

## Draft meeting minutes

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Informal Working Group on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Webex Meeting: remote only

#### Venue:

GRPE Webex

06 December 2022, 11.30 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. CET

#### Meeting documents available at:

[A-LCA 2nd session - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

### Agenda

	Time	Agenda item	Lead	Working Paper #
1	11:30 ~	Welcome and introduction	Chairs	NA
2	~ 11:35	Adoption of the agenda	Chairs	A-LCA-02-01
3	~ 11:50	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	LCA-01-20
4	~ 12:30	Proposal for sub-groups and/or task forces under the A-LCA IWG, if necessary *1	CPs NGOs	A-LCA-02-tbd
	12:30 ~ 12:45	Break		
5	12:45 ~ 13:40	Determination of the sub-groups and/or task forces for initial activities	Chairs	NA
6	~ 13:45	Reflection to ToR	Chairs	LCA-01-19
7	~ 13:50	Date and location for the next IWG	Chairs	NA
8	~ 14:00	Any other business	Chairs	NA

\*1 : No preference for document format but appreciated if the contents in LCA-02-02 are included in your proposals. Then, please send the proposals to leading team prior to meeting.

## Meeting Minutes

### Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair welcomes the participants and presents the updated agenda.

### Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

Agenda was adopted by all participants. No additional comments were raised.

*See Document: A-LCA-02-01*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-01\\_Draft%20agenda.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-01_Draft%20agenda.pdf?api=v2)

### Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented the meeting minutes from the 1<sup>st</sup> A-LCA IWG meeting, no comments concerning the meeting minutes. The chair outlined the importance of identifying the subgroups as this was explicitly written in the minutes.

General comments concerning IWG process and ToR:

- Comment from Ricardo on ToR. The chair referred him to raise this topic during item 6 of the agenda.
- EU Commission requests the possibility to give additional comments to the ToR, as many people were not able to participate in the Okinawa meeting. EU plans to give additional comments. *Both the USA (EPA) and Switzerland agreed with this position via chat.*

The chair clarified that today's discussion is dedicated to the work-structure and the need for potential subgroups. EU agreed that today's focus is on subgroups, but there should be the possibility for CPs to give additional input to the ToR in January.

Further comments on ToR, see agenda item 6.

No further comment concerning the minutes.

Minutes approved by all participants.

*See Document: LCA-01-20*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/172852238/LCA-01-20\\_Meeting\\_minutes.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/172852238/LCA-01-20_Meeting_minutes.pdf?api=v2)

## **Agenda Item 4: Proposal for sub-groups and/or task forces under the A-LCA IWG, if necessary**

### **1. Presentation Japan (MLIT)**

After internal consultation in Japan, Japan thinks that no subgroups are necessary at this stage. First, a common consensus on the scope and system boundaries is needed, after a consensus is reached, IWG may start subgroup activities by the end of 2023. Afterwards, subgroup and taskforce activities should be defined for 2024.

No questions or comments were raised.

*See Document: LCA-02-03*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-03\\_proposed%20subgroup\\_JPN.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-03_proposed%20subgroup_JPN.pdf?api=v2)

### **2. Presentation OICA**

OICA sees at the beginning a common discussion within the IWG as proposed by Japan. Then subgroups for fuel cycle and vehicle life cycle phases could be started.

Additional groups should deal with cross cutting methodologic topics and a drafting group should bring outputs together. OICA underlined that the subgroups should start after an initial alignment is done as this will prevent unnecessary work. They also stated that the Subgroups will ensure faster progress than going through all topics with the whole group.

Subgroups should also aim to lower meeting frequency and ensure better expert usage.

#### **Comments:**

**US EPA** is in general supporting Japan.

At this stage there is no need to form working groups, this should be decided at a later stage. End of 2023 may be a good timing for this, no need to decide on subgroups now, it would be premature in the work process. They also suggested to already determine a timeframe in advance.

**UK** supports the process presented by OICA. UK would not be in favour of WtW in one group, but better move the TTW into the use phase within the vehicle cycle.

*See Document: LCA-02-04*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-04\\_proposed%20subgroup\\_OICA.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-04_proposed%20subgroup_OICA.pdf?api=v2)

### **3. Presentation China**

China proposes also a general group for coordination and adds subgroups on the supply chain, use phase, end of life and a cross cutting methodology group. China proposes to take the lead for the supply chain subgroup and support the other groups.

- The supply chain working group including methodologies for battery and fuel cell should be finished before December 2024. This should help to promote the carbon emissions accounting capacity, help carbon emissions data transferring through the supply chain.
- China gave an overview of its supply chain infrastructure and basic studies done by CATARC including two standards approved in China.

- CATARC has already established an LCA system including data base and model and established data collection and information system to collect primary data.

Comments: no comments

*See Document: LCA-02-06*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-06\\_proposed%20subgroup\\_CHINA.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-06_proposed%20subgroup_CHINA.pdf?api=v2)

#### **4. Presentation CLEPA**

CLEPA clearly sees a need for a subgroup structure. An overarching group should take care of the fundamentals like scope and boundaries, but this task could be also taken by the whole IWG. Therefore, CLEPA suggests a group working on the vehicle life cycle with different taskforces for the different life cycle phases.

- In addition, a sub-group on fuel and energy is needed, dealing with energy provided for all phases. Energy is not only for the use phase, but also for production and recycling. The temporal scope should not only be the actual and historical data but also the future energy carbon footprint. This huge scope needs worldwide reliable data to be applied.
- Many questions remain on data quality and verification, which should be the task for a fourth group

CLEPA underlined that time is extremely short, too short to work sequentially.

- Supply industry senses a specific urgency for the outcome of this IWG, it should be considered to start not too late on these different topics, but in parallel to go fast.
- CLEPA highlighted the fact that different topics need many different competencies and expertise, which will need attract experts in specific subgroups.
- In addition, for example the fuels and energy topic may need input from stakeholders and experts which are not yet in the IWG, this may need additional time to constitute an expert group.
- CLEPA would support the work of most groups and CLEPA is willing to take the lead of the production TF.

#### **Comments:**

**UK:** agrees to split out fuel/energy, and not only for the use phase.

Split supply chain and vehicle on the production side, what is CLEPA's opinion?

*CLEPA responded that they see the production as one topic, but there are definitively two subtopics. CLEPA does not oppose a split but wondered if it is necessary and practical.*

**US (Argonne):** The overarching group is important at the moment. First look at overarching topics to define key items to work on, it is premature to define vehicle and fuel subgroups now.

**Chair:** questions CLEPA's opinion on need for group 1. CLEPA answered that it is open for having a subgroup or one general group tasked with the scope and boundaries which is conducted by the entire IWG.

*See Document: LCA-02-08*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-08\\_CLEPA\\_Work\\_Structure.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-08_CLEPA_Work_Structure.pdf?api=v2)

## 5. Presentation Korea

Korea presented the proposed workgroup within the excel file.

- Korea sees the need for a group 1 dealing with defining the methodology for primary data for the fuel cycle: WTT including the primary data on fuel production pathways, electricity and charging patterns, hydrogen production pathways and bio and e-fuels production pathways. In addition, requirement for secondary data need to be established. TTW methodology need to include vehicle driving cycle and lifetime definition.
- A group 2 on the vehicle production and end of life is proposed with different taskforces:
  - o A TF on material and end of life, with material and recycling in one TF to close the loop to raw material, material classification, maintenance parts, oil, tires
  - o A second TF for the supply chain and manufacturing, defining primary data requirements from OEM, either as top down or bottom-up approach still to define.
  - o Korea sees a third separate TF on batteries. EV battery related methodology should be harmonized with other battery regulations and lifetime of battery.
- Korea suggest a subgroup 3 on overall methodologies, defining a step wise approach between accuracy and workload

### Comments:

**CLEPA:** Why consider a specific TF 3 Battery? Necessary because there is a need to harmonize existing standards?

*Korea responded that there are a lot of discussions ongoing, no need to repeat in A-LCA group. Better to separately review what was done internationally on batteries.*

Korea also supporting Japan and OICA for an overarching group/discussion upfront.

*See Document: LCA-02-09*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-09\\_proposed%20subgroup\\_Korea.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-09_proposed%20subgroup_Korea.pdf?api=v2)

### **Agenda Item 5: Determination of the sub-groups and/or task forces for initial activities**

**IWG chair:** It may not the right time to specify subgroups, first we need to define the overarching scope and boundaries in main IWG. The chair agrees with Japan and OICA.

**CLEPA:** All agree that we need an overarching discussion and that the positions mainly differ on the timing when the subgroups should be installed. But what information do we need to define them? What could change the subgroup structure which we see already today? If the structure needed would be the same next year, we would lose time to set up the groups.

**US (EPA)** does think that it is premature at this point in time to form the subgroups. After the initial phase defining the overarching topics, we can define the subgroups. First it has to be defined how much in detail we need to go, to avoid that subgroups go too deep in detail which would be a waste of resources.

- In response, **CLEPA** wondered if anyone expects that the structure would at the end be different?

- The US responded that most likely, there will be subgroups on fuel cycle etc, the question is in which detail the work has to go. This has to be defined before the group starts to work.

**Ricardo:** Supports that first the high level and overarching topics must be clarified before lots of work goes into subgroups. Ricardo suggested that we should perhaps already start to gather additional experts, so that work can start later, after 6 months, without losing time. Can agree that groups on fuel/energy, vehicle cycle and methodology are needed.

**Chair:** If we agree on a first phase on high level aspects, when can we assume to go for the next phase? After half a year? Year may be too long? Can we agree on 3-6 months for first phase?

**EU COM:** Thanked the CP's and NGO's who suggested ways of work but highlighted that it might be premature to start in subgroup immediately: "we *need to start ASAP on crosscutting issues*". There is a need to further discuss the methodology before deciding on subgroups. There is the need to agree on the organization of the work, to propose how to go forward, plan for the frequency of meetings. She therefore asked the secretariat to draft a proposal for a timeframe.

**Chair Suggestion:** leading team to provide a plan for the next 6 months and calculate how frequently we can meet in these 6 months. Agreeing to review and agree on the plan during the next meeting (09/01/2023). Then plan for further progress and decide if feasible or not, not be discussed in January session.

**UK** is supporting this, would be perfect to have this plan. Would be worth an audit which expertise is lacking. Do this in parallel, not to realize in 6 months that experts are lacking.

**Ricardo:** Agree with Adam's suggestion for a knowledge/skills audit.

**USA:** agree, UK has a good proposal to define where specific expertise is needed. We are however well represented in the vehicle supply area but less represented in energy supply area. For them, we will need some support in this field.

**WBCSD:** supports UK to plan for experts ahead of time. Energy, steel, batteries. WBCSD available to support who can support best.

#### **Conclusion of the chair:**

Leading team to plan next steps and audit of lacking expertise. Plan to be agreed in January session. The leading team has thus a big assignment for next session.

#### **Agenda Item 6: Reflection to ToR**

##### **Comments on further modification of ToR:**

- **Ricardo:** Regarding my earlier comment on the ToR and including Cumulative Energy Demand - what is the process to decide/agree this. Should I send my proposed edits to include within a copy of the document and send to the secretariat? Will it then be discussed/voted on in January meeting?
  - o **Korea:** We have "energy use" in the objectives section in ToR. Wouldn't it be sufficient to cover "Cumulative Energy Demand"?

- **Ricardo**: I believe this is not specific enough, I would prefer some more explicit reference to consideration of CED as an important supplementary metric to the main GWP/carbon footprint objective.
- **Korea**: Thank you for your clarification. The term "energy use" was specifically discussed in the last meeting, but if it is not specific (or clear) enough, then I guess we need to wait for the chair's response!
- **Switzerland**: might using "primary energy consumption" be an acceptable compromise?

**EU COM**: My understanding is that the proposal on how to organise the initial phase will be presented at the January meeting. So, it might be premature to define it in the ToR now

**Netherlands** : Is there time for a few minor textual comments on the ToR?

**United States (EPA)** I would like to propose an edit to the footnote at the end of the ToR: as discussed at the first meeting, "CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents" should be "CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent as defined by the UN IPCC GWP100"

### **Submission of ToR to GRPE**

Chair: There are still potential comments from CPs until January session, the ToR comments need to be on the agenda again for next session

- After discussion with GRPE secretary, it was agreed that if there is an agreement on the ToR in next session, it can be submitted to GRPE last moment as informal document.
- **In conclusion, the plan is still to adopt the ToR during the January GRPE session.**

OICA: comment ToR wording using the term "automotive", need to replace by in certain cases by "automotive products", "automotive" is an adjective.

Secretary: tomorrow clean ToR version uploaded

### **IWG timing issue**

#### **Suggestion for working structure:**

Delete the square bracket part which referred to the possibility to define sub-groups on the 6<sup>th</sup> of December. OICA ok, Japan ok, Korea also ok.

**UK**: No problem with deleting the square brackets in the ToR. But the GRPE chair requested to put details on the working structure into the ToR. UK suggests to add a text for explanation: "Following an initial phase to determine the overarching aspects of goal and scope definition, the IWG on A-LCA could consider creating..."

**GRPE secretary** underlined that it would be important to also indicate a duration for the initial phase, to get a bit of certainty on the next steps.

**Proposal from chair**: Amending the ToR to: "*6 months until June 2023 to decide on subgroup structure, then we can identify subgroups needed and plan for subgroup activity and timeline in July*". Delay until June written in square brackets, will have however to be confirmed in January.

**GRPE Chair**: In Okinawa I indicated the importance of the A-LCA and the priority from sponsors. The activity is starting now, it is important to know the overarching aspects, but the

ambition of the stakeholders is to come up with concrete rules. This is the ambition of the CPs, there is urgency. The GRPE leading team wants to have a view on targets set by the IWG. If more time is needed, there is always the possibility to set new dates with arguments explaining the need.

**Chair: No decision on timeline today, we come back to this point in next session in January,** we will see if 6 months is appropriate, and thus today we put 6 months in square brackets in the ToR.

**EU COM:** Ask some analysis for the January meeting, get clarity on timing. Better timing including the subgroups for June.

Agree with GRPE chair that important to set milestone. Need precise calendar asap as the leadership should take into account the upcoming holidays.

**Chair:** Close discussion today.

*See Document: LCA-01-19*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/172852238/LCA-01-19\\_ToR\\_clean.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/172852238/LCA-01-19_ToR_clean.pdf?api=v2)

and with correction from UK:

*See Document: LCA-02-05*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-05\\_ToR\\_clean\\_UK%20suggestions.docx?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-05_ToR_clean_UK%20suggestions.docx?api=v2)

## **Agenda Item 7: Date and location for the next IWG**

Next meeting in Geneva January 9<sup>th</sup>, starting at 14:30 CET

**EU COM:** Asking for possibility of hybrid meeting.  
Is there a timeline for comments before the meeting?  
When feedback from leading team? What are the next steps?

**Chair:**

Next week a leading team meeting is planned, draft agenda for next meeting + weblink will be shared asap.

## **Agenda Item 8: Any other business**

**Ricardo:** input to ToR, to be discussed next session in January?

**No other business**

## **Agenda Item 9: Closing**

**The Chair** thanked all participants for their input and formally closed the meeting.