

Draft meeting minutes 6th Session of the Informal Working Group on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

In person only meeting

Venue:

Palais des Nations in Room XXVI, Geneva, Switzerland
12 April 2023, 14.30 a.m. to 17.30 p.m. CET
13 April 2023, 9.30 a.m. to 17.30 p.m. CET

Meeting documents available at:

[A-LCA 6th session - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

Agenda

Day_1 (April 12th)					
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-06-01	Agreement
~14:50	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	*A-LCA-05-06	Agreement
~15:15	4	Catena-X-PCF- Rulebook current status and next steps	CLEPA	A-LCA-06-02	Information share
16:30	5	Subgroup structure (1) Confirm the open points (2) Discuss on open points	Leading Team	A-LCA-06-03	Discussion
			Japan CLEPA	A-LCA-06-06 A-LCA-06-07	
break					
16:45	5	Adoption of subgroup structure	All	NA	Agreement
~17:00		consider coordination between IWG and SGs	Leading Team	A-LCA-06-04	
~17:30		Leadership of each SG	All	NA	Arrangement

Day_2 (April 13th)					
Time		Agenda item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose or Target
9:30 ~9:45	6	A look-back of the Day1 and introduction of the Day2	Chairs	NA	Information share
~12:30	7	Overarching aspects	Leading Team	A-LCA-06-05	Discussion
		(including break)	Korea OICA CLEPA ICCT	A-LCA-06-11 A-LCA-06-10 A-LCA-06-08 A-LCA-06-09 A-LCA-06-13	
Lunch break					
14:30 ~16:00	7	First decision on overarching aspects	Chairs	NA	Agreement
break					
16:30 ~16:50	8	Feedback of SG3 kick-off meeting	Leading Team & SG potential Leaders	NA	Information share
~17:10	9	kick-off of other SGs	Leading Team & SG potential Leaders	NA	Discussion
~17:20	10	Date and location for the next IWG	Chairs	A-LCA-06-12	notification
~17:30	11	Any other business	Chairs	NA	

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The GRPE chair opens the special GRPE session on A-LCA.

- He reminds to the participants that this is not a hybrid meeting. As a GRPE meeting translation is provided in English, French and Russian
- He reminded also that A-LCA is a very important topic for GRPE.

GRPE Agenda and running order were adopted with only one agenda point: A-LCA

The GRPE chair transferred the meeting to the co-chairs of the A-LCA.

The A-LCA chairs welcomed the participants to the 6th A-LCA meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

The chair presented the agenda (version rev 3) for the two days.

Comment from Korea on right place for Korea's contribution, it was decided that it fits best during the second day. The agenda was updated.

Korea: depend on timing, to be seen if fits. If not better on second day

The agenda was adopted with modification as version rev 4.

Agenda was adopted by all participants.

See Document: A-LCA-06-01r4

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-01r4_Agenda.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented and reviewed the meeting minutes of last session (5th session of 20/03/2023).

As minutes were posted late, adoption was delayed to morning of April 13th. The participants were invited to submit their comments by the morning of April 13th.

See document: A-LCA-05-06_Meeting_Minutes_draft.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/192840255/A-LCA-05-06_Meeting_minutes_draft.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 4: CATENA-X presentation, Martina Prox

Marina Prox from the CATENA-X rulebook team gave a presentation of the current status of the rulebook.

See document: A-LCA-06-02_Catena-X_at_UNECE GENEVA.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-02_Catena-X_at_UNECE%20GENEVA.pdf?api=v2

She pointed out that the objective is to build a global data space supporting business processes and create the first data driven value chain with broad range of participants from industry;

incorporating all participants via interoperable and trusted solutions.

Today, no comparability of specific products is given, as working with average data equalizes different performances; this approach is not supporting decarbonization efforts and is not efficiently enabling decarbonization. A standardized approach is needed based on primary data as much as possible.

CATENA-X is focusing on methodology and the rulebook today. A first version was published end of 2022, now version 2 is available after a stakeholder feedback process. Due to the many products in automotive industry, the PCF methodology must be prepared for automation.

Focus of the methodology today is cradle to gate, with a cut-off rule of 99% GHG coverage gate to gate, to be proven and to be verified.

Concerning multiple output allocation, first priority is to follow existing sector specific PCR guidelines before applying specific schemes.

The primary data share over the supply chain should increase over time guaranteeing that data become closer to reality.

The new version of the rulebook also includes definitions for the chain of custody approach and start of alignment with other PCF-initiatives.

It is essential to align with PCF initiatives from other industries (Chemical industry TFS, Battery industry GBA for example) and efforts are being made to make this happen

Full cradle to grave approach is not yet in scope for CATENA-X.

Questions/ Comments:

Ricardo:

Interesting presentation. To what extent is CATENA looking into the JRC battery CFP rules? How to deal with the differences?

CATENA-X:

We did look at the JRC CFP rules, in some cases transition definition ongoing like data quality rating, today aligned with GBA which is more simplified, but in some cases an alignment is foreseen. The circular footprint formula of the JRC Battery rules is not liked by industry, is not supported.

Nevertheless, if it becomes regulation, we must align. But the formula is seen as not feasible. If it reveals to be feasible, the discussion will be ongoing.

Ricardo:

And how taking in account electricity?

CATENA-X:

I have no clear answer today, have to come back after consultation of specialists.

CATENA-X comment: Version 2 of the rulebook is not yet published; it cannot be shared on wiki. But sharing is possible on individual basis if requested by e-mail.

Agenda Item 5a: Subgroup structure

The chair presents the current status of the subgroup structure based on the CLEPA compromise proposal and a second slide including the candidates for subgroup leadership.

See document: A-LCA-06-03_SG structure.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-03_SG%20structure.pdf?api=v2

Since last meeting input was received from Japan:

Japan presented its position, it proposes to lead subgroups 2 and 5, and Japan wants to participate as member in all subgroups. Concerning the merger of subgroups 4 and 6 Japan has no strong position, but would agree on a merger. Japan reminds that group 1 needs to be taken care of by the IWG itself.

See document: A-LCA-06-06_Japan position on subgroups.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-06_Japan%20positions%20on%20subgroups.pdf?api=v2

Korea presented its opinion orally:

Korea supports to merge SG 4 and 6. Korea these this merged SG essential for dealing with the fuel cycle, which represents the biggest portion of the vehicle GHG emissions. Korea argues that the vehicle use phase definition and the fuel cycle need to be treated together and is thus more logical.

CLEPA presented then a different view:

CLEPA started to present, as a reminder, slides from previous IWG meetings making clear that for CLEPA the goal is to develop a methodology which allows a quantification of the GHG footprint of a given product, allowing a competitive analysis between suppliers to drive GHG emissions down and being affordable as a process. CLEPA reminded also the ToR as reference, specifying the objective of considering the energy use through all life phases. Then the CLEPA proposal for the IWG structure was shown as already presented before, going in detail into the question if there is a need to merge or not to merge subgroups 4 and 6. There are 4 rationals not to merge 4 and 6:

- Keep the overall structure harmonized, do not create no specific areas
- Keep clear interfaces between the IWG and the subgroups and between the subgroups, as all life cycle phases (subgroups 2,3,4,5) have GHG emission from energy usage as key parameter.
- Subgroup 6 needs stakeholders from a specific community outside automotive. The interfaces should be harmonized by SG 1 (the IWG)
- Most important: merging subgroup 4 and 6 would be a short term view, as today the majority of GHG emissions comes from the use phase. In the future the majority of GHG emission will move to the production phase. The UNECE IWG should have a longer time horizon, there is the need for a long term view.

CLEPA conclusion: A merge is not needed, each SG should be defined with clear perimeter and membership. The overarching topics group is very important to manage all interphases

See document: A-LCA-06-07_CLEPA WG structure recommendations.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-07_CLEPA%20WG%20structure%20recommendations.pdf?api=v2

Questions/ Comments:

Chair: CLEPA defined clearly the open point to discuss

UK: The UK agrees with CLEPA to keep subgroups 4 and 6 separate, UK agrees with the rational 2 that the energy source is important throughout the whole lifecycle and rational 3 that experts are needed separately from automotive experts. If the subgroups would be merged, the SG becomes very big with lots of work and difficult to handle.

Ricardo: Ricardo also supports CLEPA with the same reasons

ICCT: ICCT would like to add even more arguments concerning the scope of the emissions, which should be the same for use-phase and for production. Methane leakage for example is also important for the production phase. To have a coherent scope and approach it makes sense to have the energy supply in a separate group

Japan: Japan states that it has no strong position if the subgroups are merged or not

Korea: Korea agreed upon the suggested structure but will keep arguing in favour of having it together, even so, they indicated that they would not oppose it.

Chair thanks Korea for comment

The chair confirmed the general consensus to have separated groups SG4 and SG6. The structure can be reconsidered on a later stage if needed as work progresses, but general consensus today is that we start with the proposed structure.

Comment from China:

China is developing regulation and standards for automotive standards. China can share its experience and sincerely thinks that it can help to work with Japan to lead the EoL working group

Slide with new SG structure is updated with China.

Proposal:

China and Japan will lead the SG 5

Comment Japan:

The first subgroup should be directly under the IWG, and not a separate SG. When will this be discussed?

Chair: SG 1 is taken by IWG itself as defined earlier, there should be no discussion

Decision on subgroup structure:

Subgroup structure adopted with separated subgroups 4 and 6,

SG 1 is taken care of by IWG itself

Comment GRPE chair:

SG should have specific spaces in UNECE wiki to be transparent for everybody, SGs should be listed under A-LCA IWG

Decision:

Wiki spaces for each SG created

Comment secretary after meeting: spaces are created, see

[Automotive - Life Cycle Assessment \(A-LCA\) - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

Agenda Item 5b: Leadership and coordination of each SG

Feedback from Subgroups 3 coordination meeting on March 4th, 2023:

- Administrative issues:
 - Subgroup Leader: Korea (Hwansoo Chong)
co-Leaders CLEPA (Ansgar Christ) and OICA (Tina Dettmar)
 - Proposal for limitation of SG membership to max 20people
if there are more than 20 people then we need to limit number of people from each CP/NGO.
 - Plan/schedule (Which parties in the IWG are relevant?(Survey of applicants then set a deadline for the application) How to invite experts? and how to start?)
 - Note: If the work load increased, we consider to divide the SG3 into 2 groups (China may be the Leader/co-leader in that case). The IWG will make the decision on it.
- Designation of tasks for SGs
 - Inputs from IWG to the SG (What is needed to start the SG's activities from the view of the SG Leaders)
 - Inputs from other SGs to the SG
 - Outputs of the SGs (Draft of methods for GHG emission in production)

Confirmation for leaders for all subgroups:

- Subgroup 2: Lead by Japan
- Subgroup 3: Lead by Korea, co-leaders CLEPA and OICA
- Subgroup 4: Lead by EC (JRC), co-leaders OICA and AVERE
- Subgroup 5: Lead by Japan, co-leader China
- Subgroup 6: co-lead by AVERE, *JRC to be confirmed*
Need still to clarify/confirm leading team for SG 6

Today, persons are named only for Subgroup 3. Concrete names for other leaders will be collected soon.

General rules for subgroups

Based on the proposal from the SG coordination meeting, rules were discussed how to manage the membership of the different subgroups.

Objective is to limit the subgroups to a manageable size of actively contributing members. The results will anyway be reported to the IWG which will also take major decisions.

Rules for membership were drafted:

PROCEDURE for Subgroup Membership, see:

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-15_PROPOSAL%20SG%20nominations%20members.pdf?api=v2

Any member of the CP/NGO's within the IWG should be able to submit a request for SG membership.

- The IWG leadership will assemble all request (by mail) and draft a list. (**submitting this list should be done by 8 May for SG2, 3, 4, 5 and 6**)
- This deadline does not include the drafting SG
- The leadership would appreciate to receive a list with: CP/NGO's per SG
 - MAIN PARTICIPANTS: Main point of contact and attendee for each CP/NGO per SG (max 2)
 - OBSERVERS: Additional (optional) attendees or back-ups for each CP/NGO per SG (no maximum)
- When there will be a need to invite experts from outside of A-LCA IWG, the SG shall inform it to the leading team of A-LCA IWG and receive the leading team's confirmation (reference: the ToR of A-LCA IWG)
- **Questions/ Comments:**

Several questions from OICA, Ricardo and CLEPA to the Chair to clarify details of the membership structure and leading team definition. Agreement is:

- Nominate members by organisations before May 8th by mail to leading team as defined in document on Procedure for Subgroup membership
- SG leader organization to name leadership members for subgroups (exception SG 6 start later after feedback from JRC)
- Need for a special treatment for SG 5 and 6. Need for outside experts, we cannot state that members come IWG participants. First possible organizations should be listed.
- OICA stated that not to lose speed, we should not wait for outside experts, but start working within the IWG and identify gaps in expertise.
For an organization it must be possible to invite experts who are not attending the IWG

The chair formally closed the first meeting day.

Agenda Item 6: A look-back of the Day1 and introduction of the Day2

The Chair welcomes the participants to the second day of the IWG meeting and introduces agenda for April 13th.

The chair gave a brief review from the meeting on April 12th.

- **Presentation of adopted subgroup structure**
- **Review of the discussion of general rules for subgroups**

Decision on General Rules for Subgroups:

Inform and name subgroup leaders: Interested parties until 8th of May

SG leaders will select participants

If need for external experts identified by SG, information from SG to IWG leading team

Comments:

Japan: SG leaders select participants independently?

Should consult with IWG leading team for selection

Chair confirms, IWG and SG should work together to select participants

GRPE secretary:

Selection criteria for subgroup members need to be public for transparency

Chair:

First criteria are

- 20 people maximum capacity
- Should be selected from proper member of IWG
- Focus on expert knowledge,
- Do we need other aspect for selection?

FRANCE:

Additional criteria: limit number of participants by organisation

OICA:

A concern for OICA is the diversity of practices between OEM and suppliers.

If participation is restricted to one participant per organization, we are missing the objective to get consensus

OICA thinks that if we see 20 volunteers, this already very positive.

Next steps on subgroups:

Subgroup 3:

The subgroup leader presented next steps for the subgroup

See document: A-LCA-06-14_following steps of SG3.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-14_following%20steps%20of%20SG3.pdf?api=v2

A first Face-to-Face Kick off meeting is proposed in May or June.

Comments: Take in account GRPE week end of May to choose date, as well as Japanese “Golden Week” and holidays in May in EU.

Subgroup 4:

SG 4 is planning for coordination meeting in April

Subgroup 5:

China has first to provide contact person for the SG5 leading team

Agenda Item 7: Overarching aspects

Korea presented an explanation of the level concept.

See document: A-LCA-06-11_ Proposal of level concept of Vehicle cycle.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-11_Korea%20Proposal%20of%20level%20concept%20of%20Vehicle%20cycle.pdf?api=v2

Korea proposes that A-LCA IWG can establish the guideline for several levels of carbon footprint (CFP) evaluation methodology (“level concept”), where each level is suited for certain application as well as can be performed depending on the availability of data.

The possibility should be given to gradually move from lower to higher level. Some comments in addition to the slides:

- Level 1 is not trivial, need define the generic vehicle, advantage is that level 1 does not need any confidential information. Could be used by agencies or researchers or by policy makers
- Level 2 defines a specific real vehicle, the OEM needs to analyse each component based on the IMDS material data base and a secondary GHG data base
- Level 3 takes into account some parts with existing PCR , approach between level 2 and level 4. Does not use a globally standardized database, but regional data or supplier data. Example: secondary data for steel produced in Korea or data from specific company
- Level 4 is the ideal case, like the Catena-X vision, but all data for this level are not available yet

Comments / questions:

Ricardo: This is a useful presentation.

Initial comments on level approach: The level approach aligns with discussions in the TranSensus project and within the EU.

The question is what to do in product development when not all data are available yet?

Simplified LCA not necessarily simple, may be generic is a better term as the lower level can be used for more general studies

By default always regional data should be used if available.

How to deal with different levels for different aspects? Worth to think about this proposal.

We need to think about a matrix approach pointing to communalities of different levels

OICA: The concept has strengths. Obvious is that you cannot compare LCA results quantitatively between levels. The approach is development phase orientated. But it enables working on decarbonization.

Ricardo: The level concept is very focused on production stage, it must focus also on use phase. At the moment the use phase has the biggest impact.

Next, OICA presented their view on overarching aspects:

Goal dependency of methodological choices in LCA

See document: A-LCA-06-10_ OICA overarching aspects.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-10_OICA_Overarching%20aspects.pdf?api=v2

OICA stated that the first step of the LCA methodology should be following the ISO standard (ISO 14040) to define the purpose of LCA. This could be:

- Fair competition for suppliers, support supplier selection by OEM
- Use for company internal steering of decarbonization, this needs a high level of detail to identify hot spots and reduction measure
- Proof decarbonization effort within industry and bring the results into reporting
- End-customer information on environmental performance of a given vehicle
- Other stakeholders' interests: Supporting data for green finance, company ESG rating, environmental rating between OEMs
- Inform policy makers and allow incentives to OEM and users

The choice of the purpose influences the methodology. If you want an LCA for improving a product the methodology is different from one targeting government level policy decisions.

Examples for choices to make are:

- Lifetime mileage example: average mileage vs real life
- Data characteristics for energy GHG footprint: static vs dynamic. Future looking or static characterizing the fleet on the road in given year

There is no right or wrong, the chosen methodology need to fit the purpose of the LCA.

There is a list of most critical overarching aspects for which a consensus needs to be found.

To find a consensus we need first to know the purpose. We need a clear definition of intended goals and the application of the methodology.

From this we can define key principles for work in subgroups.

Should focus on most critical points at the beginning

OICA therefor proposed to:

- Identify the clear goals and applications
- Use and agree on key principles
- Create a joint target image

Comments / questions:

Ricardo: Very important presentation.

Ricardo agrees with the majority of points, especially the importance of the purpose.

A comment on the static approach for energy GHG footprint data was however raised: LCA needs to allow a prevision, a static approach would be wrong. This is the difference between emission determination for one year versus an LCA.

OICA reply: LCA is used for different objectives, it can be static.

The use phase is less and less important, we see a shift to the supply chain. The dynamic approach for the use phase loses importance for the overall result.

The issue with a dynamic approach is that the dynamic needs many updates, we want here just mention that there are options.

Ricardo: The example was emission for a single year, not over lifetime.

We need to consider very different situations geographically and overtime.

Chair: The target is for contracting parties, we need to share the view of CPs, their view is important. What is view of CPs?

No feedback from CPs

Next, CLEPA presented their view on overarching aspects:

CLEPA Inputs for the A-LCA IWG at GRPE

See document: A-LCA-06-08_CLEPA summary of Overarching elements.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-08_CLEPA%20summary%20%20Overarching%20elements.pdf?api=v2

and the detailed excel file

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-09_CLEPA%20positions%20overarching%20aspects.xlsx?api=v2

CLEPA is definitively supporting the level 4 approach of Korea, for CLEPA this should be the work of the IWG. More details in the excel file, here only a short summary is given.

This is the CLEPA viewpoint and does not anticipate any final position.

- Impact category: we should just refer to the given one (IPCC), there may be the option to simplify
- Important for CLEPA: CLEPA is in favor of a bottom up cumulative approach through supply chain
- CLEPA believe that concerning the overarching aspects a lot existing work is available, we should refer to these
- Primary/secondary data: every time we can measure it is better to measure
If values are not measurable, estimates based on statistical data should be used.
If statistical data are not available, we need an assumption, here we need to agree all on the same assumption

A key point for CLEPA is the distinction between methodology versus introduction scenario of the methodology which can define steps based on data availability.

The A-LCA IWG has no mandate for an introduction scenario.

The mandate is for the methodology.

The introduction scenario of the methodology is then the a policy measure decided by policy makers.

We need to concentrate on 3 major points for the methodology:

- Universal harmonized system boundaries,
- Introduction of primary data share as KPI and
- Data quality indicator KPI

The additional excel file is the proposal from the leading team with a CLEPA added column, the column “m”, with a check mark if agreed and the SG that has to take care of, and a column “o” with the rational.

We need to agree on a general rule: the work on detailed level of the methodology needs always written documents and references, if no agreement is achieved based on the documented facts the issue must be raised to GRPE level.

Comment/questions:

No comments

Next, ICCT presented their view on overarching aspects:

Key factors of the overarching aspects in vehicle LCA methodology

See document: A-LCA-06-13_ICCT Overarching aspects.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-13_ICCT%20overarching%20aspects.pdf?api=v2

ICCT stated that it is important to define the goals as presented by OICA and confirmed the relevance of primary data as presented by CLEPA, the largest part of emissions is due to the upstream part.

ICCT then stressed the importance of real-world data, especially for plug-in hybrids. On scope, ICCT believes that Total Vehicle Lifetime, Land-Use Change Emissions and Methane Leakage Emissions should be taken into account as well

In the production phase, secondary data could be allowed when primary data are not available, but it must be clearly defined which data and the quality of data.

It is important to pay attention to primary and secondary data usage, this needs to be defined clearly by the methodology.

The availability of primary data will increase in the future, the methodology must foresee and adapt.

Comments/questions:

Ricardo, an additional thought: Agreed on methane leakage, but there is also a need to add hydrogen leakage, hydrogen can also have a significant impact

No further comments

Discussion on overarching aspects

The secretary quickly presented the excel sheet with the list of overarching topics.

Chair:

- The level concept is very nice and helps to define the target,
- CLEPA promoted the target level 4. The chair is wondering if this is appropriate for the timeline of the IWG.
- The IWG needs to decide which level should be the target for our product (the methodology to be delivered in 2025).
- What is the view of the contracting party?

Korea:

- Korea is not proposing to limit to one level, Korea proposes to have a guideline for all levels. If the scope and the goal is defined as OICA proposes, then each SG can develop the methodology for each level, the proposal is not a sequential approach.
- Korea does not suggest focussing on a single level, this was not the intention of Korea

CLEPA:

- The target is to have a methodology, this needs to address all levels. But it is not certain that all levels are needed for all life-cycle phases. For example, recycling can be another level than production, but consistency must be guaranteed, whenever using different level

OICA:

- The level needs to apply the foreground system with physical flows, then supporting sectors like electricity etc., recycling can be in the background system using secondary data.

Chair:

- If we agree on the development of all levels for each life cycle, is this also valid for SG 5 (EoL), will EoL also be applicable to all levels?

Korea:

- This needs to be analyzed. Different SG need to decide which level is reasonable for each phase.

Chair:

- If we accept the level concept, this must be the baseline for each subgroup.
- If we agree that all levels should be applied through the life cycle, this must be confirmed by the CPs. this has an impact on the to-do list.
- The Level concept needs to be agreed by the entire IWG
- The CPs need more time to consider this topic further before being able to make a decision.
- The Chair invites the opinions especially from contracting parties for next WebEx on May 23rd, 2023.

Any suggestion/concern?

OICA:

- A first step could be to start by aligning goals with levels. Get consensus on this.
- Level 3 and Level 4 are useful for OEMs and Suppliers, May be lower levels important for policy.
- For a rating there is the need for level 4, but for organizations doing the rating often these data are not available.

Chair:

- We need to consider feasibility and use the interpretation of the ToR
- Our product should help national policy making and should reflect manufacturers effort.
- Do we need to include level 4 in the current situation or should we consider feasibility and a minimum level 2 or 3 could be considered as first target?

CLEPA:

- Again, there is a confusion between developing a method and putting this method in practice immediately. The mandate is to develop the methodology, not to apply the methodology in a given timeframe.
- Level must be inclusive, not parallel. If you develop level 4 all other levels are included. We should develop on basis of level 4 and see by subgroup and lifecycle phase where we can simplify.

Korea:

- Korea agrees that we have to develop the methodology, Korea agrees with CLEPA.
- Level 4 methodology is not the problem, but perhaps all data not available immediately, then to agree on guidelines for specific levels.

Chair:

- To step forward, a preparation is needed for the next session:
Feedback from contracting parties on level concept and steps to consider for methodology development
- Level 1 to 4 for development of methodology,
but there is the difficulty of data availability, primary data availability not given,
we are not able to apply the method immediately.
Is this ok with CPs?
- The table on slide 4 in Korea's presentation on the level method could be help and give guidance for CPs
- CPs opinion is expected during next WebEx on May 23rd

Japan:

- What is the difference between method and guidance?

Chair:

- The guide explains how to use a method, the message here is if we want to calculate the GHG emission value, data are needed. This depends on national availability

CLEPA:

- CLEPA will provide a graph in the coming weeks to circulate, this will provide better understanding.
- Again, the reminder for the CPs: We have a mandate for a methodology, no mandate to collecting GHG LCA values

Ricardo:

- The level concept is developed more for production, not so much for other phases. CPs may not be expert in LCA, this is why Ricardo has a concern if CP's answers will be well founded. There is perhaps a need to define more what the levels are.
- All levels have commonality in the methodology, the difference is more in the data.

Korea:

- Difficult to say how to start . Different levels of the methodology have different applications and different goals.
- Level 1 is used w/o an individual vehicle in mind
- Level 2 uses all data in the OEM's own boundaries,
- Level 3 is including partly supplier data

Chair:

- Change in planning.
- The time until next meeting on 23rd needs to be used for better understanding of the level approach.
- Korea is asked to present a more elaborated document to help CPs.
- There will be a clear agenda item for next meeting for this topic

Agenda Item 8: Feedback of SG3 kick-off meeting

See above under agenda item 5b.

Agenda Item 9: kick-off of other SGs

SGs need more time.

No need for discussion at this point

Agenda Item 10: Date and location for the next IWG

Chair:

The chair presented the agenda for the next IWG meetings,
See presentation:

See document: *A-LCA-06-12r1_Meeting Calendar (2023-2024 Q1).pdf*

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-12r1_Meeting%20Calendar%20%282023-2024%20Q1%29.pdf?api=v2

- **Next IWG meeting 23rd May, WebEx 11:00 to 14:00**
Discussion on level concept with feedback from CPs
- **F2F IWG meeting on 30 May 2:30-5:30 in Geneva**
Input: CPs opinion
- **F2F IWG meeting on 17th and 18th of October in Brussels**
- **F2F IWG meeting in January 2024 in Geneva**
- **F2F IWG meeting in spring 2024 in Korea**

Additional subgroup-meetings TBD

- SG 4 coordination meeting week of April 24
- Other subgroups need time to prepare, submit concrete names of leaders.

Ricardo:

- What is the homework between now and next meeting on May 23rd ? Not clear.
Level proposal and xls file is posted,
but what is expected from stakeholders?

Chair:

- First priority is to get an answer on the level concept, the decision on the level concept may have influence the different topics in the xls file
- The leading team will consolidate the inputs in one xls file
- The leading team appreciates if Ricardo wants to help, other input is also welcome

Ricardo:

- Ricardo can add additional thoughts into the xls file, like Korea and CLEPA did,
Ricardo can help in bilateral way to get to a level concept clarification,
especially how level affects overarching aspects

Agenda Item 11: Any other business

Ricardo presented the European Transensus project

The presentation cannot be uploaded on wiki yet, waiting for agreement from project partners.
The presentation is just a short introduction to inform the IWG on the project objectives and identify potential overlap with A-LCA.

The project is inserted in the European Green Deal policy framework.

It tries to answer the question of the EVs and batteries. It is an EU wide harmonized real data based LCA approach.

Today real data are missing, objective is to get primary data. The methods must be affordable to be used throughout the industry from SME to big organizations.

TranSensus LCA is a coordinated support action including 11 industrial partners, 9 research partners plus 24 associated partners, bringing together experts from industry.

Overlap and differences with A-LCA:

- Same timeline
- Both are targeting an automotive LCA methodology for GHG emissions
- Transensus is not only dealing with GHG emissions, but also with other impact categories as other environmental and social impacts
- Transensus Focus only on zero emission vehicles, electric and hydrogen, not looking in hybrid, not in scope for Transensur, A-LCA deal with all vehicle types and all powertrains

Questions/ comments?

GRPE secretary:

Are the potential applications chosen by participants or given by horizon EU?

Is there a presence of legislative authorities in the project?

Ricardo:

TranSensus looks at all goals, first priority is on product level, but all relevant to all parties

Policy makers involved? The project is EU COM funded, an active part is the liaison group and link to potential application. Current interaction with DG R&D, but also with other DG and JRC. No national institutions involved

No other questions

Chair:

Agenda is completed

The chair close the IWG meeting and hands the meeting over to the GRPE chair

GRPE Chair:

GRPE agenda item GRPE AoB

- Next GRPE session already next month, afternoon May 30th until June 2nd
- On Tuesday 30th of May, afternoon, next IWG A-LCA
- It has still to be decided if the A-LCA meeting will be hold as F2F only GRPE session or as hybrid meeting in a different meeting room
- ASAP answer expected from IWG
- There will be minutes from GRPE.

The chair thanks the interpreters

The session is closed at 16:00h.

ANNEXES

Participants list established by GRPE:

Governments (UNECE Bodies) - ECE Member States

France

Ms. Elodie COLLOT

Environment regulation Sr Expert
UTAC

Italy

Mr. Antonio ERARIO

Head of Division, International Regulatory Affairs
Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport

Netherlands (Kingdom of the)

Mr. André RIJNDERS (Chair)

Senior advisor vehicle standard development
RDW, The Netherlands Vehicle Authority

Mr. Niels DEN OUDEN

Senior Advisor
RDW

Poland

Ms. Kaja WITKOWSKA-KOPKA

chief specialist
Transportowy Dozór Techniczny

Spain

Ms. Maria-Eugenia MONTES

Policy officer
Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism

Sweden

Mr. Per ÖHLUND

Senior Administrative Officer
Swedish Transport Agency

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. Adam DACK

Senior Engineer
UK Department for Transport

Governments (UNECE Bodies) - Non-ECE Member States

China

Mr. Xiang BAO

Engineer
CATARC

Mr. Yanning CHANG

Engineer
China Automotive Technology and Research Center Co.,
Ltd

Japan

Mr. Shoji AOKI

JASIC Committee Member
Japan Automobile Standards Internationalization Center
(JASIC)

Mr. Noriyuki ICHIKAWA

Visiting Researcher
National Traffic Safety and Environment Laboratory

Mr. Tomoya IJIMA

Chief Official
MLIT

Mr. Shinji NARA

Assistant Director
Japan Automobile Standards Internationalization
Center(JASIC) Geneva Office

Mr. Tetsuya NIIKUNI

Researcher
National Traffic Safety and Environment Laboratory

Mr. Hidenori NONAKA

Director
JASIC

Mr. Yoshiki SHIMODA

Director

NSTEL

Mr. Tetsuya SUZUKI

JASIC Committee Member
Japan Automobile Standards Internationalization Center
(JASIC)

Mr. Makoto TANIKURA

Deputy Director
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism
(MLIT)

Korea, Republic of

Mr. Hwansoo CHONG

Researcher
National Institute of Environmental Research

Mr. Charyung KIM

Principal Researcher
Korea Transportation Safety Authority

Mr. Tae Yong KIM

Chief Researcher
Korea Automobile Testing & Research Institute

Ms. Inji PARK

Chief Researcher
Korea Automobile Testing and Research Institute

Mr. Han Ho SONG

Professor
Seoul National University

South Africa

Mr. Dewald HORN

Principal Inspector
National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications

Mr. Joseph MASHELE

Technical Specialist
National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications

European Union

European Commission

Mr. Giuseppe DI PIERRO

Scientific Officer
EC JRC

Mr. Gian-Luca PATRONE

Scientific/Technical Project Officer
EC JRC

Non-Governmental Organizations - Consultative/ accredited with ECOSOC

Association Européenne des véhicules électriques à batteries, hybrides et à Piles à combustible (AVERE)

Mr. Romain DENAYER

Coordinator
Association

Association for Emissions Control by Catalyst - AECC

Mr. Dirk BOSTEELS

Executive Director
AECC aisbl

Mr. Joachim DEMUYNCK

Technical and Scientific Manager
AECC

European Association of Automotive Suppliers (CLEPA/MEMA/JAPIA)

Mr. Paolo ALBURNO

Director Technical Regulations
CLEPA European Association of Automotive Suppliers

Mr. Yannick BRIENT

Regulation Manager
VALEO /CLEPA

Mr. Hans NUGLISCH

Expert Regulatory Affairs Electrification & Emissions
Vitesco Technologies

Mr. Christophe PETITJEAN

Technical Regulations Director
Valeo Corporate

Mr. Martin RAUCH

Director Regulatory Affairs
Schaeffler Technologies AG & Co. KG

International Association for Natural Gas Vehicles (IANGV)

Mr. Alberto CASTAGNINI

Senior Technical Manager
NGVA Europe

International Council on Clean Transportation Inc.

Mr. Georg BIEKER

Senior Researcher
International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT)

International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA)

Mr. Edwin BASTIAENSEN

Secretary General
IMMA

Mr. Lamberto VENTIMIGLIA

Technical Officer
International Motorcycles Manufacturers' Association
(IMMA)

International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA)

Mr. George BEDENIAN

Senior Engineer
Hyundai Motor Europe

Mr. William Frank COLEMAN

Emissions Expert
Volkswagen Group

Mr. Andrea DE MARIA

emission senior expert
IVECO/OICA

Ms. Tina DETTMER

Lead LCA & DKI
Volkswagen Group

Mr. Matthieu GOY

CO2 Regulation Expert
Renault S.A.

Mr. Gyeol HAN

Research engineer
HYUNDAI MOTOR

Mr. SEUNGHO KIM

Member
OICA

Ms. Emmanuelle KOBIALKA

Sustainable Design and LCA Expert
OICA

Mr. Atsushi KOYANAGI

N/A
JAMA Europe office

Mr. Filippo LACHINA

Regulatory Subject Matter Expert
General Motors

Mr. Bruno LI PIRA

Regulatory Affair Engineer
Honda Motor Europe Ltd

Mr. Erik POSTMA

Sustainable Mobility Manager
OICA

Ms. Juliette QUARTARARO

Regulation Leader
Stellantis

Mr. Samarendra TRIPATHY

xEV Regulation & Homologation Expert
Renault SAS

Observer

Private Sector

Mr. Nikolas HILL

Head of Vehicle Technologies and Fuels
Ricardo Energy & Environment

Ms. Martina PROX

Director Expert Services
iPoint-systems gmbh / BASF ext for Catena-X PCF
rulebook team
