

Draft meeting minutes
8th Session of the Informal Working Group
on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Hybrid meeting

Venue:

European Delegation building, Room C
Rue de Grand-Pre 66, Geneva, Switzerland
30 May 2023, 14:30 to 17:30 CET

Meeting documents available at:

[A-LCA 8th session - Transport - Vehicle Regulations - UNECE Wiki](#)

Agenda

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Meeting Documents*	Purpose or Target
14:30 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chairs	NA	Information sharing
~ 14:35	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chairs	A-LCA-08-01	Agreement
~ 14:40	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Secretariat	A-LCA-07-08	Agreement
~15:00	4	Subgroup structure ✓ confirm Leaders and Participants ✓ SG activities, if available	Chairs		Information sharing
~16:15	5	Overarching Aspects ✓ Level Concept ✓ Image of Goals ✓ Update the “to-do-list”	All	A-LCA-06-09 A-LCA-07-03/04/05/6 + New documents ⁺	Discussion
Break					
~17:00	5	Overarching Aspects _continue	All		Discussion
~17:20		Next Actions (IWG and SGs) including meeting schedule	All		Information sharing
~17:25		Any other business	All	NA	Notification
~17:30		Closing	Chairs	NA	Closing

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The meeting was switched from teams to Webex due to technical problems in the meeting room. Meeting started at 14:45, the chair apologizes for the technical problems. 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-08-01r1

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674736/A-LCA-08-01r1_draft%20Agenda.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented and reviewed the meeting minutes of last IWG WebEx session (7th session of 23 May 2023). The document was posted on wiki.

No comment.

Meeting Minutes adopted.

See document: A-LCA-07-08_Draft_Meeting_Minutes.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674003/A-LCA-07-08_Draft_Meeting_minutes.pdf?api=v2

Agenda Item 4: Subgroup structure

Presentation/documentation

The chair started with an introduction of the status of the IWG structure.

He stated that the subgroup leaders were already announced and the subgroup member-lists were distributed to the sub-group leaders.

The deadline for nomination of sub-group participants expired, but if new members or experts are needed new applications can be sent. If SGs need more experts SG leader should inform the IWG leading team to assign new members and check their affiliation/ECOSOC accreditation.

Questions / Comments:

Chair: Confirmation that even after last status was circulated, new members can still be requested by SG leaders.

JP proposed to be SG 5 leader together with China, would the first coordination meeting be arranged by leading team?

Chair: A coordination meeting was thought to clarify who is leading the sub-group. In this case JP and China team discussed already. It was agreed that JP is leader, China co-leader. The SG can start directly without an additional coordination meeting arranged by the IWG.

China confirmed that China will be Co-leader of SG 5.

Chair: The chair was concluding that all SG leaders are defined, and all list of subgroups were distributed last week. All SG can start working.

Agenda Item 5: Overarching aspects

A. Presentation/documentation

The chair invites Korea to open this agenda point with its presentation.

Prof. Song presented the document available on the wiki page.

See document: A-LCA-08-03_ Clarification on level concept idea_Korea.pdf

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674736/A-LCA-08-03_Clarification%20on%20level%20concept%20idea_Korea.pdf?api=v2

Prof. Song started to remind the objectives of the ToR and the objective to balance between accuracy and workload. A compromise has to be found between a simplified LCA with limited usefulness and a full LCA which will be difficult to implement.

He recalled the basic level concept already presented in last meeting:

- Level 1: mostly fuel cycle oriented using a simplified vehicle, useful for some policy making and research
- Level 2: focus on OEM manageable scope, the level 2 is the starting point for dealing with real vehicle
- Level 3: Level 3 is expanding level 2 into supply chain variations and regional data
- Level 4: This is the ideal case, possible only if the entire value chain primary database is available.

Slide 4 illustrates the fact that the results issued from LCA studies based on different levels cannot be compared. Discrete levels must be defined to allow comparison from different studies.

Slide 5 illustrates the concept that the final product carbon footprint rules (PCR) should be one rulebook with different guidelines for the different levels.

Prof. Song proposes following next steps:

- Step 1: IWG decision on accepting the principle of the level concept
- Step 2: Decision on the expectations for the different levels, initial goals and applications (up to change under SG's work)
- Step 3: SG start working on the guidelines, this could be an iterative process between the SGs and the IWG ensuring the coherence of the overarching aspects between SGs.

Questions / Comments:

Comment from chair: Step 2 would be that CP should decide on their objectives, their applications. But this is not possible as the levels are not defined.

EPA: EPA asks for clarification. Are the levels defined for the entire LCA or only for the production phase? The document seems heavily weighted towards manufacturing, how does it fit to the whole LCA?

Prof. Song: The levels are applicable for all LCA phases, see the Ricardo presentation from last IWG meeting for some initial ideas. It is true that here the example is more for manufacturing oriented.

EPA: Thanks for clarification. Looking through document it looked like manufacturing only.

Japan: Which LCA phases do you talk about? OEM could have primary data for manufacturing, how to define primary data for use phase?

Prof. Song: Ricardo was dealing with this question in their presentation. The answer should be developed for different phases in the respective sub-groups.

Japan: We should discuss the topics for the level concept within the overarching items.

US EPA: EPA stays with its initial position communicated at the first Workshop.

EPA supports the IWG if a true LCA methodology is developed covering all LCA phases.

EPA does not support an activity producing interim results, for example only for production.

A single phase result is not telling the whole story. EPA supports LCA methodology, not a carbon footprint only method.

Prof. Song confirms that the level concept for LCA covers all life cycle stages.

Prof. Song came back to Korea xls file from the 7th IWG meeting.

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 xls illustrates the matrix for the guidelines to be developed, with a row for each LCA phase and the columns for the discrete levels. The question is how to define a mixed match between phases, for example a level 2 matched with level 4 from other phases. In other words, the question arises what to do when you mix different levels for different SG/life cycle part. This is still to be developed.

The most appropriate match is to be decided by CPs as function of the usage objective or application. It has to be kept in mind, that for an LCA result to be comparable, the same levels for each phase have to be used for the different studies. Details to be discussed and determined later.

Important: Only same levels can only be compared; this needs discrete level definitions.

Many open questions to be clarified by SG 2 to SG 6.

Questions / Comments:

Chair is asking CPs if they are ready to make a decision on the level concept. The IWG needs the opinion from CPs. The alternative is to let SGs start work and CPs review later on.

Two options to continue: CP preference on level, or start work and select later

EPA: It is not yet clear how to use the outcome. First it is important that the columns of the xls are filled out, then CPs can make a decision. Filling in the gaps for the other parts of the life cycle should then help to make an informed decision. It is difficult to make a recommendation if the details are not yet known.

Chair: It seems that the preference of CPs is to start tasks by SGs to provide more details on different levels. Today we have leaders and members, so the SGs can start. We will review later.

EPA: If each column is fully developed some idea how to use can be given, for example for consumer information. Perhaps to be decided by IWG and not by SG.

IWG secretariat: Should each SG develop the goals? SGs should propose the definitions, not the goal.

Chair: Having the definition helps to define the goals like shown in table

OICA: EPA's statement is clear; we need all phases. But do we need same level for each phase? Level one useless for some, level 4 not achievable in timescale.

Question: Where is shipping between locations taken in account?

OICA: shipping is part of supply chain and production, covered in SG 3

OICA: The question which level is preferable to the CPs is still open. What is the objective should be answered first, then the level can be defined to serve the application the CP wants.

If there is no opinion on applications from the CPs, the SGs start to define the levels and the CPs can decide afterwards what application can be suitable. As no one objected, the IWG agreed that the SG's would further define this and identify how each of these levels could be applied.

Coffee break

Decision on Level Concept:

The level concept presented by Korea is agreed as basic principle.

Details have to be developed by Sub-groups and IWG.

B. Status of SG 3 initiation from SG 3 chair

Korea as SG 3 leader invites China to the leading team.

**IWG chairs confirms the leading team for SG 3 as:
Leader Korea, three co-leaders CLEPA, OICA and China.**

The IWG chair asks the SGs to consider the deadline set by the ToR, and proceed within the SGs the discussion which level can be achieved in timeframe.

SGs should define which level the SG wants to achieve and when.

Action item:

Two questions are asked to the SGs, answering these is as first task:

1. Which level is targeted within the deadline. Question to each SG
2. Which level should finally be achieved and when? Question to all SGs

CLEPA: The group is still confusing methodology and application. Methodology can be done in the time frame, the application and data collection of is for a later timeframe Timing not the problem for the methodology development. Lower levels are a simplification of the more detailed higher level approach. If all start with the most detailed one, simplifying is easy. CLEPA suggests that all start with developing level 4, this would be the most effective process.

But we have to consider that the application of level 4 is not possible in 2025, but the methodology development can be done until 2025. SGs should start to work all on level 4. Then in a next step, the application can be developed.

Chair : Is this meant only for the production phase?

CLEPA: This approach hold for all phases

Comment from Japan: CP cannot identify target level currently. Need to define which level can be achieved in 2025.

Prof Song: We are not in the position to define which level can be used for which application. SGs can come up with ideas which level can be proposed. SGs develop the matrix, to be discussed and aligned then within the IWG.

CLEPA: The purpose is not to provide all data in 2025. The objective is to provide the methodology. CLEPA (Hans) underlined that it is a methodology and requires the hypothesis that the data will at one stage in time be available (in level 4).

OICA: It is important to know why we do this. This need to be given by CPs.

EPA: EPA will take an action item. EPA will provide its vision for what different levels can be used and to what can they apply.

Chair: Is it possible to have only one methodology? Is it possible having same boundary conditions?

Prof. Song: Example Level 2 and 3 will use different databases. Different levels have different goals and scope. Level 2 is excluding supply chain but uses generic data. This is completely different than level 4 with completely different boundaries, here the supply chain included. Different goal and scope means to me that this is a different methodology.

Chair: We agreed on applying the level concept, but it is still difficult to understand the details. We need more time as IWG and more guidance from SGs.

As Leading team we consider a Webex before summer. Until then it is agreed that the SG proceed to provide more guidance for the level concept. Review of status before the summer break.

C. OICA presentation

OICA presents the file available on the wiki page.

See document: A-LCA-08-02_Level concept_OICA.ppt

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674736/A-LCA-08-02_Level%20Concept_OICA.pdf?api=v2

OICA summarized on two slides their input to the overarching aspects. See the slides for details.

- OICA considers that it is necessary to add the objectives for the methodology.
- The definition of the vehicle model should be added.
- Secondary functions like charging need to be added.
- The system boundaries and EoL allocation are still missing

Questions / Comments:

Chair: The chair stated that the topic needs more discussion. The chair mentioned also that Ricardo has sent a presentation, but Ricardo was not able to join the meeting.

IWG members are asked to review the Ricardo file until next session.

See document: A-LCA-08-04_Hierarchy of Overarching aspects_Ricardo.xlsx

https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/198674736/A-LCA-08-04_Hierarchy%20of%20Overarching%20aspects_Ricardo.xlsx?api=v2

No additional comments for overarching comments

Ricardo's presentation, whom is not present today, will be added to the Wiki and members are invited to review the document by next time.

Agenda Item 6: Next steps

IWG chair: The leading team plans to hold an IWG web session before summer holidays

Decision:

Next IWG Webex 10/07 11h30 CET (Monday)

Next F2F and hybrid IWG meeting:

October 17th and 18th in Brussels, co-hosted by CLEPA/VERE/ACEA and AECC

One Webex-meeting will be considered in September.

Action items:

- EPA will provide its vision for what different levels can be used and to what can they apply.
- SG leaders have SG member list, SGs should start to work.
- SGs are asked to provide more concrete guidance concerning leveling concept, to be reviewed in IWG Webex

Two questions are asked to the SGs, answering these is as first task:

- Which level is targeted within the deadline. Question to each SG
- Which level should finally be achieved and when? Question to all SGs

The session was closed at 17:30

Agenda item 7: Any Other Business

No comments were raised.

Agenda item 8: Closing

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

ANNEXE

In person participants list (39 participants):

A-LCA 8th session		
30 May 2023		
NAME	ORGANISATION	SIGNATURE
Charyung KIM	KATRE	
PATRONE GIAN-LUCA	JRC	Gian Luca Patrone
PAFFUMI ELENA	EC JRC	Elena Paffumi
Zhang Tongzhu	CATARC	张彤宇 Zhang Tongzhu
Chang Yanming	CATARC	常彦明 Chang Yanming
Chen Ji	VW AG	
Coleman William	VW AG	W. Coleman
Helmut Fritz	BHU/OICA	Helmut Fritz
Podina Erika	OICA	
RAUCH Martin	CLEPA/Schaeffler	
Arisuki Kiyonagi	OICA	
Matthew Cox	Australia	
Per Othman	Sweden	
Michael Oechiw	USEPA	
Adam Dack	UK	
Dirk Bosters	AEC	
Jacques Demuyck	AEC	
Tetsuya SUZUKI	Japan, Jasic	鈴木 徹也
Isao Tabushi	Japan, Jasic	田部 伊生
TOMOTA TIZUMA	Japan, MLIT	戸島 知哉
Makoto TANIKURA	Japan, MLIT	谷本 真
LAHINA FILIPPO	OICA	Filippo Lahina

NAME	ORGANISATION	SIGNATURE
Bruno L. PIRA	OICA	
Rob Cuelenaere	NL-TNO	
Thomas Fehrer	NL-TNO	
Etienne COLLET	FR-UTAC	
Christophe PETITJEAN	CLEPA - Valeo	
August Christ	CLEPA - Bosch	
Hwan soo CHONG	S. Korea, NIER	洪完洙
Andrey Kozlov	NAMI - Russia	
ALBERTO CASTAGNINI	NGVA EUROPE	Alberto Castagnini
Jongseon LIM	KOREA	정세원 LIM
Alexey Terenchenko	NAMI Russia	
José OLIVEIRA	CLEPA - DENSO	
Sari NISHIMURA	OICA - TME	佐里
Suhan Park	KOREA (Korea Univ.)	Suban Park
Suhaz Joshi	Continental India.	Suhaz Joshi
LESON Guay	ELCC	

Online participants list (70 participants):

