

Draft meeting minutes

2nd Session of the Subgroup 4 (Usage Phase)

of the IWG on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Google Meet:

[HTTPS://MEET.GOOGLE.COM/JPJ-DKYB-EWY?HS=224](https://meet.google.com/JPJ-DKYB-EWY?HS=224)

Meeting documents available at:

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG4+-+2nd+meeting>

Agenda

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose or Target
01:00 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chair	NA	Introduction
~ 13:10	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-02-01	Agreement
~ 13:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-01	Agreement
~ 13	4	Scope and definitions (draft proposal) >Presentation(s) from members >Group discussion	Chair TBC Participants	A-LCA-SG4-02-02 TBC	Presentation
~ 13:50	5	Timeline	Participants	NA	Agreement
~ 13:55	6	Any other business	Participants	NA	Notification
~ 14:00	7	Closing	Chair	NA	Closing

Meeting

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair welcomes the participants to the 1st SG4 meeting and provided some overview of the main topics for today's meeting. In addition, the chair presented the agenda.

Agenda item 2: Approve agenda

The agenda was approved by the participants.

Agenda item 3: Adoption of the last meeting minutes

GREEN EURONCAP: Page 2 and 3 asked for changes

- Page 2: Change a position/wording with regard to
- Page 3: Instead of penalizing, this should be

RICARDO: Levelling concept should allow comparison but this should be able to compare in nominal numbers. (last point of page 2) You should acknowledge the differences while allow compare with very limited elements.

George (OICA): Comparing between the levels makes no sense, but this should not be the case.

Hans (CLEPA): This depends on what you call comparability and how you include this into the discussion. A priori, for us, you can't compare between different levels as these levels will take into account different parts.

Agenda item 4: Scope and boundaries

Presentation from Japan:

Japan presented a few slides as discussion starter for this subgroup meeting. Japan's proposal links data sources (with proposed approach) with the the ToR and its different authorities and OEM motivation. Japan (Nick san) suggested that the use phase parameters should be region specific and contracting parties should decide.

CLEPA: CLEPA (Hans) suggest that the used phase should use the same methodology and not compulsory same drive cycle. Level 4 can be use of real world region specific data. Guideline can suggest use of OBFCM data or so.

Chair: Understands the presentation and finds it an interesting approach. However, there are some reservations but this is EU specific. EU agrees that implementation should be regional but odd that same vehicle will show different values. May be we should find a way to compare.

ICCT: We have two questions: the lifetime milage is up to another subgroup? Who? Suggests to include different powertrains as basic factor.

Japan: Lifetime and distance is not for us to consider but for the CP to consider. With regard to the discrepancy factor, we do not have powertrain values in Japan. This is very different between regions, countries and CP's.

ICCT: Mentioned that the methodology should take into account the lifetime in the registration country but should also take into account lifetime outside the registration country.

Green NCAP : Outcome can be an equation and each region can adjust according to regional situation.

RICARDO: With regards to slides 2-4: we should also include: (1) GHG emissions not directly related to fuel consumption - i.e. fugitive emissions/leakage (e.g. CH4 from gas vehicles, H2 from hydrogen vehicles), or from emissions aftertreatment (e.g. N2O). (2) Emissions resulting from use of Urea in SCR systems (direct emissions, plus production of Urea); (3) other aspects besides remaining parts (i.e. consumed fluids, etc.).

Chair: Similar vehicle with similar uses should result in similar results.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-02-04 Discussion starter Japan](#)

Chair: Quickly presented the slides that the co-chairs presented. The chair summarised the scope ('In-use consumption' (including charging efficiency), service life , regular consumption, maintenance) and ask for comments.

Samarendra presented the chairs view:

- Need to define which vehicle types we want to include
- Need define the service line (OEM or default)
- Need to define the powertrain for energy consumption and the frequency of maintenance
- Need to afterwards identify when and where testing systems exist
- Which values do we want to include into the methodology? The idea here is to have an exhaustive list in order to not have diverging results:
 - o ICCT propose to discuss energy efficiency topic also with SG6. ICCT also propose to define life time use (duration and not only distance)
 - o Ricardo suggested to include other greenhouse gas leakage should be included (methane, H2 etc.) . NGVA Europe asked what kind of leakage (combustion or storage). Ricardo clarifies that its storage only. In addition, Ricardo suggested that SCR should also be included.
 - o Green NCAP suggested to use some dependent factors such as more lubrication oil consumption or other consumption. Green NCAP mentioned that if we don't include these factors and battery durability, than methodology can be criticized. Chair propose to keep this as open issue.
 - o Chair suggested not to include durability of different devices (battery durability) at this stage.

At the end, the Chair also proposed a way of work for the coming months/weeks:

- Agree on a timeline and schedule for the coming months, with 1,5h meetings
 - o Chair: suggested to have 2 meetings in September
 - o Chair: One meeting per month will be needed

Members raised several topics that should be included into the discussion.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-02-02 Draft proposal chair](#)

Agenda Item 5: Next steps & next meeting

Based on preferences and availabilities, the chair and participants agreed that the next SG meeting will be held twice in September and afterwards, one meeting per month will be considered.











































Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing

The chair invited the participants to share their additional topics/remarks. None were raised.

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

ANNEXES

Participants list:

 Romain Denayer Your presentation		⋮	 ICCT - Georg Bieker		⋮
 Alberto Castagnini		⋮	 Nikolas Hill		⋮
 Damyanov / Green NCAP		⋮	 NORIYUKI ICHIKAWA		⋮
 Dirk Bosteels		⋮	 sam t		⋮
 Duc-Nam LUU, HUTCHI...		⋮	 Seunghyun Ha_OICA		⋮
 Filippo Lachina		⋮	 Shinichiro Takada		⋮
 Francois Cuenot		⋮	 Tetsuya Suzuki		⋮
 Fundu C. Ertem Kappler		⋮	 Tetsuya SUZUKI (JPIJARI)		⋮
 George Bedenian		⋮	 TSUYAMA		⋮
 Georgios Fontaras		⋮			
 Giuseppe Di Pierro		⋮			
 Hans Nuglisch		⋮			