

Draft meeting minutes
4th 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/ZUD-RMHE-ICX?HS=224](https://meet.google.com/zud-rmhe-icx?hs=224)

Meeting documents available at:

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG6+-+4th+meeting>

Agenda

Meeting info	
Date	September 21 st 2023
Time	12:00noon - 01:30pm CEST
Venue	Online
Link	Webex: https://meet.google.com/zud-rmhe-icx?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-SG6-04-01	Agreement
~ 12:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	NA	Agreement
~ 12:40	4	Scope and definitions (draft proposal) >Open questions & IWG answers >Overview of fuels >>JRC >>NGVA Europe >Controversial topics list >Discussion	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-04-02 A-LCA-SG6-03-04 A-LCA-SG6-04-03 A-LCA-SG6-03-03	Presentation
~ 12:55	5	Any other business	Participants	NA	Notification
~ 13:00	6	AOB & 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 chair excused himself for not sending through the latest version of the minutes. He indicated that he will make sure to have them finished and validated during next meeting.

Agenda item 4: Scope and boundaries

Open questions to the IWG A-LCA:

- Chair presented the different answers and, based on Hans's remark, indicated that he will reach out to the different relevant SG's.
- Hans underlined the importance to also solve certain problems directly

CEFIC: What kind of data and what type of granularity

JRC: Remarked that the slides on Wiki are the wrong ones.

JRC: Send an e-mail this morning RED or JEC methodology. JRC proposes that they propose it during the next SG6 meeting.

NGVA: Agrees that the JRC proposal on RED and/or JEC (version 5) as very relevant. So they believe that this is the bases of the discussion. Also important to include all types of pathways.

- Important to include all CBM-methods and their different impacts depending on the type of natural gas pathways.
- How to consider this for each type of vehicle? And should we include all of them in the evaluation.
- CLEPA we should have this discussion between SG4 and SG6, and not only SG6 as this is linked to the usage. (regional, countries, ...) With as again the most important question the future outlooks.
- JRC wanted to be sure that we all align that we should asses all the fuels and energy carriers. Being to detailed might be an issue and thus favours the work through technological hot spots. Amongst which electricity, biogas, agricultural crops, ... But focus on the high-level methodology.
- CEFIC: There are very important differences in types of fuels and the granularity is important for the analysis. With each time very different results and impacts on GHG-emissions.

- JRC understood that this is not the good but that there should be a common default methodology without having specific numbers attributed.
- NGVA agrees and would suggest to simplify but at the same time to not miss anything. And should also include the possibility to have
- JRC, there are a lot of differences between how and which emissions are included by the good boundary conditions.
- CLEPA agrees that we do not need to generate the data. But the list from NGVA should be based on the distribution region. Each and every type should be in the database, but the mix on the market should also be taken into account here.
- CONCAWE: Most important methodological question of the blend coming from different fuel stocks which has been discussed in the controversial topics list. Goal of SG6 is not to make a new methodology but to align the different methodologies. LCA already exists in the methodology.
- JRC wondered if there are other approaches to the REDII and JRC. CEFIC indicated that different

The Chair proposed to set up the excel-list to a shared location for participants

- NGVA wondered if the transmission-losses, charging-losses, ... should be included.
- JRC wondered if we should solve the points related to the controversial topics list. Trying to identify the hot spots.

CEFIC: Wondered if we should structure it around the different types of SCOPE EMISSIONS. CLEPA underlined that scope 2 & 3 are only for corporate publications and scope 1 for the product. So it will depend of the goal and usage of the methodology in the future.

Chair moved the discussion to the controversial topics list

- CONCAWE underlined the importance of having some consensus on these open topics as they will help the development of a
- JRC would like to underline that we do not agree with the ISO-standards as mentioned in the list now and raised several other questions.
SG6 agreed to remove the first 'controversial topics'.
- CLEPA underlined the need to include the average as this will also be necessary for the future. The average should be a forward-looking one.
- CEFIC argued in favour of carbon capture and storage.
- CONCAWE agrees and suggest to remove point one. In addition, Gustav wondered who will use the methodology and why.
- NGVA agrees with Hans for the fuels and that regional values are needed. With regard to the future fuels, this should be taken into consideration separately.
- The Chair will put this on the shared location to also add comments and remarks.

JRC wondered if SG6 will present during the meeting in October. Also for certain timed questions where the alignment should be raised towards the other SG's and the IWG in order to address this point.

Agenda item 5: AOB & Closing

Next meetings have been scheduled on 12 and 19 October 2023.

Transmitted by SG6 secretariat

Informal document: LCA-SG6-04-04
4th SG6 meeting on LCA, 21 September 2023

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:

IN MEETING

Contributors		19	^
	Romain Denayer (You) Meeting host		
	Romain Denayer Your presentation		
	(탄소중립연구원)손세미		
	AECC eu		
	Alberto Castagnini		
	Anne Bouter		
	Dirk Bosteels		
	Eunji Yoo		
	Francois Cuenot		
	Frédéric Aertsens (CEFI...)		
	Frédéric Aertsens (CEFI...)		
	Gustav Krantz		
	Hans Nuglisch		
	JAPAN Reino Mezaki		
	Julien Garcia (IFPEN - FR)		
	kyungju Jeon		
	Louis Bernaert		
	Matthieu Goy		
	Seungho kim		
	SUZUKI Tesuya (JP/JARI)	