# Draft meeting minutes 2nd Session of the Subgroup 6 (Fuel & Energy Cycle)

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

#### **Google Meet:**

HTTPS://MEET.GOOGLE.COM/IKZ-XDJT-NVN?HS=224

## Meeting documents available at:

https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG6+-+2nd+meeting

## **Agenda**

Meeting info				
Date	July 11 <sup>th</sup> 2023			
Time	12:00noon - 01:00pm CEST			
Venue	Online			
Link	Webex: https://meet.google.com/ikz-xdjt-nvn?hs=224			

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose
					or Target
12:00 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chair	NA	Introduction
~ 12:10	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-02-01	Agreement
~ 12:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-01	Agreement
~ 12:40	4	Scope and definitions (draft proposal)	Chair		Presentation
		>Overview of fuels	TBC	A-LCA-SG6-02-02	
		>Discussion	Participants		
~ 12:50	5	Timeline	Participants	NA	Agreement
~ 12:55	6	Any other business	Participants	NA	Notification
~ 13:00	7	Closing	Chair	NA	Closing

#### Meeting

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

The chair welcomed the participants. The chair indicated that the wiki for this SG was finally launched.

# Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was approved by the participants.

# Agenda item 3: Adoption of the last meeting minutes

Last meeting minutes were approved by the participants. The chair invited the

participants to review the minutes on wiki in the future.

The chair reminded the participants that the SG agreed last time that the target level for this SG is level 4. This requires the identification of all fuel types and methodologies.

#### Agenda item 4: Scope and boundaries

<u>Presentation by the chair:</u> The chair presented a first draft of a spreadsheet that he prepared. Amongst others, the chair mentioned the following elements:

- Existing methodologies linked to certain fuel types, limitations, boundaries, scope level 4, what emissions related to production, transport, storage (if any), leakage, land-use, and/or any other emissions. Also added possibility to write down other considerations – electricity how far do we go? Do we consider the construction of wind turbines or other infrastructure construction?
- Preliminary remarks: 3 other levels what considerations for levels 1, 2, and 3. DO we miss any expertise?
- Review different types of fuel; do we miss any fuel types?

See document(s): A-LCA-SG6-02-02 Draft fuel list.xlsx

#### Preliminary questions and remarks:

- Ricardo: Why diesel/biodiesel on Petrol? Biodiesel and ethanol under biofuel category.
- <u>EU Commission (JRC)</u>: Recommend the overarching title: gasoline/diesel pool – lower level, gasoline and gasoline substitute, biodiesel substitute.
- <u>Ricardo</u>: Separate category gasoline, diesel but if this is done this way, ethanol should be under each.
- <u>Chair</u>: may be the same for electricity; there are different sources of electricity; within that category, there are other sources. Sources and then product
- Ricardo: fuels for auto cycle engine, diesel cycle engine more accurate, then petrol gasoline, ethanol, synthetic,...
- <u>Chair:</u> There is no need to have an overarching title. Have all types of fuel; just consider product; different ways of producing the fuels.
- ICCT: Intensity of carbon changes depending on where they are from.
   Biodiesel from different sources may affect the carbon intensity.
  - Ricardo: Hydrogen is the same (source may affect carbon intensity)
  - ICCT: Need to combine fuel pathways for electricity.
- <u>EU Commission (JRC)</u>: Split biofuel, biodiesel, ethanol biodiesel is one sub-category but the system boundaries of conventional biodiesel, biodiesel from biostock/biomass are different.
- Alberto Castagnini: There are a lot of pathways.

2<sup>nd</sup> SG6 meeting on LCA, 11 July 2023

- Concawe: everything that is not controversial is already in the literature –
  we do not do anything about that; we should focus on addressing on the
  methodology.
- <u>Chair:</u> limitations for each fuel type; work first on fuel type then going to the details of controversial methodologies; may be good to have some overview as not everyone is familiar;
  - <u>Concawe:</u> Controversial points are land use change, substitution, and/or multi-functionality; did not mean to spoil the discussion.
  - Chair: Allowing do redefine certain methodologies or is that not the case?

#### **Group discussion:**

- <u>CLEPA:</u> agree with a list of everything; European study well accepted by industry; what about other regions?
- o ICCT: US also considered (EPA); Brazil, Japan also referred to the US.
- Concawe: Any methodologies in JRC?
- ICCT: No, but need to decide within the SG. Methodologies are controversial.
- <u>EU Commission (JRC)</u>: Commenting on the JRC study; a bit old study; not sure when to meet the deadline; allocation choice is substitution – not sure whether we agree with this allocation choice.
  - <u>Chair:</u> Good to list energy pathway by the JRC study please share it. We can get this approved by the IWG in addition to this SG.
- Concawe: focus on harmonizing the methodology.
- ICCT: JRC study discussed electricity pathway. Also combining pathways; land-use, projected change
- Chair: mixture of pathways from different sources; let's finalize the list, have it approved on IWG on 9/7/2023. Need 5 minutes.
- Concawe: Any discussion on indirect land use? How do you take care of that?
  - <u>ICCT:</u> we may need to just determine whether we include this or not; refer to the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA) framework.
  - <u>EU Commission (JRC)</u>: two frameworks in use in which we need to define thresholds – take a midpoint between the two modeling teams.
  - <u>Chair:</u> were you discussing land-use emissions? Referring to the ToR.
     Land use emissions can be expressed in GHG emissions?
    - ICCT: land use change emissions not just land use; natural vegetation – loss of bio carbon stock
    - Chair: moving on general discussion on system boundary; share the comment on fuel with different pathway to produce those fuels; controversial points – can we list those?
  - o Concawe: few suggestions on controversial points; substitution how do

we do? how to model intermittency; average or marginal? compare determining products and by-products – how to compare with functional unit; these are some examples of controversial points.

- <u>Chair:</u> proposed that other participants can share on Wiki; finalize the list of fuels; identify methodology for fuel pathway; agree on methodology.
  - o ICCT: scope of energy use (during production)?
  - Chair: do they include it in their analysis? This is to be discussed in the IWG as it is relevant to other SGs. Boundary across different SGs.
  - <u>EU Commission (JRC)</u>: geographical scope is important; if we begin with level 4 – more complex, representative but time-consuming; less carbon intensity; level 3 – national or regional, or assembly of countries (relative less accurate); level 2 based on market scope (US, Europe, Asia, etc.); level 1 – global market.
  - Chair: It makes sense for me. Level 4 for electricity is from your power outlet – very local.
  - David W (<u>Volvo</u>): goes back to allocation; storage of electricity in battery from various sources; use phase is different from energy phase.
  - o Chair: energy phase rather than use phase.

## Agenda Item 5: Next steps & next meeting

Based on the discussion, the chair highlighted the following actions:

- Listing of the fuel sources based on the JRC documents
- Identification by CONCAWE of the main controversial points
- Listing of questions which we would like to raise to the A-LCA IWG

In addition, the members agreed to organise the next meeting on 29 August from 12:00-13:00 CEST.

# Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing

The chair repeated the open positions for the secretariat of this subgroup.

No additional comments or remarks were raised.

The chair formally thanked the participants and closed the meeting.

#### **ANNEXES**

#### **Participants list:**

