

Draft meeting minutes
3th 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/ZBB-SYIS-WFT?HS=224>

Meeting documents available at:

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG6+-+3th+meeting>

Agenda

Meeting info	
Date	August 29 th 2023
Time	12:00noon - 01:00pm CEST
Venue	Online
Link	Webex: https://meet.google.com/zbb-syis-wft?hs=122&authuser=0

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-SG6-03-01	Agreement
~ 12:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-02-04	Agreement
~ 12:40	4	Scope and definitions (draft proposal) >Controversial topics list >Overview of fuels >Discussion	Chair Concawe Participants	A-LCA-SG6-03-xx A-LCA-SG6-03-xx	Presentation
~ 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. After a brief introduction, the chair proceeded to the first point on the agenda.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was approved by the participants.

Agenda item 3: Adoption of the last meeting minutes

The following comments/questions were raised by the participants:

- One participant raised the fact that Corsia is written with a ‘C’ and not an ‘S’
- JRC underlined the importance to mention them as JRC and not the EU Commission. This helps to differentiate.

Last meeting minutes were approved by the participants. The chair invited the participants to review the minutes on wiki in the future.

Agenda item 4: Scope and boundaries

Goal & objective

The chair briefly presented the identified goals and objectives of this WG. None of the members commented on this and none of the participants opposed, so this is considered as approved. *With that understanding that this can evolve over time.*

Presentation and discussion about the Fuels List

JRC briefly provide more information about their fuels and energy list and invited the other participants to comment. The following questions/remarks were raised:

- CONCAWE: Thanked JRC for this proposal and indicated that they do not have major remarks on the list. They do however believe that several questions and controversial topics might remain open. These should be tackled asap.
- Volvo underlined the importance to take into account the complexity of electricity usage and the types of timings (time in the day, lifetime, ...). This will be important as predictions will be very important.

Presentation and discussion about the Controversial Topics List

CONCAWE presented their first draft of controversial topics list. They highlighted the importance and need of solving certain boundary elements before we can complete the rest of the methodology. They mentioned the need to think about ISO14040 and the possibility to use allocations, the necessity to include intermittence due to the time-element, the questions about bi-products (consequential and/or attributional emissions) and the possibility or not to include inland use change related emissions as well. (ILUC)

- JRC thanked CONCAWE for the draft and shared some comments:
 - o Like to add one to the first point: to what extent, we will be able to use same allocation among all the fuel pathways? First answer: we won't be able to do this. Bio-based fuels. Do we need the same allocation among fuels? Yes
 - o About the second point: this is easier. We start with Level 4 (more detailed/accurate), intermittency level 4 – take real electricity mix at one location at one time. Decrease to lower levels by taking wider assumptions. Temporal considerations for electricity; real time carbon intensity of electricity based on geography and hourly-based.
 - o About the 3rd point: non-biological fuel can answer this question. Additionality ensures you are not competing with already establish renewable sources.

- About the 4th point: the trickiest one. Consequential; we have to work on attributional; CORCIA methodology; we used attributional.
- NGVA: We don't understand about the first point about the last sentence.
 - Referring to ISO is not suitable? Can you clarify?
- CONCAWE: complying with ISO standards is not common.
 - We did not allocate to oil products.
 - Use system expansion to include all (from the refining process?)
 - IPCC, one of the US agencies

Agenda Item 5: Timeline

Based on general feeling and ongoing activities, the chair presented a broad timeline for the coming months. The following timing has been approved:

- September-December 2023:
 - Approve goals and objectives
 - Agree on fuels list and methodologies
 - Finalize and solve controversial topics
- January-March 2024:
 - Agree and draft methodology-ies
- April-Summer 2024:
 - Draft, discuss and agree on draft methodology for fuels & energy

Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing

AOB: Questions to IWG: Where do we the system boundary and cut-off point between fuel and energy SG and other subgroups (SG3 and 4) Exp. Charging equipment, fuel station, infrastructure.

- Which leveling approach should we take (compared with other SG)?

CONCAWE: Open questions are good; there are some controversial issues; holistic approach.

CLEPA/VITESCO: Support level 4 development as most data are available.

CONCAWE: Suggest Level 1 or 2 as we try to investigate methodology but not LCA. Controversial issue is on precision not on accuracy.

NGVA: starting level 4 or level 1. Start with level 4 first.

CONCAWE: disagree; controversial topics are more related to level 1; level 4 is more detailed.

JRC: Allocation topic is the same for level 1, 2, 3, and 4. Do we need to choose level? I tried to explain in the last meeting but that may have not been clear; level 4 is more complex and representative/accurate. It should have the lowest emissions on GHG emissions; incentivize level 4 approach; level 1 is the worst-case scenario – world geographical – less complex/accurate. Allocation, we use the same allocation between level 1 and level 4.

CLEPA/VITESCO: agree with Anne. Land use; level 4 is more temporal and geographical level; what is application area and how to integrate the data; classic fuel and electricity as

electricity is variable with time; refinery has a less variability. Many points to decide for electricity.

CONCAWE: If we go with Level 4, we are okay with level 1 through 3. I will be okay even if we decide to go with level 4. Harmonize or improve the methodology.

CHAIR: controversial questions apply to level 1 and level 4; argue to target level 4; but need to align/discuss with SG/IWG.

VOLVO: regarding level; different methodologies for different levels are needed (e.g., time of electricity use).

--

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

The chair formally thanked the participants and closed the meeting.

ANNEXES

Participants list:

People X

IN MEETING

Contributors 23 ^

S	Seunggu Kang (Lu... (You) ⋮	⋮
	AECT eu 🔊	⋮
A	Alberto Castagnini 🔊	⋮
A	Anne Bouter 🔊	⋮
D	David Weiner/ Volvo Cars 🔊	⋮
E	Eunji Yoo 🔊	⋮
F	Francois Cuenot 🔊	⋮
G	Gustav Krantz 🔊	⋮
	Hanno Bachler 🔊	⋮
H	Hans Nuglisch 🔊	⋮
I	ICCT - Georg Bieker 🔊	⋮

I	ICCT - Georg Bieker 🔊	🔊	⋮
J	Julien Garcia (IFPEN - FR) 🔊	🔊	⋮
J	Juliette Quartararo (OIC... 🔊	🔊	⋮
K	Kwang-kuk Cho 🔊	🔊	⋮
k	kyungju Jeon 🔊	🔊	⋮
M	Marco Raugei (RICARDO) ⋮	⋮	⋮
M	Matthieu Goy 🔊	🔊	⋮
R	Reino MEZAKI 🔊	🔊	⋮
	Romain Denayer Meeting host ⋮	⋮	⋮
S	Seunghyun Ha_OICA 🔊	🔊	⋮
S	Stefan Still 🔊	🔊	⋮
s	suzuki (JP/JARI) 🔊	🔊	⋮
T	Tetsuya Suzuki 🔊	🔊	⋮