

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 2

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	<p>No - Chapter is missing: guidance on the preparation of uncertainty data (please consider requiring descriptive statistics for each flow, e.g. at a minimum the mean, median, and first and third quartiles)</p> <p>guidance on unit process data parameterization, perhaps within the context of section 2.3.2</p> <p>guidance on modeling closed loop processes</p>	<p>Some sections are complete, while others need fortification such as uncertainty assessment.</p>
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	<p>No: The text reads as if no one has attempted to apply this guidance (perhaps a case study will help clarify guidance in general)</p>	<p>needs improvement. It apperas that the text is more like a technical paper, rather than a guide. Taregt users are not necessarily LCA researchers. Thus, improving readabilty is required.</p>
3 <i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i>	<p>No: The repeated reference to the "targeted database" is perpetuating differences (e.g., nomenclature) between databases which might be resolved herein. Consider instead refering to standard data formats... ISO14048 and possibly EcoSpold and ILCD.</p>	<p>yes</p>
4 <i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i>	<p>did not comprehensively check</p>	<p>needs clearer and consistent defintions</p>
5 <i>Are all important references listed?</i>	<p>Some mentioned in the text are not included</p>	<p>No. at least one reference should be cited for a method mentioned in the teext, for instance, Monte Carlo simulation, Pedgree matrix etc.</p>

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 3

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2	Answers - Peer Reviewer 3
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	Yes	The discussion of attributional vs. consequential LCA modeling is incomplete as it needs more description. More examples are needed throughout. At least two quantitative examples of how different allocation techniques lead to substantially different results are suggested (for instance HCl co-product for a variety of products; lignin filter cake allocation from ethanol production)	Yes
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	No	The text is consistent, but perhaps too esoteric. This is a technical subject, so that is expected, but it would be helped immensely by including more examples - keep them simple.	Yes with some edits from the authors still required. It might be a good idea to have a short description for each chapter that in simple terms explains the topic covered so that less advanced practioners get an idea of the topic.

<p><i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In many cases, this section discusses what is currently done - but does not give guidance on what should be done - i.e. last paragraph of 2.4.2. In general - multiple allocation techniques should be evaluated to ensure results are not merely a product of modeling technique. At the same time, guidance to select a particular method may be required for use in databases, etc.</p>	<p>Yes. Section 2 is extremely technical though but outlines the various options/approaches which should be helpful for database developers. Section 3 is very condensed and refers to other Chapters (for which I have no manuscript). I recommend that section 3 is completed with key recommendations further discussed in Chapter 2 and 4 to improve readability and increase completeness for Chapter 3.</p>
<p><i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>(no answer given)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Are all important references listed?</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>(no answer given)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 4

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2	Answers - Peer Reviewer 3
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	Yes	Yes	yes
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	Yes	Yes	yes
3 <i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i>	Yes	Examples to illustrate some recommendations, or some notions like the difference between databases and library would help the understanding.	yes
4 <i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i>	Yes, but I have made 5 comments on the Glossary using sticky notes	When present, yes	no general glossary in the file for chapter 4
5 <i>Are all important references listed?</i>	Uncertain	<i>(no answer given)</i>	no reference list in the file for chapter 4

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 5

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	It is basically complete. However, more discussions on recent development of MRIO databases are advisable.	Yes - does a nice job laying out different types of data sources that would assist in meeting evolving stakeholder needs, and discussing pros/cons of different sources and approaches.
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	It is understandable. However, the use of important words, IOA, IOT, IO-LCA, is a little confusing.	Yes
3 <i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i>	Yes, it does.	Yes
4 <i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i>	I propose a couple of changes in the Comment-by-page sheet.	Yes
5 <i>Are all important references listed?</i>	Important references are basically listed. I propose one additional reference in the Comments-by-page sheet.	Somewhat - would recommend adding some sources in the intro to describe the trends cited (increasing consumer interest and market demand...) and in section 5.4.2, reference the UN standard mentioned in the first standard; some of the references need to be completed and alphabetized.

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 6

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2	Answers - Peer Reviewer 3
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	In general, the chapter is complete and thorough Some more details on how confidentiality of data could be maintained in the context of international databases might be useful as this is a common problem of data collection and data sharing. This may particularly affect international efforts at capacity building which might be viewed with suspicion by potential data providers. This is already the case at a national level. I'm not sure if this may have already been addressed in other chapters.	I think 6 is a very important chapter, even if I don't know the others. The guidance still is rather limited in the chapter. It's more a strong statement for the importance of capacity building related to LCA database development. I'm not fully sure about the goal of the full document, but with chapter 6 there is few specific guidance on capability deveelopment.	Yes
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	Yes	Mostly yes, see some comments	Yes
3 <i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i>	Yes	Partly it does it, but what is meant with interlinked and how linking od datasets can work does not become clear, so it remains rather weak in terms of real practices, but indicates where such technical practices are needed	Yes
4 <i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i>	Yes	no access to glossary	<i>(no answer given)</i>

5 <i>Are all important references listed?</i>	Yes	no access to references, if the footnotes are meant to be references, I would recommend a different citation style, avoiding footnotes	Yes
---	-----	--	-----

UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative - Type 2 Peer Review Process
Global Guidance Principles for LCA Databases

Comments by question - CHAPTER 7

Question	Answers - Peer Reviewer 1	Answers - Peer Reviewer 2
1 <i>Is the Chapter thorough and complete?</i>	yes	not having the full picture of the document, chapter 7 is not easy to fully judge for me, but overall it seem to be very complete and comprehensive. I like the scenario approach, unless it does not fully work in this case, as the scenarios are not real alternatives, but as stated more development directions that will probably be combined.
2 <i>Is the text in general consistent and understandable?</i>	yes/partial	Mostly yes, see some comments. Definitions are missing, if you only have access to chapter 6 and 7
3 <i>Does the document/chapter advance the technical practices associated with LCA databases, and/or does it provide an indication of where/how the practices should advance?</i>	yes	Yes it does.
4 <i>Are the definitions present in the glossary, (relevant for your chapter), appropriate, precise, understandable and consistent?</i>	yes	no access to glossary
5 <i>Are all important references listed?</i>	yes	the list of references is mainly a link list and would not be acceptable from a scientific point of view. I'm not familiar with citation guidelines for UN publications, but would recommend to use references in the same way this is done in any peer reviewed scientific paper. This may also lead to wider use of the document in the scientific community.