

**Draft meeting minutes**  
**5<sup>th</sup> Session of the Informal Working Group**  
**on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)**

**Webex Meeting: Remote only**

**Venue:**

GRPE Webex

20 March 2023, 11.30 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. CET

**Meeting documents available at:**

[A-LCA 5th Meeting - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

**Agenda**

<b>Time</b>		<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>	<b>Purpose or Target</b>
11:30 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chairs	NA	Information share
~11:35	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chairs	*A-LCA-05-01	Agreement
~11:45	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	**A-LCA-04-05	Agreement
	4	Inputs from member on overarching aspects and sub-group structure	Korea CLEPA others	will be uploaded	Discussion
break					
~13:45	5	Summary and next actions on overarching aspects and sub-group structure	Leading Team	will be uploaded	Discussion
~13:50	6	Date and location for the next IWG	Chairs	NA	notification
~14:00	7	Any other business	Chairs	NA	

## Meeting Minutes

### **Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction**

The chair welcomes the participants to the 5<sup>th</sup> A-LCA meeting and presented the agenda.

### **Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda**

No remarks have been raised with regards to the agenda.

**Agenda was adopted by all participants.**

*See Document: A-LCA-05-01r1*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-01r1\\_Draft%20agenda.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-01r1_Draft%20agenda.pdf?api=v2)

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

The chair presented the meeting minutes of last session (4<sup>th</sup> session of 13/02/2023).

No comments.

**The minutes were adopted.**

*See document: A-LCA-04-05\_Draft\_Meeting\_Minutes.pdf*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840245/A-LCA-04-05\\_Draft\\_Meeting\\_minutes.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840245/A-LCA-04-05_Draft_Meeting_minutes.pdf?api=v2)

### **Agenda Item 4: Inputs from member on overarching aspects and sub-group structure**

The Chair invited the participants who submitted proposals to explain their submissions.

#### **Presentation from South Korea (Han Ho Song)**

Han Ho Song presented the excel file with the Korean inputs and positions.

Main overarching topics were discussed line by line.

*See document: A-LCA-05-02\_Korea positions for overarching aspects.pdf*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-02\\_Korea%20positions%20for%20overarching%20aspects.xlsx?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-02_Korea%20positions%20for%20overarching%20aspects.xlsx?api=v2)

- Applicable Automotive categories:  
Priority 1 on passenger cars, then expand to other categories which may need other definitions for the functional units
- Scope of GHG species:  
GHG species based on IPCC report, for automotive clear focus on CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O
- System boundaries:  
Korea presented an idea with the proposal of creating discrete levels for the automotive LCA concerning parts and vehicle production, resulting in different coverage by primary and secondary data.  
The levels can result in adapted compromises of the methodology taking in account different availability of data. A lower level at the beginning can be chosen, moving to

higher levels over time. More details will be presented in next meetings.

- Cut-off criteria could be based on the applied level within the level system, more tight criteria applied for an upper level.
- Vehicle production: It has to be clarified which processes are included in the methodology
- It is important to ensure consistency with existing work & regulation.  
For example, consistency should be ensured with the future EU Battery PCR in the future battery regulation.
- The excel sheet need to be updated concerning the production subgroup structure.
- Subgroup structure:  
see the original proposition from Korea.  
Korea agrees on a separate subgroup for EoL.  
Korea suggests that the use phase should include the Well-to-Wheel energy supply, maintenance parts and tyres should be included in the vehicle production sub-group.  
The reason forwarded by Korea is that the proportion of GHG emissions from the fuel cycle represents a big portion compared to production and EoL.

#### REMARKS/COMMENTS:

- **OICA (Tina Dettmer):**  
Different levels of details is a good idea, but we should also include the goals in order to correctly identify the level of detailedness of the analysis which allows to reach these goals.  
The level structure could structure details of methodology versus goals like for example sustainability reporting, customer information or decarbonisation of supply chain.
- Other key challenge:  
The alignment with existing regulation and guidance documents. We have to decide where to align with existing regulation, standards or existing guidance documents OR if we prefer having a completely new approach. A possibility may also be to allow different approaches for different components.
- Overall OICA supports Korea's presentation, it points to the main challenges.
  - Korea replies that CPs and companies have different opinions on how to approach A-LCA. The level structure can allow different solutions for different goals.  
Why not plan immediately for these different levels, allowing a consensus by applying different levels of approaches.
  - The Chair asked for more clarification of the concept. Does a different level mean also a different level of accuracy?
  - Korea replied that the proposal with levels is not as simple, the level would define the coverage by primary data of the LCA for different components and tier levels.  
The highest level should include everything as primary data.
  - The Chair gave as an example a simple system with few parts like a suspension system which may use primary data, for a much more complicated system like an automatic driving system using many parts and suppliers it will be more difficult to be completely covered by primary data. Different levels could be applied.
  - Korea confirms that it will present more details in next meeting
- **Ricardo (Nikolas Hill):**  
The level system sounds like a practical system that needs to be looked deeper into. It will help the level of details and will allow for a better analysis. Ricardo also indicated that they agree with OICA's remark on the importance of better identifying the goals,

purposes and background. This could be a clear harmonized approach including flexibility for different purposes.

- Korea agreed with this analysis.
- **CLEPA (Ansgar Christ):**

Asked a question about the proposal from Korea, does this discuss the details while relating them to the TIER-levels? Is the main aim of the proposal directed to the application or addressing accuracy?  
The tier level is not necessarily correlated with the importance of GHG emissions, the last tier steps may be mainly assembly with few CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

  - Korea confirmed that it is not about high/low accuracy but rather on the level of existing data. But the accuracy is different for different parts/steps of the analysis, confirming it is not primarily about the accuracy. Korea will explain more in detail in later meetings.
- **Japan (Tabushi):**

Agrees with the idea of different levels of primary data, but what will we do with primary data that we do not have? Japan believes that it is not possible to get primary data through all supply chain. How to do with areas where secondary data are necessary.

  - Korea replies that this is exactly the point why levels of approaches make sense. May be in the future with approaches like for example CATENA-X we can get to a full LCA, but at this moment we see limited availability of data in lower tiers in the supply chain.  
This is why levels are needed. The level applied is limited by data availability. Another reason for levels is the application for different regulations/applications. Korea believe this should be a good start which can be expanded in the future.

**The Chair invited Korea to further develop their idea by next meeting.**

### **Presentation from CLEPA (Ansgar Christ)**

*See document: A-LCA-05-04\_CLEPA\_Overarching.pdf*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-04\\_CLEPA\\_Overarching.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-04_CLEPA_Overarching.pdf?api=v2)

Ansgar Christ presented the CLEPA position on the overarching aspects.

To start with, he reminded the most important reason why we are working on this, with a clear vision from CLEPA: The motivation is to improve the PCF of supplier products, this needs a high level of granularity for the LCA methodology.

The goal should be to improve CO<sub>2</sub> footprint while having a competitive environment at affordable cost. CLEPA reviewed their proposal for subgroups and overarching aspects. They made the following remarks:

- A general top-line approach will only allow for costumer comparison but will have no real impact. An in dept analysis is thus our preferred manner while this has a real impact on emissions and prospers competition.  
The same analysis delivering different results for each company as function of their GHG performance requires a uniform methodology to be comparable.

- With regard to the overarching aspects, CLEPA underlined the importance to define the cut-off criteria, secondary data and allocation schemes.
  - o Recycled materials enter free of burden
  - o Carbon offsetting is not allowed
  - o Differentiate between declared and finished goods
  - o Focus on an attributional approach → step by step
  - o Already use existing ISO 14067 & 14040/4
  - o Primary data should be the goal, secondary data may be used if satisfying quality
- CLEPA's principal guidelines are:
  - o Comparability (quantitative)
  - o Globally Applicable (big & small companies all over the world)
  - o Minimal Effort (quantification & verification)

## REMARKS/QUESTIONS

- **Chair:** In CLEPA presentation, for the subgroup structure, the WG1 could be the whole IWG?  
CLEPA confirms.
- **OICA (Tina Dettmer):** There are a lot of open questions here both general and technical. It would be good to discuss at the beginning the objectives.
  - o CLEPA: we should make sure that the methodology can serve different aspects. Technical details should be defined for the most detailed approach, this can then also be applied to other levels.
- **Japan (Tabushi):**  
Japan is looking into a similar direction as CLEPA.  
How to define a declared product and how would you define from which part the emissions come?
  - o CLEPA indicated that the declared unit relates to the product as delivered to the customer, it is different for the different steps through the supply chain.
 How to consider kg of material? Divide the GHG emissions by weight of part?
  - o No division of the GHG emissions of a part by its weight. We differentiate between material which is not accountable from accountable parts in the production process. In the early stage we should use kg of material. Once we deal with an intermediate product, then the part is declared unit.
 It seems difficult to compare different parts, example tyre versus door. Not clear how to define declared unit.
  - o There is no comparison between the different parts. There is a CO<sub>2</sub> value per door, or a CO<sub>2</sub> value per tyre. The different parts are added through the assembly process to obtain the final CO<sub>2</sub> value for the vehicle.
- **ICCT (Georg Bieker):**  
ICCT has a question concerning the Catena-X slide. It makes sense to have competition by comparison but there is a risk that self-reporting would be insufficient, both, for primary as for average data.
  - o CLEPA underlined that competition is not possible if one company is reporting based on averages and others based on primary data. It is crucial to only allow primary data or qualitative secondary data where needed. But there is the need to use conservative data for secondary data sets to avoid distortion because

stakeholder would use secondary data from pure industry averages if they do perform less good than average.

- Hans Nughlich from CLEPA confirmed this reality as well, LCA can only be average or based on primary data, this is a choice for the IWG.

- **South Korea (Han Ho Song):**

Underlined that this is how they see it and that the levels they speak of do not result in average data. They are also looking at primary and secondary data to be used in the comparison.

- **Ricardo (Nicolas Hill):**

Ricardo appreciates the CLEPA presentation, primary data first is where we have to get ultimately.

A question is how we can determine what means conservative data. But this can be discussed later. Conceptual the approach is ok; question remains how to make in practical.

- CLEPA: agrees on the challenge, no solution right now.

- **OICA (Tina Dettmer):**

OICA confirms that there is no worst-case data set, but for the main hot spots there is knowledge where we are too optimistic. For many points it could be possible to give advice for worst case. Essential is promoting primary data.

- **ICCT:**

A simple proposal could be to define the worst case for example as 10% over average. A worst-case correction factor could be defined.

**Presentation from Japan (Tabushi):**

*See document: A-LCA-05-03\_SG structure by JPN.pdf*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-03\\_SG%20structure%20by%20JPN.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-03_SG%20structure%20by%20JPN.pdf?api=v2)

Japan presented a slide explaining the need to discuss preconditions to be defined by IWG before dividing in subgroup.

REMARKS/QUESTIONS

- **CLEPA (Ansgar Christ):**

Why using primary data only for Tier 1 and using secondary data for deeper supply chain?

- JP: Small enterprises often cannot provide primary data. Then secondary data should be defined by upper level of supply chain. There is a need that for some level of supplier the use secondary data accepted.
- CLEPA: This is not necessarily a question of Tier level, down the supply chain there are often big companies supplying to a broad customer basis.
- JP: yes but we may lose the information through smaller suppliers in the supply chain

- **JRC (Anne Bouter):**

For the use phase, does the fuel carbon intensity include a WTW approach?

- Japan: just list what is to be discussed concerning carbon intensity of fuel, the

topic need to be discussed further.

We should divide in TTW and WTT and decide what to include.

To be discussed later in use subgroup.

- **Ricardo:**

Japan's presentation is a useful contribution.

Comment from Ricardo: what about second life usage of batteries, this would lead toward a consequential approach of LCA, how to deal with it?

- **ICCT:**

An additional thought: a critical point for the use phase is whether changes of carbon intensity over lifetime will be covered or not? Time variability of carbon footprint is important for the use phase

- Japan: yes, these are important points, need to be discussed in the subgroup.

## **Agenda Item 5: Summary and next actions on overarching aspects and subgroup structure**

### **Presentation by the Chair of the IWG**

*See document: A-LCA-05-05\_Notesfrom Leading Team.pdf*

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-05\\_Notes%20from%20Leading%20Team.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-05_Notes%20from%20Leading%20Team.pdf?api=v2)

The chair presented suggestions for the following steps made by the A-LCA IWG Leading Team.

The working group structure, as current status, was presented based on the compromise proposal made by CLEPA during the last meeting. He reminded that this is a baseline still open for discussion.

Some first candidates for the leading teams for subgroups were also presented:

Candidates for the production phase are: Korea, OICA and CLEPA

Candidate for the Use phase is OICA

Candidates for leading the overarching aspects are the technical secretariat and CLEPA.

***Additional comment:***

*Since the IWG meeting on March 20<sup>th</sup> additional candidates declared themselves.*

*The status on March 30<sup>th</sup> is:*

*SG1 (IWG) Overarching aspects: Technical secretariat and CLEPA*

*SG 2 Materials: Japan*

*SG 3 Production: Korea, China, OICA, CLEPA*

*SG 4 Use phase: EC(JRC), OICA and AVERE*

*SG 5 End of Life: Japan*

*SG 6 Energy supply: EC(JRC) and AVERE*

### REMARKS/QUESTIONS

- **EC (JRC) (Georgios Fontaras):**

EU COM and JRC discussed. anEC (JRC) want to get more involved, could co-chair use phase. Not clear if one solid WTW group or split in two subgroups.

Will bring more at Geneva meeting about involvement of EU COM and JRC

- IWG Chair: the subject of the use phase subgroup is still under discussion

- **EC (JRC) (Anna Bouter):**  
JRC would like to get involve in task 6 fuel and energy, dependent on final structure
  - o IWG Chair: It is still open if merge SG 4 and 6
- **IWG Chair:**  
Does China have an opinion?
  - o China (Zhao Mingnan): China would like to join as co-chair subgroup 3, part and vehicle production
- **Japan MLIT** will give information next session next session on subgroup participation
- **AVERE:**  
Would like to participate in SG 4 and SG 6, to be confirmed
- **IWG Chair:**  
We are still missing a lead for SG 2 and SG 5. If nobody volunteers, the IWG will lead. Drafting SG will come later.

The Chair presented slide 3 with the timing proposal. Subgroup 3 and 4 have candidates for the lead, these groups could start with a coordination meeting.

April 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> will focus on overarching subjects, 1 day overarching aspect, 0.5 day for subgroups

Proposal: SG 3 and 4 should start before April. Need for coordination meeting.

Other subgroups may be delayed.

#### REMARKS/QUESTIONS

- **CLEPA (C. Petitjean):**  
SG 6 is linked to subgroup 4, but also to other subgroups. It is better to keep a clear structure to make responsibilities clear. It needs to be clear who does what

IWG Chair: This will be discussed at in person meeting in Geneva. The structure will be finalized and confirmed next session.

IWG co-secretary: We plan to call a coordination meeting between the leading team and the subgroup lead candidates. We need to define members of this coordination meeting. Each stakeholder has to provide specific member names. Please OICA, CLEPA, China, Japan and Avere send e-mail with candidate names and mail addresses before the leading team meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> of March.

#### **Agenda item 6: Date and location for the next IWG**

Next A-LCA IWG meeting (6<sup>th</sup> session) 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> of April in Geneva hosted by GRPE as special GRPE session. Agenda is published on the GRPE wikipage.

The leading team will finalize the agenda on 22<sup>nd</sup> March.

7<sup>th</sup> session will be held in conjunction with GRPE June.

A-LCA IWG is scheduled Tuesday May 30<sup>th</sup> afternoon in the GRPE room.

In person meetings only, no webex.

**OICA request to leading team:**



Please include in the mail with the invitation a clear message if specific tasks are expected from members, like request for input. This needs to be mentioned clearly in the mail, not only as an agenda item.

**EU DG CLIMA (Ana Danila):**

For DG Clima it is very difficult to attend in person even in Geneva, would appreciate the effort for webmeeting

GRPE secretary: very difficult, budgetary issue, not part of regular budget.

**IWG Chair:**

The leading team considers the 8<sup>th</sup> IWG meeting to be held in Brussels in Autumn, in October. Still TBD for date and location, to be communicated at next meeting.

**Agenda item 7: Any Other Business?**

No additional remarks or questions were raised by the participants.

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

---

**ANNEXES**

**Participants list: (66 participants)**

The following table represents the data extracted from the participant list screenshots:

Initials	Name	Affiliation
HT	Hans Nuglisch	CL... Moi
NT	NIIKUNI, Tetsuya	Organisateur
HN	Han Ho Song	/ South ...
	Nikolas Hil...	
JN	Japan, Tetsuya Niikuni	Co-organisateur
J	JAPAN/JASIC_JCHIAKWA	Co-organisateur
AD	Adam Dack	UK DFT
AC	Alberto Castagnini	
	Ana Danila	-EC
AC	Alberto Castagnini	
DC	David Weiner	/ Volvo Cars
AC	Alberto Castagnini	
AN	Ana Danila	-EC
BN	Benedetta Nucci	
BB	Burcin Bassahinoglu	
CC	C.Petitjean	Clepa/Valeo
C	C.R.Kim	-Korea
C	CANADA	Leeson_Guay
CO	CLEPA	- Jose Oliveira
DC	David Weiner	/ Volvo Cars
DC	David Weiner	/ Volvo ...
DP	Di PENG	-CHINACRAES
DB	Diana Bartaune	BMW
EB	EC-JRC	Anne BOUTER
EU	Elodie Collot	- UTAC/FR
EG	ETRMA	Alex van Gelderen
GH	George Bedenian	- OICA Hy...
GF	Georgios Fontaras	
GJ	Gian Luca Patrone	JRC
GJ	Gian Luca Patrone	JRC
GJ	Giuseppe DI	PIERRO JRC
GK	Gyeol Han	, South Korea
HC	Hwansoo Chong	_S.Korea
HK	hyeonu kim	
IB	ICCT	- Georg Bie...
IP	INDIA-ARAI-PN	PAWAR
IK	Inji Park	_KATRI Korea
JJ	Japan_Suzuki	JARI
JJ	Jelica Pavlovic	JRC
JA	Joachim Demuyne	AECC
JC	Johanna Berlin	Volvo Cars
JN	Julien GARCIA	IFP Energies...
KO	K.YAMAMOTO	OICA/JAMA
KA	Koichiro Aikawa	
KT	Kosmehl, Torsten	T.
MR	M Goy	RSA
MM	Mike Geller	MECA
MI	MLIT	- Tomoya Ijima
MY	Moosang Yu	_OICA
	Nikolas Hill	[Ricardo]
OP	OICA	- Bruno Li Pira
OL	OICA	- Filippo Lachina
OG	OICA	- Tina Dettmer Volks...
PJ	Paffumi Elena	EC JRC
RA	Ravinder Choda	, AAPC
RA	Romain Denayer	AVERE
RA	Romain Denayer	AVERE
RA	Romain Denayer	AVERE
SO	Sam TRIPATHY	OICA-Renault
SK	SEUNGHO, KIM	
ST	Shinichiro	TAKADA
SA	Stefan Still	, AVL
S	Sungwon	_OICA_HKMC
SH	SWITZERLAND	- Phili...
TJ	TABUSHI	Japan
TK	Taewan Kim	
TK	Taewan Kim	
TK	Taewan Kim	
TK	Taewan Kim	
TK	Taewan Kim	
TM	Takuya Mimori	
TZ	Tobias Fink	, ZF/CLEPA
TM	Toshiyuki	MARUNO
UC	UNECE	- Francois Cuenot
WC	Wenhao	Chen
XC	Xin Sun	China
YK	YS LIM	_SOUTH KOREA
ZC	Zhao Mingnan	China