

Draft meeting minutes

3rd Session of the Informal Working Group on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Hybrid Meeting

Venue:

Palais des Nations, Room XXIV and Webex
09 January 2023, 14:30 to 17:30 CET

Meeting documents available at:

[A-LCA 3rd Meeting - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

Agenda

Time		Agenda item	Lead	Working Paper #	Purpose or Target
14:30 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chairs	NA	Information share
~14:40	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chairs	A-LCA-03-01	Agreement
~15:00	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	A-LCA-02-11	Agreement
~15:45	4	Finalise ToR*	Chairs	A-LCA-03-02_v1	Agreement
		Proposals from IWG member	Ricardo	A-LCA-03-05	
~16:00		Break			
~17:10	5	Overall timeline and sub-group structure	Chairs	A-LCA-03-03 04	Discuss and determine next actions
		Proposals from IWG member	Korea	A-LCA-03-06	
~17:20	6	Date and location for the next IWG	Chairs	NA	Information share
~17:30	7	Any other business	Chairs	NA	

* : Your written proposals with justification should be sent to Leading Team by no later than January 8, 2023.

Original ToR (A-LCA-02-10) is available in the following URL

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-10_ToR_latest_20221206.docx?api=v2

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair welcomes the participants to the 3rd A-LCA meeting and presents the agenda.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

Agenda was adopted by all participants.

See Document: A-LCA-03-01

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/190087382/A-LCA-03-01_agenda_rev1.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented the meeting minutes of last web-session (06/12/2022).

See document A-LCA-02-11_Draft_Meeting_minutes.pdf:

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/186516515/A-LCA-02-11_Draft_Meeting_minutes.pdf?api=v2

The chair highlighted that there was the possibility given to CPs to submit written input for this January session. No comments from CPs were received.

- The only comment received before today's meeting was from Ricardo detailing a wording proposal discussed during the December 6th meeting for taking in account the cumulative energy use during the life-cycle, see below ToR discussion.
- The plan is to adopt the ToR during this January GRPE session on January 12th, means that today after finalization, ToR has to be sent to the GRPE secretariat.

The meeting minutes highlight also the task for the leading team to prepare a planning and timeline to be presented today.

No comments were received during the meeting concerning the meeting minutes.

The minutes were adopted.

Agenda Item 4: Finalize ToR

The chair presents the ToR main paragraphs based on the revised version (document A-LCA-03-05) capturing the discussion during last meeting and having integrated the input received from Ricardo:

See document A-LCA-03-05_v1_ToR with comments_RicardoProposal.docx

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/190087382/A-LCA-03-05_v1_ToR%20with%20comments_RicardoProposal.docx?api=v2

Ricardo proposed to include a wording specifying that primary/cumulative energy consumption should be defined and reported. The topic was already discussed during last meeting on December 6th (see meeting minutes).

Ricardo proposed before the meeting a wording which was included as paragraph 1.4 and 1.5 in the introduction part and a modification of paragraph 2.2 in the objective part

of draft document. This was discussed during the meeting:

“1.4. To meet these long-term objectives, it is also highly important to take actions that make the most efficient use of renewable and other low GHG sources of energy.

1.5. The transport sector is a major contributor to global GHG emissions and energy consumption, and road transport has the majority of the overall transport sector emissions and energy consumption.”

“2.2. Methods of measurement of GHG emissions and energy consumption of automotive life cycles are not defined under either the 1958 Agreement or the 1998 Agreement. The objective of the IWG on A-LCA is to develop an internationally-harmonised procedure to determine the carbon footprint* of different technologies, also considering energy use (though the supplementary cumulative energy demand** LCA indicator), for energy pathways and automotive types from production to use and disposal, as a resolution under the framework of WP.29.”

There was a long and intensive discussion during the meeting, Ricardo defending his proposal, supported by UK, and most other participants (OICA, CLEPA, Japan, Korea, US) preferring the original version of the ToR, fearing that the introduction of the cumulative energy will delay the process and deviate the focus from GHG emissions. The option to keep only the modification of the introduction of the ToR was also discussed but not retained.

Decision taken for further steps:

Decision was taken to come back to the initial Korean proposal of the objectives and to delete the addition in paragraph 2.2. This one is already integrating a wording foreseeing the consideration of energy use during lifecycle.

Paragraph 2.2 was set in square brackets and not finalized during the meeting. CPs should check their position and give feedback in next meeting.

In the following, as reference, the detailed transcription of the discussion:

Comments from IWG meeting participants:

OICA: The A-LCA methodology should focus on global warming, leave energy consumption as additional impact category, not included in the document, and decide later whether to use it. OICA prefers to leave the Ricardo comment out. If we include it, we will be obliged to work on it. This can slow the progress down.

Ricardo: Many options exist to mitigate climate change using powertrains and fuel chain. LCA is an important indicator, but only on vehicle level, vehicle LCA does not take in account the effects on fleet and system level. As we do not plan to develop a fully consequential LCA, we need nevertheless to consider the impact of different GHG reduction solutions on fleet level. To meet long term climate goal, we need to take in account the use of available green energy. Total resource efficiency for the lifecycle needs to be taken in account. This is a little bit more work to collect the data on energy efficiency, but it is really important. The detailed wording can be discussed, but we need to take the subject in account.

Chair: Today the Ricardo proposal on energy consumption is included in the objectives, but OICA would like to delete this addition. We do not want to open a discussion on further impact categories for the moment.

Would it change how to model the system, does it change something in GHG LCA methodology?

If we take cumulative primary energy use, why not taking other impact categories?

Ricardo: Taking in account cumulative primary energy use should not change the methodology but has a real impact on GHG emission on larger system scale.

Switzerland: Sees the Ricardo proposal as a clarification at the beginning of the work and had the understanding that both were already in the ToR.

UK: Supports the Ricardo proposal, or a modified wording clarifying the priorities of GHG emission versus energy use.

Korea: The term energy use should be used instead of energy consumption. They agree with the importance of the point of Ricardo but agrees also with OICA about the risk to delay the process. Perhaps we should discuss the energy use later. The energy indicator does not necessarily need to be fixed in the ToR.

Chair tent to agree with comment from Korea. "The ToR should stay more general. First priority are GHG emissions, then there could be the potential to analyse other indicators later. The ToR should keep only general terms."

Japan: First priority is GHG and then energy consumption

US EPA: More general wording would be preferred. Part of the work to do in the IWG should then be to discuss the scope and indicators at a later stage.

UK: Supports Ricardo on the importance of energy consumption, it should be clearly in the objectives that energy use is to be considered alongside with GHG, if it is considered as secondary priority, there is a risk to misinterpret GHG results

CLEPA: Why not keep it in the introduction and skip it in the objectives!

OICA: supports, good solution (introduction only)

Ricardo: If you prefer, maybe 'Primary Energy Consumption' in the introduction - CED is just the LCA terminology/for this specific indicator.

China: Agrees with the opinions from Korea and Japan, GHG is our priority, and we could consider CED and other impacts in our next steps.

Ricardo: My main concern is that I believe it should be best practice to provide both GWP and CED indicators when reporting information on LCA for the climate/carbon context.

CLEPA: From an academic point of view I agree with Ricardo. From a very practical aspect I would leave it with GWP because companies would have to report on their energy use and efficiencies. This is competitive information, and nobody is sharing voluntarily! We hamper our efforts to quantify GWP with the extension to CED!

Ricardo: The most important aspects are for the energy production chain, and for the vehicle efficiency in combination.

CLEPA: That is understood, but we do not define GHG reduction strategies in this WG!

Ricardo: From my perspective it is about providing sufficient information for the right decisions to be made (not what these decisions are) - is this not the point of the WG? The point is that both indicators are required for a more complete picture from the climate perspective. I am sure we will have useful discussions on this during the course of the work anyway.

Korea: Korea prefers not to include an additional indicator. In the original ToR energy use through lifecycle is already mentioned for consideration.

Ricardo: presented some slides to clarify the point better. Key points are on slide, indicator of energy consumptions alongside with GHG helps interpretation of results, we need GHG and energy footprint to analyse and use results of LCA.

Comment chair: showing energy consumption to users would be good, Discussion will come later when we develop our tool. GHG emissions first, then energy use.

Korea: Considering energy use during the life cycle is original intention from Korea and mentioned in the original wording.

EPA: Here specific metric is not appropriate, keep it as open issue, discuss in detail in later discussions

Update from GRPE session January 12th and 13th:

The chair presented the status report (informal document GRPE-87-38) and the draft status of the ToR without the Ricardo proposal in square brackets.

Comments during GRPE session:

EU COM: EU welcomes the discussion but believes that the ToR with 2.2 in original version is acceptable, GRPE could proceed to adoption.

UK: Confirms that the ToR with paragraph 2.2 as drafted can be adopted

GRPE Chair suggests that the text can be adopted at a later point of the day, the ToR for final approval should be provided later in the afternoon.

After further discussion and having received a written agreement from Ricardo, a clean version of the ToR in its original version without the additional points from Ricardo was presented for adoption by GRPE on Friday, January 13th.

Additional requirements from Ricardo will be discussed in subgroups later.

Japan: thanked the A-LCA leadership team for the accelerated discussion for adoption

The ToR for the A-LCA IWG was adopted as GRPE-87-39r1

See document GRPE-87-39r1e.pdf

[GRPE-87-39r1e.pdf \(unece.org\)](#)

Agenda Item 5: Overall timeline and subgroup structure

The chair presented the excel document on planning and work structure.

See document A-LCA-03-03:

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/190087382/A-LCA-03-03_Overall%20timeline_v1.xlsx?api=v2

Comments to presentation of timeline:

Japan supports in general the proposal of the leading team, but the time for overarching aspects should be changed based on ToR changes and the depth of discussion on overarching aspects

OICA: Some lines to be added, especially the purpose, the goal and scope of the work, some more details to add.

Chair: This is a first review of the document, all inputs to the file will be welcome. Please send input to leading team.

OICA: Questions need for external consultancy as presented. OICA has the feeling that there is a lot of expertise on those topics within the IWG.

UK: The request came from us. Probably there is a need for some external consultancy, but not necessarily the ones indicated in the excel. To be re-discussed.

The chair presented the timeline for the first 6 months. The proposal is a hybrid meeting in April and then in June, with web meetings in-between.

Conclusion by the chair: We proceed the discussion with this timeline but input to the table is welcome.

Then Korea presented a proposal for a subgroup structure

See document A-LCA-03-06:

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/190087382/A-LCA-03-06_Proposal%20for%20subgroup%20structure_Korea.pdf?api=v2

Korea agrees overall with the timeline but sees the subgroup structure differently, see presentation.

- Instead of subgroup 1 for material production and component manufacturing, Korea sees a group 1 for materials including raw materials and recycling of materials. Component productions should be separated from materials and better combined with vehicle production. Components and in-house parts can not necessarily be differentiated, the split is different for different manufacturer.
- Korea sees also the subgroup use phase dealing with the fuel/energy production pathways.

Comments:

Japan: Basically, follow Korea. Subgroup 1 need to consider recycled material. But even if recycled material is good to combine with material production, it should be treated differently. Japan would like to have specific recycled material group.

- Korea will discuss internally and then give feedback to Japan

OICA likes both, there are reasons for both. Either one group for material and recycling as proposed by Korea or two groups as proposed by Japan. If there are two groups however, they need a good linkage.

Ricardo: Agreement with OICA, that it can be two groups, but need to be interlinked. They however raised concerns on the use phase: vehicle usage and energy production should be considered separately. It may be useful to separate the vehicle-related aspects (energy consumption, parts/maintenance, tailpipe and other emissions directly from the vehicle operation) from fuel/energy production aspects.

Korea: Agrees that there should be a separation between the fuel cycle and other fluids on vehicle side. For the vehicle different driving cycles need to be specified. The use phase should better be named energy cycle and maintenance treated in SG 2.

China: We agree to organize Materials and End of Life in the same subgroup if necessary.

- But we would not suggest combining the parts and vehicle production, because parts such as power batteries and tyres could not be determined directly by the OEMs, it is necessary to consider them separately. Therefore, we would like to suggest adding one additional SG of Parts, combining Bought & Inhouse parts production if necessary.

Concluding remarques by the chair:

- We tentatively agreed on a timeline
- Structure of subgroup: Forming of the subgroups will be part of the discussion on overarching aspects. Subgroups should start around March or April.
- The chair will finalize the structure & timeline by next hybrid meeting in April.

Update from GRPE session January 12th:

The Commission noted the need to keep any split into subgroups at a reasonable and manageable level to ensure that the work remains focused and the IWG can deliver on its objective.

Agenda item 6: Schedule for future meetings

Next meeting will be a webex meeting, suggested date is February 13th.

No objection in room, Ricardo problem with truck LCA.

Meeting date February 13th adopted for next webex.

For next hybrid meeting, two dates were proposed, place and sponsor (CP/NGO) has to be found.

Update from GRPE session January 12th:

To facilitate the next hybrid meeting, the GRPE Chair announced the organization of a dedicated GRPE session the 12th and 13th of April 2023 in Geneva, with a dedicated specific session for the A-LCA IWG.

Formally, this meeting will not be an IWG meeting, but a dedicated GRPE session.

The GRPE secretary confirmed the availability of Palais des Nations, room XXV with translation and all usual facilities.

A further WebEx will be organized between the April Hybrid meeting and the next hybrid meeting during GRPE on May 30th.

As May 29th is a bank holiday, only one day is available for IWG meetings before the formal GRPE sessions. Half a day session is reserved for A-LCA IWG on May 30th.

Short term calendar:

13 February 2023 → Webex meeting (*Time tbc*)

17/18 or 24/25 April 2023 → Hybrid meeting (*Geneva*)

XX May 2023 → Webex meeting (*Time tbc*)

30 May 2023 → Hybrid meeting (*Geneva*)

30 May 2023 – 02 June 2023 → GRPE meeting (*Geneva*)

Agenda item 7: AoB?

No general input or Any Other Business was raised.

- The chair presented the report to be provided to GRPE. No comments or remarks were raised to this brief report.

The chair thanked all participants and formally closed the meeting.

ANNEXES

Participants list:

In-Person: (44 participants)

1. *Tetsuya Niikuni (A-LCA co-chair)*
2. *Charyung Kim (A-LCA co-chair)*
3. *Nick Ichikawa (A-LCA co-secretary)*
4. *Hans Nuglisch (A-LCA co-secretary)*
5. *Romain Denayer (A-LCA secretary)*
6. *Adam Dack (UK)*
7. *Duncan Kay (UK)*
8. *Atrushi Koyahagi (OICA/JAMA)*
9. *Bruno Li Pira (OICA/HONDA)*
10. *Michael Olevhiw (US EPA)*
11. *Werner Tober (BMK/Austria)*
12. *Philippe Montreuil (EUROMOT)*
13. *Paul Williams (EUROMOT)*
14. *Juliette Quartaramo (OICA/Stellantis)*
15. *S. Tripathy (OICA)*
16. *Tina Dettmer (OICA/Volkswagen)*
17. *Erik Postma (OICA)*
18. *Giustino Manzo (OICA)*
19. *Katsuya Yamamoto (OICA/Nissan)*
20. *A. Terenchenko (NAMI/Russia)*
21. *Andrey Kozlov (NAMI/Russia)*
22. *Stephan Verstaig (/)*
23. *Philipp Hallauer (Switzerland)*
24. *Theodoor Stoverinck (Netherlands)*
25. *Niels den Ouden (Netherlands)*
26. *Elodie Collot (France)*
27. *Isao Tabushi (Japan)*
28. *Ijzma Tomoyer (Japan)*
29. *Yulci Toba (Japan)*
30. *Hidenori Xlonalen (Japan)*
31. *Taeyong Kim (Korea)*
32. *Inji Park (Korea)*
33. *Hwanson Chong (Korea)*
34. *Seungho Kziy (OICA/Hyundai)*
35. *Sungwon Choi (OICA/Hyundai)*
36. *George Bedenian (OICA/Hyundai)*
37. *Yisol Kim (OICA/Hyundai)*
38. *Christophe Petitjean (CLEPA/Valeo)*
39. *José Oliveira (CLEPA)*
40. *Basto Brezuy (AECC/MECA)*
41. *Dirk Bosteels (AECC)*
42. *André Rijnders (GRPE - chair)*
43. *François Cuenot (GRPE - secretary)*
44. *Per Öhlund (Swedish Transport Agency)*

Webex: (74 participants, some of whom were present in person as well as online)

