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Executive summary

A spatially-explicit global scale methodology for terrestrial acidification in Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA) is currently unavailable. The objective of this work is to derive characterisation factors (CFs) that mathematically quantify the relation between an acidifying emission and its impact to the soil and to biodiversity. For this purpose, a characterization model has been developed that evaluates respectively the atmospheric fate, the soil sensitivity through changes in the hydrogen ion (H+) concentration of soil solution, as well as through estimation of soil critical load and the effects in the form of the potentially not occurring fraction (PNOF) of vascular plant species.

The ILCD handbook (European Commission-Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, 2011) recommends to use the method of Accumulated Exceedance (AE) (Seppälä et al., 2006) updated by Pösch et al. (2008) at the midpoint level for the acidification impact category. It is, however, classified as “‘recommended with some improvements needed’ (Level II out of III)” (European Commission-Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, 2011). At the endpoint level, no method is recommended to be used because no methods are sufficiently mature to be recommended. However, van Zelm and colleagues’ (2007) method is recommended as interim to be used for internal application (European Commission-Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, 2011).

In this project, LC-IMPACT, we develop two midpoint approaches (based on critical load and on H+) and one endpoint approach based on the potentially not occurring fraction (PNOF) of species. The two methods are described in this deliverable. The comparison between the current and recommended midpoint and endpoint methods is shown in Tables 0.1 and 0.2.

At the midpoint level, we provide country (and continent) CFs worldwide; up to now, only CFs for European countries (and a general European continent CF) were available (Posch et al. 2008). We explore two midpoint methods in this work, both based on an atmospheric pollutant transport model across continents. To date, such models have not been used to calculate CFs. These two methods include soil sensitivity modeling based on (1) a geochemical soil model and (2) a critical load exceedance calculation. The spatial resolution, nonetheless, decreases to 2.0° x 2.5° degrees.

At the endpoint level, similar to the midpoint method, country and continent CFs are developed. Previously, country CFs were available only on a continental scale, e.g., for European countries for van Zelm et al.’s method (2007). Further, while the van Zelm et al. (2007) method covers generic European forest vegetation, the effect modeling developed during this project differentiates between vegetation types (biomes). In Europe, for example, forest types can vary from boreal forests in Scandinavia to mediterranean woodlands in Greece.

For a comprehensive assessment of the impact of acidification on terrestrial ecosystems, the authors of this report recommend that LCA’s terrestrial acidification CFs include an evaluation of atmospheric fate and a soil sensitivity midpoint CF. A species sensitivity endpoint CF is also recommended, although there is a high uncertainty regarding endpoint modeling. The main limitation of the critical load method is that it cannot be used in combination with an effect factor. The critical load method thus cannot express the impact of acidification on ecosystems, and the impact score cannot be compared with other impact categories (e.g., eutrophication, ecotoxicity).
Table 0.1. Comparison of existing and recommended midpoint terrestrial acidification methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Recommended method (by this study)</th>
<th>Existing method (Posch et al. 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>2.0° x 2.5°</td>
<td>0.5° x 0.5°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-specificity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric transport across continents</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxides (NOₓ)</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (NH₃)</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial aggregation of CF</td>
<td>Country; Continent (all)</td>
<td>Continent (Europe only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Based on 2005 reports</td>
<td>Based on 2010 estimates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0.2. Comparison of existing and recommended endpoint terrestrial acidification methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endpoint</th>
<th>Recommended method (by this study)</th>
<th>Existing method (van Zelm et al. 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>2.0° x 2.5°</td>
<td>50 km x 50 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-specificity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric transport across continents</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₃</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial aggregation of CF</td>
<td>Country; Continent (all)</td>
<td>Continent (Europe only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Based on 2005 reports</td>
<td>Based on 1990 to 2000 reports and 2001 to 2010 estimates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Roughly 50 km x 50 km in European latitudes
4 Only European countries
5 Not specific for European forest types
1. Introduction

Project scope
Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA) quantifies the environmental impact associated with the manufacture of a product or provision of a service (de Haes et al., 1999). LCIA can be performed at the midpoint or at the endpoint level. At the midpoint level, indicators measure the physicochemical processes occurring in the environment due to consumption of a resource or emission of a substance. Endpoint-level indicators describe the overall effects of these processes through societal values, such as ecosystem quality, human health and resource depletion. For the acidification impact category, midpoint indicators measure impact on environment along the cause-effect chain, such as changes in soil chemical properties, while at the endpoint, the indicator describes impact on the ecosystem, such as biodiversity losses (Roy et al., 2012a). An important advantage of endpoint LCIA is that the endpoint indicator can easily be compared in terms of unit across different impact categories, e.g. with the potentially not occurring fraction (PNOF) of species or potentially affected fraction (PAF) of species. In addition, endpoint indicators are easier to interpret and to be communicated for LCA practitioners given that all midpoint impact indicators are grouped in a reduced number of areas of protection, i.e., four categories for IMPACT 2002+ (Jolliet et al., 2003) which are understandable for non LCA experts (ecosystem quality, human health and resource depletion and global warming). On the other hand, endpoint LCIA introduces model uncertainties that are not present in a midpoint LCIA (Bare, 2010).

In order to translate the environmental impact of a given flow (e.g., emission) to or from the biosphere, LCIA employs characterisation factors (CFs). In the case of terrestrial acidification (or any other impact following the emission of a pollutant), the CF is the relationship between the emission of a substance and the impact on the environment. The acidification of terrestrial systems is mainly caused by nitrogen oxides (NO_x), ammonia (NH_3), and sulphur oxides (SO_2 and SO_4) (Roy et al., 2012a). Other acidifying pollutants include hydrogen chloride (HCl), hydrofluoric acid (HF), hydrogen sulfide (H_2S), and phosphoric acid (H_3PO_4), but given their short transport range (van Zelm et al., 2007), they are not taken into account in this study.

Contribution of this work to state-of-the-art LCIA methodologies

The main contributions of this work to current LCIA methodology for terrestrial acidification are as follows:

1- Inclusion of atmospheric pollutant transport estimates across continents: Current LCIA spatially-explicit methodologies for terrestrial acidification have been developed for specific countries or continents (Bare et al., 2003; Goedkoop and Spriensma, 2000; Hayashi et al., 2004; Huijbregts et al., 2000; Potting et al., 1998; Seppälä et al., 2006; van Zelm et al., 2007), although the transport of pollutants across continents has been shown to be relevant (Kajino et al., 2011). This work introduces the atmospheric transport of pollutants overseas following Roy et al. (Roy et al., 2012b).

2- Inclusion of a critical load (CL) exceedance methodology for non-European areas: Current LCIA CL exceedance frameworks include only emissions released in Europe and affecting the European continent (Posch et al., 2001; Seppälä et al., 2006). As emissions elsewhere have
become increasingly important (Kuylenstierna et al., 2001), this work introduces a framework for CL exceedances worldwide based on the method of Bouwman et al. (2002).

3- **Inclusion of a spatially-differentiated effect model to characterize the impact of soil acidification on plant diversity:** Current endpoint CFs for terrestrial acidification include a European-generic effect model based on European forest species (van Zelm et al., 2007) or a single plant species (Hayashi et al., 2004). This work introduces spatially-differentiated effect models based on the work of Azevedo et al. (2013), who showed that vegetation types respond differently to soil acidity (i.e., pH).

**Environmental mechanism**

The far majority of atmospheric emissions of acidifying pollutants occur following fossil fuel combustion or volatilization of urea fertilizer in agricultural fields (Bouwman et al., 2002). After atmospheric transformation, these pollutants are deposited on soils via dry or wet deposition and, consequently, change the chemical composition of the soil solution by increasing the concentration of hydrogen (H\(^+\)) and aluminum ions and reducing the cation exchange capacity and base saturation of soils (Bouwman et al., 2002). Ultimately, soils which undergo acidification may become unsuitable for survival of certain plant species (Falkengren-Grerup, 1986; Falkengren-Grerup et al., 1998).

2. **Materials and Methods**

**Use of CFs in LCIA**

LCIA computes CFs through the characterisation model framework proposed by De Haes et al. (2002). Emission data (\(E\), expressing emitted mass of \(\text{SO}_2\), \(\text{NO}_x\) and \(\text{NH}_3\) in kg pollutant emitted·yr\(^{-1}\)) in generic landscape, continent, country or gridcell \(i\) for pollutant \(p\) from the inventory (LCI) are converted into impact category scores \(S\) by application of the CFs as presented in Equation 1.

\[
S_{i,p} = \sum_p (E_{i,p} \cdot CF_{i,p})
\]  

(1)

In order to generate impact scores over all locations, one can either calculate an average or a weighted average for location \(i\) by using weighting factor \(W\) to reflect unequal location size or importance, as follows:

\[
S_{i,p} = \sum_i W_i \sum_p (E_{i,p} \cdot CF_{i,p})
\]  

(2)

In the case that inventory data are available only at the country, continental or generic scale, the aggregated CF at the same scale should be applied.

Midpoint and endpoint CFs should be applied whenever possible, in order to analyse and compare results at both levels.

**Characterisation models**

The three characterisation models proposed by this study (Types 1 to 3) and their underlying fate and effect models are described in the following paragraph. This is followed by a description of how normalization scores can be obtained by combining pollutant emission estimates with the CFs derived in this work.

Characterisation factors Types 1 and 3 follow the framework of the current interim endpoint method (van Zelm et al., 2007), where a marginal change in an emission of pollutant \(p\)
from location $i$ causes a change to soil properties of receiving location $j$ and, ultimately, biodiversity of plants in $j$. Type 2 follows the framework of CL exceedance in a receiving compartment introduced by Bouwman et al. (2002).

**Midpoint: Type 1**

Type 1 CFs (mol H$^+$·L$^{-1}$· m$^2$·kg$^{-1}$·yr) for emitting location $i$ for pollutant $p$ are described following the work of Roy et al. (Unpublished) as:

$$CF_{i,p} = \sum_j (FF_{i,j,p} \cdot SF_{j,p})$$

where $FF_{i,j,p}$ (keq$_{deposited}$·kg$_{emitted}^{-1}$) describes the atmospheric fate factor of $p$ (i.e., NO$_x$, NH$_3$, or SO$_x$) emitted from location $i$ and deposited in location $j$; $SF_{j,p}$ (mol H$^+$·L$^{-1}$·m$^2$·keq$_{deposited}^{-1}$·yr) is the soil sensitivity factor of location $j$ for deposited pollutant $p$.

**Midpoint: Type 2**

Type 2 CFs (meq H$^+$·kg$^{-1}$·yr) for emitting location $i$ for pollutant $p$ are described following the work of Bouwman et al. (2002) as:

$$CF_{i,p} = \sum_j (FF_{i,j,p} \cdot t_{meq,p} \cdot ER_j)$$

where $t_{meq,p}$ (meq H$^+$·kg$^{-1}$) is a conversion factor from mass of pollutant $p$ (kg) to miliequivalent of H$^+$ (meq H$^+$) and $ER_j$ (dimensionless) is the critical load exceedance ratio for soil $j$.

**Endpoint: Type 3**

Type 3 CFs (m$^2$·kg$^{-1}$·yr) for emitting location $i$ for pollutant $p$ are described following the work of Roy et al. (Unpublished) as:

$$CF_{i,p} = \sum_j (FF_{i,j,p} \cdot SF_{j,p} \cdot EF_j)$$

where $EF_j$ (mol H$^{-1}$·L) is the effect factor in location $j$.

**Fate and effect models**

**Atmospheric fate model**

The atmospheric fate factor $FF_{i,j,p}$ is the increase in the deposition of pollutant $p$ in $j$ ($\Delta De_{j,p}$) following an increase in emission of $p$ from $i$ ($\Delta Em_{i,p}$). It is described following the work of Roy et al. (2012b) as

$$FF_{i,j,p} = \frac{\Delta De_{j,p}}{\Delta Em_{i,p}}$$
where $\Delta D e p_{j,p}$ (keq\text{deposited} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1})$ is the change in deposition of $p$ on receiving soil $j$ following a 10% increase in emission $\Delta E m_{i,p}$ (kg\text{emitted} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1})$ of $p$ in $i$. This percentage increase is commonly used as a marginal increase in LCIA studies (Huijbregts et al., 2000; Krewitt et al., 2001; Potting et al., 1998). The $F F_{i,j,p}$ were obtained from Roy et al. (2012b), who calculated worldwide source receptor matrices (SRMs) resulting in spatially explicit atmospheric fate factors on a 2°x2.5° scale. For a given emission vector, the resulting grid-specific depositions are obtained by matrix-vector multiplication, avoiding the evaluation of the entire numerical (generally) non-linear model(s) of atmospheric transport and dispersion processes (Seibert and Frank, 2003).

Roy et al. (2012b) based their calculations on the GEOS-Chem global tropospheric chemistry model (Bey et al., 2001). GEOS-Chem is a 3D model of tropospheric chemistry driven by assimilated meteorological observations from the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS) of the NASA Data Assimilation Office (Bey et al., 2001). Roy et al. (Roy et al., 2012b) used the yearly averaged results from a GEOS-Chem 2°x2.5° grid spatial resolution simulation for the 2005 reference year, i.e. 2005 being representative of meteorology of the average from 1961 to 1990, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Climatic Data Center (2005).

**Soil sensitivity model**

The soil sensitivity factor $S F_{j,p}$ is the marginal increase in the concentration of $H^+$ ($dC_j$) following a marginal increase in the deposition of pollutant $p$ in soil $j$ ($d D e p_{j,p}$). It is described following the work of Roy et al. (2012a) as:

$$S F_{j,p} = \frac{dC_j}{d D e p_{j,p}} \cdot A_j = \frac{\Delta C_j}{\Delta D e p_{j,p}} \cdot A_j$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $C_j$ (mol H\textsuperscript{+} L\textsuperscript{-1}) is the H\textsuperscript{+} concentration of soil solution of $j$ in the receptor grid cell and $A_j$ (m\textsuperscript{2}) is the area of $j$. In this study, $A_j$ was defined by the sum of the areas of soils with the same PROFILE (See following paragraph for details) input parameters within a 2°x2.5° atmospheric grid. In total, 99515 receiving areas across the 13104 atmospheric grids were considered.

The soil sensitivity factors (SFs) were calculated with the PROFILE (Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992) geochemical steady-state model. PROFILE is based on a mass balance calculation for different soil layers. Among other outputs, it estimates the pH in the soil layer solution. The model requires atmospheric deposition values, weather characteristics and soil parameters (Supporting information 1). Following the ISRIC-Wise database (v 1.1) (Batjes, 2006), the soil depth was set to 1 m and split into five layers of 20 cm each. With this depth, we covered most (92 to 100%) of the vegetation root zone (Supporting information 1). To determine the SFs, averaged pH values were calculated using the biome-specific root distribution fraction from Jackson et al. (1996) as a weighting factor (Supporting information 1). We used the terrestrial ecoregion and biome classification (14 in total) by Olson et al. (2001).

**Critical Load Exceedance Ratio**

The model recommend in the ILCD handbook (European Commission-Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, 2011) developed successively by Seppälä et al. (2006)
and Posch et al. (2008) relies on the CL data generated for Europe in the context of the 1999 amendment of the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP) (Hettelingh et al., 2001). This CL data covers Europe and has not yet been developed on the global scale due to lack of availability of soil composition parameters. The only existing CL model applicable on a global scale is the one developed by Bouwman et al. (2002), relying on cation exchange capacity and base cations. The CL exceedance ratio $ER_j$ is described following the work of Bouwman et al. (2002) as:

$$
ER_j = \begin{cases} 
    0, & \text{for } \frac{\text{DepT}_2}{\text{CL}_j} \leq 1 \\
    \frac{\text{DepT}_2}{\text{CL}_j}, & \text{for } \frac{\text{DepT}_2}{\text{CL}_j} > 1 
\end{cases}
$$  

(8a)

(8b)

where $\text{CL}_j$ is the critical load (CL, keq deposited·m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$) threshold for soil $j$, and $\text{DepT}_2$ is the Type 2 total deposition acidifying pollutants into grid $j$. Harmful effects to soil occur when the sum of deposited charges $\text{DepT}_2$ (keq deposited·m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$) is greater than the CL for $j$ (Eq. 6a). We assumed that emissions cause no harmful effects to soil if the total deposited charges do not exceed the CL (Eq. 6a) or if soils are covered by ice, rock and sea and, thus, $ER_j = 0$. The calculations for $\text{CL}_j$, $\text{DepT}_2$, and grid-specific $ER_j$ are detailed in Supporting information 2.

Vegetation effect model

The effect factor $EF_j$ is the marginal increase in the PNOF of vascular plant species ($dPNOF_j$, mol H$^{+}·L^{-1}$) following a marginal increase in the concentration of H$^+$ in $j$ ($dC_j$). For example, an effect factor equal to 0.5 mol H$^{+}·L^{-1}$ indicates that the increase in 1.0 mol of H$^+$ triggers the potential non-appearance of 50% of vascular plant species in grid $j$. It is described following the work of Roy et al. (Unpublished) as:

$$
EF_j = \frac{dPNOF_j}{dC_j} = -(PNOF_j)^2 \cdot \left[ e^{-\frac{\log_{10}C_j + \alpha_j}{\beta_j}} \right] \cdot \left[ \frac{-1}{\beta_j} \cdot \frac{1}{C_j \log_{10}10} \right]
$$  

(9)

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ (dimensionless) are grid-specific coefficients illustrating respectively the concentration of H$^+$ at which the PNOF equals 0.5 and the slope of the function of PNOF and H$^+$. PNOF is described as a function of pH by Azevedo et al. (2013) for individual terrestrial biomes of the world. We used the map delineated by Olson et al. (2001) to recognize the biome type (14 in total) in each grid $j$. Biome-specific coefficients for the logistic curve of PNOF – pH (and, thus, PNOF – H$^+$) are described in Supporting information 3.

Uncertainty analysis

The influence of the FFs, SFs and EFs parameter uncertainty(ies) on the CFs uncertainty was evaluated with a Monte Carlo simulation (with random sampling, not latin hypercube).

Due to the complexity of the underlying atmospheric modeling input datasets interactions,
we considered FF a single parameter which varied at increasing intervals as the distance from the emission location increased. The variation of each FF was specified with a lognormal distribution. This distribution is defined by a geometric mean (calculated based on the arithmetic mean of generated FFs) and a standard deviation (calculated based on accuracy observations by Roy et al. (2012b), i.e., 25% accuracy at the emission location and up to 1000% accuracy at locations farthest from the emission location).

The SF uncertainty related to the accuracy of the input parameter was evaluated by Roy et al. (2012a). Consequently, each SF was considered to be lognormally distributed with an uncertainty factor of 100 (95% confidence interval).

The uncertainty of each EF was based on the uncertainty of the pH estimates (the working point of the pH – PNOF relationship curve) and the model regression α and β uncertainty. The 95% confidence intervals for pH were taken from Roy et al. (2012a). For α and β, the 95% confidence intervals were taken from Azevedo et al. (2013), as explained in Supporting information 3. For the biomes with model parameters derived from other biomes with similar climate conditions, we quantified an EF standard deviation originating from a switch from known parameters to parameters from a completely different “similar climate condition” biome (e.g. boreal forests parameters were approximated using mixed forests parameters instead). The uncertainty in the EFs for these two biomes was modelled with a lognormal distribution, defined by the calculated EFs and the standard deviation of pH values.

We then sampled 1000 values of FFs, SFs and EFs based on the specified uncertainty distributions. To ensure coherence, the sum of the sampled FFs related to one source location was evaluated and could not amount to more than 1 kg deposited kg emitted\(^{-1}\). If the sum exceeded this limit, the samples were discarded and new values were sampled. With those samples we calculated 1000 ∑FF, ∑FF·SF and CFs for each emitting grid, indicating the uncertainty in the grid-specific CF values.

Characterisation factors at larger spatial units

To derive CFs at larger spatial units \(c\) (i.e., country, continent, and world), we calculated the average of the CFs between emitting grids \(i\) located within the spatial unit \(c\) of interest based on their geographical coordinates (Supporting information 4).

Normalization factors

Non-weighted normalization factors

Grid-specific normalization factors (NF\(_i\)) are described as:

\[
NF_i = \sum_p (CF_{i,p} \cdot E_{tot,i,p})
\]  

(10)

where \(E_{tot,i,p}\) (kg emitted\(^{-1}\)·yr\(^{-1}\)) is the total emission of pollutant \(p\) from emitting grid \(i\) in one year, based on 2005 emission data (2012b). The emissions \(E_{tot,i,p}\) for SO\(_2\), SO\(_4\), NO\(_x\), nitric acid (HNO\(_3\)),...
and NH$_3$ are given as kg of SO$_2$·yr$^{-1}$, kg of SO$_4$·yr$^{-1}$, and so on. For each of the three types of CFs (Types 1 to 3), the units for NF$_i$ are mol H$^+$·L$^{-1}$·m$^2$, meq H$^+$, and m$^2$, respectively. We employed emission data representative of the year 2005 following Roy et al. (2012b).

To derive NFs at larger spatial units $c$ (i.e. country, continent, and world), we calculated the average of the NFs between emitting grids $i$ located within the spatial unit $c$ of interest based on their geographical coordinates (Supporting information 4).

3. Results

Characterisation factors

Types 1 and 3

Types 1 and 3 grid-specific CFs are shown in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. Note that the numerical values of grid-specific CFs used in Figs. 1 and 2 are available in Supporting information 4. Type 1 CFs varied up to five orders of magnitude (Fig. 1), and the highest values were found in the Northern Hemisphere (particularly for acidifying pollutants based on NH$_3$ and SO$_2$).

High impacts to soil were attributed to emissions from Western China, Northern India, and Kazakhstan (Fig. 1a). Type 3 CFs also varied up to five orders of magnitude (Fig. 2). The largest Type 3 CFs were found for emission locations situated in central Asia, central Africa and Canada. CFs were largest for emission locations for which pollutants are then deposited on land characterized by large areas with low buffering capabilities (indicated by high pH change) and a working point of the pH-PNOF relationship curve associated with a steep slope value. The most frequent CF result for SO$_2$ (2.48 m$^2$·yr·kg emitted$^{-1}$) was higher than for NH$_3$ (2.43 m$^2$·yr·kg emitted$^{-1}$) and NO$_x$ (1.33 m$^2$·yr·kg emitted$^{-1}$). For a given pollutant, CFs ranged over five (for NO$_x$ and SO$_2$) to six (for NH$_3$) orders of magnitude. The spatial variability of the CFs of a given pollutant was several orders of magnitude higher than the variability between pollutants.
Fig. 1 Type 1 characterisation factors (mol H⁺·L⁻¹·m⁻²·kg⁻emitted⁻¹·yr⁻¹) for (a) NOₓ, (b) NH₃, and (c) SO₂.
Fig. 2 Type 3 characterisation factors \( (m^2 \cdot kg_{\text{emitted}}^{-1} \cdot yr) \) for (a) NO\(_x\), (b) NH\(_x\), and (c) SO\(_2\).

Type 2

Type 2 midpoint CF\(_1\) values followed the same distribution pattern for all three gases SO\(_2\), NH\(_x\) and NO\(_x\). Specifically, there were three main CL exceedance poles where the continental CF
exceeded 0.1 meq$_{\text{deposited}}$ H$^+$ · yr$^{-1}$ · kg$_{\text{emitted}}^{-1}$ · yr: North America, Asia and Europe (Figure 6 (a),(b),(c)). Eastern Asia was the most affected area with values exceeding 15 meq$_{\text{deposited}}$ H$^+$ · yr$^{-1}$ · kg$_{\text{emitted}}^{-1}$ · yr as a maximum. CL$_j$ and ER$_j$ used for CF$_i$ calculation are mapped in Supporting information 1, and CF$_i$ results on a continental and country scale are in Supporting information 4.

Countries with highest CF$_i$ values are in meq$_{\text{deposited}}$ H$^+$ · yr$^{-1}$ · kg$_{\text{emitted}}^{-1}$ · yr: Bangladesh with an average 2.3, Laos with 2.5, Netherlands with 2.3, Serbia with 2.4 and Vietnam with 2.2. These results reflected the fact that countries with large areas have heterogeneous results and cannot have an important country average CF$_i$. This lead to the conclusion that grid-scale analysis should be preferred to country-scale analysis given that the influence of the country area adds additional skew in the results.

A statistical analysis was performed to assess the variability of 2 x 2.5° CF$_i$ results over continents. Figure 7 shows the lower quartile, median, upper quartile, the lowest datum still within 1.5 interquartile range (IQR) of the lower quartile, the highest datum still within 1.5 IQR of the upper quartile and the average in red. The average corresponds to the continental CF. From these figures and their detailed interpretation in Supporting information 6, we concluded that CF$_i$s are heterogeneous in North America as well as in Asia, homogeneous with low values in South America, Africa and Oceania (CF$_i$<0.1 meq$_{\text{deposited}}$ H$^+$ · yr$^{-1}$ · kg$_{\text{emitted}}^{-1}$ · yr), and homogeneous with high values in Europe (CF$_i$>0.1 meq$_{\text{deposited}}$ H$^+$ · yr$^{-1}$ · kg$_{\text{emitted}}^{-1}$ · yr). All gridcells were equal to zero for Antarctica.

This statistical analysis confirmed that the continents with higher terrestrial acidification potential are Asia, Europe and North America, where average continental CF values are superior to 0.1. Other continents showed lower results by more than one order of magnitude and were not considered as overall significantly affected by exceedance of CL (using 2005 emission data and 2006 CL data). However, disparity of results in Asia as well as in North America showed that the use of continental scale CFs does not give sufficient accuracy in the CF$_i$ range, and a gridcell scale analysis is thus preferred.
**Fig. 3** Statistical analysis of spatially differentiated CF, at 2°x2.5° grid within North America, South America, Europe, Africa, Asia and Oceania.

**Comparison between spatial aggregation levels**

The ratio between a 2° x 2.5° CF within a given spatial resolution and its coarser resolution CF was between 0.6-0.9, 1.1-1.7 and 1.0-1.3 for the global, continental and country resolutions, respectively (Fig. 4). This means that 2° x 2.5° CFs found within countries, for example, will be, on average, 1.0 to 1.3 times higher than the country CFs. It is also demonstrated that 24 to 36%, 4 to 12% and 1 to 4% of the 2°x2.5° CFs within the global, continental and country spatial resolutions, respectively, varied by more than one order of magnitude (Fig. 2, -1>10log (ratio) <1) as compared to the specified coarser spatial resolution CFs.
Fig. 4 Cumulative distribution of the log_{10} of the ratio between the 2°x2.5° CFs and the global, continental and country level resolution Type 3 CFs they fall in (x-axis) for emissions of a) NO\textsubscript{x}, b) NH\textsubscript{3} and c) SO\textsubscript{2}.

Uncertainty analysis

Results showed a variance of less than 0.06 for CF with different values of FF (∑FF) (Table 1). The variance CF for different values of FF and SF (∑FF×SF) is between 0.88 and 0.94 with slopes of the linear regression that are approximately 1. The strong correlation between ∑FF×SF and endpoint CFs was also confirmed by the relatively low standard error and residual sum of squares (RSS) of the regressions.

The ratios between the Monte Carlo varied and original ∑FF, ∑FF×SF and CF were found inside a 10\textsuperscript{±0.1} (0.79-1.26), 10\textsuperscript{±0.5} (0.32-3.2) and 10\textsuperscript{±1.5} (0.032-32) interval, respectively (Fig. 4). It was thus assumed that the FF is responsible for approximately 4%, SF for 6% and EF for 90% of the CFs’ total evaluated uncertainty.

Table 1. Regression analysis of the spatial variability between endpoint characterisation factors (i.e., ∑FF×SF×EF) with both atmospheric fate (∑FF) and atmospheric fate-soil sensitivity (∑FF-SF) per emitted pollutants. R\textsuperscript{2}, σ, and RSS stand for coefficient of variation, standard deviation, and residual sum of squares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Equation of linear regression</th>
<th>R\textsuperscript{2}</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>RSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>log (CF) = 0.4 \log (ΣFF) + 3.7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>log (CF) = -2.0 \log (ΣFF) - 15.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>8798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>log (CF) = 0.9 \log (ΣFF) + 7.8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>7124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ \Sigma FF \times SF \text{ and CF (i.e. } \Sigma FF \times SF \times EF) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Log (CF) Equation</th>
<th>EF1</th>
<th>EF2</th>
<th>EF3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>( \log (CF) = 1.0 \log( \Sigma FF \times SF ) + 3.8 )</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>( \log (CF) = 1.0 \log( \Sigma FF \times SF ) + 3.6 )</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>( \log (CF) = 1.1 \log( \Sigma FF \times SF ) + 3.9 )</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Discussion**

This study determined spatially-explicit CFs for terrestrial acidification at the global scale, thus enabling assessment of life cycle emissions occurring across the world. The following paragraphs (1) describe the main features and limitations of the Types 1 and 3 characterisation models, (2) compare results of this study to those of other studies, (3) discuss the outcome of EFs on the uncertainty of the characterisation model, and (4) recommend which midpoint and endpoint characterisation models should be used for terrestrial acidification LCIA.

**Interpretation of results**

Results showed that emissions in North America, Africa, western and northern Europe and central Asia generate high potential impacts, since high CFs values were observed in these areas. Roy et al. (2012b) showed that atmospheric FFs are highest at close proximity from the emission location. Roy et al. (2012a) showed that high SFs (resulting from a substantial change in H\textsuperscript{+} concentration due to small deposits over a large area) occur in the Canadian shield region, the Scandinavian region, the Amazon basin, central Africa and parts of east and southeast Asia. Consequently, if assessment is limited to atmospheric fate and sensitivity, emissions in these locations will generate the highest impacts (i.e., high CFs).

However, due to the relatively high EF of “desert and xeric shrubland biome”, the regions of western North America (Nevada region), North Africa, central Asia and Western Australia also experience nontrivial impact. In biomes characterized by inherently low soil pH, e.g. (sub)tropical moist broadleaf forests, the EF was typically close to zero since the modeled pH was far from the pH zone where the steepest slope of the PNOF-pH regression occurs. Concurrently, as no weighting was performed based on the number of species in a biome or on the vegetation density, the method presented here represents the fraction (not the total number) of non-occurring species in an area. As a result, locations with a poor number of species will exhibit a higher affected fraction than very species-rich locations.

**Limitations**

This section discusses the limitations related to the assumptions and/or choices in the CF calculations. First, deposition was considered evenly distributed within a 2\(^{o}\times2.5^{o}\) grid, neglecting local factors favoring deposition (e.g., mountains) within the grid. Global atmospheric models with greater resolution are required in order to account for these factors.

Second, terrestrial acidification can cause a number of other environmental impacts, including nutrient depletion, increased in soil solution H\textsuperscript{+} concentration (or decrease of pH), and increased concentrations of toxic aluminum species (Jeffries and Ouimet, 2004). By using soil solution H\textsuperscript{+} concentration as the soil sensitivity indicator, the direct harm to the vegetation was
evaluated. The increase in soil solution $\text{H}^+$ concentration was chosen over the other types of indicators because it is recognized as a successful predictor of species richness and a primary indicator of soil acidity (Pepppler-Lisbach and Kleyer, 2009; Whittaker, 1972). Furthermore, Roy et al. (Roy et al., 2012a) showed that other soil sensitivity indicators, such as aluminum concentration or nutrient concentration (in the form of base cations), are more sensitive to soil input parameters uncertainties as compared to soil solution pH.

Third, the assessment of a marginal change in emissions and deposition is still under discussion. Several authors (Huijbregts et al., 2000; Krewitt et al., 2001; Potting et al., 1998) used a +10% variation, while others tried a combination of different values with a maximum of 50% (Seppälä et al., 2006; van Zelm et al., 2007). These studies showed that results were insensitive to important incremental changes. Similarly, Roy et al. (2012a) tested the variation of the receiving environment’s SF over 100 randomly chosen receiving environments with increments of depositions of 1%, 5% and 10%. The results indicated that a 1% change was not sufficient to create a change in pH values in numerous soils, while a quasi-linear relation between the registered pH at 5% and 10% increment was observed. Thus, we deemed a 10% increment to be acceptable.

Fourth, Azevedo et al. (2013) empirically identified an optimum pH—the pH at which species richness is highest. Accordingly, this study could have considered that there would be no effect at pH higher than the optimum, instead of extrapolating Azevedo et al. (2013) regression model to pH values higher than this optimum pH. However, if the optimum pH had been considered, only 33% of the soil areas would have EFs greater than zero (0). Furthermore, for some biomes, important gaps of non-occurring species near the optimum pH would have been registered. Such gaps could be observed with the desert and xeric shrubland biome, which would show a PNOF of 0 at pH = 7.4 but a PNOF of 0.14 following an infinitesimal decrease of pH. Extrapolation of the regression does not allow for a smooth transition over the entire pH range, a transition believed by the authors to be representative of natural processes. Nevertheless, the variation in CFs was quantified between both scenarios, and it was found that in 90% of the cases, CFs would be higher by less than 30% if we extended the regression model to the entire pH range, instead of considering an optimum pH (Supporting information 3).

Finally, unavailable model regression parameters impaired the effect assessment in Central America, India and the mountain regions of Asia. Indeed, these territories were approximated with parameters from other environments. The lack of data for these regions hinders accurate interpretation of the potential impacts.

Comparison to other studies

The European CFs developed in this study are compared with the CFs of Goedkoop and Spriensma (2000) and van Zelm et al. (2007); See Table 2. This study and van Zelm et al. (2007)’s results showed a similar relative importance of NO$_x$, NH$_3$ and SO$_2$ per unit emission. However, van Zelm et al. (2007) derived systematically lower CFs values. This may be explained by the fact that van Zelm et al. 1) used the EUTREND (Van Jaarsveld J. A. et al., 1997) atmospheric model, which does not include impacts caused by air emissions that travel outside of Europe; 2) used the dynamic soil model SMART (Kros et al., 1995), with which the steady-state simulation showed a 25 to 65% difference when using PROFILE to calculate CLs (Kurz et al., 1995); 3) assessed changes in soil base saturation instead of $\text{H}^+$ concentration; 4) used a base saturation-PNOF dose-response
curve that yielded a gentler slope than the H+ concentration-PN0F dose-response, thus creating lower EFs in Europe; and/or 5) limited their assessment of potential impacts to European forest ecosystems, unlike the present assessment, which included numerous types of ecosystems.

The study of Goedkoop and Spriensma (2000) resulted in similar absolute CFs for NO\textsubscript{x} and NH\textsubscript{3}. However, the results differed significantly in terms of SO\textsubscript{2}. This may be explained by the fact that Goedkoop and Spriensma (2000) (1) modeled impacts in the context of the Netherlands and then extrapolated their resulting EFs to Europe; (2) did not rely on atmospheric fate modelling, preferring a 10-mole marginal change to mapped deposition levels; (3) used the SMART model to evaluate changes in many soil properties, assessing the potential impacts of both acidification and eutrophication (SO\textsubscript{2} is not a eutrophying substance) instead of soil acidity changes, and (4) assessed the potentially disappeared fraction of species (PDF) for more than 900 Dutch plant species with the MOVE model (Latour and Reiling, 1993).

Table 2. Comparison of available biodiversity losses endpoint CFs and contribution of substances to the endpoint CF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncertainty analysis

Considering both spatial variability and uncertainty analysis results, the evaluation of both atmospheric fate and soil sensitivity could be seen as a trade-off between environmental relevance and uncertainty. While it is undeniable that the integration of ecological EFs in calculating endpoint CFs reveals information on the actual damage to ecosystems and allows for the meaningful aggregation of the consequences of different impacts, it can also be concluded that including the EF increases uncertainty typically without significant added value in terms of spatial variability.

Comparison between Type 1 and Type 2 CFs

Type 1 and Type 2 CFs relied on the same atmospheric FFs but differed in the exposure modeling. Although both models used the same database of soil properties (Batjes, 2009), the input parameters for the Type 2 CFs (i.e., cation exchange capacity and base saturation) are different than those for Type 1 CFs (i.e., change in H\textsuperscript{+} concentration of soil solution). In addition, the changes in soil pH followed a 10% increase in emissions, while the CL exceedance model employed background emissions. Results on the gridcell and country level did not show correlation between Type 1 and Type 2 CFs due to these differences in exposure modelling.
Recommendations

Based on the outcomes of this study, it is recommended that calculation of terrestrial acidification CFs in LCA follows an integrated approach and includes an evaluation of (1) atmospheric fate and soil sensitivity with the Type 1 midpoint CF and (2) species sensitivity with Type 3 endpoint CF. This approach gives the opportunity to make a consistent midpoint and endpoint assessment by considering an EF, which is not possible with the CL method (Type 2 CF).

5. Conclusions

This work provides a consistent framework to derive spatially-explicit characterisation factors at both midpoint and endpoint levels at the global scale for terrestrial acidification. An atmospheric fate model (GEOS-Chem), a soil fate model (PROFILE), a CL model and a biome-specific vegetation effect model were implemented to achieve this. The GEOS-Chem model allowed for atmospheric pollutant transport across continents to be accounted. The PROFILE model, previously implemented in European studies, was extrapolated to all soils across the world. The CL model generated global results on a 5’ by 5’ resolution. The vegetation effect model was based on the framework of species-sensitivity distributions and was built on worldwide empirical data from literature. Midpoint and endpoint CFs were provided at country and continental scales. The high impact to soil occurs in high latitude areas of Canada, Scandinavia, and Eastern Russia due to the low acid neutralizing capacity (ANC) of these soils combined with the important SO₂, NH₃ and NOₓ emissions in these areas. North America, Africa, Western and Northern Europe and central Asia exhibit the highest endpoint CFs. In these locations, impact to soil is enhanced by the presence of sensitive ecosystems, such as the boreal forests of Canada and Scandinavia, and/or the presence of highly pH-sensitive species.

This study found that atmospheric FFs show little spatial variability. Consequently, impact assessment based solely on atmospheric fate is not sufficient to differentiate between the potential impacts of the same product or service at different emission locations. The multiplication of the soil SF by the atmospheric FF demonstrated the importance of considering the sensitivity of soils to spatial variability. Also showed by this study, a low correlation exists between soil chemical indicators reaction modeling CFs (Type 1 CFs) and CL based CFs (Type 2 CFs). The difference between the models is related to exposure modeling, specifically soil sensitivity indicators, soil indicators change modelling, difference between marginal and background emissions modelling.

It is therefore recommended that computation of terrestrial acidification CFs in LCA follows an integrated approach and includes an evaluation of atmospheric fate and soil sensitivity with Type 1 midpoint CFs as well as an evaluation of species sensitivity with Type 3 endpoint CFs.
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A list of input parameters for the model PROFILE is shown in Table S1.1. The calculation of soil SFs based on PROFILE were described in detail by Roy et al. (2012a).

The multiple (soil) layer approach of the PROFILE model makes it possible to assess the indicator values based on root distribution across soil layers. Root distribution according to depth was estimated as:

$$RF_n = 1 - \omega^d$$  \hfill (S1.1)

where \(RF_n\) is the cumulative root fraction from the soil surface to depth \(d\) (cm) and \(\omega\) is the fitted extinction coefficient. Known \(\omega\) values and calculated root distribution as a function of terrestrial biomes are shown in Table S1.2.

The five-layer pH values (1 per soil layer \(n\)) were aggregated into a single value indicator using roots distribution as a weighting factor as:

$$pH_j = \sum_n(pH_n \cdot RF_n)$$  \hfill (S1.2)

### Table S1.1 PROFILE parameter description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weather parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation [m]</td>
<td>WorldClim-Global climate database (Hijmans et al., 2005)</td>
<td>10 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature [°C]</td>
<td>WorldClim-Global climate database (Hijmans et al., 2005)</td>
<td>10 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atmospheric deposition [keq/ha/yr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acidifying substances</td>
<td>Deposition from GEOS-Chem for 2005 (Bey et al., 2001)</td>
<td>(2^\circ \times 2.5^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride, sodium and magnesium deposition</td>
<td>Percentage of sea-salt deposition from GEOS-Chem for 2005 (Roy et al., 2012b)</td>
<td>(2^\circ \times 2.5^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium deposition</td>
<td>10% of soil dust deposition (Roy et al., 2012b)</td>
<td>(4^\circ \times 5^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium deposition</td>
<td>2% of soil dust depositon (Roy et al., 2012b)</td>
<td>(4^\circ \times 5^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer height [cm]</td>
<td>Set to follow the ISRIC-Wise database (Batjes, 2006)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil texture</td>
<td>ISRIC-Wise database (Batjes, 2006)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Spatial resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[% sand, silt, clay]</td>
<td>Maximum water content is a function of soil texture. Water content was assumed to be 80% of field capacity (Rawls et al., 1982)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil water content [m$^3$ water/m$^3$ soil]</td>
<td>ISRIC-Wise database (Batjes, 2006)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil bulk density [kg/m$^3$]</td>
<td>ISRIC-Wise database FAO qualitative drainage class to which a value of absorbed water percentage was attributed (Aherne et al., 1998; Alveteg et al., 1998; Batjes, 2006; Hodson et al., 1996; Jönsson et al., 1995; Reynolds, 1997; Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water entering/leaving layer [%]</td>
<td>Worldwide vegetation types map (Olson et al., 2001) was used to determine net uptake values from Duan et al. (2004)</td>
<td>0.5° x 0.5°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface area [m$^2$/m$^3$]</td>
<td>Calculated in PROFILE (Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoff [m]</td>
<td>Calculated in PROFILE (Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net uptake [keq/ha/yr]</td>
<td>Calculated from the total organic carbon (TOC), dry bulk density, water content and typical values of DOC from literature (Aherne et al., 1998; Alveteg et al., 1998; Batjes, 2006; Hodson et al., 1996; Jönsson et al., 1995; Reynolds, 1997; Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) [mg/l]</td>
<td>A global soil order classification map was used to determine an average mineralogy, which was obtained from sampling data (NRCS, 2009; Reich and Eswaran, 2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineralogy [% minerals]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{\text{exp}}$ [unitless]</td>
<td>Default value: 3 (Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\log K_{\text{Al}}$ [kmol$^2$/m$^3$]</td>
<td>Soil layer default values (Aherne et al., 1998; Alveteg et al., 1998; Batjes, 2006; Hodson et al., 1996; Jönsson et al., 1995; Reynolds, 1997; Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) pressure [atm]</td>
<td>Soil layer default values (Aherne et al., 1998; Alveteg et al., 1998; Batjes, 2006; Hodson et al., 1996; Jönsson et al., 1995; Reynolds, 1997; Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC/N uptake efficiency [unitless]</td>
<td>Soil layer default values (Aherne et al., 1998; Alveteg et al., 1998; Batjes, 2006; Hodson et al., 1996; Jönsson et al., 1995; Reynolds, 1997; Warfvinge and Sverdrup, 1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-immobilisation and denitrification [keq/ha/yr]</td>
<td>Followed the method in Bouwman et al. (2002)</td>
<td>5x5 arc minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S1.2 \( \omega \) and root distribution fractions according to terrestrial biomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biomes</th>
<th>( \omega )</th>
<th>0-20 cm</th>
<th>20-40 cm</th>
<th>40-60 cm</th>
<th>60-80 cm</th>
<th>80-100 cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tundra</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreal forest / Taiga</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate conifer forests</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate broadleaf and mixed forests</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montane grasslands and shrublands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate grasslands, savannas and shrublands</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean forests, woodlands and scrub</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert and xeric shrublands</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical moist broadleaf forest</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical coniferous forests</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical dry broadleaf forests</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded grasslands and savannas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPORTING INFORMATION 2

The critical load $CL_j$ in receiving grid $j$, which is dependent upon cation exchange capacity and base saturation was obtained following the classification proposed by Bouwman et al. (2002), Table S2.1.

Type 2 total deposition of acidifying pollutants on grid $j$ $DepT2_j$ (meq·m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$) was calculated following Bouwman et al. (2002) as

$$DepT2_j = \sum_p \sum_i \left[ \left( FF_{i,j,p} \cdot ET2_{i,p} \cdot t_{meq,p} \cdot A_j^{-1} - N_{p,j} \right) \cdot (1 - f_{p,j}) - x \cdot t_{meq,BC} \cdot BC_j \cdot A_j^{-1} \right] \tag{S2.1}$$

where $FF_{i,j,p}$ is the atmospheric fate factor (kg$_{deposited}$·kg$_{emitted}^{-1}$), $ET2_{i,p}$ (kg$_{emitted}$) is the Type 2 total emission of pollutant $p$ from emitting grid $i$ deposited into $j$, $t_{meq,p}$ (meq·kg$^{-1}$) is a conversion factor from mass of pollutant $p$ (kg) to miliequivalents (meq), $A_j$ is the area (m$^2$) subjected to the atmospheric deposition the deposition, $N_{p,j}$ (meq·N·m$^{-2}$) is the nitrogen immobilization rate, $f_{p,j}$ (dimensionless) is the fraction of nitrogen lost by denitrification, $x$ (dimensionless) is an adjustment factor, $t_{meq,BC}$ (=4159 meq·kg$^{-1}$) is a unit conversion factor for base cation deposition, $BC_j$ (kg·m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$) is the base cation deposition in grid $j$.

Emission estimates $ET2_{i,p}$ were obtained from the EDGAR database (Butler et al., 2008). $t_{meq,p}$ for nitrogen and sulphur are, respectively, 71,393 and 31,185 meq·kg$^{-1}$. $N_{p,j}$ is given as:

$$N_{j,p} = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{for } p = SO_x \\
N_i \cdot \frac{\sum_j FF_{i,j,NO_x}}{\sum_j FF_{i,j,NO_x} + \sum_j FF_{i,j,NH_3}}, & \text{for } p = NO_x \\
N_i \cdot \frac{\sum_j FF_{i,j,NH_3}}{\sum_j FF_{i,j,NO_x} + \sum_j FF_{i,j,NH_3}}, & \text{for } p = NH_3
\end{cases} \tag{S2.2a/b/c}$$

where $N_i$ is the long term net immobilization rate (5.4 meq·N·m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$) suggested by Bouwman et al. (2002).

$f_{p,j}$ was determined based on the drainage class of different soil taxonomic groups following Zobler et al. (1986) and Bouwman et al. (1993), Table S2.1. The $f_{p,j}$ for very poorly drained, poorly drained, imperfectly drained, well to moderately well drained, and excessively to well drained soils were given as 0.8, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, and 0.2, respectively (Bouwman et al., 2002).

Table S2.1 $f_{p,j}$ depending on the drainage class of different soil taxonomic groups (Bouwman et al., 1993; Zobler, 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage class definitions</th>
<th>1 = very poorly drained</th>
<th>2 = poorly drained</th>
<th>3 = imperfectly drained</th>
<th>4 = well to moderately well drained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>very poorly drained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>poorly drained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>imperfectly drained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>well to moderately well drained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Soil taxonomic group | Drainage class
--- | ---
acrisol | 3
 cambisol | 1
 chernozem | 1
 podzoluvisol | 2
 rendzina | 1
 ferralsol | 1
 gleysol | 5
 phaeozem | 2
 lithosol | 1
 fluvisol | 1
 kastanozem | 1
 luvisol | 3
 greyzem | 3
 nitosol | 1
 histosol | 5
 podzosol | 2
 arenosol | 1
 regosol | 1
 solonetz | 3
 andosol | 1
 ranker | 1
 vertisol | 3
 planosol | 3
 xerosol | 1
 yermosol | 1
 solonchek | 1
 ice | -

The adjustment factor $x_p$ is given as:

$$x_p = \left\{ \frac{\sum_i F_i j_p}{\sum_p \sum_i F_i j_p} \cdot \frac{BC}{Dust} \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S2.3)

where $\frac{BC}{Dust}$ is the ratio of base cation to dust deposition, suggested by Tegen and Fung (1995) as equal to 0.2.

$BC_j$ data were obtained based on the 4°×5° resolution map by Tegen and Fung (1995).
Figure S2.1 Critical load (CL) map on a 5’×5’ resolution (Bouwman et al., 2002). The map was adapted to a 2° x 2.5° resolution grid for this study. Spatial recalculation of CL from a 5’ x 5’ to a 2° x 2.5° resolution was performed by using the most frequent value of CL in an array in order to prevent occurrence of positive CL values in coastal zones dominated by sea area.

Fig. S2.2 Exceedance ratio ($ER_j$) on a 2°×2.5° resolution.
Biome-specific PNOF – pH logistic functions were derived for vascular plant species by Azevedo et al. (2013) as:

\[
PNOF_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\frac{a_j - pH_j}{\beta_j}\right)}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\frac{a_j + \log_{10}C_j}{\beta_j}\right)}}
\]  

(S3.1)

where \(pH_j\) is the soil pH (dimensionless), \(C_j\) is the concentration of \(H^+\) (mol H\(^+\)·L\(^{-1}\)), and \(a_j\) and \(\beta_j\) are logistic-regression coefficients of grid \(j\) (Table S3.1).

The PNOF functions are based on observational field data where species occurrence at individual pH ranges is confirmed but factual absence is not. Accordingly, we chose PNOF as our impact indicator since we could not verify that the fraction of species disappeared. The latter is represented by the potentially disappeared fraction, PDF.

The coefficients \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) were not available for the (sub)tropical coniferous forest and (sub)tropical dry broadleaf forest biomes. Thus, for grids located in these biomes, we employed the coefficients derived originally for the (sub)tropical moist broadleaf forest biome based on the similarity of climates according to the Köppen-Geiger classification (Kottek et al., 2006).

**Table S3.1** pH optimum and biome-specific coefficients \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) (95% confidence interval) for different terrestrial biomes of the world, source: Azevedo et al. (2013). NS stands for non-significant at the 95% confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biome</th>
<th>(Range of) optimum pH</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)Tropical Moist Broadleaf Forest</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.55 (3.51 to 3.6)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.14 to 0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical grassland, savanna, and shrubland</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.55 (4.40 to 4.70)</td>
<td>0.16 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)Tropical coniferous forest</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sub)tropical dry broadleaf forest</td>
<td>4.3 to 6.0</td>
<td>3.72 (3.67 to 3.77)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.20 to 0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded grassland and savanna</td>
<td>5.9 to 6.6</td>
<td>5.31 (5.10 to 5.51)</td>
<td>0.33 (0.14 to 0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert and xeric shrubland</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.76 (6.68 to 6.83)</td>
<td>0.36 (0.28 to 0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Forest, Woodland, and Shrubland</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.64 (6.21 to 7.08)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.54 to 1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate Broadleaf Mixed Forest</td>
<td>4.7 to 5.1</td>
<td>3.57 (3.53 to 3.61)</td>
<td>0.36 (0.32 to 0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate Grassland, Savanna, and Shrubland</td>
<td>5.1 to 5.7</td>
<td>4.42 (4.37 to 4.47)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.22 to 0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate Coniferous</td>
<td>4.7 to 4.8</td>
<td>3.33 (3.17 to 3.50)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.11 to 0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>pH Range</td>
<td>Carrying Capacity (kg C/ha/year)</td>
<td>Productivity (kg C/ha/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montane grassland and shrubland</td>
<td>6.0 to 7.0</td>
<td>5.92 (NS)</td>
<td>0.01 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreal Forest / Taiga</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.21 (4.09 to 4.32)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.55 to 0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra and alpine</td>
<td>7.0 to 7.3</td>
<td>4.76 (4.62 to 4.90)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.33 to 0.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This supporting information describes the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets accompanying this deliverable (Table S4.1).

**Table S4.1 Description of accompanying Microsoft Excel spreadsheets.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Referenced in</th>
<th>Worksheets</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characterisation factor CF&lt;sub&gt;i,p&lt;/sub&gt; (Type 1 and Type 3)</td>
<td>Type 1: mol H&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;·L&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;·m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;·kg&lt;sub&gt;emitted&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt; · yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt; Type 3: m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;·kg&lt;sub&gt;emitted&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Eq. 1 and 3</td>
<td>‘GridMidCF’</td>
<td>‘CF.xlsx’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryMidCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentMidCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalMidCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GridEndCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryEndCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentEndCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalEndCF’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GridEmiss’</td>
<td>‘Emissions.xlsx’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryEmiss’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentEmiss’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalEmiss’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GridMidNS’</td>
<td>‘NS.xlsx’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GridEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission data E&lt;sub&gt;i,p&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>kg of SO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;, kg of SO&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;, kg of NO&lt;sub&gt;x&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;, kg of HNO&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;, and kg of NH&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;·yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Eq. 8</td>
<td>‘CountryEmiss’</td>
<td>‘Emissions.xlsx’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-weighted normalization score NF&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Type 1: mol H&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;·L&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;·m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; Type 3: m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Eq. 8 and 9</td>
<td>‘GlobalMidNS’</td>
<td>‘NS.xlsx’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalMidNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GridEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CountryEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ContinentEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘GlobalEndNS’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>