (2), 181–186.
- 632 (29) Verones, F.; Bare, J.; Bulle, C.; Frischknecht, R.; Hauschild, M.; Hellweg, S.; Henderson,
633 A.; Jolliet, O.; Laurent, A.; Liao, X.; Lindner, J. P.; Maia de Souza, D.; Michelsen, O.;
634 Patouillard, L.; Pfister, S.; Posthuma, L.; Prado, V.; Ridoutt, B.; Rosenbaum, R. K.; Sala,
635 S.; Ugaya, C.; Vieira, M.; Fantke, P. LCIA Framework and Cross-Cutting Issues
636 Guidance within the UNEP- SETAC Life Cycle Initiative. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2017**, *161*,
637 957–967.
- 638 (30) Rantakokko, J.; Thuné, M. Parallel Structured Adaptive Mesh Refinement. In *Parallel*
639 *computing*; Springer, Ed.; London, 2009; pp 147–173.
- 640 (31) Edelsohn, D. Hierarchical Tree-Structures as Adaptive Meshes. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C* **1993**,
641 *4* (5), 909–917.
- 642 (32) Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Hellweg, S.; Hertwich, E. Do We Need a Paradigm Shift in Life
643 Cycle Impact Assessment? *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *45*, 3833–3834.

- 644 (33) Benini, L.; Boulay, A.; Sala, S. Cross-Scale Consistency in Life-Cycle Impact
645 Assessment. In *SETAC Europe 25th Annual Meeting*; 2015.
- 646 (34) Hoekstra, A. Y. A Critique on the Water-Scarcity Weighted Water Footprint in LCA.
647 *Ecol. Indic.* **2016**, *66*, 564–573.
- 648 (35) Pfister, S.; Boulay, A.-M.; Berger, M.; Hadjikakou, M.; Motoshita, M.; Hess, T.; Ridoutt,
649 B.; Weinzettel, J.; Scherer, L.; Döll, P.; Manzardo, A.; Núñez, M.; Verones, F.; Humbert,
650 S.; Buxmann, K.; Harding, K.; Benini, L.; Oki, T.; Finkbeiner, M.; Henderson, A. Letter
651 to the Editor: Understanding the LCA and ISO Water Footprint: A Response to Hoekstra
652 (2016) “A Critique on the Water-Scarcity Weighted Water Footprint in LCA.” *Ecol. Indic.*
653 **2017**, *72*, 352–359.
- 654 (36) Leão, S.; Roux, P.; Núñez, M.; Loiseau, E.; Junqua, G.; Sferratore, A.; Penru, Y.;
655 Rosenbaum, R. K. A Worldwide-Regionalised Water Supply Mix (WSmix) for Life Cycle
656 Inventory of Water Use. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *172*, 302–313.
- 657 (37) de Graaf, I. E. M.; Sutanudjaja, E. H.; van Beek, L. P. H.; Bierkens, M. F. P. A High-
658 Resolution Global-Scale Groundwater Model. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **2015**, *19* (2), 823–
659 837.
- 660 (38) Van Zelm, R.; Huijbregts, M. A. J. Quantifying the Trade-off between Parameter and
661 Model Structure Uncertainty in Life Cycle Impact Assessment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
662 **2013**, *47* (16), 9274–9280.
- 663 (39) Verones, F.; Pfister, S.; Hellweg, S. Quantifying Area Changes of Internationally Important
664 Wetlands Due to Water Consumption in LCA. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *47*, 9799–
665 9807.
- 666 (40) Hanafiah, M. H.; Leuven, R. S. E. W.; Sommerwerk, N.; Tockner, K.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.

- 667 Including the Introduction of Exotic Species in Life Cycle Impact Assessment: The Case
668 of Inland Shipping. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *47*, 13934–13940.
- 669 (41) Berger, M.; van der Ent, R.; Eisner, S.; Bach, V.; Finkbeiner, M. Water Accounting and
670 Vulnerability Evaluation (WAVE): Considering Atmospheric Evaporation Recycling and
671 the Risk of Freshwater Depletion in Water Footprinting. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *48*
672 (8), 4521–4528.
- 673 (42) Hughes, J. D.; Langevin, C. D.; Banta, E. R. *Documentation for the MODFLOW 6*
674 *Framework*; 2017.
- 675 (43) Arnold, J. G.; Srinivasan, R.; Muttiah, R. S.; Williams, J. R. Large Area Hydrologic
676 Modeling and Assessment Part I: Model Development. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* **1998**,
677 *34* (1), 73–89.
- 678 (44) Trapp, S.; Matthies, M. *Chemodynamics and Environmental Modelling. An Introduction*;
679 1998.
- 680 (45) Holzbecher, E. *Environmental Modeling Using MATLAB*; 2012.
- 681 (46) ESA. *Land Cover CCI: Product User Guide, Version 2*; 2016.
- 682 (47) FAO; UNESCO. Effective Soil Depth Map. 2007.
- 683 (48) Calerga. *Sysquake User Manual*; 2016.