

AutoPCF: Efficient Product Carbon Footprint Accounting with Large Language Models

Zhu Deng^{1,#}, Jinjie Liu^{2,#}, Biao Luo¹, Can Yuan¹, Qingrun Yang¹, Lei Xiao¹, Wenwen Zhou^{1,*}, Zhu Liu³

¹ Alibaba Cloud, Hangzhou, China

² School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

³ Department of Earth System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

These authors contribute equally.

* Corresponding: zhoubo.zww@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

The product carbon footprint (PCF) is crucial for decarbonizing the supply chain, as it measures the direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions caused by all activities during the product's life cycle. However, PCF accounting often requires expert knowledge and significant time to construct life cycle models. In this study, we test and compare the emergent ability of five large language models (LLMs) in modeling the 'cradle-to-gate' life cycles of products and generating the inventory data of inputs and outputs, revealing their limitations as a generalized PCF knowledge database. By utilizing LLMs, we propose an automatic AI-driven PCF accounting framework, called AutoPCF, which also applies deep learning algorithms to automatically match calculation parameters, and ultimately calculate the PCF. The results of estimating the carbon footprint for three case products using the AutoPCF framework demonstrate its potential in achieving automatic modeling and estimation of PCF with a large reduction in modeling time from days to minutes.

1 Introduction

Climate change and its adverse effects have become a pressing global concern, mandating immediate action for sustainable practices and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions¹. Product Carbon Footprint (PCF), which quantifies life cycle emissions associated with products, enables informed decision-making and the development of effective strategies for reducing environmental impact². While Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) has been widely used to estimate the PCF, this approach often faces big challenges. For example, the determination of system boundaries and construction of complete inventories of products' life cycles necessitates extensive research, often relying on a combination of primary data collection, literature reviews, and expert judgment³, which is time-consuming, resource-intensive, and subject to uncertainties⁴. Given the limitations of existing methods, exploring alternative approaches that enhance the efficiency and objectivity of carbon footprint estimation becomes necessary.

The emergence of large language models (LLMs), such as the GPT series⁵⁻⁷ and GLM^{8,9}, provides the possibility of a rapid generation of professional knowledge. LLMs are powerful deep learning models that have been trained on vast amounts of text data, enabling them to

generate coherent and contextually relevant responses. Moreover, they are often deployed on the cloud to improve response efficiency. When using pre-trained or fine-tuned LLMs for professional knowledge question answering, the models can leverage their inherent knowledge to enhance performance and efficiency in providing accurate and insightful responses. Therefore, LLMs have been widely applied in various domains, including software¹⁰, finance¹¹, biology¹², medicine¹³, geography¹⁴, and carbon management^{15–17}. The corpus used for training LLMs contains a wide range of texts, which may include supply chain information related to product carbon footprint (PCF), and have the potential to generate detailed descriptions and simulate various production processes^{18–21}. This suggests the possibility of applying LLMs to PCF modeling and estimation to improve efficiency^{22–24}.

In this study, we propose an automatic AI-driven product carbon footprint accounting framework, called AutoPCF, which is primarily driven by LLMs. We employed five general LLMs to automatically generate the production processes and their use of raw materials and energy as well as their wastes, to establish 'cradle-to-gate' life cycle models. In this study, we applied AutoPCF to three products which are hot rolled round steel, printed and dyed fabric, and lithium iron phosphate battery. Combining with the semantics-based matching model, we matched the emission factors corresponding to raw materials and energy for each production process, and finally calculated their carbon footprint. The benchmark between the AutoPCF results and those estimated by our experts shows promise of using the AutoPCF framework to scale and accelerate the process of product carbon footprint accounting compared with traditional expertise-based processes.

2 Materials and method

2.1 Scope definition

The accounting of PCF usually follows an LCA process, which generally includes five stages: raw material extraction, manufacturing, distribution, use, and end-of-life disposal. This accounting scope is also known as 'cradle-to-grave'²⁵. In this study, the PCF accounting scope is 'cradle-to-gate', which mainly focuses on the production and manufacturing process of the product, as it is one of the most concentrated life cycles for raw materials and energy²⁶.

2.2 The traditional expertise-based process

Estimating PCF generally comprises three primary steps: determining system boundaries, conducting a life cycle inventory analysis, and evaluating environmental impacts. LCA analysts establish a life cycle inventory (LCI) based on their expert knowledge and experience, according to the defined system boundaries of the product's carbon footprint. Specifically, analysts typically dismantle the processes of each life cycle stage of the product and determine the inputs and outputs required for each process to ultimately build the product's life cycle model. They then evaluate the environmental impacts (i.e., greenhouse gas emissions) of all inputs and outputs throughout the product's life cycle. The input items of the product usually include raw materials and energy, and greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the production of raw materials, consumables, and secondary energy sources (e.g., electricity) that occur

during the product's life cycle are included in the product's carbon footprint (Scope 2+Scope 3 upstream). Output items typically include waste gas, wastewater, and waste materials, such as greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the use of fossil fuels (Scope 1). Finally, these greenhouse gas emissions are converted into carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂-eq) and added up to calculate the product's carbon footprint.

This process can be time-consuming and involves breaking down each life cycle stage of the product based on industry production experience or relevant literature to determine inputs and outputs for each process. Then, values for the input-output inventory are determined based on actual production conditions, and the results are ultimately calculated. Although there are some life cycle modeling tools and life cycle databases that can help improve calculation efficiency, it still takes several days or months to complete the carbon footprint assessment of a product.

2.3 AutoPCF: the AI-driven automatic framework

The AutoPCF framework follows a similar process to the traditional expertise-based process of PCF modeling and estimation. However, unlike LCA, which requires expert knowledge for inventory construction and emission factor selection, AutoPCF leverages Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Deep Learning algorithms for these tasks. For inventory construction, AutoPCF primarily utilizes the capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs). By providing appropriate prompts to LLMs, the framework generates and outputs all the production processes of a product. LLMs are also used to generate specific activity data for each production process. In terms of emission factor selection, AutoPCF employs semantic similarity to automatically match the activity name with the corresponding emission factors from a database, obtaining the emission factor value of each activity. The carbon footprint of the product is calculated based on the activity data generated by LLMs and matched emission factors. All of these steps can be automated through programming and encapsulation. By simply providing the name of a product, the framework can automatically generate the life cycle inventory and carbon footprint of the product.




Figure 1 | The AutoPCF framework.

2.3.1 The 'cradle-to-gate' inventory analysis

Introducing LLMs

LLMs have shown excellent ability in a wide range of NLP tasks and can better obtain corresponding text content according to the research purpose by appropriately adjusting prompts and combining in-context learning^{27,28}. During the training of LLMs, a significant amount of text corpus is used, such as GPT-4 with more than 1 trillion parameters. The GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 training datasets include the Common Crawl dataset, the Webtext2 dataset, two internet-based book corpora, and Wikipedia⁷. The Common Crawl dataset, which contributes 60% of the total weight in the training mix, contains petabytes of data obtained over 12 years of web crawling²⁹. Plenty of data about carbon footprint can be found in it, e.g., data from carbonfootprint.com³⁰. For GLM-130B, the training data include 1.2T Pile English corpus, 1.0T Chinese WudaoCorpora, and 250G web-crawled Chinese corpora⁹. Although specific descriptions of the training data for ChatGLM-6B and Tongyi Qianwen were not found, their datasets should also be adequately large to be prepared for carbon footprint assessment. Such a large amount of text corpus may equip the LLMs with knowledge of the production process and input-output activity inventory of products.

Table 1 | Large language models used in this study.

LLM	Size	Description
GPT-3.5 ^{7,31}	175B	Developed by OpenAI, GPT-3.5 is a set of models that improve on GPT-3. Gpt-3.5-turbo is the most capable GPT-3.5 model, with 4096 maximum tokens and training data up to Sep. 2021.
GPT-4 ^{31,32}	>1T*	Developed by OpenAI, GPT-4 is more capable than any GPT-3.5 model, with 8192 maximum tokens and training data up to Sep. 2021.
GLM-130B ⁹	130B	Developed by Tsinghua University, GLM-130B is a bilingual language model. It outperforms GPT-3 175B in English and ERNIE TITAN 3.0 260B in Chinese.
ChatGLM-6B ³³	6.2B	ChatGLM-6B is an open bilingual (Chinese and English) language model based on the GLM framework. It has some limitations due to its small size, including a lack of English ability.
Tongyi Qianwen ³⁴	>10B	Developed by Alibaba Cloud, Tongyi Qianwen is a large language model supporting both Chinese and English. It will be integrated into all business applications across Alibaba's ecosystem.

* No official report. Estimated by users.

In this study, we employed 5 LLMs in AutoPCF, and evaluate their performance in the PCF modeling (See **Table 1**). The API for ChatGLM-6B is locally deployed in this study, while the APIs for the other four LLMs are all called through HTTP requests. We utilized the generation

ability of LLMs to quickly perform product lifecycle inventory analysis by guiding LLMs to break down the production process and activity inventory of the product through appropriate prompts. This breakdown process is conducted in a conversational way by gradually providing prompts and incorporating contextual information.

Inventory analysis

Using LLMs for inventory analysis involves two steps: production process breakdown and activity inventory construction. Firstly, we perform a production process breakdown for the product. We first construct a prompt that predefines the question and output requirements, providing a template for the generation of subsequent results (see **SI Text 1**). Next, we make full use of the contextual learning ability of LLMs to replace the product name in the template, and LLMs output the production process of the product. Then, for each production process, we let LLMs generate the activity inventory (i.e., a list of raw material inputs, energy consumption, and waste generated). Similarly, we first construct a prompt containing input-output templates, and then let LLMs output the activity inventory list for that production process (see **SI Text 1**). The prompts used for various LLMs are generally kept consistent and are not specifically optimized for individual models.

To evaluate the performance of the inventory analysis by LLMs compared to the expert-based process, we follow the ROUGE method³⁵ and define three metrics, *recall*, *precision*, and *F1-Score*. The *Precision* is defined as the fraction of correct retrieved instances among all the retrieved instances (instance here means the item in the inventory, such as coke breeze, pig iron, oxygen, etc.). The *Recall* is the ratio between the number of the correct retrieved instances and all correct instances. The *F1-score* is the harmonic mean of precision and recall, which can measure the overall performance of the model.

$$precision = \frac{\text{the number of correct retrieved instances}}{\text{the number of all retrieved instances}} \quad (1)$$

$$recall = \frac{\text{the number of correct retrieved instances}}{\text{the number of all correct instances}} \quad (2)$$

$$F1\text{-score} = 2 * \frac{precision * recall}{precision + recall} \quad (3)$$

Generating activity data of the inventory

Activity data refers to the amount of raw materials or energy consumed during the production process. In traditional LCA assessment, activity data is collected through automatic monitoring or questionnaires. In this study, we used two methods to generate activity data required for PCF accounting, including the direct generation approach and the indirect estimation approach.

Direct generation approach: We constructed appropriate prompts to enable LLMs to automatically generate and output activity data corresponding to the inventory (see **SI Text 1**). However, not all LLMs are capable of generating seemingly reasonable activity data. Our results suggest using GPT-3.5 to directly generate activity data.

Indirect estimation approach: It employed a top-down method based on industry-wide macro-statistics data to generate activity data for each process in the emission inventory. We matched

the activities in the inventory with the industries in the input-output table to convert the input economic quantity into a physical quantity, which determines the amount of raw materials or energy input (see **SI Text 4**). This approach was applied to all LLMs for activity data estimation. However, there is in fact a large discrepancy between the actual input-output of product production and the industry-wide input-output, resulting in a considerable level of uncertainty in the calculated results when using this approach.

2.3.2 Product carbon footprint assessment

Semantic-based emission factor matching model

To estimate the environmental impact of each activity in the inventory, it is generally necessary to multiply the activity data by the emission factor (i.e., the amount of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of activity data) to convert the activity data into greenhouse gas emissions. In this study, we employed a semantic-based model to match the aforementioned activities with their corresponding emission factors. The emission factor database used in this study is the Ecoinvent v3.9.1 database³⁶. The names of both the emission factors and activities are first encoded into vectors with a length of 768 by a pre-trained language model. We calculated the semantic similarity between each activity vector and all emission factor vectors (**Eq. (4)**), identifying the emission factor with the shortest vector distance (considered as the highest similarity) to match it with the corresponding activity as its emission factor.

$$\cos_sim(\vec{a}, \vec{f}) = \frac{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{f}}{|\vec{a}| \cdot |\vec{f}|} \quad (4)$$

where $\cos_sim(\vec{a}, \vec{f})$ is the cosine similarity between the activity vector and emission factor vector, \vec{a} and \vec{f} are the activity vector and emission factor vector.

2.4 Product carbon footprint accounting

In PCF accounting, the first step is to break down the production process of the product life cycle, and obtain the inputs, energy use, and outputs of each process. The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by each process can be calculated using the following formula:

$$E_s = AD_f * EF_f \quad (5)$$

Where E_s denotes the GHG emissions from process s ; AD_f and EF_f are the activity data and the corresponding GHG emission factor of the activity f , such as the raw materials input or energy consumption in the process³⁷.

The PCF assessment takes into account seven greenhouse gases, namely carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃), which are covered by the UNFCCC/Kyoto Protocol. To provide a standardized measure, the PCF is expressed in terms of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂-eq) based on their respective Global Warming Potentials (GWPs).

The overall PCF estimation accuracy is measured by the percentage error between the actual and the estimated PCF. To establish a reliable benchmark, we invited human experts to conduct PCF estimation based on actual production data from select factories, such as the

PCF estimation of hot rolled round steel³⁸, printed and dyed fabric^{39,40}, and lithium iron phosphate battery^{41–46}. The results are served as the ground truth for comparison. This approach allows us to gauge the effectiveness of the proposed AutoPCF model in producing accurate and reliable PCF estimates, providing a robust basis for assessing its performance against expert estimates.

$$Error = \left| 1 - \frac{PCF_{AutoPCF}}{PCF_{expert}} \right| \quad (6)$$

3 Results

3.1 The emergent ability of LLMs on the ‘cradle-to-gate’ product inventory analysis

As shown in **Fig 2**, we use precision (P), recall (R), and F1-Score (F1) as evaluation metrics to assess the differences between the LLMs generated results and the expert-based process (see **Materials and Method**). The results showed that for the production process, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 had a higher average F1-score of 0.59 and 0.53 for the three products than other models, indicating their better performance in modeling product production processes. In comparison, the average F1-score of GLM-130B and ChatGLM-6B were only 0.20 and 0.37, respectively. Specifically, the precision of GPT-4 results was the highest, reaching 56%, indicating that the GPT-4 decomposition results are closer to the expert-based production process. The recall of GPT-3.5 was high (72%) but the precision was a little lower (52%), indicating that although GPT-3.5 found as many production processes as possible, many of the generated answers are not within the expert-based process. In comparison, the average precision and recall are only 41% and 18% for GLM-130B and 49% and 30% for ChatGLM-6B respectively.




Figure 2 | Performance of inventory analysis by using the five large language models (i.e., GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Tongyi, GLM-130B, and GLM-6B). The performance is evaluated by three metrics, precision (P), recall (R), and F1-score (F1), all ranging from 0 to 1, with 1 being the best and 0 being the worst compared to the expert-based process.

For the activity inventory, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 also outperformed the other models in all three metrics, with a precision exceeding 59%, recall exceeding 32%, and F1-Score above 0.4 (GPT-3.5 achieved an F1-Score of 0.53 for modeling the inventory of printed dyed fabric, and GPT-4 reached an F1-Score of 0.50). This indicates that GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 perform relatively better in modeling the activity inventory of these three products. In comparison, GLM-130B and GLM-6B showed relatively poorer performance in all three metrics, especially for hot rolled round steel, where F1-Score was only 0.13 and 0.1, respectively.

3.2 The AutoPCF estimations of the three product cases

Using LLMs to split the production processes and activity lists of three products, we generated activity data using two methods: direct generation method (LLMs directly provide activity data) and indirect estimation method (matching activity lists with industry data). Based on these activity data, we compared the median and uncertainty range of the final PCF results with those of the human expert model results to evaluate the accuracy and stability of these model assessments. The results (**Fig 3**) showed that AutoPCF with GPT-3.5 exhibited the highest accuracy and stability for the direct generation method. GPT-4 had a similar accuracy to GPT-3.5, but its stability was not as good as GPT-3.5. In comparison, the results based on the indirect estimation method had lower accuracy and stability. For the lithium iron phosphate battery, all models showed significant differences compared to the results of human experts. The human expert results themselves also had a high degree of uncertainty.

In the case of hot rolled round steel, GPT-3.5 with direct generation demonstrated accurate PCF estimation, with a median PCF value within 10% error. The mean estimation value for AutoPCF with GPT-3.5 was 2.1 kgCO₂-eq/kg, while human experts' mean estimation value stood at 2.3 kgCO₂-eq/kg. Additionally, AutoPCF based on GPT-3.5 and direct generation also achieved accurate PCF estimation for printed and dyed fabric, with its estimation range falling within the range given by experts. However, when it comes to estimating the PCF of lithium iron phosphate battery, AutoPCF using all LLM models showed higher error compared to human experts' estimations (e.g., GPT-3.5 yielding an average estimation of 24.6 kgCO₂-eq/kg, while human experts averaged 13.3 kgCO₂-eq/kg). However, the maximum PCF value given by GPT-3.5 with direct generation (27.1 kgCO₂-eq/kg) was comparable to that of human experts (22.0 kgCO₂-eq/kg). Traditionally, PCF assessment for lithium iron phosphate batteries is commonly expressed in kgCO₂-eq/kWh. For the purpose of harmonization, we have transformed this measure into kgCO₂-eq/kg by using the relationship between battery capacity and weight, aligning it with battery weight. However, this conversion introduces potential errors due to the diverse array of battery materials and weights, leading to inaccuracies. Further investigation into the intricacies of production processes and emission inventories reveals that this divergence was also influenced by variations in production methods and emission sources. AutoPCF's outcomes often assumed a production scenario involving the recycling of used batteries, wherein the high emission factors of these recycled batteries contributed to the higher PCF estimation results.




Figure 3 | Carbon footprint estimation of the three selected products (hot rolled round steel, printed and dyed fabric, and lithium iron phosphate battery). The gray bars denote the 25% to 75% carbon footprint estimation range estimated by human experts, while the activity data is collected from industrial expertise. The red bars denote the 25% to 75% carbon footprint estimation range of hot rolled round steel, printed and dyed fabric, and lithium iron phosphate battery, with both the inventory analysis and the activity data directly generated by LLMs. The blue bars denote the 25% to 75% carbon footprint estimation range of hot rolled round steel, printed and dyed fabric, and lithium iron phosphate battery, with the inventory analysis conducted by the LLMs and using the activity data estimated by industrial proxy data (see SI Text 4). The error bar represents the 1.5 interquartile range (IQR) of the estimation results for different models.

Moreover, the accuracy of the production process and activity inventory analysis results of LLMs significantly influenced, though not entirely determined, the accuracy of PCF results. For instance, when using the direct generation approach, GPT-4 exhibited higher precision and the same recall in the inventory analysis of printed and dyed fabric compared to GPT-3.5. However, the PCF estimation results based on GPT-3.5 were higher and more accurate (see **Fig. 2 and Fig. 3**). This indicates that although GPT-3.5 omitted some "standard" activity items, it included various equivalent or alternative activity items in the inventory analysis, owing to the diversity of production processes. Consequently, it obtains comparable PCF results with human experts. Additionally, with the direct generation approach, GPT-4 showed higher recall and F1-Score in the inventory analysis of hot rolled round steel compared to GLM-130B. However, the PCF estimation results based on GPT-4 were lower and more accurate. This suggests that even though GLM-130B might cause more "standard" omissions in the activity inventory analysis, it could give higher estimates of activity data with higher emission factors.

3.3 The generalization potential of the AutoPCF

For the three products, GPT-3.5 exhibited relatively good stability among the five models in both inventory analysis and activity data generation. Therefore, we selected 20 industrial products and used the AutoPCF with GPT-3.5 model to estimate their PCFs. The results showed that AutoPCF with GPT-3.5 may generally overestimate the carbon footprint of these products. Except for section steel, lime and nonwoven fabric, AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 displayed higher PCF estimation results for the other 17 products. This was primarily due to the higher energy consumption data generated by GPT-3.5.

Among this set of 20 products, AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 demonstrated impressive performance for certain products, including section steel, nonwoven fabric, PVC, and automotive aluminum alloy, with a percentage error within 20% compared to human experts' estimations. In particular, the PCF estimation discrepancy for section steel by AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 (4.23 kgCO₂-eq/kg) was significantly low compared to human experts (4.35 kgCO₂-eq/kg). For common products like section steel with relatively uniform production processes, LLMs can provide accurate responses based on information extracted from sufficient relevant training data. However, AutoPCF might result in high carbon footprint estimation errors for certain products, e.g., alumina. Upon analyzing the inventory and activity data generated by LLMs, we found that the raw materials were within reasonable ranges due to the prescribed limits in our prompts (1 kg product). The substantial error lies in LLMs producing higher electricity consumption values for each production process, leading to PCF overestimation. This discrepancy indicates that these LLMs may lack sufficient relevant training data on the electricity consumption of alumina production, leading to the generation of misleading information. This highlights the need to investigate methods that enhance the generalization capabilities of AutoPCF. While LLMs are powerful language models capable of generating human-like text, they are not immune to inaccuracies and may provide incorrect information when faced with unfamiliar prompts. Hence, considering the model's limitations and the quality of its training data is crucial to ensure reliable and accurate results when utilizing LLMs for specific tasks, such as estimating PCFs.




Figure 4 | Carbon footprint estimation of 20 industrial products based on AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 (Detergent, Lightweight concrete block, Lime, Newspaper, Crude steel, Section steel, Copy Paper, Steel bar, Woven Plastic Packing Bag, Potash fertilizer, Alumina, Tempered glass, Architectural glass, Carbon steel, Polythene, Nonwoven fabric, PVC, Pesticide, Steel products, Automotive aluminum alloy, Glass average). The inventory analysis and the activity data are directly generated by the GPT-3.5, and the PCF is then estimated by AutoPCF. The ground truth value is given by human experts. The dotted red line represents the accurate estimation with no error compared to human experts. The yellow dots denote the carbon footprint of the three products (section steel, lime and nonwoven fabric), with AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 underestimating their carbon footprints than human experts. The blue dots denote the carbon footprint of the other 18 products, with AutoPCF-GPT-3.5 overestimating their carbon footprints compared to human experts.

4 Discussion

4.1 Uncertainty of the AutoPCF estimations

The uncertainties in expert-based PCF estimation stem from diverse factors, including the intricate and variable nature of production processes, data availability and quality, and subjective judgment when making assumptions. Regarding the emission inventory, experts were tasked with compiling a comprehensive and detailed list of GHG emissions associated with various sources throughout the product's life cycle. The accuracy and completeness of this emission inventory can vary based on available data and the level of expertise of the experts. Subjective judgment in the estimation process can introduce variations and uncertainties in the final results. Uncertainties may arise from incomplete or missing data on

emission sources. The reliability of activity data, such as energy consumption, material inputs, and process parameters, played a crucial role in PCF estimation. Experts often rely on available data, historical records, or industry standards to estimate these parameters. However, the need to use proxy data or generalize information can introduce uncertainties due to variations in data quality and the absence of specific data for certain processes. Estimating emission factors, which quantify GHG emissions per unit of activity or material, can also be challenging. Experts might draw upon emission factors from different sources or adapt them to specific contexts, leading to uncertainties in PCF estimation. Moreover, variations in the production of products across different factories, regions, or countries further compound the uncertainty. Experts may need to make assumptions or use models to estimate emissions for certain stages, and the selection of these assumptions and models can introduce uncertainties in the final PCF estimation.

Due to the stochastic nature of LLMs, which can provide different answers for the same question under multiple inquiries, ensuring stability became challenging and introduced performance inconsistencies. Nevertheless, when estimating activity data directly or indirectly, AutoPCF based on GPT-3.5, ChatGLM-6B, or Tongyi Qianwen demonstrated lower uncertainty compared to human experts for the selected three products, indicating their reliable stabilities. However, AutoPCF with GLM-130B or GPT-4 tended to introduce larger uncertainties, particularly in the PCF estimation of printed and dyed fabric and lithium iron phosphate battery. The use of an industry matching model with an accuracy of only 74% for indirect estimation contributed to the observed large uncertainty. The results revealed that AutoPCF based on ChatGLM-6B, Tongyi Qianwen, or GPT-3.5 with indirect activity data generation exhibited lower uncertainty compared to that with direct activity data generation, underscoring the importance of accurate activity data collection. Moreover, since the semantic-based emission factor model achieves an accuracy of 92%, the mismatched emission factors for some emission sources can also contribute to uncertainties. Despite these potential sources of uncertainty, AutoPCF based on GPT-3.5 and direct activity data generation consistently provided a PCF estimation range comparable to that of human experts. For instance, the uncertainty estimation range of human experts for hot rolled round steel was [1.4, 3.0], while AutoPCF with GPT-3.5 and direct generation yielded [2.1, 3.3], achieving PCF estimation at an expert level. The rigorous assessment of uncertainty in the AutoPCF framework allowed for a better understanding and interpretation of the PCF estimation results, enhancing the reliability and applicability of the proposed methodology in environmental research and carbon footprint assessments.

4.2 Improved efficiency by AutoPCF

The emission inventory comprises a comprehensive and detailed list of GHG emissions linked to various emission sources. The consistency and completeness of the emission sources can reflect the accuracy of the LLM model in identifying emission inventories, and further significantly influence the results of PCF estimation (see **Fig 2** and **Fig 3**). GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 exhibited better performance in generating both emission inventory and activity data, leading to more accurate PCF results when the AutoPCF is based on these two LLMs.

The proposed AutoPCF not only provides considerably believable estimation results but also demonstrates remarkable cost and time efficiency compared to human experts. Traditionally, experts relied on their experience from previous studies to compile the emission inventory and estimate PCF, resulting in variations and potential discrepancies. The intricate nature of production processes, facilities, materials, and products adds complexity and time consumption to precisely determine the exact emission sources. In contrast, AutoPCF offers an automatic and streamlined approach for PCF estimation, significantly reducing the need for extensive manual labor and saving valuable time and costs. Leveraging the power of LLMs, AutoPCF can tap into vast amounts of text data to learn from the collective knowledge, while deep-learning models rapidly output accurate information. These factors together contribute to the high efficiency of the AutoPCF framework, making it a promising and valuable method for estimating PCF and driving advancements in environmental research. For instance, the quick PCF estimation capabilities enabled by AutoPCF allow for continuous tracking of corporate carbon footprints and large-scale promotion. This opens up new possibilities for dynamic carbon footprint management, enabling timely interventions and targeted carbon reduction strategies.

However, the observed disparities in the emission inventory and PCF results still raise questions regarding whether our proposed AutoPCF and LLMs can be considered complete substitutes for human expertise, warranting further investigation into this matter. Future work can focus on enhancing the performance and accuracy of the underlying deep-learning models and LLMs used in AutoPCF. This may involve exploring advanced architectures, incorporating more diverse training data, and fine-tuning the models to specific industry sectors. Especially, the LLM models can be improved by constructing a local knowledge base and training an LLM model specially designed for PCF estimation. This integration of external knowledge can enhance the accuracy of the generated answers by reducing the inclusion of irrelevant or incorrect information. Note that ensuring the high quality and suitability of the knowledge base also plays a crucial role in achieving more accurate and reliable results. Optimizing and customizing prompts can help better extract information and improve the accuracy of emission inventory. Moreover, a novel PCF estimation model completely dependent on LLM models is to be studied by designing reasonable prompts, like AutoGIS¹⁴. Improving the interpretability of the models can also enhance stakeholders' trust in the generated carbon footprint estimates.

4.3 Generalization

The generalization capacities of AutoPCF and LLMs in estimating PCF can be both promising and challenging. LLMs, with their ability to learn from vast amounts of text data, can capture complex patterns and relationships in language, making them potentially adept at understanding and estimating PCF-related information from diverse sources. However, LLMs may lack specialized domain knowledge specific to PCF estimation, especially when dealing with complex industrial processes or specific product categories. The generalization capacity of LLMs depends on the availability and diversity of data used during their pre-training. Limited access to high-quality PCF-related data may affect their accuracy and generalization to new scenarios and different products. In addition, LLMs may inadvertently produce biased

estimations in PCF if the training data contain biases, leading to inaccurate and unreliable results. While LLMs can generalize well within their pre-training domains, transferring their knowledge to specific PCF estimation tasks may require fine-tuning or adaptation to task-specific data.

Reiterate that PCF needs to be calculated based on real product production processes and activity data from the corresponding factories. It is important to acknowledge that even human experts cannot achieve 100% consistency of the inventory and PCF results due to the complexity and variability of production processes and raw materials. The objective here is to obtain the most comprehensive estimate of the carbon footprint of a product. Based on the estimated PCF, the standardized PCF default values are to be determined and can be used as a reference for environmental disclosure, especially for a producer who cannot provide credible and transparent PCF calculations.

It is important to acknowledge that even human experts cannot achieve 100% consistency of the inventory and PCF results due to the complexity and variability of production processes and raw materials. The objective here is to obtain the most comprehensive estimate of the carbon footprint of a product. Based on the estimated PCF, the standardized PCF default values are to be determined and can be used as a reference for environmental disclosure, especially for a producer who cannot provide credible and transparent PCF calculations.

5 Conclusion

This paper proposes the AutoPCF framework, which utilizes large language models (LLMs) to assist LCA practitioners in estimating product carbon footprints (PCF) with enhanced efficiency and reduced costs. Although LLMs are not yet entirely accurate in estimating PCF, some pre-trained models such as GPT-3.5 have demonstrated good knowledge of production processes and activity lists. The AutoPCF framework utilizes deep learning methods to develop a matching model that replaces expert experience in identifying the industry sector, collecting activity data, and suggesting carbon emission factors. The automatic PCF modeling approach of AutoPCF allows for the rapid estimation of the carbon footprint of a specific product category with minimal data input, making it a versatile and efficient tool for promoting sustainability practices, supporting decision-making, and contributing to global environmental goals.

Future work aims to reduce the uncertainty and enhance the reliability of the AutoPCF in estimating PCF. Several key areas can be addressed to achieve these goals. Firstly, enhancing the training data for the LLMs used in AutoPCF is essential by incorporating a broader and more diverse range of texts related to PCF estimation. This will enable the models to better comprehend and interpret specific prompts, resulting in more accurate responses. Secondly, fine-tuning LLMs on domain-specific data related to carbon footprint estimation can enable the models to adapt and specialize for specific tasks, thereby improving performance on relevant prompts. Thirdly, crafting prompts carefully to provide clear and specific instructions to the language models should be explored. Fine-tuning prompts based on the particular model's strengths and weaknesses can yield more accurate and reliable results. Additionally, improving the accuracy of the industry matching model and emission factor

matching model is necessary to reduce uncertainty stemming from activity data collection and emission factor matching. Fourthly, efforts should focus on improving the quality and completeness of the emission inventory data used in the estimation process. Relying on reliable and up-to-date emission factors and data sources will help reduce uncertainties in the emission inventory. Moreover, collaboration among experts, peer review, and transparent documentation of methods and assumptions can significantly contribute to uncertainty reduction and enhance the accuracy of PCF estimation. Involving domain experts in the field of PCF estimation to provide insights, validate the results, and address uncertainties will foster a collaborative effort that leads to more accurate estimations.

The continuous advancement and refinement of AutoPCF hold great promise for revolutionizing carbon footprint estimation and promoting sustainable environmental practices in diverse industrial sectors and regions. By incorporating these techniques, AutoPCF is believed to be capable of generating more accurate and robust PCF results for a wide range of products. In addition, a PCF calculator based on AutoPCF is to be launched in the future, containing a wide range of products for various industries.

References

1. Liu, Z., Deng, Z., Davis, S.J., Giron, C., and Ciais, P. (2022). Monitoring global carbon emissions in 2021. *Nature Reviews Earth and Environment* 3, 217–219. 10.1038/s43017-022-00285-w.
2. Kronborg Jensen, J. (2012). Product carbon footprint developments and gaps. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management* 42, 338–354. 10.1108/09600031211231326.
3. Curran, M.A., Laboratory (US), N.R.M.R., Research, O. of, and Development, U.S., Environmental Protection Agency (2006). *Life-cycle assessment: principles and practice*.
4. McKinnon, A.C. (2010). Product-level carbon auditing of supply chains: Environmental imperative or wasteful distraction? *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management* 40, 42–60. 10.1108/09600031011018037.
5. Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., and Sutskever, I. (2018). Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training.
6. Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., and Sutskever, I. (2019). Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners.
7. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. (2020). Language Models are Few-Shot Learners.
8. Du, Z., Qian, Y., Liu, X., Ding, M., Qiu, J., Yang, Z., and Tang, J. (2022). GLM: General Language Model Pretraining with Autoregressive Blank Infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers) (Association for Computational Linguistics)*, pp. 320–335. 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.26.
9. Zeng, A., Liu, X., Du, Z., Wang, Z., Lai, H., Ding, M., Yang, Z., Xu, Y., Zheng, W., Xia, X., et al. (2022). GLM-130B: An Open Bilingual Pre-trained Model. 10.48550/arXiv.2210.02414.
10. Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H.P. de O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al. (2021). Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *arXiv.org*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374v2>.
11. Wu, S., Irsoy, O., Lu, S., Dabrovolski, V., Dredze, M., Gehrmann, S., Kambadur, P., Rosenberg, D., and Mann, G. (2023). BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance. 10.48550/arXiv.2303.17564.
12. Madani, A., Krause, B., Greene, E.R., Subramanian, S., Mohr, B.P., Holton, J.M., Olmos, J.L., Xiong, C., Sun, Z.Z., Socher, R., et al. (2023). Large language models generate functional protein sequences across diverse families. *Nat Biotechnol*, 1–8. 10.1038/s41587-022-01618-2.
13. Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S.S., Wei, J., Chung, H.W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., et al. (2023). Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 1–9. 10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2.
14. Li, Z., and Ning, H. Autonomous GIS: the next-generation AI-powered GIS.
15. Zhu, J.-J., Jiang, J., Yang, M., and Ren, Z.J. (2023). ChatGPT and Environmental Research. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 10.1021/acs.est.3c01818.
16. Rillig, M.C., Ågerstrand, M., Bi, M., Gould, K.A., and Sauerland, U. (2023). Risks and Benefits of Large Language Models for the Environment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 57, 3464–3466. 10.1021/acs.est.3c01106.
17. Agathokleous, E., Saitanis, C.J., Fang, C., and Yu, Z. (2023). Use of ChatGPT: What does it mean for biology and environmental science? *Science of The Total Environment* 888, 164154. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.164154.
18. Wu, T., He, S., Liu, J., Sun, S., Liu, K., Han, Q.-L., and Tang, Y. (2023). A Brief Overview of ChatGPT: The History, Status Quo and Potential Future Development. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica* 10, 1122–1136. 10.1109/JAS.2023.123618.
19. Liu, Y., Han, T., Ma, S., Zhang, J., Yang, Y., Tian, J., He, H., Li, A., He, M., Liu, Z., et al. (2023). Summary of ChatGPT/GPT-4 Research and Perspective Towards the Future of Large Language Models. 10.48550/arXiv.2304.01852.

20. Rathore, D.B. (2023). Future of Textile: Sustainable Manufacturing & Prediction via ChatGPT. *Eduzone: International Peer Reviewed/Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal* 12, 52–62.
21. Wang, X., Anwer, N., Dai, Y., and Liu, A. (2023). ChatGPT for design, manufacturing, and education. *Procedia CIRP* 119, 7–14. 10.1016/j.procir.2023.04.001.
22. Bahrini, A., Khamoshifar, M., Abbasimehr, H., Riggs, R.J., Esmaeili, M., Majdabadkohne, R.M., and Pasehvar, M. (2023). ChatGPT: Applications, Opportunities, and Threats. In *2023 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*, pp. 274–279. 10.1109/SIEDS58326.2023.10137850.
23. Frederico, G.F. (2023). ChatGPT in Supply Chains: Initial Evidence of Applications and Potential Research Agenda. *Logistics* 7, 26. 10.3390/logistics7020026.
24. Biswas, S. (2023). Importance of chat GPT in Agriculture: According to chat GPT. 10.2139/ssrn.4405391.
25. Meinrenken, C.J., Chen, D., Esparza, R.A., Iyer, V., Paridis, S.P., Prasad, A., and Whillas, E. (2020). Carbon emissions embodied in product value chains and the role of Life Cycle Assessment in curbing them. *Scientific Reports* 10, 1–12. 10.1038/s41598-020-62030-x.
26. Niccolucci, V., Rugani, B., Botto, S., and Gaggi, C. (2010). An integrated *footprint* based approach for environmental labelling of products: the case of drinking bottled water. *Int. J. DNE* 5, 68–75. 10.2495/DNE-V5-N1-68-75.
27. Lu, Q., Qiu, B., Ding, L., Xie, L., and Tao, D. (2023). Error Analysis Prompting Enables Human-Like Translation Evaluation in Large Language Models: A Case Study on ChatGPT. 10.48550/arXiv.2303.13809.
28. Cheng, L., Li, X., and Bing, L. (2023). Is GPT-4 a Good Data Analyst? 10.48550/arXiv.2305.15038.
29. Want to use our data? – Common Crawl <https://commoncrawl.org/the-data/>.
30. Common Crawl Index http://index.commoncrawl.org/CC-MAIN-2021-39-index?url=carbonfootprint.com/*.
31. OpenAI Platform <https://platform.openai.com>.
32. OpenAI (2023). GPT-4 Technical Report. 10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774.
33. ChatGLM-6B (2023).
34. Tongyi Qianwen <https://qianwen.aliyun.com/>.
35. Lin, C.-Y. (2004). ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries.
36. Wernet, G., Bauer, C., Steubing, B., Reinhard, J., Moreno-Ruiz, E., and Weidema, B. (2016). The ecoinvent database version 3 (part I): overview and methodology. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 21, 1218–1230. 10.1007/s11367-016-1087-8.
37. Shi, X., and Meier, H. (2012). Carbon Emission Assessment to Support Planning and Operation of Low-carbon Production Systems. *Procedia CIRP* 3, 329–334. 10.1016/j.procir.2012.07.057.
38. Khalid, Y., Wu, M., Silaen, A., Martinez, F., Okosun, T., Worl, B., Low, J., Zhou, C., Johnson, K., and White, D. (2021). Oxygen enrichment combustion to reduce fossil energy consumption and emissions in hot rolling steel production. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 320, 128714. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128714.
39. Fishwick, M. (2012). A Carbon Footprint for UK Clothing and Opportunities for Savings.
40. Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Joint Research Centre), Beton, A., Cordella, M., Perwuelz, A., Desaxce, M., Gibon, T., Dias, D., Boufateh, I., Farrant, L., Kougoulis, J., et al. (2014). Environmental improvement potential of textiles (IMPRO Textiles) (Publications Office of the European Union).
41. Tao, Y., Sun, T., and Wang, Z. (2023). Uncovering various paths for environmentally recycling lithium iron phosphate batteries through life cycle assessment. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 393, 136263. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136263.
42. Amarakoon, S., Smith, J., and Segal, B. (2013). Application of Life-Cycle Assessment to Nanoscale Technology: Lithium-ion Batteries for Electric Vehicles.

43. Life Cycle Environmental Assessment of Lithium-Ion and Nickel Metal Hydride Batteries for Plug-In Hybrid and Battery Electric Vehicles | Environmental Science & Technology
<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/es103607c>.
44. Life cycle assessment of lithium-ion batteries for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles – Critical issues - ScienceDirect <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652610002167?via%3Dihub>.
45. Lai, X., Gu, H., Chen, Q., Tang, X., Zhou, Y., Gao, F., Han, X., Guo, Y., Bhagat, R., and Zheng, Y. (2022). Investigating greenhouse gas emissions and environmental impacts from the production of lithium-ion batteries in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 372, 133756.
[10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133756](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133756).
46. Lu, Q., Wu, P.F., Shen, W.X., Wang, X.C., Zhang, B., and Wang, C. (2016). Life Cycle Assessment of Electric Vehicle Power Battery. *Materials Science Forum* 847, 403–410.
[10.4028/www.scientific.net/MSF.847.403](https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/MSF.847.403).

Supplementary Information

SI Text 1 | Inventory analysis by using large language models

Large language models have shown excellent ability in a wide range of NLP tasks and can better obtain corresponding text content according to the research purpose by appropriately adjusting prompts and combining in-context learning. The characteristics of LLM can help researchers quickly determine the system boundary and emission inventory of target products in the process of LCA carbon footprint calculation.

The steps for constructing the production process and emission inventory are as follows:

1) Construct the production process of a product

```
prompt_to_generate_process=PromptTemplate(
    template="""
        You are now an expert in the production of "{product_name}".
        Please tell me the process stages involved in the "{product_name}" production process and
        return the results as follows:
        1. Output the result in JSON format.
        2. The result is a list containing only the names of the production process, such as ["process A",
        "process B", "process C"]
        3. If you can't get an answer from known information, return "None".
        """,
    input_variables=["product_name"]
)
```

- A) First, we defined LLM as an expert in the field of production of our target product.
- B) Second, we guided LLM to answer the process stage in the production of the target product.
- C) And then, in order to facilitate subsequent data processing, we specify a structured output format like a JSON list.
- D) Besides, in order to avoid the generation of false information as much as possible, we asked it to return "None" when it did not have enough knowledgeable information.

2) Construct the life cycle inventory of a product

```
prompt_to_generate_inventory = PromptTemplate(
    template="""
        You are now an expert in the production of "{product_name}". The production process of
        "{product_name}" can be divided into the following stages: {process_list}. Based on your knowledge,
        please tell me what raw materials and energy are needed, what products, wastewater, solid waste,
        and waste gas are produced in the "{current_process}" process of producing 1{unit} of
        "{product_name}", and provide the corresponding quantities of raw materials, energy, products,
        wastewater, solid waste, and waste gas in JSON format. Please note the following requirements:
    """
```

1. The entity types included in JSON must belong to: [Product, Raw material, Energy, Waste gas, Wastewater, Solid waste].
2. The JSON format conforms to the following form: {output_format},
3. The units used in the results are all in international standard units, belonging to [kg, kWh, m, m3, MJ].
4. If the substance in "Raw material" comes from the previous process, it should be noted which process it comes from in "source"; if not, "source" should be "None".

```

"""
    input_variables=["product_name", "process_list", "current_process", "unit", "output_format"]
)
output_format = {"Product": [{"name": "A", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kg"}],
                 "Raw material": [{"name": "B", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kg", "source": "process"}],
                 "Energy": [{"name": "C", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kWh"}],
                 "Wastewater": [{"name": "D", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kg"}],
                 "Solid waste": [{"name": "E", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kg"}],
                 "Waste gas": [{"name": "F", "quantity": 1, "unit": "kg"}]}

```

- A) In this part, we defined LLM as an expert in the field of production of our target product as well.
- B) And then, we asked LLM to answer the detailed information of each process in the answer list of step 1). The detailed information included the input (raw material and energy) and output (product, wastewater, solid waste and waste gas) inventories.
- C) For processing data easier, we specify a structured output format like a JSON dictionary, and also rule the unit in the result.
- D) Considering that the raw materials of part of the process may come from the previous process, we use the filed "source" for marking.

SI Text 2 | Indirect estimation approach of activity data by using industrial proxy data

1) Industrial classification matching

To address the issue of inconsistent industrial classification categories across different assessment processes, an approach is adopted to harmonize and align the categories. In this paper, the breakdown of product carbon footprints (PCFs) is initially presented using the Central Product Classification (CPC) categories. However, Chinese macro-statistics data typically follow the industrial classification system for national economic activities, known as GB/T 4754.

To bridge this gap and determine the activity data for the corresponding industry, a deep-learning based semantic matching model is employed. This model enables the alignment of other classification categories with the CPC framework. By mapping the emission inventory's CPC categories to the relevant activity data category, the corresponding industry-specific activity data is identified. This ensures consistency and accuracy in linking the emission inventory with the appropriate activity data, enabling a comprehensive assessment of the PCF for different industries.

2) Activity data of raw material

Input-Output Tables (IOTs) describe the sale and purchase relationships among industries. For any certain industry, IOTs provide the value of raw materials per unit of product acquired from other industries. The amount of raw material is calculated based on the unit value of products, such that

$$m_{ij} = \frac{v_{ij}v_i}{v_j} = \sum_k m_{ijk} \quad (S1)$$

where m_{ij} is the total amount of raw materials acquired from industry j per unit of product in industry i , m_{ijk} is the amount of raw material k acquired from industry j per unit of product in industry i , v_{ij} the value of raw materials acquired from industry j per unit of product in industry i , and v_i/v_j is the unit value of products in industry i/j . Assuming the input-output efficiency is 100%, the material balance in industry i is

$$\sum_j m_{ij} = 1 \quad (S2)$$

3) Activity data of energy consumption

For a certain industry, the amount of energy consumption per unit of product is calculated based on the total energy consumption, the total production value, and the unit value of products, such that

$$e_{ix} = \frac{E_{ix}v_i}{V_i} \quad (S3)$$

where e_{ix} is the amount of energy x consumption per unit of product in industry i , E_{ix} is total energy x consumption in industry i , and V_i is total production value in industry i .

4) Activity data of transportation

For a certain industry, based on its province-wise/city-wise data of production value, the spatial distribution is determined. With the activity data of raw material, the probabilistic transportation distance for transferring one raw material to one province/city is sampled, which obeys the probability distribution

$$P(D_{im} = D_{nm}) = \frac{V_{in}}{V_i} \quad (S4)$$


where D_{im} is the transportation distance for transferring raw material from industry i to province/city m , D_{nm} is the transportation distance from province/city n to province/city m , and V_{in} is the production value in industry i in the province/city n .

5) Activity data of waste


For a certain industry, the amount of waste per unit of product is calculated based on the total amount of waste, the total production value, and the unit value of products, such that

$$w_{iy} = \frac{W_{iy}v_i}{V_i} \quad (S5)$$


where w_{iy} is the amount of waste y per unit of product in industry i , and W_{iy} is total waste y in the industry i .



SI Figure 1 | The flowchart of the activity data collection.



SI Figure 2 | The flowchart of the production process and emission inventory generation



SI Figure 3 | The framework of the semantic-based emission factor matching model.