



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

A New Model for Assessing Sustainability of Complex Systems

Integrating LCA and RA for Sustainability

Gayathri Babarenda Gamage

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Civil and Environmental Engineering

The University of Auckland, 2011

ABSTRACT

Assessment of sustainability is an essential step in determining if action taken is sustainable. Early research in sustainability assessment was based on reconciling the three pillars (environmental, economic and social) using the weak sustainability model. Today there are numerous indicators (single and composite) for measuring impacts in the three systems (environmental, economic and social) using the strong sustainability model where current thinking emphasises the need for system thinking rather than the reductionist concept of pillars. Most existing indices/methods measure single aspects of sustainability and the more integrated indicators are aimed at national or global level assessments.

A review of existing indicators, methods and models within the context of complex system sustainability showed that no single existing index, method or model was able to assess sustainability of complex systems since most fail to account for complex system characteristics such as system dynamics, interconnections and interdependencies of system components, system's ability to learn and remember, emergence of novel behaviours, co-evolution, etc. However, two analytical methods, Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) and risk assessment (RA), were found to have significant potential for addressing concerns regarding sustainability of complex systems as they were able to account for complex system characteristics. Thus LCA and RA were integrated in a new model to assess sustainability. The model is tested on case study product systems to illustrate applicability, potential issues and areas for improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With gratitude I acknowledge my academic supervisor, Associate Professor Carol Boyle, for her helpful guidance, valuable insight as well as for furthering my interest in sustainability. Thanks also to my co-supervisor Dr. Ir. Ron McDowall for your support. Many thanks to my advisory committee members: Dr. Rainer Seidel and Prof. Bruce Melville from the University of Auckland; Mr. Jake McLaren, my company advisor and Environmental Manager at Formway, for your support, friendship and valuable insights; and Mr. John Gertsakis. I am grateful to Technology New Zealand for the financial support for this research (Technology Industry Fellowship grant no.FMYX0506). Thanks also to Dr. Sarah McLaren and Dr. Barbara Nebel for helpful insights on LCA studies.

Thanks are due to the many Formway staff members for your knowledge, input and support while I was conducting my case study research in Wellington. Special thanks to Formway's R&D staff (former and current): Bob Stewart, Mark Pennington, Ed Burak, Damon Burwell, Paul Wilkinson, Ian Footit, Mike Francis, Sonia Guild, Peter Osbourne, Damon Boswell, Kat, Greg Smith and any others who I've been privileged to interact with, for their help during my work and for showing me true teamwork in practice. Special thanks to Jon Prince, my former mentor at Formway design studio for your humour, leadership and unfaltering faith in my abilities. Many thanks also to Peter van de Laar for your helpful knowledge and input on Formway processes.

My sincerest gratitude to my parents for their support– I am indebted to you forever for your love, the many lessons in life and values you have taught me. My brother Prasad and sister Dinesha have been supportive through the years. The Ranasinghe family, who became my second family while I was based in Wellington, thank you so much. I would also like to thank my dear friends and fellow doctoral candidates Dan, Idil and Jeff who were supportive throughout the PhD process, a great source of inspiration, strength and laughter. I'd like to thank Roger for brightening my days and Vanessa for her friendship. Lastly, I would like to dedicate this to the memory of my grandparents.

CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Aknowledgements	v
List of Figures.....	xi
List of Tables	xv
List of Acronyms	xvii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Objectives.....	4
1.1.1 Outcome of Objectives	5
1.2 Research Scope	5
1.3 Contribution to Knowledge.....	6
1.4 Summary of Content	6
1.6 The Literature.....	7
1.7 Publications	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review	9
2.1 Sustainability, Systems and Resilience.....	9
2.1.1 Resilience, Complex Adaptive Systems and Sustainability	11
2.2 Sustainability Assessment	14
2.2.1 Triple Bottom Line (TBL)	15
2.2.2 EIA-driven Integrated Assessment.....	16
2.2.3 Objectives-led Assessment	16
2.2.4 Assessment for Sustainability	17
2.2.5 Principle Based Assessment.....	17
2.3 Existing Sustainability Assessment Methods and Models	18
2.4 Sustainability Principles	20
2.4.1 Bellagio Principles	21
2.4.2 Hannover Principles.....	21
2.4.3 Precautionary Principle.....	22
2.4.4 12 Principles of Green Engineering.....	22
2.4.5 Gibson’s General Principles	23
2.4.6 Sustainability Principles for Engineers.....	24
2.4.7 Western Australian Sustainability Principles	24
2.5 Assessments, Indicators and Indices.....	25
2.5.1 The Natural Step (TNS)	30
2.5.2 Critical Limits and Critical Natural Capital (CNC)	30
2.5.3 Footprints: Ecological, Carbon and Water.....	31
2.5.4 Emergy	33
2.5.5 Exergy	34
2.5.6 Barometer for Sustainability.....	34

2.5.7	Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI)	35
2.5.8	Well-Being Assessment (WI)	35
2.5.9	Genuine Savings Indicator	36
2.5.10	Sustainability Performance Index (SPI)	36
2.5.11	Living Planet Index	36
2.5.12	Genuine Progress Indicator	37
2.3.13	Human Development Index (HDI)	37
2.5.14	Product Sustainability Index	38
2.5.15	Sustainability Assessment by Fuzzy Evaluation (SAFE)	38
2.5.16	Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)	41
2.5.17	Life Cycle Costing	43
2.5.18	Social Life Cycle Assessment	44
2.5.19	Integrated Life Cycle Assessments	44
2.5.20	Risk Assessment (RA)	45
2.5.21	Integrated LCA-RA	48
2.5.22	Ecosystem Resilience	49
2.6	Chapter Conclusions	50
Chapter 3: Evaluating Sustainability Assessments		52
3.1	Characteristics of CAS and Their Significance for Sustainability	53
3.1.1	Multiple Agents, Diversity, Connectedness, Nestedness, Lack of Absolute Boundaries and Lack of Controllers	55
3.1.2	Nonlinearity, Dynamic Nature of Systems, Chaos and Predictability	57
3.1.3	Feedback loops, Memory, Self Organisation, Emergence and Co-evolution	58
3.1.4	Limits, Resilience and Adaptive Capacity	60
3.1.5	Holism	63
3.2	Evaluating Existing Sustainability Assessments	64
3.2.1	Criteria for Evaluating Sustainability Assessments	65
3.2.2	Evaluating the Assessments	75
3.3	Chapter Conclusions	80
Chapter 4: Choice of Methods for Integration		83
4.1	Method Comparison and Selection	84
4.1.1	Risk Assessment	84
4.1.2	Ecological Resilience	85
4.1.3	Ecological Footprint	86
4.1.4	Sustainable Process Index (SPI)	86
4.1.5	Product Sustainability Index (PSI)	87
4.1.6	Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)	87
4.1.7	Barometer of Sustainability	88
4.1.8	Sustainability Assessment by Fuzzy Evaluation (SAFE)	88
4.2	LCA and RA for Assessing Sustainability of Complex Systems	91
4.3	Chapter Conclusions	93
Chapter 5: A New Model for Assessing Sustainability of Complex Systems		95
5.1	Integrated Assessments for Sustainability	95
5.2	Existing Integration of LCA and RA	99
5.2.1	Method of Integration - Nishioka et al. (2002; 2006)	100

5.2.2	Method of Integration - Matthews et al. (2002)	101
5.2.3	Method of Integration - Wegener Sleeswijk et al. (2003)	101
5.2.4	Method of Integration - Sonnemann et al. (2004)	101
5.2.5	Method Comparison - Pant et al. (2004)	106
5.2.6	Method of Integration - Wright et al. (2008).....	106
5.2.7	Method of Integration - Kikuchi and Hirao (2009)	108
5.2.8	Synopsis – Integrations.....	109
5.3	New Integrated Model	111
5.3.1	A: Goal and Scope	113
5.3.2	B: Inventory	121
5.3.3	C: Impact Assessment.....	125
5.3.4	D: Risk Analysis	130
5.3.5	E: Risk Treatment; F: Communication; and G: Monitoring.....	139
5.4	Chapter Conclusions	140
Chapter 6: Case Study and Results		143
6.1	Case study Methodology	146
6.1.1	Data for the Model	146
6.2	Case Study – LIFE chair.....	149
6.2.1	Goal and Scope Definition	152
6.2.2	Inventory Analysis.....	155
6.2.3	Impact Assessment	169
6.2.4	Risk assessment	178
6.2.5	Risk Treatment.....	193
6.3	Chapter Conclusions	194
Chapter 7: Discussion.....		195
7.1	The Model: Critique and Potential Improvements	195
7.1.1	Complexity in the Model	196
7.2	Critique of the Model.....	204
7.3	Proposed Improvements to the Model	208
7.4	Risk and Sustainability.....	213
7.4.1	Sustainability, Continuity and Collapse	214
7.4.2	Perception of Risk, Needs and Wants.....	221
7.4.3	Social Contexts and Barriers to Risk Understanding.....	223
7.5	Chapter Conclusions	226
Chapter 8: Conclusions and future work.....		229
8.1	Sub-objective 1.....	230
8.2	Sub-objective 2.....	232
8.3	Sub-objective 3.....	234
8.4	Risk Treatment and Sustainability.....	237
8.5	Critique of the Research and Future Work	239
8.5.1	Critique of the Model	240
8.5.2	Future Work.....	240

References	243
Appendix A	273
Appendix B	287
Appendix C	289

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Panarchy – revolt and remember cycles (Reproduced from Holling et al., 2002a)	12
Figure 2: Classification of sustainability assessments	19
Figure 3: SAFE methodology (Reproduced from Phillis and Andriantiatsaholiniana, 2001).....	40
Figure 4: Phases of Life Cycle Assessment (Reproduced from ISO, 1997)	41
Figure 5: Risk Management framework (AS/NZS4360: 2004).....	46
Figure 6: System showing multiple agents, connectedness, nestedness and lack of absolute boundaries.....	55
Figure 7: Three system levels of a panarchy together with connections between them (slightly modified from Holling (2004)).....	56
Figure 8: Function of feedback loops, memory, adaptation, self-organization, emergence leading to co-evolution (modified from Wikipedia (2010))	58
Figure 9: Attributes of resilience (modified from Walker et al. (2004)).....	61
Figure 10: Heuristic model of the adaptive cycle. Reproduced from Allison and Hobbs (2004) ...	62
Figure 11: Full mode and attribution mode of analysis showing the unit processes investigated (Reproduced from Udo de Haes et al., 2000).....	99
Figure 12: Integration of LCA and RA according to Sonnemann et al. (2004) – steps generating eco-technology and damage assigning phases	103
Figure 13: Dominance analysis and spatial differentiation (reproduced from Sonnemann et al. (2004))	105
Figure 14: “Schematic illustration of the methodology used to integrate an environmental fate and transport model (CHEMGL), an economic input–output life cycle assessment (EIO-LCA) model, and a risk assessment tool for a screening-level analysis.” (Reproduced from Wright et al., 2008).....	107
Figure 15: Integrated evaluation phases of life cycle assessment (LCA) and risk assessment (RA) with data requirements. The solid arrows represent procedures, the dotted arrows are data, and the required steps in each activity are represented by boxes. (Reproduced from Kikuchi and Hirao, 2009).....	109
Figure 16: Sustainability assessment framework integrating LCA and RA	112
Figure 17: Streamlined sustainability assessment – reduced to three systems	114
Figure 18: Streamlined sustainability assessment	115
Figure 19: Full sustainability assessment comprised of streamlined assessments per system ...	115
Figure 20: Complete sustainability assessment	116

Figure 21: System boundaries to consider.....	118
Figure 22: Sources of data for the inventory	121
Figure 23: Inventory matrices for the three systems (environmental, social and economic).....	122
Figure 24: The inventory showing connections among the inputs and outputs of the overall system.	123
Figure 25: Example of the level of complexity with respect to inventory data	124
Figure 26: From LCI to midpoint and endpoint impacts	125
Figure 27: Spatial and temporal differentiation resulting in a matrix of impacts per media, time and space.	129
Figure 28: Classifying inventory data in terms of medium, location and time	130
Figure 29: Incoming and outgoing risks related to needs of the product system	132
Figure 30: Risks related to selected impact categories	133
Figure 31: Risks to the product system as a result of risks pertaining to the needs of the system	133
Figure 32: Risk model for evaluating risks	137
Figure 33: Risk model for evaluating risks changing with time (accumulation)	138
Figure 34: Formway products featuring GRID workstation system and screens, LIFE chairs and TRAFFIC storage	143
Figure 35: Main components and material make up for the LIFE chair	150
Figure 36: Comparison of LIFE material composition with aluminium and GFN bases.....	151
Figure 37: Life cycle processes of LIFE	154
Figure 38: Global warming potential for aluminium with different recycled contents.....	157
Figure 39: Global warming potential for recycling aluminium	167
Figure 40: New Zealand electricity composition used in the LCA (MED, 2006).....	168
Figure 41: U.S.A electricity composition (EPA, 2005)	169
Figure 42: Comparison of global warming potential for electricity models per country	169
Figure 43: % impact comparison of the two LIFE chair models using default categories relative to each impact category of the chair model with aluminium base	171
Figure 44: %GWP100 results for the life cycle stages of the two LIFE chair models	172
Figure 45: %GWP100 results from raw material extraction and refinement stage	173
Figure 46: %GWP100 results from waste management stage considering landfill versus recycling	174
Figure 47: %Impact of different aluminium recycled content on the total life cycle of the two chair models.....	175

Figure 48: Risk matrix for evaluating risks.....	179
Figure 49: Nested hierarchy of CAS associated with the product system showing “remember” and “revolt” arrows which are synonymous to risk knowledge or risk events (modified from Holling (2004))	190
Figure 50: Interconnections associated with components	197
Figure 51: Tracking system dynamics through time and space.....	199
Figure 52: Path of the system with respect to level of risk	200
Figure 53: Risk evaluation matrix according to proximity to system limits/thresholds	201
Figure 54: Risk to and from the product system propagating through systems	203
Figure 55: Sustainability of system via risk assessment	206
Figure 56: “The logical grid used to locate and distinguish scenarios (Reproduced from Taylor et al., 2007)	209
Figure 57: Four scenes used to embed the risk assessment (modified from Taylor et al., 2007)	210
Figure 58: Source of risk to system of concern	211
Figure 59: Hierarchy of CAS according to size, cycle speed, complexity and uncertainty (modified using Holling, 2004)	215
Figure 60: S-curves representing product life cycle stages	216
Figure 61: Decisions for sustainability	220
Figure 62: Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1968).....	222
Figure 63: Knowledge pathways required to move from risk to sustainability	224
Figure 64: Continuation of the system via risk mitigation	225
Figure 65: Sustainability assessment framework integrating LCA and RA	233
Figure 66: Source of risk to system of concern	238
Figure 67: Complete sustainability assessment	239

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Existing sustainability assessment methods and models	27
Table 2: Comparing risk and sustainability (Grey and Wiedemann, 1999)	47
Table 3: Comparison of environmental RA and LCA (Sonnemann et al., 2004)	48
Table 4: Characteristics of complex adaptive systems	54
Table 5: Evaluating existing methods and models used to assess sustainability	76
Table 6: Candidates for new model	80
Table 7: Summary of advantages, disadvantages and potential for assessing sustainability of complex systems among 8 existing methods and models	90
Table 8: Comparison of integration methods	97
Table 9: Purpose, method and outcome of LCA + RA integration attempts	110
Table 10: Common impact categories for LCA (Guinée et al., 2002)	126
Table 11: Temporal and spatial differentiation of impact categories (modified from Stranddorf et al., 2005)	128
Table 12: Choice of risk analysis techniques (table constructed from data in ISO 31010/FDIS) ..	135
Table 13: Comparison of competitor products (Babarenda Gamage et al., 2008; Spitzley et al. 2006; Steelcase, 2004)	145
Table 14: Risk factors according to Formway management	148
Table 15: Material composition of the LIFE chair models with aluminium and GFN bases	150
Table 16: Recyclable content of the LIFE chair	152
Table 17: Origin of raw materials for components	156
Table 18: Materials in LIFE	156
Table 19: Plastics in LIFE LCA	156
Table 20: Processing of LIFE materials	160
Table 21: Aluminium supplier input	161
Table 22: Steel supplier input	162
Table 23: Transport 1: Modes and distances from suppliers to Formway	163
Table 24: Data used for packaging	164
Table 25: Distance and mode of transport to customer	164
Table 26: Environmental, social and economic risk associated with impact categories associated with impact categories	180
Table 27: Classification of generic risk to the LIFE product system from selected resources	186

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAS	Complex Adaptive Systems
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CBA	Cost-Benefit Analysis
CNC	Critical Natural Capital
EF	Ecological Footprint
ESD	Ecologically Sustainable Development
EWI	Ecosystem Wellbeing Index
EDIP	Environmental Design of Industrial Products (Denmark)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPI	Environmental Performance Index
ESI	Environmental Sustainability Index
FCA	Full Cost Accounting
FCEA	Full Cost Environmental Accounting
GPI	Genuine Progress Indicator
GRI	Global Reporting Initiative
GWP	Global Warming Potential
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HDI	Human Development Index
HWI	Human Wellbeing Index
IFOTIS	In Full, on Time and in Spec
ISEW	Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare
IDEMAT	Industrial Design Materials
IPENZ	Institute for Professional Engineers New Zealand
IPENZ	Institute of Professional Engineers of New Zealand
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
IIDEX	International Interior Design Exposition
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LCCA	Lice Cycle Costing Assessment
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LCC	Life Cycle Costing
LCIA	Life Cycle Impact Assessment
LPI	Living Planet Index
MCA	Multi-Criteria Analysis
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PPP	Policies, Plans and Programs
PSI	Product Sustainability Index
REPA	Resource and Environmental Profile Analysis

RA	Risk Assessment
SELCA	Social and Environmental Life Cycle Assessment
SLCA	Social Life Cycle Assessment
SETAC	Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SAFE	Sustainability Assessment by Fuzzy Evaluation
SPI	Sustainability Performance Index
SD	Sustainable Development
TNS	The Natural Step
TCA	Total Cost Assessment
TBL	Triple Bottom Line
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund