



HAL
open science

Method to analyse the contribution of material's sensitivity in buildings' environmental impact

Endrit Hoxha, Guillaume Habert, Jacques Chevalier, Manuel Bazzana, Robert Le Roy

► To cite this version:

Endrit Hoxha, Guillaume Habert, Jacques Chevalier, Manuel Bazzana, Robert Le Roy. Method to analyse the contribution of material's sensitivity in buildings' environmental impact. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2014, 66, pp.54-64. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.056 . hal-01157320

HAL Id: hal-01157320

<https://enpc.hal.science/hal-01157320>

Submitted on 29 May 2023


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.

Accepted Manuscript

Method to analyse the contribution of material's sensitivity in buildings' environmental impact

Endrit Hoxha, Guillaume Habert, Jacques Chevalier, Manuel Bazzana, Robert Le Roy



PII: S0959-6526(13)00758-0

DOI: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.056)

Reference: JCLP 3763

To appear in: *Journal of Cleaner Production*

Received Date: 6 May 2013

Revised Date: 11 October 2013

Accepted Date: 25 October 2013

Please cite this article as: Hoxha E, Habert G, Chevalier J, Bazzana M, Le Roy R, Method to analyse the contribution of material's sensitivity in buildings' environmental impact, *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2013), doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.056.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Method to analyse the contribution of material's sensitivity in buildings'**
2 **environmental impact**

3

4 Endrit Hoxha^{1,2}, Guillaume Habert³, Jacques Chevalier¹, Manuel Bazzana¹, Robert Le Roy^{2,4}

5

6 1 Université Paris-Est, Centre Scientifique et Technique des Bâtiments (CSTB), Division Environnement et
7 Ingénierie du Cycle de Vie, 24 rue Joseph Fourier 38400 Saint Martin D'Hères, France.

8

9 2 Université Paris-Est, UMR NAVIER, Ecole des Ponts Paris Tech, 6-8 av Blaise Pascal, Cité Descartes,
10 Champs-sur-Marne, 77455 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France.

11

12 3 Institute of construction and infrastructure management, Chair of Sustainable construction, Swiss Federal
13 Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich), Wolfgang Pauli Strasse 15, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland.

14

15 ⁴ GSA Laboratory, ENSAPM, 14 Rue Bonaparte 75006 Paris, France.

16

17

18 **Keywords:** LCA, building, uncertainty, variability, contribution analysis.

19

20

21

22 **Abstract**

23 The assessment of environmental performances of building is now commonly based on a life
24 cycle approach. The current studies comparing such performances highlight the problems
25 related to uncertainties in the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) results. The aim of this study is
26 to identify the sensitivity and robustness of LCA models to uncertainties related to building
27 materials in order to strengthen comparisons which can be done between building projects

28 and secure the assessment of the building environmental performance calculation. However,
29 in this study, all uncertainties are not covered and we restricted our calculation to
30 uncertainties related to the use of building materials during the life cycle of the whole
31 building. We have considered that the relative contribution of each material to the
32 environmental impact of building is sensitive to three key points which are submitted to
33 uncertainties: the service life of the building component; the environmental impact of this
34 building component's production and the amount of material used in the building. The
35 assessments of the uncertainties are treated at two levels: the material or element level and the
36 building level. A statistical method, based on Taylor series expansion is developed to identify
37 the most sensitive and uncertain parameters, with standpoint to strengthen comparison
38 between projects. The first results are promising, although further work remains to be done to
39 better quantify the uncertainties at the material scale.

40

41 **1. Introduction**

42 Buildings are the largest energy consumers and greenhouse gases emitters, both in the
43 developed and developing countries (UNSTATS, 2010). In continental Europe, the energy
44 used in buildings alone is responsible for up to 50% of carbon dioxide emissions (Capros,
45 2001; Levine et al., 2007). Urgent changes are therefore required relating to energy savings,
46 production and application of materials, use of renewable resources, and to reuse and
47 recycling of building materials. However, to be able to focus on the pertinent and most
48 sensitive aspects of the building sector, it is fundamental to accurately quantify which part of
49 the life cycle of which element is the main contributor to the environmental impacts. To do
50 so, and since more than 30 years, scientific community have developed and validate life cycle
51 assessment (LCA) methodology (Heijungs *et al.*, 1992; Fink, 1997; Klöpffer, 2006;

52 Sonnemann *et al.*, 2003). The assessment includes the whole life-cycle of a product, process,
53 or system encompassing the extraction and processing of raw materials, manufacturing,
54 transportation and distribution, use, reuse, maintenance, recycling and final disposal. LCA has
55 become a widely used methodology, because of its integrated way of treating the framework,
56 impact assessment and data quality (Klöpffer, 2006). LCA methodology is based on ISO
57 14040 and consists of four distinct analytical steps: defining the goal and scope, creating the
58 life-cycle inventory, assessing the impact and finally interpreting the results (ISO, 2006).

59 However, as LCA is more and more used as an analytical decision support tool (Fava *et al.*,
60 1993; Werner and Scholz, 2002; Blengini and Di Carlo, 2010), it can be used to assist policy
61 decision and the question of the reliability of its results becomes then pregnant. The
62 sensitivity of results to hypothesis and data quality has long been discussed (e.g. Huijbregts,
63 1998; Basset-Mens and van der Werf, 2005; Lloyd and Ries, 2007; Wand and Shen, 2013).
64 Concerning buildings, the reliability and robustness of results is even more complex than for
65 the other industrial sectors due to their very long service life. It induces large question on how
66 to assess the fact that:

67 - The energy during the use phase as well as its nature (and its associated environmental
68 impact) will drastically change during the next 50 years (Grübler *et al.*, 1999; de Vries *et al.*,
69 2007; Tian and de Wilde, 2013).

70 - Some Building materials have a lower service life than the building itself (Kellenberger and
71 Althaus, 2009) and their effective service life is influenced by many factors which can be
72 classified between failure, dissatisfaction and change in consumer needs (Cooper, 2004).
73 Failure is related to the degradation of the building elements and depends significantly on use
74 condition (humidity, UV, temperature, etc...), dissatisfaction is mostly associated with styling
75 changes, fashion trends and finally occupant needs may also change over time when
76 occupants have children or become elderly for instance. All these factors will strongly affect

77 the service life of building elements (Ashworth, 1996; Potting and Blok, 1995) and then, the
78 amount of material needed for all the service life of the building.

79 Uncertainties in buildings are also controlled by the same type of uncertainties than for other
80 industrial sectors: environmental database quality (Weidema and Wesnaes, 1996),
81 technological variation between materials' production plant (Lewandowska *et al.*, 2004;
82 Reap *et al.*, 2008; Gomes *et al.* 2013). A review of uncertainties in LCA can be found in
83 (Huijbregts, 1998; Björklund, 2002; Imbeault-Tetreault, 2010).

84 As a consequence, if we want to be able to assess the environmental impact of two building
85 projects and be able to promote the choice of one rather the other, we need firstly to quantify
86 these uncertainties and in a second step, identify the main contributions. In the present study,
87 we will only study the uncertainties related to the building materials used during the life cycle
88 of the building. For the moment, most of the LCA on buildings are comparing building
89 designs without paying attention to the associated uncertainties. Others are using uncertainties
90 associated with the pedigree matrix (Weidema and Wesnaes, 1996; Frischknecht and
91 Rebitzer, 2005) which inform only on the quality of the environmental data but not on the
92 service life uncertainty. A few studies have tried to address the mixed question of
93 environmental data quality and service life for building elements but these studies were
94 limited to one specific building's element (Aktas and Bilec, 2012). In our study the LCA of
95 the building is calculated from the decomposition of the building in building material and
96 component combination. The elements such are the windows, solar water heater etc., were
97 preferred to be treated as building element and not decomposed in materials as their service
98 life is defined at that scale. This choice can also be justified by SETAC who recommend
99 paying attention to reference flows and not necessarily distinguish every materials (SETAC,
100 1999). The assessment of the uncertainties is treated at two levels: the material (or element)
101 level and the building one. At the material level we want to identify which type of uncertainty

102 has the most influence on the environmental performance of a material. We identified
103 uncertainties concerning its production process, the quantity effectively used on site or its
104 service life in the building. At the building scale we want to identify which material or
105 element has the most influence on the environmental performance of the building.
106 To do so, a statistical method is used to identify the main parameters which contribute to the
107 uncertainty of final results. The contribution analysis includes sensitivity and uncertainty
108 analysis. Indeed a parameter which has a small sensitivity but a large uncertainty may be just
109 as important as a parameter with a larger sensitivity but smaller uncertainty (Imbeault-
110 Tetreault, 2010; Morgan *et al.*, 1990)]. A description of the method is presented in the next
111 section. Once the methodology is developed it is applied to one case study of two houses
112 projects.

113

114 **2. Method**

115 Different methods have been proposed to evaluate data inaccuracy in LCA outcomes
116 (SETAC, 2001). A review of uncertainty analysis methods can be found in (Björklund, 2002;
117 Leroy, 2009). In this research we are developing a simplified analytical method based in
118 Taylor series expansion. The other main alternative is the Monte Carlo simulation which is a
119 numerical method that artificially allows the reconstruction of a random phenomenon
120 simulating fictitious samples based on hypothesis on random variables. It is therefore
121 necessary to define the probability density for the model inputs, assumed to be independent,
122 which will be propagated to obtain the probability density of the output variable (Murtha,
123 2000). The Monte Carlo method is therefore time consuming and require realistic hypothesis
124 on the distribution function.

125 The method we develop, based on analytical method derived from Taylor series expansion
 126 (Ciroth, 2004), is on the contrary easy to implement. We first propose a method for
 127 contribution analysis and then for uncertainty propagation and calculation.

128

129 2.1. General theory of contribution analysis

130 The contribution analysis includes sensitivity and uncertainty analysis.

131

132 2.1.1. Sensitivity analysis

133 The key purpose of sensitivity analysis is to identify which key data or assumptions
 134 significantly influence the result. This analysis allows simplifying data collection and analysis
 135 without compromising the robustness of a result and to identify crucial data that must be
 136 thoroughly investigated (Annex 31, 2004).

137 Sensitivity analysis can be described as follow:

138 Supposing an output variable z which depends on n inputs variables $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n$ and
 139 their dependence which is expressed by a function f :

$$140 \quad z = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n) \quad (1)$$

141 Therefore, for a single nominal scenario, for which the different input variables have a given
 142 value $X^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0, \dots, x_i^0, \dots, x_n^0)$ (each might be the mean, median or the mode values), the
 143 corresponding nominal output value is then defined as:

$$144 \quad Z^0 = f(X^0) \quad (2)$$

145 (Morgan *et al.*, 1990) has defined the normalised sensitivity coefficient known as elasticity
 146 coefficient by the equation:

$$147 \quad U_z(x_i) = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right]_{x_i^0} \times \frac{x_i^0}{z^0} \quad (3)$$

148 Equation (3) can be used to calculate the relative change of the output result for a nominal
 149 variation in the input x_i . For instance, if we consider an equation such as $z = x_1^2 \times x_2$. For a
 150 scenario $\mathbf{X}^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0)$ and an output value $z^0 = x_1^0 \times x_2^0$, the sensitivity coefficients for the
 151 two inputs (x_1, x_2) have the value: $U_z(x_1) = 2$ and $U_z(x_2) = 1$. It means that for a change
 152 in input variable x_1 of 1% the output varies by 2%, and for a change in input variable x_2 of
 153 1% the output varies by 1%.

154

155 2.1.2. Uncertainty analysis

156 A physical quantity can be expressed as $x_i = x_{true} \pm \epsilon_{x_i}$, where ϵ_{x_i} represent the uncertainties
 157 associated with a supposed exact value x_{true} , for which we have accepted the mean value
 158 $x_{true} = x_{mean}$. The degree of uncertainty for the variable x_i is usually expressed by its
 159 standard deviation σ_{x_i} which is defined as the square root of the variance $var(x_i)$.

$$160 \sigma_{x_i} = \sqrt{var(x_i)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{mean})^2} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\epsilon_{x_i})^2} = \sigma_{\epsilon_{x_i}} \quad (4)$$

161

162 2.1.3. Contribution analysis

163 To perform a contribution analysis we must keep in consideration both analyses: sensitivity
 164 and uncertainty. The contribution analysis which follows is mainly inspired by (Ciroth *et al.*
 165 2004; Morgan *et al.*, 1990; Protassov, 2002; NASA, 2010; and Taykir, 2000). In the following
 166 we present two methods of calculation of the relative contribution of inputs variables in
 167 output result.

168 In the first method, we propose to use a power series expansion of the continuous function
 169 $z = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n)$ with respect to a chosen nominal scenario \mathbf{X}^0 . The Taylor series
 170 expansion provides a way to express deviations of output data from its nominal value z^0 in

171 term of deviations of its input variables from their nominal values \mathbf{x}_i^0 . If we can assume the
 172 independence of input variables, the first order approximation of Taylor series expansion of
 173 function will be expressed:

$$174 \quad \text{var}(\mathbf{z}) \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}(x_i) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right)_{\mathbf{x}^0}^2 \quad (5)$$

175 If $\Delta x_i = \sigma_{x_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right)_{\mathbf{x}^0} \right|$, then equation (5) has the form:

$$176 \quad \text{var}(\mathbf{z}) \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta x_i^2 \quad (6)$$

177 And the relative contribution of each input variable to the output result can be defined by
 178 equation:

$$179 \quad RC_{M1}(x_i) = \frac{\Delta x_i^2}{\text{var}(\mathbf{z})} \times 100 \quad (7)$$

180 A second method to identify the contribution of inputs data to output result is to study
 181 different scenarios of $f(\mathbf{x}_i)$. In our case the output result is supposed to be a function of n
 182 input parameter, so n scenarios will be performed.

183 In the first scenario, all the input variables are determined except one: x_1 . Applying expansion
 184 defined in equation (5) to this scenario will then provide:

$$185 \quad \text{var}(z_{[x_1]}) = \text{var}(x_1) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right)_{\mathbf{x}^0}^2 \quad (8)$$

186 which can be simplified as:

$$187 \quad \sigma_{z_{[x_1]}} = \sigma_{x_1} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right)_{\mathbf{x}^0} \right| = \Delta x_1$$

188 Applying the Taylor series expansion with all other scenarios will have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta x_2 &= \sigma_{x_2} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \right)_{X^0} \right| \\
\Delta x_3 &= \sigma_{x_3} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3} \right)_{X^0} \right| \\
&\vdots \\
189 \quad \Delta x_1 &= \sigma_{x_1} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right)_{X^0} \right| \\
&\vdots \\
\Delta x_n &= \sigma_{x_n} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right)_{X^0} \right|
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

190 Uncertainty in the output variable can then be calculated as a sum of the contribution of each
191 scenario:

$$192 \quad \Delta z \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{x_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right)_{X^0} \right| \tag{10}$$

193 The relative contribution of each input parameter to the output result is calculated by
194 equation:

$$195 \quad RC_{M2}(x_i) = \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta z} \times 100 \tag{11}$$

196 Both methods (equation (7) and (11)) can be used for identifying which input variable induces
197 the main variation in the output variable. The difference between the two methods is that the
198 first method (equation (7)) enhances the contribution of the input parameter with the higher
199 contribution due to the square values. In order to have a contribution analysis that allow
200 identifying a group of parameter and not only one, we prefer to use the second method. In the
201 practice it is easy to be demonstrated that the hierarchy of the inputs contribution in output
202 result is the same whatever the method used.

203

204 2.2. *Applied method for life cycle assessment of buildings*

205 In this section the method will be applied in Life Cycle Assessment of Building. From the EN
206 15978 standards (EN-15978, 2011), environmental performance of buildings can be presented
207 as a sum of the environmental performance of its building material plus the energy and water
208 consumed during the use phase. In the present paper, we only consider the building materials

209 used during the life cycle of the building. Further research should be done to understand how
 210 water and energy consumption during the operation phase can be integrated in the method and how
 211 to couple all uncertainties (Peuportier et al., 2013). For instance, it would be fundamental in a
 212 broader study to associate uncertainties due to energy use during building operation and the
 213 uncertainty on the degradation potential of building materials. This is however, beyond the scope of
 214 this study which is restricted the uncertainties in embedded energy in building materials.. In this
 215 study, we consider that the contribution of materials/elements in environmental performances
 216 of building (I_f) can be calculated as a decomposition of building in c materials/elements

$$217 \quad I_f = \sum_{i=1}^c I_{f,i} \quad (12)$$

218 And the environmental performances of materials are calculated by the equation:

$$219 \quad I_{f,i} = m_i \times k_{f,i} \times n_i \quad (13)$$

220 Where

221 m_i is the mass of material i used for the construction of the building

222 $k_{f,i}$ is the environmental impact for the impact category f associated with the life cycle of one
 223 unit mass of the building material i ;

224 n_i is the number of time the material i has to be replaced during the service life of the
 225 building;

$$226 \quad n_i \text{ is calculated as: } n_i = \frac{LB}{LM_i} \quad \forall n_i \in \mathbf{R}, \quad (14)$$

227 where:

228 LB is the service life of the building;

229 LM_i is the service life of the material i ;

230 The contribution analysis of buildings has therefore to be done at two different scales: the
 231 material scale and the building scale because equations which are defining the associated
 232 impacts are different at the two scales.

233

234 2.2.1. Contribution analysis method for life cycle assessment of buildings

235 The contribution analysis has to be applied at two different scales.

236 At the material scale, the variability of the results for the environmental performance of the
237 materials (13), can be expressed as:

238
$$\Delta I_{f,i} = \sigma_{k_{f,i}} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial k_{f,i}} \right)_{X^0} \right| + \sigma_{m_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial m_i} \right)_{X^0} \right| + \sigma_{n_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial n_i} \right)_{X^0} \right| \quad (15)$$

239 With: $X^0 = (k_f^0, n^0, m^0)$, that are the mean value.

240 The relative contributions from the different input parameters to the output result are:

241
$$RC_{M2}(k) = \frac{\Delta I_k}{\Delta I_{f,i}} \times 100 ; RC_{M2}(m) = \frac{\Delta I_m}{\Delta I_{f,i}} \times 100 ; RC_{M2}(n) = \frac{\Delta I_n}{\Delta I_{f,i}} \times 100 \quad (16)$$

242 with: $\Delta I_k = \sigma_{k_{f,i}} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial k_{f,i}} \right)_{X^0} \right| ; \Delta I_m = \sigma_{m_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial m_i} \right)_{X^0} \right| ; \Delta I_n = \sigma_{n_i} \left| \left(\frac{\partial I_{f,i}}{\partial n_i} \right)_{X^0} \right|$

243 At the building scale, the environmental impact of one building can be presented by equation
244 (12). However, as the partial derivative of the different building material is equal to 1:

245
$$\frac{\partial I_f}{\partial I_{f,i}} = 1 \quad \forall i \in [1; c]. \quad (17)$$

246 The contribution of inputs variables is then simplified and reduced to the sum of uncertainties
247 of each material.

248
$$\Delta I_f = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{I_{f,i}} \quad (18)$$

249 The relative contributions from the different inputs variables to output variable are then only:

250
$$RC_{M2}(I_{f,i}) = \frac{\sigma_{I_{f,i}}}{\Delta I_f} \times 100 \quad (19)$$

251 with: $\Delta I_{f,i} = \sigma_{I_{f,i}}$

252

253 2.3. *Uncertainty analysis*254 2.3.1. *Central limit theorem*

255 The second fundamental theorem of probability is the Central Limit Theorem. This theorem
 256 proposes that if $\mathbf{z} = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n)$ is the sum of n mutually independent random
 257 variables, then the distribution function of \mathbf{z} is well-approximated by a certain type of
 258 continuous function known as a normal density function, which is given by the formula:

$$259 \quad f(x, x_{\text{mean}}, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-x_{\text{mean}})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad \text{for } -\infty \leq x \leq +\infty \quad (20)$$

260 where: x_{mean} is the mean (location parameter) and σ is the standard deviation (scale
 261 parameter).

262

263 2.3.2. *Calculation of uncertainty propagation*

264 Different methods have been proposed to calculate and propagate uncertainties, such as
 265 analytical uncertainty propagation methods, calculation with intervals and fuzzy logic and
 266 stochastic modelling etc., (SETAC, 2001). In this research we focused on uncertainty
 267 propagation using Taylor series expansion. Using equation (5) for evaluation of uncertainties
 268 in impact environmental of materials we will obtain:

$$269 \quad \text{var}(I_{fi}) \approx \text{var}(k_{fi}) \left(\frac{\partial I_{fi}}{\partial k_{fi}}\right)_{x^0}^2 + \text{var}(m_i) \left(\frac{\partial I_{fi}}{\partial m_i}\right)_{x^0}^2 + \text{var}(n_i) \left(\frac{\partial I_{fi}}{\partial n_i}\right)_{x^0}^2 \quad (21)$$

$$270 \quad \sigma_{I_{fi}} = \sqrt{\text{var}(I_{fi})} \quad (22)$$

271 And the variances of environmental performance of building are calculated by equation:

$$272 \quad \text{var}(I_f) \approx \sum_{i=1}^c \text{var}(I_{fi}) \quad (23)$$

$$273 \quad \sigma_{I_f} = \sqrt{\text{var}(I_f)} \quad (24)$$

274 The uncertainties in environmental performance of building can be calculated by its standard
275 deviation.

276

277 **3. Application: Case study on two projects**

278

279 *3.1. Presentation of the two studied projects*

280 In this case study we have applied the methodology presented above in order to compare two
281 different projects of single-family detached house. The studied houses are not real case study
282 but have been designed as reference house by the Centre Scientifique et Technique du
283 Bâtiment (CSTB), France. The surface area of houses is equal to 100 m² and the service life is
284 considered to be equal to 50 years. One of the projects is a house with a reinforced concrete
285 structure and the second one is made with a wood structure. Figure 1 presents the plan and a
286 3D model of the reference houses. The detailed quantities of materials taken into account in
287 each project are presented in the table 1.

288

289 *3.2. Sources of uncertainties at material scale*

290 The uncertainties come from combined factors at the material scale. As shown in equation
291 (15), uncertainties are considered to come from the mass, the service life and the elementary
292 environmental impact of each material.

293

294 *3.2.1. Mass*

295 To evaluate the uncertainties associated with mass variation of materials, we used data
296 coming from value of waste generated on construction site (ADEME, 2001). We also used
297 data from discussion with experts to evaluate differences which can exist between provisional
298 maps and the reality. As a consequence, we have considered in this study, variations from -

299 5% to +10% of materials quantity for all building materials. The mean is considered to be
300 equal to the quantity of material defined in the project, and the standard deviation is
301 calculated by supposing a triangular distribution for the uncertainties considered (Heijungs
302 and Frischknecht, 2005).

303

304 3.2.2. *Service life of building materials*

305 Service life of materials has been calculated through the use of different references in order to
306 define a mean value and a standard deviation for each material. In the table 2 we have
307 presented the minimum and maximum values found in references and mean and standard
308 deviation calculated for each non-structural materials and elements. It has to be noted that
309 uncertainties are not issued from durability studies, nor from detailed sociological studies on
310 user behaviour but from a survey we did on scientific literature that define a service life of
311 building materials to perform LCA studies. Therefore the mean and standard deviation values
312 on table 2 shows the variability, which currently exists between studies. We can also suppose
313 that these studies have chosen valid service life values and that the variability we identify is
314 then linked with an effective variability in the use of building materials. For the structural
315 materials, we considered that their service life was similar to the one of the house.

316

317 3.2.3. *Elementary environmental impact of each building material*

318 The environmental impact of each building material is based on values from the French
319 environmental products declaration (EPD) available in INIES database (INIES, 2009). These
320 data are company specific or collective data and are calculated with French NF P 01-010
321 standard (AFNOR, 2004) on construction products EPD. As it is EPD data, they follow the
322 same general principles as EPDs assessed through the European standard EN 15804. It means
323 that the environmental impact value covers all the life cycle of a product (production,

324 transport, use, demolition and end of life). The impact categories are the one from the NF P
325 01-010 standards (AFNOR, 2004). These standards are close to CML methods (Guinée et al.,
326 2002). It has to be noted that it is only because we used this EPD data format, that we could
327 simplify the LCA of building materials involved in the life cycle of a building as a
328 multiplication of elementary impact of the building material (through all the life cycle), the
329 mass used for the construction of the building and the number of time we have to replace it.

330 When the EPD doesn't exist, environmental impacts have been calculated from Ecoinvent
331 database (Kellenberger et al., 2007). However, as Ecoinvent is a calculation from cradle to
332 gate (production at plant), results need to be adapted to be compared to INIES database
333 (cradle to grave). In this case, the environmental impacts of material's production (cradle-to-
334 gate) have been calculated using Simapro v2.2 software (Goedkoop and Oele, 2004) and
335 Ecoinvent database. Then then other phases such as transport, use and end of life have been
336 added by taking a given ratio from the production phase. Actually, previous works have
337 shown that it was possible, without deteriorating too much the results, to consider the other
338 phases of the life cycle as a given percentage of the production phase (Lasvaux, 2010). The
339 details of these percentages are presented in table 3c.

340 Concerning the standard deviation used for the elementary impact k of building materials,
341 three cases have been considered:

342 **Case 1:** There are several EPDs for the same material or element. In this case the mean and
343 standard deviation was calculated using these EPDs. A list of materials for which the
344 elementary environmental impact uncertainties have been calculated with this method is
345 presented in table 3a.

346 **Case 2:** There is only one EPD linked to the material or element considered. In this case, the
347 standard deviation coming from the pedigree matrix of the process associated with the
348 production of the material in the Ecoinvent database has been used; and the EPD value has

349 been considered as the mean value. A list of materials for which the elementary
350 environmental impact uncertainties have been calculated with this method is presented in
351 table 3b.

352 **Case 3:** There is no EPD in the INIES database. In this case, mean value is calculated from
353 EcoInvent once adapted to cradle-to-grave and the standard deviation is coming from the
354 pedigree matrix of the process associated with the production of the material in the Ecoinvent
355 database. In the only case of reinforced concrete elements, a further uncertainty concerning
356 the amount of steel has been added (table 3c).

357

358 3.3. *Uncertainty calculation*

359 Once all the uncertainties are defined, we used the equation (22) for evaluation of
360 uncertainties in environmental performance of material and then equation (24) for evaluation
361 of uncertainties in environmental performance of building. From the central limit theorem, the
362 uncertainties in environmental performances of building are presented two standards
363 deviation 2σ away from the mean.

364

365

366 4. Results

367

368 4.1. *Environmental assessment of the two projects*

369 Figure 2 shows eight indicators of environmental impact for the two projects.

370 The variability of the results takes into account the uncertainties from building materials. Two
371 types of results can be seen depending on the impact category. For the impact category related
372 to global warming (GWP) the results show that the project with reinforced concrete structure
373 with a variation between 469.7 and 674.5 kg eq CO₂/m² has a significant greater

374 environmental impact than the wood structure where values vary from 232.6 kg
375 eq CO₂/m². However, for all the other impact categories uncertainties induce variations so that
376 the two projects do not have significant differences (Figure 2).

377 In order to reduce the uncertainties and choose the best project, we propose to identify the
378 contribution of the different material to the global results in order to evaluate where are the
379 easiest and most efficient improvements which can be done to reduce this variation and have
380 finally a significant difference between the two projects.

381

382 4.2. Contribution analysis

383 To do so, it is necessary to perform a contribution analysis which is done by the simplified
384 method at the material level (equation (16)) and at the building level (equation (19)). Results
385 are shown in Figure 3.

386 The contribution analysis at the material scale allows distinguishing which one of the 3
387 parameters (service life, mass and elementary impact) has the greatest contribution to
388 variability. It seems clear that uncertainties on the exact mass of material used do not
389 influence the variability. Furthermore, except for structural materials which have, by
390 hypothesis, a service life equal to the house's service life, the variability for the other
391 materials seems to be essentially controlled by the service life uncertainties. A few exceptions
392 such as plaster, non-structural wood and zinc have a contribution of service life and
393 elementary impact on uncertainties which are comparable.

394 At the building scale, figure 3 shows clearly that thermal insulation (rock wool), PVC and
395 bitumen (waterproofing) are sharing most of the variability of the houses. It is also interesting
396 to note that even if the mean contribution of reinforced concrete is important (mass x
397 elementary environmental impact), its uncertainty is so low that the variability at the building
398 scale is still quite low. On the contrary, there are materials such as bitumen or plaster which

399 have not a great contribution to the mean environmental impact of the projects, but that due to
400 uncertainties on service life (and partly on elementary environmental impact), could
401 contribute in some circumstances (shortest service life with an inefficient production
402 process) to a much larger part of the global building's environmental impact.

403

404 **5. Discussion**

405

406 *5.1. Sensitivity of results to hypothesis on uncertainties*

407 The result that we have obtain in term of relative contribution of the different materials to the
408 variability of building's environmental impact are, of course, dependant on the uncertainties
409 on the 3 parameters (m, k, n) of each material. Therefore, it seems important to evaluate the
410 accuracy of these uncertainties. What can be observed from the figure 3 is that the
411 contribution of one material is never controlled by mass uncertainties for atmospheric
412 acidification indicator. However, it is the parameter that has been calculated with the lowest
413 accuracy (only expert advice) and for which we have then taken the largest possible variations
414 (15%). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that even, if the accuracy of mass uncertainties is
415 not perfect, the fact that we had a very low contribution of mass, show that this parameter is
416 not important for uncertainty calculation.

417 Concerning assumption on service life, the uncertainties on service life of building materials
418 are based on an extensive review and even if they could be improved, this study present for
419 the first time, as far as we know, a methodology for the comparison of two different projects
420 considering the uncertainties and variability in service life on different building materials
421 associated with uncertainties on their individual environmental impact. The only strong
422 hypothesis we made is to consider that structural material last as long as the house. This

423 assumption where concrete, bricks or wood last as long as the house, could be discussed and
424 probably improved. We think that the appropriate way of assessing this uncertainty would be
425 to have uncertainty on the service life of the house rather than on the structural materials.
426 Actually, it can be explained as the fact that if concrete is deteriorated through corrosion or
427 that if bricks wall is fractured, it might reduce the service life of the entire house, rather than
428 just inducing the replacement of structural materials. It can be easily demonstrated that the
429 contribution of the service life, impact coefficient and quantity taken off in material and
430 element level doesn't depend in the service life of building. But the contribution of material at
431 building scale can be controlled by the service life of the building. This aspect should
432 however be assessed in more details in further works. Thus, it is worthwhile to note that the
433 methodology would be the same.

434 Finally, uncertainties on individual environmental impact of materials have been taken as
435 much as possible form variability between EPDs. From that point of view, these variations are
436 more related to difference in process efficiency between companies as EPDs are industry
437 based data and can be specific to one industry company and therefore to the efficiency of their
438 production process. It is different from variability values coming from EcoInvent where the
439 standard deviation comes from the PEDIGREE matrix which characterize the quality of the
440 data. Typically how many surveys have been done, are data measured or coming from
441 experts, etc... It is not related with a "physical" variability between industrial sites but rather
442 a variability related to assumption on the quality of data.

443 5.2. *Towards a decision tool ?*

444 In that situation, the developed method provides a first step towards a tool, which will give
445 the relative contribution of each material to the variability of the building. In this particular
446 case, we identified bitumen, PVC and rock wool (in the reinforced concrete house) as major
447 contributors, due to uncertainties on their service life. It could then be possible to try to

448 improve the service life of the specific products to reduce the uncertainty. For instance, a
449 control on site work could be done, just after that the rock wool has been fixed in order to
450 certify that it has been done correctly (vapour barriers, humidity control, etc.). Similar work
451 could be done for bitumen where it could for instance be mandatory to avoid an exposition to
452 UV or high temperature in order to reduce bitumen potential deterioration and assure a given
453 service life. Finally, PVC tubes which represent a total length of 83 meter in this project,
454 could be installed in a way that they can easily be checked and only partially removed so that
455 the majority of PVC tubes can also have given service life expectation. But the identification
456 of specific materials is also due to internal bias of our method. Firstly it can be due to the
457 house we studied and the quality of the data collected. Is 83 m of PVC tube in a single house
458 of 100 m² reasonable or very particular? Further case study should then be assessed with the
459 method developed in this study to strengthen the study. It can also be due to the fact that the
460 EPD we used for one building material is specific to one very specific product which is not
461 exactly the same as the one used in the house. For instance, for PVC tube, the only data
462 provided in the INIES database is for tubes with a diameter of 12.5 cm. It is probably not the
463 only size of PVC tube used in the house and the contribution of PVC might then be
464 overestimated.

465 The methodology proposed here is then a potential tool for stakeholders to quickly evaluate in
466 a project which aspects will induce a large variability on the expected environmental
467 performance related to building materials. However, before that, more case studies should be
468 done and the database on building materials expanded as for the moment, all building
469 materials do not have EPDs.

470

471 **6. Conclusion**

472 This paper focused on the uncertainties associated with building materials when assessing
473 environmental impact of building. To do so, our methodology was based on the statistical
474 method of contribution analysis which is used to identify parameters having the greatest
475 contribution to the uncertainty of final results.

476 Previous studies have been working with Monte Carlo analysis which is time consuming
477 when addressing uncertainties of each material. In this study, we developed and tested a
478 simplified method based on Taylor series expansion. This allows very quickly knowing, at the
479 building scale, which material has the greatest contribution to the environmental impact
480 variability when we only focus on the impact of building materials used during the life cycle
481 of a building and do not consider energy and water used during the operation phase and the
482 possible relationship between operation energy and grey energy. This fast identification could
483 then be one of the tools stakeholders can use to constrain constructors or design offices to
484 provide controls or design modification on specific aspect of the building, in order to better
485 constrain service life of some building materials.. These first results presented here are
486 encouraging as it has been shown that it is possible to choose which materials' parameters has
487 to be constrained in order to significantly reduce the uncertainty on the results. However
488 further work is needed, in particular to improve the database on uncertainties at the material
489 scale and the number of materials covered in the EPD database.

490

491 **Acknowledgements**

492 The research was funded by the Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment, Grenoble-
493 France. This work is part of a national project ANR BENEFIS for sustainable building and
494 city, and national project ELODIE 2.

495

496 **References**

- 497 ADEME-Agence de l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie, 2001. Gestion Sélective
498 des déchets sur les chantiers de construction, France.
- 499 AFNOR-French Standardization Agency, 2004. Environmental quality of construction
500 products-environmental and health declaration of construction products, France.
- 501 Aktas, C.B, Bilec, M.M., 2012. Impact of service life on US residential building LCA results.
502 International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, 17, 337-349.
- 503 Aktas, C.B., 2011. Impact of product service life on life cycle assessment results. PhD thesis.
504 University of Pittsburgh.
- 505 Albano, J.R., 2005. Maintenance des bâtiments En 250 fiches pratiques. Deuxième édition.
506 Librairie du MONITEUR, France; p. 492.
- 507 Annex 31, 2005. Sensitivity and Uncertainty. Energy-Related Environmental Impact of
508 Building. International Energy Agency, Energy Conservation in Buildings and
509 Community Systems. Available from: <http://www.iisbe.org/annex31/index.html>;
510 (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 511 Ashworth, A., 1996. Estimating the life expectancies of building components in life-cycle
512 costing calculations. Structural Survey, 14(2), 4-8.
- 513 Bahr, C., Lennerts, K., 2010. Lebens-und Nutzungsdauer von Bauteilen.
514 Forschungsprogramm, „Zukunft Bau“, des Bundesinstituts für Bau-, Stadt-und
515 Raumforschung (BBSR), sowie des Bundesamtes für Bauwesen und Raumordnung
516 (BBR), p. 129.
- 517 Basset-Mens, C., van der Werf, H.M.G., 2005. Scenario-based environmental assessment of
518 farming systems: the case of pig production in France. Agriculture, Ecosystems and
519 Environment, 105, 127-144.

- 520 Björklund, A.E., 2002. Survey of approaches to improve reliability in LCA. *International*
521 *Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7(2), 64-72.
- 522 Blengini, G.A., Di Carlo, T. 2010. Energy-saving policies and low-energy residential
523 buildings: an LCA case study to support decision makers in Piedmont (Italy). *The*
524 *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 15, 652-665
- 525 Bosquet, S., 2003. Etude d'un système autonome de production d'énergie couplant un champ
526 photovoltaïque, un électrolyseur et une pile à combustible : réalisation d'un banc d'essai
527 et modélisation. PhD thesis, Ecole des Mines de Paris.
- 528 Capros, P., Kouvaritakis, N., Mantzos, L., 2001. Economic evaluation of sectorial emission
529 reduction objectives for climate change: top-down analysis of greenhouses gas emission
530 possibilities in the EU. Contribution to a study for dg environment: European
531 Commission by Ecofys Energy and Environment, AEA Technology Environment and
532 National Technical University of Athens.
- 533 CatalogueConstruction.CH, 2009. Available from: [www.catalogueconstruction.ch/ch/fr/](http://www.catalogueconstruction.ch/ch/fr/catalogueconstruction.asp)
534 [catalogueconstruction.asp](http://www.catalogueconstruction.ch/ch/fr/catalogueconstruction.asp). (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 535 Ciroth, A., Fleischer, G., Steinbach, J., 2004. Uncertainty calculation in life cycle assessment.
536 A combined model of simulation and approximation. *International Journal of Life Cycle*
537 *Assessment*, 9(4), 216-226.
- 538 Cooper, T., 2004. Inadequate life? Evidence of consumer attitudes to product obsolescence.
539 *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 27(4), 421-449.
- 540 de Vries, B.J.M., van Vuuren, D.P., Hoogwijk, M.M., 2007. Renewable energy sources: Their
541 global potential for the first-half of the 21st century at a global level: An integrated
542 approach. *Energy Policy*, 35, 2590-2610.

- 543 EN-15978, 2011. Contribution des ouvrages de construction au développement durable-
544 Évaluation de la performance environnementale des bâtiments-Méthode de calcul,
545 France. European Standards.
- 546 Fava, J.A., Consoli, F., Dension, R., Dickson, K., Mohin, T., Vigon, B., 1993. A Conceptual
547 Framework for Life-Cycle Impact Assessment; Society of Environmental Toxicology
548 and Chemistry SETAC: Sandestin, FL, USA.
- 549 Fink, P., 1997. LCA History: How It Came About? The Roots of LCA in Switzerland -
550 Continuous Learning by Doing. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 2(3),
551 131-134.
- 552 Frenandez, N.P., 2008. The influence of construction materials on life-cycle energy use and
553 carbon dioxide emissions of medium size commercial building. PhD thesis, School of
554 Architecture, Victoria of Wellington.
- 555 Frischknecht, R., Rebitzer, R., 2005. The ecoinvent database system: a comprehensive web-
556 based LCA database. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 13, 1337-1343.
- 557 Goedkoop, M., Oele, M., 2004. Simapro Database Manual, Methods Library. Pre consultants
558 BV.
- 559 Gomes, F., Brière, R., Habert, G., Feraille, A., Lasvaux, S., Tessier C. 2013. Adaptation of
560 environmental data to national and sectorial context: application for reinforcing steel
561 sold on the French market. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 18, 926-938
- 562 Greenspec, 2013. Available from: <http://greenspec.co.uk/html/durability/durabilitycontent.html>.
563 (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 564 Grübler, A., Nakićenović, N., Victor, D.G., 1999. Modelling technological change:
565 Implications for the global environment. *Annual Review of Energy and the*
566 *Environment*, 24, 545-569.

- 567 Guinée, J.B., Gorrée, M., Heijungs, R., Huppes, G., Kleijn, R., van Oers, L., Sleeswijk, A.,
568 Suh, S., Udo de Haes, H.A., de Bruijn, H., van Duin, R., Huijbregts, M.A.J., 2002. Life
569 Cycle Assessment: An Operational Guide to the ISO standards. Kluwer Academic
570 Publishers, Dordrecht.
- 571 Heijungs, R., Frischknecht, R., 2005. Representing Statistical Distributions for Uncertain
572 Parameters in LCA: Relationships between mathematical forms, their representation in
573 EcoSpold, and their representation in CMLCA. *International Journal of Life Cycle
574 Assessment*, 10(4), 248-254.
- 575 Heijungs, R., Guinée, J., Huppes, G., Lankreijer, R., Udo de Haes, H., Wegener Sleeswijk, A.,
576 Ansems, A., Eggels, P., Duin, R., Goede, H., 1992. *Environmental Life Cycle
577 Assessment of Products: Guide and Backgrounds*; CML, Leiden: Utrecht, The
578 Netherlands.
- 579 Home Inspection, 2010. Available from: [http://www.atdhomeinspection.com/average-product-](http://www.atdhomeinspection.com/average-product-life.htm)
580 [life.htm](http://www.atdhomeinspection.com/average-product-life.htm). (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 581 Huijbregts, M.A.J., 1998. Application of Uncertainty and Variability in LCA, Part I: A
582 General Framework for the Analysis of Uncertainty and Variability in Life Cycle
583 Assessment. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 3(5), 273-280.
- 584 Imbeault-Tetreault H., 2010. Propagation analytique de l'incertitude à travers le calcul
585 matriciel d'une analyse du cycle de vie. Paster thesis. Ecole polytechnique de Montréal.
- 586 INIES , 2009. Database. <http://www.inies.fr/>. (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 587 ISO 14040-International Standardisation Organisation 14040, 2006. *Environmental
588 Management Life Cycle Assessment Principles and Framework*. International Standards
589 Organization, Brussels.

- 590 Jungbluth, I., Bauer, C., Dones, R., Frischknecht, R., 2005. Life Cycle Assessment for
591 Emerging Technologies : Case studies for Photovoltaic and Wind Power. *International*
592 *Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 10(1), 24-34.
- 593 Kellenberger, D., Althaus, H.J., 2009. Relevance of simplifications in LCA of building
594 components. *Building and Environment*, 44, 818-825.
- 595 Kellenberger, D., Kunniger, T., Althaus, H.J., 2007. Life cycle inventories of building
596 products: cement products and processes, final report ecoinvent V2.0 No.7. EMPA
597 Dübendorf: Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories.
- 598 Klöpffer, W., 2006. The role of SETAC in the development of LCA. *International Journal of*
599 *Life Cycle Assessment*, 11(Supplement 1), 116-122.
- 600 Kottje, J., Deutsche, V.M., 2007. ECO-Häuser, Attraktive Häuser mit günstigen
601 Unterhaltskosten. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt München.
- 602 Kurti, I., 1971. Ubereinstimmung der Lebensdauer des Konstruktionen und der Funktionellen
603 Zeitgemässheit von Wohnhäusern. *Periodica Polytechnica Architectura*, 15(n°3-4). p.
604 195-219.
- 605 Lair, J., 2000. Évaluation de la durabilité des systèmes constructifs du bâtiment. PhD thesis,
606 Université Blaise Pascal Clermont II.
- 607 Lasvaux, S., 2010. Etude d'un modelé simplifié pour l'analyse de cycle de vie des bâtiments.
608 PhD thesis, L'école Nationale Supérieure des Mines de Paris.
- 609 Leroy, Y., 2009. Développement d'une méthodologie de fiabilisation des prises de décisions
610 environnementales dans le cadre d'analyses de cycle de vie basée sur l'analyse et la
611 gestion des incertitudes sur les données d'inventaires. PhD thesis, Arts et Métiers
612 ParisTech.

- 613 Levine, M., D. Ürge-Vorsatz, K. Blok, L. Geng, D. Harvey, S. Lang, G. Levermore, A.
614 Mongameli Mehlwana, S. Mirasgedis, A. Novikova, J. Rilling, H. Yoshino, 2007:
615 Residential and commercial buildings. In *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation.*
616 *Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the*
617 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R.
618 Dave, L.A. Meyer (eds)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom
619 and New York, NY, USA.
- 620 Lewandowska, A., Fohynowicz, Z., Podlesny, A., 2004. Comparative LCA of Industrial
621 Objects Part 1: LCA Data Quality Assurance - Sensitivity Analysis and Pedigree
622 Matrix. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 9(2), 86-89.
- 623 Lloyd, S.M., Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, Propagating, and Analysing Uncertainty in Life-
624 Cycle Assessment: A Survey of Quantitative Approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*,
625 11(1), 161-179.
- 626 Minnesota Building, 2004. Center for Sustainable Building Research. Available from:
627 <http://www.buildingmaterials.umn.edu/materials.html>. (accessed: 13.03.2013).
- 628 Morgan, M.G., Henrion, M., Small, M., 1900. *Uncertainty. A guide to Dealing with*
629 *Uncertainty in Quantitative Risk and Policy Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- 630 Murtha, J., 2000. *Decisions Involving Uncertainty: An @RISK tutorial for the petroleum*
631 *industry*. 2nd Edition, New York.
- 632 NASA-National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2010. *NASA handbook:*
633 *Measurement Uncertainty Analysis Principles and Methods*. Nasa Measurement Quality
634 Assurance Handbook-Annex 3. Washington DC 20546. Available from:
635 <https://standards.nasa.gov/documents/detail/3315776>.
- 636 OPAC 38, 1993. *Projet global, qualité entretien. Evaluation des besions en entretien*, France.

- 637 PERET, J., 1995. Guide de maintenance des bâtiments. Paris. Ed. : Le Moniteur, France, p.
638 431.
- 639 Peupartier, B., Thiers, S., Guiavarch, A. 2013. Eco-design of buildings using thermal
640 simulation and life cycle assessment. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 39, 73–78.
- 641 PI BAT, 1995. Vieillissement des éléments de construction et coût d'entretien. Données pour
642 l'entretien et la rénovation des immeubles d'habitation. Office fédéral des questions
643 conjoncturelles, p.110. Available from:
644

- 661 Available from: ftp://ftp.cmhc-
662 schl.gc.ca/mah/fr/French_Version_Capital_Replacement_Planning_Manual.pdf .
- 663 Setac, 1999. LCA in building and construction: A state-of-the-art report of SETAC-EUROPE.
664 Hét instituut voor kwaliteit in de bouw.
- 665 Setac, 2001. Europe LCA working group 'data availability and data quality'. International
666 Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, 6(3), 127-132.
- 667 Sonnemann, G., Castells, F., Schuhmacher, M., 2003. Integrated Life-Cycle and Risk
668 Assessment for Industrial Processes, Lewis Publishers: Boca Raton, FL, USA.
- 669 Taykir, J., 2000. Incertitudes et analyse des erreurs dans les mesures physiques. Masson
670 Sciences.
- 671 Tian, W., de Wilde, P. 2013. Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis of building performance
672 using probabilistic climate projections: A UK case study. Automation in Construction,
673 20, 1096–1109
- 674 Unpublished, 2013. Data gathered by BEST - Politecnico di Milano-CSTB.
- 675 Unpublished, 2013. Data gathered by CSTB from a French Building Property Management
676 company. Various publications from the International Conference on Durability of
677 Building Materials and Components. Guideline for LCC prepared by the division of
678 facilities development (DFD), France.
- 679 UNSTATS, 2010. Greenhouse gas emissions by sector (Absolute values). New York: United
680 Nation Statistical Division.
- 681 Wang, E., Shen Z. 2013. A hybrid Data Quality Indicator and statistical method for improving
682 uncertainty analysis in LCA of complex system – application to the whole-building
683 embodied energy analysis. Journal of Cleaner Production. 43, 166–17

- 684 Weidema, B.P., Wesnaes, M.S., 1996. Data quality management for life cycle inventories-an
685 example of using data quality indicators. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 4, 167-174.
- 686 Werner, F. Scholz, R.S. 2002. Ambiguities in decision-oriented Life Cycle Inventories The
687 Role of mental models. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7, 330-338

688

689 **Figure caption**

690 Figure 1. Floor plan for the reference house.

691 Figure 2. Comparison between two projects of single houses for different environmental
692 impact categories. Uncertainties at the material scale are calculated and propagated
693 using the methodology developed in this study. Error bars represent standard deviation
694 ($\pm 2\sigma$)

695 Figure 3. Relative contribution of the different parameters at the two scales studied for the
696 two house projects. At the building scale, the contribution of the different materials with
697 their uncertainties is shown and compared between the two projects. At the material
698 scale, the contribution of the mass, the elementary impact and the lifetime expectancy
699 are shown. Error bars represent standard deviation ($\pm\sigma$).

700

701 **Table caption**

702 Table.1. List of materials used for the construction of the two studied houses.

703 Table 2 Expected lifetime of materials. Mean value and standard deviation are calculated
704 from a number of reference values for each material. Minimum and maximum values
705 are also shown. References for these variations are: [1] Pi BAT, 1995; [2] Frenandez,
706 2008; [3] Aktas, 2011; [4] SCHL-CMHC, 2000; [5] Minnesota Building. Center for
707 Sustainable Building Research, 2004; [6] Albano, 2005 ; [7] Greenspec, 2013; [8]
708 Home Inspection, 2010; [9] Catalogue Construction, 2009; [10] OPAC 38, 1993 ; [11]
709 Kurti, 1971 ; [12] INIES, 2009; [13] Référentiel millésime 2012 synthèse., 2012. [14]
710 Bahr and Lennerts, 2010; [15] Kottje and Deutsche, 2007; [16] Lair, 2000 ; [17]

711 PERET, 1995; [18] Bosquet, 2003; [19] Jungbluth et al., 2005; [20] CSTB, 2012; [21]
712 Politecnico di Milano-CSTB, 2012.

713 Table.3.a. List of materials for which variation in the elementary environmental impact
714 (Mean, SD) has been calculated directly from the EPD values.

715 Table.3.b. List of materials for which the EPD value is used as a mean value and standard
716 deviation is calculated with Pedigree matrix from ecoinvent.

717 Table.3.c. List of materials for which no EPD exist. The environmental impact is calculated
718 from Ecoinvent production process data on which a percentage of the impact of the
719 material production is added to the result to build an equivalent of the EPD.

720

721 **Highlights:**

722 We perform a life cycle assessment of two different projects on the same single house

723 We propagate the uncertainties and variability on inputs data at building scale

724 A method is proposed to analyse the relative contributions of input variables

725 This method is used to strengthen comparison between projects

Building materials or elements	details	Reinforced concrete house	Wooden house	Unit
		Qty	Qty	
Non-structural clay materials	Tiles	130	Idem	m ²
Structural clay materials	Wall	25727	-	kg
	Mortar	1530	-	kg
Non-structural concrete	Sill	347	-	kg
	Blinding concrete	1.44	Idem	m ³
	Concrete layer/grout	4.94	Idem	m ³
	Beam	3.216	-	m ³
	Column	0,9821	-	m ³
Reinforced concrete	Foundations	11.31	Idem	m ³
	Stairs	0,4935	-	m ³
	Floor	8,276	-	m ³
	Slab	15	Idem	m ³
	Garage door	4.8	Idem	m ²
Non-structural steel	Uprights and rails	54.5	Idem	kg
	Valves	27.5	Idem	kg
	Ext. & int. doors	13.45	Idem	m ²
Non-structural wood	Cabinet for sink	0.065	Idem	m ³
	Shutter	-	15.63	m ²
	Paneling	-	54.54	m ²
	Truss construction	3.82	Idem	m ³
	Beam	-	1.13	m ³
Structural wood	Column	-	0.32	m ³
	Stairs	-	0.2657	m ³
	Deck	-	6	m ³
	Wall	-	6.8015	m ³
Thermal insulation	Glass wool	-	809	kg
	Rock wool	1211	-	kg
	Shutter	15.63	-	m ²
PVC	Pipelines	519.5	-	kg
	Paneling	54.54	-	m ²
Bitumen	Waterproofing	159.25	Idem	m ²
Plaster	Products for false ceilings/suspended ceilings/Wall coverings	4643	Idem	kg
Acoustic insulation	Polyurethane	243.5	Idem	kg
Solar hot water panels	Water heater	4	Idem	m ²
Window	PVC	15.61	-	m ²
	Bois	-	15.61	m ²
Paint	Paint	166.6		kg
	Varnish		115.2	kg
Electrical installation	Outlets/light-switch/ mini- breakers/ lamps/etc.	1	Idem	u
	Porcelain WC	2	Idem	u
	Porcelain Sink	2	Idem	u
	Acrylic Bathtub	1	Idem	u
Sanitary installation	Enameled sandstone Kitchen sink	1	Idem	u
	Enameled sandstone shower plate	1	Idem	u
	Porcelain paving	72.13	24	m ²
Zinc	Gutter system	10.6	Idem	m ²

Building materials or elements	details	Lifetime				Number of data	References
		Min	Mean	Max	SD		
Non-structural clay materials	Tiles	15	49.44	100	19.09 N=18	[36,49,50,52,56,57,59,60,63,64]	
Non-structural concrete	Mortar	15	36.52	100	15.75 N=36	[36,44,52,56,58]	
	Sill					Same as windows	
Non-structural steel	Garage door	10	18.57	35	7.48 N=19	[44,47,51,56]	
	Uprights and rails					Same as plaster	
	Valves	10	16.25	25	4.41 N=12	[44]	
Non-structural wood	Ext. & int. doors	10	37.15	80	16.67 N=58	[36,44,45,47,49,50,52,54,57,58,59,62,63]	
	Cabinet for sink					Same as porcelain sink	
	Shutter	10	28.75	60	10.97 N=36	[44,49,51,53,55,58,59,62]	
	Paneling	10	3.26	100	16.54 N=46	[44,45,48,50,51,55,58,59,62,63]	
Thermal insulation	Glass wool	20	38	60	15.49 N=10	[36,49,52,58,62]	
	Rock wool	20	37.5	60	15.85 N=10	[36,49,58,62]	
PVC	Shutter	15	25.05	40	9.33 N=18	[36,49,55,58,59,62]	
	Pipelines	15	25.64	60	9.34 N=22	[36,44,47,49,50,57,58,59,62]	
	Paneling	15	27.14	50	12.19 N=7	[36,49,50,55,58,59]	
Bitumen	Waterproofing	5	27.78	60	16.9 N=50	[36,44,45,47,48,49,50,52,58,59,62]	
Plaster	Products for false ceilings/suspended ceilings/Wall coverings	15	33.14	70	13.17 N=68	[36,45,47,49,52,57,58,59,62,63]	
Acoustic insulation	Polyurethane	20	37.14	60	16.03 N=7	[36,49,52,55,58,62]	
Solar hot water panels	Water heater	10	23.21	60	13.53 N=14	[36,44,49,50,52,59,60,61]	
Window	PVC	20	33.06	50	10 N=18	[44,49,50,51,52,59,62]	
	Wood	15	37.76	60	12.92 N=29	[36,44,45,49,50,51,52,58,59,62]	
Paint	Paint	5	15.64	50	8.92 N=83	[36,44,45,46,48,49,51,55,57,58,62,63]	
	Varnish					Same as paint	
Electrical installation	Outlets/light-switch/ mini- breakers/ lamps/etc.	5	19.31	60	9.4 N=204	[36,44,47,51]	
Sanitary installation	Porcelain WC	15	27.92	50	10.54 N=12	[36,44]	
	Porcelain Sink	15	26.43	40	8.99 N=7	[36,44]	
	Acrylic Bathtub	10	27	50	11.12 N=13	[36,44,48]	
	Enameled sandstone Kitchen sink					Same as porcelain sink	
	Enameled sandstone shower plate					Same as bathtub	
	Porcelain paving	10	47.3	100	23.37 N=26	[36,44,46,48]	
Zinc	Gutter system	10	18	30	5.87 N=10	[49,53,57,59,59,62]	


Materials	Elements
Non-structural clay	Tiles
Structural clay	Wall
Non-structural concrete	Mortar Sill
Non-structural steel	Garage door Uprights and rails Valves
Structural wood	Truss construction Stairs Deck
Thermal insulation	Glass wool Rockwool
PVC	Paneling
Bitumen	Waterproofing
Plaster	Ceilings / walls
Acoustical insulation	Polyurethane
Paint	Paint Varnish
Sanitary installation	Porcelain paving


Materials	Elements
Non-structural concrete	Blinding concrete Concrete layer/grout
Structural wood	Beam Column
PVC	Pipelines
Bitumen	Waterproofing
Window	Wood
Electrical installation	Outlets/light-switch/ mini-breakers/ lamps/etc.
Sanitary installation	Porcelain WC Porcelain Sink Acrylic Bathtub Enameled sandstone Kitchen sink Enameled sandstone shower plate

Materials	Elements	Contribution of the other life cycle phase (%) *	Variability in steel quantity (kg) (min-mean-max)
Reinforced concrete	Beam	Concrete: r(3),u(20),w(2) Steel: u(20),w(5)	80-130-180
	Column	Idem	50-80-150
	Foundations	Idem	20-40-80
	Stairs	Idem	5-40-100
	Floor	Idem	5-40-100
	Slab	Idem	5-40-60
Non-structural steel	Garage door	r(10),u(20),w(3)	
	Uprights and rails	u(20),w(5)	
	Valves	u(20),w(5)	
Non-structural wood	Cabinet for sink	r(10),u(20),w(2)	
	Shutter	r(10),u(20),w(9)	
	Paneling	r(10),u(20),w(9)	
Structural wood	Wall	u(20),w(2)	
PVC	Shutter	r(10),u(20),w(1)	
Solar hot water panels	Water heater	u(20),w(5)	
Window	PVC	u(20),w(15)	
Zinc	Gutter system	r(4),u(20),w(1)	


* life cycle phase not integrated in Ecolnvent cradle to gate data are:

r: Raw materials; u: transport and end of life; w: waste on construction site





ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Highlights:

We perform a life cycle assessment of two different projects on the same single house

We propagate the uncertainties and variability on inputs data at building scale

A method is proposed to analyse the relative contributions of input variables

This method is used to strengthen comparison between projects

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT