Draft meeting minutes
7th Session of the Informal Working Group on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Webex
23 May 2023, 11.30 a.m. to 14.00 p.m. CET

Meeting documents available at:
https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/A-LCA+7th+session

Agenda

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Meeting Documents	Purpose or Target
11:30 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chairs	NA	Information sharing
~ 11:35	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chairs	A-LCA-07-01*	Agreement
~ 11:40	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	A-LCA-06-16**	Agreement
~ 11:50	4	Sub-group structure: - Confirmation Leadership of SG - Review SG participants	Chairs	A-LCA-07-02*	Decision & status update
~ 12:10	Break				
~ 13:30	5	Overarching aspects : - Levelling concept - Other stakeholder positions - General Discussion	Korea Ricardo CLEPA Japan tbc+	A-LCA-07-03* A-LCA-07-04* A-LCA-07-05* A-LCA-07-06*	Presentation Remarks Discussion
~13:40	6	Next Steps	Chairs	A-LCA-07-07*	Summary
~ 13:50	7	Any other business	All	NA	Notification
~ 13:55	8	Closing	Chairs	NA	Closing

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair opens the A-LCA IWG Webex meeting and welcomes the participants.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

The chair presented and reviewed the agenda of today.
No comments.
Agenda was adopted by all participants.

See Document: A-LCA-07-01r1
https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-01r1_draft%20Agenda.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented and reviewed the meeting minutes of last session (6th session of 12 and 13 April 2023). The document was posted on wiki. The chair apologized in the name of the leading team for late posting.

No comment.

Meeting Minutes adopted.

See document: A-LCA-06-16_Draft_Meeting_Minutes.pdf
https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198673093/A-LCA-06-16_Draft_Meeting_minutes.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 4: Subgroup structure

The chair presented the document A-LCA-07-02_SG with the current status for leaders, participants and observers for each subgroup.

He insisted that the leading team is still expecting candidates (names) for the missing leader ships of SG 4, 5 and 6.

See document: A-LCA-07-02_Draft_Meeting_Minutes.pdf
https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-02_SG.pdf?api=v2

Questions / Comments:

OICA: For all SGs the number of participants is lower than 20. Did the leadership team filter already the applications to stay below the limit or are all candidates taken?

> Answer from chair: no filtering was applied, all applications received by mail are counted. Candidates without specification if main participant or observer were counted as main participants.

EU: The EU Commission can confirm the lead for SG 4, but the EU Commission cannot lead the SG 6 due to missing internal approval. For the moment AVERE is the only stakeholder leading SG 6.

> Chair: Confirms taking this change in account.

Ricardo: The slides shown indicate only 2 observers for SG 1, led by the IWG leading team.

Why? Ricardo thought that the SG 1 is integral part of the IWG, there was no request to candidate for participation. Ricardo was assuming that all IWG members are participating.

> Chair: The chair confirmed that the SG1 members are all IWG members, but the leadership is provided by the leading team of the IWG, participation is open for everyone.

The chair asked for confirmation that leaders for the overarching topics are the leadership team of the IWG. This was agreed by the IWG.

Ricardo: The presented document shows the number of participants, but today it is not clear who are the participants, which institutions are participating. The names from the shown excel file would be helpful.

> Chair: The leadership team will create a clean version of the excel to be distributed at least to SG leaders with the name of the stakeholder institutions which are participating.

ICCT: ICCT again asked for clarification if all IWG members are considered for SG 1 or if participants should apply?

> Chair: SG1 will be reviewed within the whole IWG, a nomination for SG1 membership is not necessary. Overarching aspects are discussed within the whole IWG.

European Aluminium: Asked if it would still be possible to join the SGs?

> Chair: Yes. The leading team realized that May 8th was too restrictive. Nomination is till open. But it is recalled that there is a limitation of number of participants. The nomination at least for an initial phase will close on May 30th at next session. Please send candidates beforehand to prepare the meeting by the leading team.

The Chair was again appealing for leadership for SG6. This point will be again subject next week at F2F.

Japan: Japan introduced the nominated leaders personally:

- Leader for SG 2 Isao Tabushi (Honda)
- Leader for SG 5 Shoji Aoki (Nissan)

EU: The EU to name the leaders for SG 4:

- Giuseppe Di Pierro (JRC)
- Georgios Fontaras (JRC)

Break from 12:30 to 12:45 CET

Agenda Item 5: Overarching aspects

Korea presented the excel file on the level concept.

See document: A-LCA-07-03_Guidance_for_levelling_concept_Korea.xlsx

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-03_Guidance_for_levelling_concept_Korea.xlsx?api=v2

The file is showing the framework of the level concept. Column B and C is showing the SG and the corresponding life cycle stages. Then the following columns show the 4 proposed levels.

The file contains a first indications for guidelines for the SGs for each level, which have to be developed by the subgroups. Developing this matrix should be a major task for the SGs.

To come up with a guideline we need to provide first the goal and the application for the specific level. For example, the goal for level 2 for SG 2 could be the use for policy making related to OEMs. Most data within this scope would be under control of the OEM.

A guideline is always for a specific goal and a specific application.

Once the goal and the application are determined for each subgroup, then each SG can develop in detail the guidelines.

First, the goal and the application must be setup as overarching item by the IWG. When knowing how the guideline to be developed by a SG will be used, only then the detailed guidelines can be developed.

- As step 1 the level concept needs to be accepted officially.
- When agreed, the IWG needs to setup the overall goals, applications and boundaries for all levels.
- Then CP and NGOs should provide their preferences for different levels. If the CPs agree that they are interested mainly in some specific levels, then the IWG can set priorities or work simultaneously or sequential through the levels.

Proceeding like this, the SGs will have target levels and goals, they can develop guideline to fill up the matrices.

Questions / Comments:

Chair: At the end what is the goal for the SGs, what the SG should achieve or what is the application?

> Answer: The goal is what should be achieved by the approach.
> Example: Goal can be supporting technology selection or set quantitative limits for products/ monitoring of determining real GHG values for specific products.

ICCT: ICCT agrees with the need to start first with defining goal and scope as defined in ISO.

OICA: OICA appreciates the approach and the steps how to proceed as presented by Korea. OICA thinks that we can develop all levels simultaneously, this should be easy. This approach could allow fast progress.

Ricardo: Ricardo agrees with OICA's comments. Going up the levels is going more specific for the methodology. They also believe that the different levels do not specifically mean a very different application. Policy choice must be generic and robust. Going up levels changes the specificity of the approach. This is a good concept but there is a need to think of the details.

> **Korea**: Not always one approach is included in other. Level one for policy making in the

production phase may include a detailed approach for future use phase scenarios.

Ricardo: This is confusing, thought that going up the level means just more details. Policy is not only in level 1, but policy making can also require higher levels.

No further comments.

Presentation RICARDO:

Ricardo presented the uploaded presentation.

See document: A-LCA-07-04_Level Concept_Ricardo.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-04_Level%20Concept_Ricardo.pdf?api=v2

Ricardo presented some basic ideas on the level concept especially for other life cycle phase than the production phase, open for discussion.

A basic consideration is the definition of the vehicle under consideration: a typical vehicle versus a specific variant of a vehicle. A typical vehicle is good for basic technology comparison, but to answer customer expectations it is important to account for performance and characteristics under real world usage conditions.

Questions / Comments:

OICA: OICA thinks that different levels always mean that foreground and background data go in more details. Again, to define the detail level, first it is important to define the goals, then one can decide on the data detail level

Ricardo is not against this if it is possible to share this data on a safe and good manner. Although some risks exist due to different use and different testing between regions may be a barrier to this.

Presentation CLEPA

CLEPA presented its view on the level concept.

See document: A-LCA-07-05_Level Concept_CLEPA.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-05_Level%20Concept_CLEPA.pdf?api=v2

CLEPA stated that different levels are distinguished mainly by the data quality, all use the same methodology.

The scope for the IWG is the methodology and not the different applications.

Methodology and guideline are not the same. All levels should follow one methodology, they distinguish themselves in the definition of the functional unit and the data details which should be detailed in the guidelines. This requires a similar methodology for each level of the level concept while each level adds on to the previous level. The difference is then mostly based on the quality and indepthness of the required data.

Level 4 is the most detailed and sophisticated, other levels should be based on the same methodology; differentiation is given by the availability of detailed data. The guideline needs to define the data quality and detail level for a specific goal.

Questions / Comments:

OICA: OICA supports the idea that a solid core/backbone should hold for all levels.

Ricardo: Ricardo agrees with the point in the CLEPA presentation: one methodology, differentiated by detail mainly on the data (/implementation).

No more comments.

Presentation Japan

Japan presented its view.

See document: A-LCA-07-06_Level Concept_JPN.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-06_Level%20Concept_JPN.pdf?api=v2

Japan decided to support the level concept presented by Korea. But the concept needs to be in line with the ToR and its goals, this means it must help policy making and encourage automotive industry to reduce the carbon footprint. In this case, the focus on the implementation and the impact on policy decisions should be taken into account as first and foremost goal, independently of the level used.

Questions / Comments:

Co-secretary: The requirement of the ToR allows lots of interpretation, needs more discussion and analysis. As the ToR clearly states that the proposal should have impact on policies and should encourage OEM's to reduce their carbon footprint. The latter point is open for discussion and should thus be defined more precisely.

Agenda Item 6: Next steps

The chair presented the leading team vision for the next steps.

See document: A-LCA-07-07_Next steps.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-07_Next%20steps.pdf?api=v2

All IWG members should give input to the timing sheet with the list of overarching aspects and update if possible, the excel sheet.

Questions / Comments:

No comment

Agenda Item 7: Any other business

Comment from Korea: The proposed level concept was developed mainly because of issues with the availability of data. Objective is to be realistic, setting different levels.
In general, different studies are using different data quality. Discrete levels of accuracy allow to compare between studies within one level.
But the goal and the application should be set first. This helps for clarification of the limitations of the methodology for each level, for each discrete data quality level.

OICA: For next meeting already next week, is there homework to do?

Chair: It is expected from all stakeholders to provide the final name list of names for all SGs. Next meeting we will talk more about overarching aspects, if stakeholder have input,

please send it before the meeting. Participants are also invited to review Korea's proposal as this will be used as basis for next week's discussions.

Next meeting:
Next meeting will be held on May 30th in the EU offices in Geneva.

There is a limitation in the number of persons who can participate in person.
If the capacity is exceeded, please connect remotely

Agenda Item 8: Closing

The session was closed by the chair at 14:15

ANNEXE

Connected participants~~:~~ (61 participants):