

Methods note · Everyday practice

A break-even point with blanks left in

Omar Haddad · 8 October 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

A replacement product's operating efficiency does not establish when its additional manufacturing emissions will be repaid. This methods note constructs a conditional break-even model for a working desk light while leaving unsupported parameters explicitly unknown. The GHG Protocol Product Standard, European Commission energy-label guidance, and UK conversion-factor methodology inform the treatment of service equivalence, electricity boundaries, and comparison limits. A hypothetical contrast between two operating schedules illustrates sensitivity without assigning a real footprint. The analysis then considers changing electricity supply, remaining product life, later replacement, and unmatched service at the horizon. No numerical break-even date or saving is claimed. The practical outcome is a decision record that distinguishes useful conditional arithmetic from an environmental conclusion requiring product-specific evidence.

Keywords: break-even analysis · product lifetime · unknown parameters · electricity

A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

When the missing value is the answer

A claim that a more efficient product will repay its manufacturing emissions within a certain number of years sounds precise. It can conceal several unanswered questions: compared with what existing product, used how often, supplied by which electricity system, and kept for how long? A calculated date is not informative if the inputs that determine it have been supplied by optimism rather than evidence.

This methods note develops a deliberately transparent break-even calculation for replacing a working desk light. It draws on the GHG Protocol Product Standard, European Commission energy-label guidance, and the UK government's conversion-factor methodology. It is an analytical example, not a lighting assessment. The fictional case contains explicit unknown parameters and does not assign product emissions, forecast a grid, or claim a real saving.

The narrow question is whether lower operating emissions can outweigh the additional emissions caused by an early replacement within a relevant period. Financial payback, visual comfort, safety, and accessibility are separate questions. A lamp that cannot provide suitable light is not a valid alternative merely because its electricity consumption is low. Establish equivalent useful illumination before comparing inputs.

Write the simplest conditional model

Let M be the incremental non-use emissions associated with replacing now rather than continuing with the existing light. This includes the new product's relevant manufacture and delivery, plus any difference in end-of-life treatment. Let P_o and P_n be the existing and new power requirements in kilowatts for equivalent lighting, h annual operating hours, and g an electricity emissions factor in kilograms of carbon-dioxide equivalent per kilowatt-hour.

Under constant use and a constant factor, the annual operating difference is $(P_o - P_n) \times h \times g$. If that quantity is positive and the other assumptions hold, the simplified break-even time is $T = M / [(P_o - P_n) \times h \times g]$. The units cancel to years. If the denominator is zero or negative, this model supplies no positive operating-emissions repayment of a positive M .

The equation is a conditional relationship, not a discovered lifetime. It assumes both lights remain functional over the period, the lighting service stays equivalent, and there are no additional replacements or changed habits. It also compresses emissions occurring at different times into a cumulative total. Those assumptions must accompany the equation, especially when a product's plausible remaining life is shorter than the calculated interval.

A worked comparison with deliberate blanks

Consider two fictional workspaces using the same existing light and considering the same replacement. Workspace A needs it for two hours on each working day; Workspace B needs it for eight. Suppose the power difference is measured on a comparable basis, but the replacement's manufacturing inventory is unavailable. All else equal, Workspace B accumulates the modelled operating difference four times as quickly. Neither workspace yet has a justified numerical break-even date.

That ratio is useful because it identifies a decision-sensitive variable without inventing an emissions factor. However, it holds only while the other quantities remain equal. Different daylight, brightness settings, standby behaviour, or replacement lifetimes may break the relationship. A reading lamp in one space and a room-lighting system in another do not deliver equivalent service just because both are described as lights.

The purchasing note should show the blanks. Record M as unknown, the source of the power estimates, the

assumed working days, and the proposed analysis period. For a sensitivity exercise, a supplier-supported range for M could later generate a range of conditional dates. Until then, a precise answer would be a scenario chosen by the analyst, not evidence about these products.

A decision can still proceed for another reason. The existing light may fail to meet an accessibility requirement, or a replacement may be necessary after a safety assessment. In that case, compare feasible replacements rather than presenting an unavailable keep option as the baseline. The emissions calculation should explain the actual decision, not retroactively supply a virtuous justification for one already made.

Use a changing electricity pathway carefully

Over several years, electricity supply and operating patterns may change. Replace the constant annual difference with a sum: for each year, multiply the power difference by that year's operating hours and the stated electricity factor, then add the annual values. Break-even occurs only if that cumulative difference reaches M before the assumptions cease to apply.

The UK conversion-factor documentation explains how reporting factors are constructed, including distinctions between electricity generation, upstream activity, and transmission and distribution. A historical reporting factor is not automatically a forecast or an estimate of the marginal generation changed by a new load. Select a factor appropriate to the question, identify its year and boundary, and do not mix incompatible factors across options.

A decarbonising-supply scenario would reduce later operating differences relative to an otherwise identical constant-factor case. That is a property of the model, not a prediction for a particular location. Show several justified pathways where necessary. Do not claim that buying renewable electricity makes production, infrastructure, or all marginal use emissions vanish. Procurement claims and physical electricity modelling require their own explicit accounting rules.

Remaining life changes the comparison

Early replacement and replacement at failure are different decisions. If the existing light would otherwise fail soon, the baseline includes a later replacement. Charging the replace-now option for a new product while assuming the keep option operates forever biases the comparison. Both pathways must provide the same service over the same horizon, including replacements that become necessary within it.

Conversely, dividing a new product's manufacturing emissions by its advertised lifespan does not demonstrate that keeping an existing product is inferior. Average annualised footprints and the consequences of replacing today answer different questions. Historical manufacturing emissions already incurred are not newly caused by the decision. Disposal, repair, secondary use, and the timing of the next purchase can still differ between pathways.

For a short decision horizon, one option may retain more usable life at the end. State how that remaining service is treated. Extending the horizon, comparing repeated replacement cycles, or reporting the unmatched

residual service are possible approaches, but each needs assumptions. A convenient cut-off must not make a long-lived option appear wasteful merely because its service extends beyond the spreadsheet.

What the available evidence can support

The European Commission's label guidance distinguishes energy consumption from the efficiency class and explains that rescaled classes cannot simply be mapped onto older ones. Use comparable consumption information, not the visual distance between two letters. A standard test also does not establish the hours, settings, or conditions of a particular workspace.

The GHG Protocol Product Standard includes manufacture, distribution, use, and end of life, while warning that comparative claims require further consistent specifications. Its framework cannot fill a supplier's missing inventory. Ask whether a declared footprint concerns the light source, the complete luminaire, included control gear, or a different product configuration. Different declared objects should not silently become a single M .

Prioritise evidence according to its ability to change the decision. If all credible operating-hour cases imply that repayment would require service beyond a known support limit, another decimal place in power measurement is unlikely to help. If the conclusion turns on manufacturing emissions, request that information rather than refining an unrelated electricity tariff. This is a value-of-information argument, not a demand for exhaustive measurement.

Limitations and the useful conclusion

The simplified model omits changes in brightness, shared lighting, repair, product failure distributions, and behavioural responses unless they are added explicitly. It treats carbon-dioxide equivalent as the selected indicator and does not resolve material depletion, glare, or disposal hazards. A qualified professional should handle electrical safety and installation. No household should continue using unsafe equipment while waiting for a carbon calculation.

A responsible break-even statement can therefore be conditional: the replacement would need a specified cumulative operating difference, under named use and supply assumptions, before a named lifetime limit. Where a crucial parameter is unknown, retain the unknown. That is more decision-useful than a confident year assembled from unrelated averages, because it shows precisely what evidence could turn uncertainty into a defensible choice.

References

1. World Resources Institute and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (2011). Product Life Cycle Accounting and Reporting Standard.
2. European Commission. Understanding the Energy Label, including label rescaling and consumption information.
3. Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2025). Government greenhouse gas conversion factors for company reporting, methodology paper.