

## Draft meeting minutes

### 4th 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/MMX-DRMJ-VRK?AUTHUSER=0&HS=122>

#### Meeting documents available at:

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG4+-+4th+meeting>

### Agenda

Meeting info	
Date	October 10 <sup>th</sup> 2023
Time	11:00am – 12:30pm CET
Venue	Online
Link	<a href="HTTPS://MEET.GOOGLE.COM/MMX-DRMJ-VRK?AUTHUSER=0&amp;HS=122">Google Meet Link</a>

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose or Target
11:00 ~	1	Welcome and introduction	Chair	NA	Introduction
~ 11:05	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-04-01	Agreement
~ 11:10	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-03-07	Agreement
~ 11:20	4	Presentation by Riccardo	Riccardo	A-LCA-SG4-04-02 A-LCA-SG4-04-03 A-LCA-SG4-04-06	Presentation
~ 11:30	5	OICA presentation/feedback/proposal	OICA	A-LCA-SG4-04-07 A-LCA-SG4-04-08 A-LCA-SG4-04-09	Presentation
~ 12:25	6	Consolidated proposal Scope & Definitions >Group discussion	Chair Participants	A-LCA-SG4-04-05	Presentation
~ 12:30	7	Any other business & Closing	Participants	NA	Closing

### Meeting

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

The chair welcomes the participants to the 4<sup>th</sup> SG4 meeting and provided some overview of the main topics for today's meeting. In addition, the chair presented the agenda.

The chair excused the participants for the late start. This is due to technical issues and problems.

### **Agenda item 2: Approve agenda**

The agenda was approved by the participants.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-04-01 Draft AgendaV2.pdf](#)

### **Agenda item 3: Adoption of the last meeting minutes**

MLIT: Asked for two amendments to the minutes:

- “And Japan supports the boundaries as suggested by JRC, with maintenance is also included in the disposal phase.”
- “Japan suggests that each CP should define”

Approved.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-03-07 Draft Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

### **Agenda item 4: Presentation by Ricardo**

Ricardo had several questions and remarks following last SG-meeting. Ricardo asked/suggested if:

- Is it possible to bring additional clarifications to the JRC proposal?
- Inclusion of battery degradation should be included as the loss in efficiency of fuel cells should be included as well.
- Ricardo wonders if the equivalence mix will be possible. It is a nice idea but hard to realise.
- Ricardo suggest to think the possibility to have all vehicle cycles in the overview.
- With regards to the levelling concept, Ricardo believes that we should aim for level 4 which aims for a specific vehicle. This should be already represented in the level 3 vehicle model to a certain extend.
- Ricardo also underlined that the SG will define the energy usage while this SG should also maybe make some recommendations.
- Ricardo also suggested that regional RW in level 2 could be decided about by the relevant CP as this has sometimes already some recognition (like WLTP).
- Ricardo suggest that level 3 could ideally be our fallback option target for product LCA, considering each OEM's specific model variant with OEM's specific dataset. Also maintenance should be model specific and service life should be regional with option to declare higher with evidence.
- Ricardo also suggested that the level 1 and 2 of the analysis are based on average numbers and then have the level 3 and level 4 very well specified. With level 4 as target for the future.

See document(s):

[A-LCA-SG4-04-02 Ricardo\\_UNECE IWG A-LCA\\_SG4-3rd.pdf](#)

[A-LCA-SG4-04-03 Ricardo\\_level concept.pdf](#)

[A-LCA-SG4-04-06 Ricardo comments\\_discussion tool.xlsx](#)

Japan asked what are Ricardo's expectations regarding battery capacity-loss versus the efficiency loss.

- Ricardo understands this difference with 96% of efficiency to 95% at end-of-life. Ricardo is researching this in order to better estimate the difference in losses.
- ICCT underlines that efficiency-losses are very marginal in real life. As such, they would suggest to not include it at this stage for BEV's.
- Ricardo believes that the effect for fuel cells is real. Question is, do we include it and is it significant?
- ICCT underlines that we should define the lifetime of a vehicle (milage, output, ...) this is something that we need to look at.
- Ricardo and ICCT agreed that we need default values for certain elements of the analysis. GRPE secretariat agrees.

#### **Agenda Item 5: OICA presentation/feedback/proposal**

OICA their view of the scope and boundaries. The mentioned the following elements:

- Difficult to go further than what is measured today. (GTR15)
- Agrees with category 1.1
- OICA suggests to use GTR15 powertrains in a first phase.
- OICA is reviewing other discussion points

On the boundaries, OICA believes DC charging should not be included as homologation values are based on AC charging which includes on-board charger efficiency.

OICA also underlined the importance of the use of in-use energy consumption which are regional homologation values reflecting regional usage. OICA is open for additional +X% adjustment factor but questions how to define the adjustment factor. Discussion with different stakeholders:

Discussion with different stakeholders:

- Ricardo agrees that so far OBFCM monitoring is required only for ICE vehicles, but their knowledge almost every car can collect real world driving data so OBFCM could be included ideally.
- ICCT underlined that there is an issue with time. Depending on the purpose of the methodology, OBFCM can help to define the adjustment factor on real life usage.
- JRC highlights that the SG4 should aim at realistic fuel and energy consumption values to be used in the methodology, since OEMs are working on realist emission factor Member States (in EU) have been already adopting realistic Emission Factors for years now.

The chair invited OICA to think in a more ambitious manner for the first phase, because real life factors are already being used. JRC does understand OICA's arguments and hope we come up with a consensus.

The chair is happy to see some conversation in the topics and would be happy to underline these in the following presentation. The chair invited OICA to think in a more ambitious manner for the first phase, because real life factors are already being used. JRC does understand OICA's arguments and hope we come up with a consensus.

The chair is happy to see some conversion in the topics and would be happy to underline these in the following presentation.

See document(s):

[A-LCA-SG4-04-07 OICA Discussion tool for LCA SG4 methodology template.xlsx](#)

[A-LCA-SG4-04-08 OICA position 10\\_10\\_2023.pdf](#)

[A-LCA-SG4-04-09 OICA LCA levels matrix OICA draft 29092023.pdf](#)

### **Agenda Item 6: Consolidation proposal Scope & Definition**

JRC presented the topics on which the SG4 agree:

- Scope, Boundaries (only GhG) and Maintenance + regular consumption
- With some topics that still need to be agreed on: Life duration/milage and levelling concept
- JRC invited the participants to consider the possibility to have a task force for defining some details.
- JRC indicated that they believe that level 2 and level 4 of the levelling concept are the most important once.

Questions and comments by participants:

- GreenNCAP: Who is the audience of a level 2 analysis?
  - o JRC indicated that CP's need more flexible tools to understand emissions with a fallback option. GreenNCAP underlined that we should have a market analysis in order to compare vehicle types.
- GreenNCAP asked to also better define 'real world'.
  - o ICCT: Comment about slide 6, ICCT would like to flag that the slide is an oversimplification. May not be possible Impossible to receive the data directly from SG6 and should thus provide something as SG4 a method from SG4 .

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-04-05 JRC updated proposal.pdf](#)

### **Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing**

The chair indicated that the next meeting will be on 7 November 2023 from 11h00-12h30.










































































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:

IN MEETING

Contributors		23	^
	Romain Denayer (You) Meeting host		
	AECC eu		
	Francois Cuenot		
	Georg Bieker		
	George Bedenian		
	Georgios Fontaras		
	Giuseppe Di Pierro		
	Green NCAP / Damiano...		
	Hans Nuglich		
	Hans Nuglich		
	Hee-Jeong Yim		
	Juliette Quartararo (OIC...		
	Ludovic (Saint-Gobain S...		
	Martin RAUCH / Clepa		
	MLIT Reino Mezaki		
	Nikolas Hill		
	Nikolas Hill Presentation		
	NORIYUKI ICHIKAWA		
	Notta Bot		
	OICA - Filippo Lachina		
	sam t		
	sam t Presentation		
	Shinichiro Takada		
	tsuyama_oica_suzuki		
	鈴木徹也	