

Critical Review Statement
***CFP-Tool for asphalt
traffic areas***

Report Nr. P120320044

DEKRA Alles im grünen Bereich

Commissioned by: Gieseke GmbH
Leugermannstraße 3
48431 Rheine

Version: CFP-Tool for asphalt traffic areas Version (January 2026)

Prepared by: Gieseke GmbH

Reviewed by: DEKRA Assurance Services GmbH

References:

- ISO 14067 (2018): Greenhouse gases – Carbon footprint of products – Requirements and guidelines for quantification
- ISO 14071 (2024): Environmental management – Life cycle assessment – Critical review processes and reviewer competencies: Additional requirements and guidelines to ISO 14044:2006

CONTENT

1. Scope of the Critical Review	3
2. Review process.....	3
3. General evaluation	4
4. Conclusion	5

1. SCOPE OF THE CRITICAL REVIEW

The reviewer was tasked with assessing whether:

- the methodology to calculate Carbon Footprints of Products (CFP) is consistent with the relevant international standard (ISO 14067:2018),
- the assumptions made, the data and the calculation procedure used are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the goal of the methodology,
- the documentation is transparent and consistent.

The critical review was performed at the end of the CFP methodology development according to paragraph 4.3.3 of ISO 14071:2024 and 6.2 of ISO 14044:2006 by an independent external expert. This critical review statement is only valid for the specific methodology documentation in its final version dated 20.01.2026. The critical review was mainly done based on the documentation of the methodology 'CFP-Tool for asphalt traffic areas'. Additionally, the documentation of an exemplary calculation of one product was provided. The verification of the LCI model and individual background datasets is outside the scope of this review.

2. REVIEW PROCESS

The review process was performed in accordance with ISO 14071:2024 and coordinated between Gieseke and the reviewer. As a first step in the review process, the independent reviewer was selected based on his product specific and life cycle assessment (LCA) competence. The review process started with a kick-off meeting on 24.09.2025. The review for the final report was conducted via two iteration rounds (for details see table below). Throughout the review process the reviewer gave feedback via a comment list giving impulses to be integrated into the methodology and questions for clarification of details. The comments were discussed during review meetings. In each round, the CFP documentation was revised by Gieseke and made available to the reviewer in an updated version. The second iteration led to a well-structured and transparent CFP methodology documentation.

Iteration Round	Submission to reviewer	Provision of feedback from reviewers
1 st Iteration	06.10.2025	20.10.2026
2 nd Iteration	16.01.2026	20.01.2026
Final Version	21.01.2026	21.01.2026

The reviewer checked the full implementation of the issues and agreed to conclude the critical review process. The reviewer acknowledges the unrestricted access to all requested information, the dedicated efforts of Gieseke to address the comments provided, as well as the open and constructive dialogue during the entire critical review process. The final review statement was submitted on 11.02.2026. All versions of the documentation (reports and data), including the individual reviewer's comments, questions and associated answers, are archived and can be made available upon request and consent of Gieseke.

3. GENERAL EVALUATION

This methodology concerns the product carbon footprint associated with the production, transport and installation (cradle-to-site) of asphalt traffic areas.

The methodology was developed and applied in a professional manner using state-of-the-art methods in conformity with ISO 14067:2018.

The objective of Gieseke in creating the methodology is, to determine more efficiently and precisely the carbon footprint of the installation of their customer specific asphalt traffic area products. The methodology will be used in customer specific projects to determine and communicate the CFP of the constructions.

The goals and reasons for creating the methodology as well as the intended audiences and application of the methodology are clearly described. The description provides adequate information on the scope of the methodology, the product system to be investigated, the functional unit, the system boundary, data quality, cut-offs, assumptions and limitations, allocation procedures and impact category.

The primary data and background data used as well as the data quality are transparently described in the methodology report.

The major recommendations of the reviewer aimed at validating the scientific approach for calculating product-specific energy consumption during production with additional primary data from a production site. Another major recommendation was to ensure that supply chain emissions are included when using secondary datasets outside of established LCA databases. It was also noted that the literature sources for the calculation approaches and secondary data used in the methodology should be better described and specified, especially in regard to energy consumption. In accordance with the requirements and recommendations of the reviewer Gieseke revised the CFP methodology and its documentation.

Despite all necessary due diligence performed during the critical review process by the reviewer, Gieseke remains responsible for the information and data underlying the CFP methodology.

The methodology and its application using an example product is clearly presented in various meaningful tables fulfilling the specific ISO 14067:2018 reporting requirements. In addition, the results are interpreted with regards to dominant life cycle stages and most significant processes or materials contributing to the total carbon footprint.

The documentation also presents a data quality evaluation, which increases the transparency and provides an improved understanding of the methodology and its results. The conclusions drawn from methodology and its application supports insights into how to further improve data quality and to plan concrete measures for reducing the CFP of the product group.

As with every CFP, the outcomes of a specific calculation also depend on the choices made in the scope definition. Therefore, the results need to be interpreted in the context defined. It should be noted that the outcomes of a calculation may not be generalized beyond the defined scope. The compliance of individual CFP results with ISO 14067:2018, other than the example product, was not part of this review.

4. CONCLUSION

Gieseke answered all questions to the reviewer's satisfaction. Suitable solutions were developed and implemented into the CFP methodology for all requirements and recommendations.

The Gieseke CFP methodology and tool for asphalt traffic areas meet all relevant requirements of ISO 14067 for the calculation customer-specific cradle-to-site projects.

This CFP methodology has been developed and applied in conformity with ISO 14067:2018. It can be considered detailed and robust. The reviewer found the methodology and its execution to be adequate for the defined purposes of the study. Furthermore, the underlying data, life cycle model, assumptions and calculations are appropriate and valid and lead to plausible results. The interpretation reflects the results in a suitable manner and relevant conclusions and recommendations are drawn.

As with any CFP calculation, the results depend heavily on the data used and the decisions made when creating a calculation. Therefore, only the CFP methodology and the tool based on it can be verified in this critical review. Product-specific calculations created with the help of the methodology or tool must be verified individually if verification is required.

Stuttgart, 11.02.2026

A circular green stamp with the DEKRA logo in the center. The text around the logo reads "DEKRA Assurance Services GmbH" at the top, "70565 Stuttgart, Handwerkstraße 13" at the bottom, and "HhH" on the right side.

i. A. Oliver Glauner

DEKRA Assurance Services GmbH