



European Union European Regional Development Fund

The carbon footprint of the activities of the Food Bank of Navarra

Maite M. Aldaya Researcher ISFOOD, UPNA



20 to 22 October 2020 · 3rd Transnational Learning Journey in Satakunta



Table of contents

- 1. Context, concepts and methodology
- 2. Carbon footprint of the activities of the Food Bank of Navarra (FBN)
- 3. GHG emissions in a scenario "without the action of the FBN"
- 4. Comparison of emissions "with and without the action of the FBN"



* Link to the report: https://bancoalimentosnavarra.org/wpcontent/uploads/2020/10/Informe-Huella-Carbono-BAN.pdf



1. Context, concepts and methodology



1. Context





1. Concepts and methodology

Carbon footprint of an organization

- Measures the total GHG emissions caused directly or indirectly by an organization.
- Unit: tonnes of CO₂ equivalent (t CO₂e)
- GHG emissions are measured in terms of CO₂, since it is the GHG with the greatest influence on global warming
- * GHGs: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydroflucarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃)



1. Concepts and methodology

Calculation of GHG emissions

GHG emissions (t CO_2e) = Activity data x Emission factor

Activity data: Data on the magnitude of a human activity resulting in emissions.

Source: Consumption invoices, vehicle mileage, food records destined to certain locations, interviews of volunteer transport.

Emission factor: A coefficient that quantifies the emissions of a gas per unit activity. Source: MITECO, OCCC, ADEME, MCP.

Source: MITECO (2016), GHG Protocol (2005), ISO 14064-1 (2019), IPCC (2019)



1. Concepts and methodology



Annual carbon balance of the FBN =

- + Emissions generated by the FBN
- Emissions avoided by the use of potentially disposable food



2. Carbon footprint of the activities of the FBN



2. Carbon footprint of the activities of the FBN

GHG emissions from the FBN activities in 2018 and 2019







GHG emissions as a result of two elements:

- The additional food production that would be necessary for the beneficiaries to feed in the absence of the FB.
- The waste management, mostly organic, that the food wasted would generate in controlled landfills or during its treatment.



GHG emissions of the main categories of food not wasted by the action of the BAN in 2018 and 2019





GHG emissions related to waste management by type of treatment and location in 2018 and 2019



 $t CO_2 e$



4. Annual carbon balance of the FBN

4. Annual carbon balance of the FBN



GHG emissions in the scenarios "with" and "without" the action of the BAN, and emissions avoided by the BAN in 2018 and 2019





In summary

- The carbon footprint of the FBN was 147 t of CO₂e in 2018 and 148 t of CO₂e in 2019, mostly associated with the transport of food and volunteers.
- In both 2018 and 2019, the emissions avoided by the use of food, which would otherwise be wasted, are notably higher than those generated by the activities of the FBN.
- Consequently, the activity of the FBN prevented the emission of 4,568 t of CO_2e in 2018 and 4,157 t of CO_2e in 2019.
- These results highlight the importance, not only social but also environmental, of the FBN, since it prevents a large amount of GHG from being emitted into the atmosphere.





European Union European Regional Development Fund

Thank you!

Questions welcome

www.interregeurope.eu/LCA4Regions