

### 1.3.3. CARBON FOOTPRINT STUDY IN CONSTRUCTION IN SPAIN

OERCO2  
ONLINE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE FOR INNOVATIVE STUDY OF CONSTRUCTION  
MATERIALS LIFE CYCLE

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.

This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein

1



ROMANIA  
GREEN  
BUILDING  
COUNCIL



Consortium members: Universidad de Sevilla (US), Asociación Empresarial de Investigación Centro Tecnológico del Mármol, Piedra y Materiales (CTM), CertiMaC Soc. Cons. a r. L. (CertiMaC), Centro Tecnológico da Cerâmica e do Vidro (CTCV), Universitatea Transilvania din Braşov (UTBV), Asociația România Green Building Council (RoGBC).

## 1. Introduction

The carbon footprint study is focused in investigations related to construction industry, in which this indicator has been evaluated in the construction phase, using ACV methodologies and equivalents.

## 2. Related research

From the civil work sector, we emphasize these two inquiries:

Fernández-Sánchez y Rodríguez-López (2010) assessed various indicators of sustainability in construction projects, explicitly applying to roads. With an innovative methodology concluded that the most important indicators in these types of projects are, sorted by relevance: power consumption, waste management, ecological footprint, carbon footprint (CO<sub>2</sub> emissions), health and safety.

Another survey of Barandica et al. (2013) allowed, through an innovative management system, reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in highway projects. Four types of highway projects were assessed in construction phase with ACV methodology. According to the authors, the initial effort to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should be focussed in two points: earth movements and improvement in efficiency of machinery. Secondly, the choice of materials and restoration of environmental systems.

It is too important in civil work, although the same applies to other type of constructions, environmental impact assessments. Thus, for example, CEMEX Company has developed an indicator (CO<sub>2</sub> footprint) to evaluate carbon footprint in their products. According to CEMEX, the objectives of this indicator are the following:

- Quantifying the gas emissions in CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents of their products, in order to support emission reduction targets.
- Performing a benchmark between different installations of the company to promote a continuous improvement in carbon footprint reduction.
- Communicating their carbon footprint products to the stakeholders. This information allows to customers obtain a specific footprint of CEMEX products that will be used in their projects.

The carbon footprint evaluated by the company counts the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent directly and indirectly emitted during the entire building process, to the door of the CEMEX factory (approach “cradle to gate”). All the production steps are considered, from the raw materials generation as of natural resources and their transport, through manufacturing and packaging (if it’s necessary), to the moment when the product leaves the CEMEX factory.

The methodology developed by CEMEX is based on the norm ISO 14040:2006 “Life cycle assessment” and the standard PAS 2050:2008 “Specification for the assessment of the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of goods and services”, such as versions “draft” of ISO 14067 “Carbon Footprint of products” and the protocol WBCSD/GHG “Product Life Cycle Accounting and Reporting Standard”.

On the sustainable materials level, there are studies related to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions too. Martínez-Alonso y Berdasco (2015) assessed the carbon footprint in wood products in the north of Spain. Wood analysed was structural use and non-structural. The methodology used to determine the carbon footprint was PAS 2050 “Specification for the assessment of the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of goods and services”, applying cradle to gate analysis. Sensitivity studies were made to consider the influence of the transport from the origin and sawmills efficiency. The study determined that for 1 m<sup>3</sup> of wooden products, the total of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were in the range of 100 to 400 kg CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

In addition, Gieseke et al. (2016) publication is important, because it analyses the situation of the construction field from the point of view of the awareness in the use of sustainable materials. For that purpose, various actors specialized in sustainable materials (technicians, promoters, factories, managers, etc.) were analysed the advantages and disadvantages of the use of these materials by surveys and interviews.

The objective of the study was to understand the economic, technique, practice and culture barriers that prevented professionals selecting low carbon materials.

Finally, we focus on studies related to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the phase of building construction. We are going to analyse three surveys:

First, Mercader et al. (2010) raise the generation of a quantification model of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions produced during the implementation of the usual constructive model like residential blocks intended for social housing derived from the manufacturing process of the material resources used in their implementation. Identification and quantification of the construction materials consumed, allowed knowing the environmental impact produced by the defined typology, through one of the most important indicators of environmental impact associated to weight per m<sup>2</sup> of construction, like CO<sub>2</sub> emissions deriving from the process of manufacture of the construction materials used in their execution. The practical implementation to a set of ten

construction projects located in Seville, provided conclusive data about the quantification of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions produced during the execution, identifying the greatest environmental impact.

González y García Navarro (2006) were pioneers in Spain in evaluation of construction materials from the point of view of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This assessment was verified through the study of three houses with low environmental impact. According to the authors, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in construction phase could be reduced to a 30%, with careful selection of low environmental impact materials. The purpose of the study was to quantify CO<sub>2</sub> avoided emissions with the method presented in the selection phase, in other words, in the project design. The three houses evaluated were compared with a standard house without low environmental impact materials. These three houses were built according to low impact criteria, and they used alternative sources of energy.

Finally, Ortiz et al. (2009) assessed a Catalonia house following the life cycle management methodology. The life cycle management can be applied to all set of construction process, enabling the improvement of sustainability indicators and building's loads during their life cycle. To illustrate, a study was implemented in a typical Mediterranean house in Catalonia, using the methodology, and which estimated life is about 50 years, and projected according to CTE. The objective of the investigation is to use sustainability indicators in the design, use and maintenance phases. The conclusion was that the use could involve to 90% of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associates to all life cycle of the building.

Thus, the use phase was considered the most critical for the needs of heating, cooling, ventilation, illumination, electrical appliances and cooking.

Additionally, it was concluded that the appropriate combination of the improvement in the behaviour of the materials, change consumption patterns and application of specific legislation conditions of buildings to build would further improve.

### 3. References

Gonzalo Fernández-Sánchez, Fernando Rodríguez-López, 2010. A methodology to identify sustainability indicators in construction Project management—Application to infrastructure projects in Spain. *Ecological Indicators* 10 (2010) 1193–1201.

Oscar Ortiz, Cecile Bonnet, JoanCarles Bruno, Francesc Castells, 2009. Sustainability based on LCM of residential dwellings: A case study in Catalonia, Spain. *Building and Environment* 44 (2009) 584–594.



Jannik Giesekam, John R. Barrett & Peter Taylor (2016) Construction sector views on low carbon building materials, *Building Research & Information*, 44:4, 423-444.

María Jesús González, Justo García Navarro, 2006. Assessment of the decrease of CO2 emissions in the construction field through the selection of materials: Practical case study of three houses of low environmental impact. *Building and Environment* 41 (2006) 902–909.

P. Mercader, A. Ramírez de Arellano, M. Olivares, 2012. Modelo de cuantificación de las emisiones de CO2 producidas en edificación derivadas de los recursos materiales consumidos en su ejecución. *Informes de la Construcción* Vol. 64, 527, 401-414.

Jesús M. Barandica, Gonzalo Fernández-Sánchez, Álvaro Berzosa, Juan A. Delgado, Francisco J. Acosta, 2013. Applying life cycle thinking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from road projects. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 57 (2013) 79-91.

Celia Martínez-Alonso, Lorena Berdasco, 2015. Carbon footprint of sawn timber products of *Castanea sativa* Mill in the north of Spain. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 102 (2015) 127-135.