

## Draft meeting minutes

### 5<sup>th</sup> 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/VVY-XTZT-KPC](https://meet.google.com/vvy-xtzt-kpc)

#### Meeting documents available at:

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG4+-+5th+meeting>

### Agenda

Meeting info	
Date	November 7 <sup>th</sup> 2023
Time	11:00am – 12:30pm CET
Venue	Online
Link	<a href="https://meet.google.com/vvy-xtzt-kpc?authuser=0&amp;hs=122">https://meet.google.com/vvy-xtzt-kpc?authuser=0&amp;hs=122</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-SG4-05-01	Agreement
~ 11:10	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-04-10	Agreement
~ 11:40	4	Consolidated draft proposal Scope & Definitions - Presentation Japan (Update)	Chair Japan	A-LCA-SG4-05-02 A-LCA-SG4-05-03 A-LCA-SG4-05-04	Discussion
~ 12:20	5	Introduction to guidebook methodology for road transport	Emisia	A-LCA-SG4-05-05	Presentation Discussion
~ 12:25	6	Preliminary discussion on a proposal about the functional unit (at IWG request)	Chair	NA	Preliminary discussion
~ 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.

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

The chair presented the agenda.

Japan indicated that they will need 10 minutes to explain their updated proposal. This has been included into the agenda and will be updated on the wiki.

No additional comments were raised and the agenda was approved.

See document(s): <https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-01%20Draft%20Agenda.pdf?api=v2>

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

The chair invited the participants to share their comments and remarks about the minutes. No comments were raised.

The meeting minutes have been approved.

See document(s): <https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316407/A-LCA-SG4-04-10%20Draft%20Meeting%20Minutes.pdf?api=v2>

### **Agenda item 4: Consolidated draft proposal Scope & Definitions**

Chair: provided an update of the ongoing discussions and proposal. The chair explained the ongoing key points and highlighted the points on which the SG should agree in the coming meetings. The chair highlighted the level concept, service life duration, reparability, maintenance, task forces within SG4, inclusion of charging infrastructure, OBFCM data vs TA only, which GhG to consider? And interaction with other SG's.

- The chair asked if there are any volunteers to lead the first draft on consumables and maintenance. OICA will take the lead on this and interested members may contact Sam: [samarendra.tripathy@renault.com](mailto:samarendra.tripathy@renault.com)
- The chair reviewed the slides presented at the Brussels meeting regarding the level concept. The chair underlined that the general consensus is that we need at least two of the four levels. The chair indicated that JRC is in favour of a 2-level approach comprising of a high detailed level based on manufacturer data, and a lower detail fall back option at every step, where the user can revert to in case of lack of specific data. Such generic methodologies support emissions monitoring and inventorying, and are used for LCA analyses since years. Such methodologies exist in several countries/CP's.

See document(s): [https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-02%20CHAIR%20Overview%20of%20discussions\\_20231107.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-02%20CHAIR%20Overview%20of%20discussions_20231107.pdf?api=v2)

Riccardo: Level 4 should be vehicle model with specific variations while level 3 could be generic/general models. This is already used by for example Polestar.

- Polestar communicated about a same vehicle model with different engine and battery packs. Riccardo says they prefer to have components-specific details in level 4 and not only the model.
- JRC underlined also the role this will have in HDV's but wonders if it will also play a role for conventional vehicles.
- AVERE shared this view and underlined the possible differences between a same vehicle model.
- JRC understands the arguments but wonders if this will really play a role in the future.

- UNECE (François) underlined the importance of having specific family definitions and numbers. This could be the WLTP-values. It all depends on how you define a vehicle model.

Japan: Ichikawa-san provided more information about their views and updated presentation from last meeting.

- Underlined the importance of the timeline of the IWG and methodology
  - o Japan would like to confirm that realistic doesn't mean real-world
  - o Agrees with the boundaries as proposed by the chair
  - o Is taking into consideration the CO2 equivalent calculation as proposed by JRC and believes that the energy mix should be defined by SG6 with the usage of the regional value.
  - o Japan believes that the levelling concept is not needed for SG4
- Japan referred to their Excel and mentioned the following elements:
  - o SG4 should think about using the existing IPPC species-classification
  - o In the usage phase, Japan underlined the practical solution to exclude other sources and indirect emissions.
  - o Regional energy mix values will up to SG6 to define.
- Questions:
  - o Riccardo: Understands that not all emissions are being tested today, but in that case, Riccardo would suggest to use other (more generic) data. Updating this data in the future when it can be tested.
  - o The chair underlined the necessity to not exclude anything at this point.

See document(s): <https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-03%20JRP%20Discussion%20tool%20for%20LCA%20SG4%20methodology.xlsx?api=v2>

[https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-04%20JPN%20contributions\\_A-LCA.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-04%20JPN%20contributions_A-LCA.pdf?api=v2)

### **Agenda Item 5: Introduction to guidebook methodology for road transport**

Emisia (Giorgos Mellios): Presented more information about the UNECE CLRTAP and EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook. So the UNECE has a link to it as well. *(this was mentioned by François in the comments of the meeting)*

Presentation of the guidebook:

- All types of vehicles and vehicle technologies that are in scope
- Calculation of emissions/energy consumption:
  - o Emissions factor via an algorithm in MJ/km
  - o Temperature and it's impact on the emissions
  - o CO2 calculation based on fuel consumption, lubricant oil consumption (unintentional combustion) and Urea Consumption
- Questions:

- Chair wondered if they also have it for methane-emissions? → Yes
- The chair wondered if data about activity is also available? → *Exists for EU countries but not yet for other countries. This exists but could be used in any country that uses the Euro-standards (China, India, Australia, South-America, ...)*
- The chair wondered if it would be possible to develop some reference-tables for different countries (Europe) and non-EU countries with similar values. → *This is possible with different aggregation-levels for EU countries. This can be rather easily be produced if the format is clear.*
- Riccardo: wondered if mileage and lifetime could be an interesting and suitable solutions but at first view this does not match. Riccardo indicated that they struggle to see how we can implement this. How could this be implemented for a specific vehicle model. (real-life versus type approval values) → *The question about milage and age is important and our datasets take into account the lifetime milage for any vehicle category/brand. This evolves over the years and is of importance to the vehicle and by country. Calculated on survival-rate as well (losses). With regards to the real driving emissions, Giorgos indicated that these methodology is also provided in the guidebook.*
- ICCT: Thanked for the presentation and had a few questions:
  - Is the survival rate also taking into account export outside of EU?
  - Is methane included in this guidebook?
  - How big would the deviation be between real data and type approval data? → *Guidebook and data are based on real-driving emissions. No type approval data is taken into consideration in the guidelines.*
  - Wondered if the bottom-up or top-down method would be an interesting view. This would be ongoing (JRC, IEA, ...) but this is a hard exercise.
- GRPE (François): This might be used in lower level of the levelling concept. What is the average share of non-CO2 combustion/non-combustion GhG-emissions? And should we take these into account? François wonders if we have to include it or not, depending on the magnitude. → *This is less then 5%, so this is not very high.*

The chair thanked the speaker and indicated that the goal of the SG would probably be to come up with something similar with more details. This requires also fall-back options, this could be fulfilled by this guidebook with default values, this could be our level 1 go-to solution, allowing this SG to work on level 4.

*The slides will be shared with the participants.*

Emisia wondered if it would be interested to join these meetings. → *The chair will review internally but indicated that they are not against it.*

See document(s): [https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-05%20EMISIA\\_Energy%20Consumption%20GHG%20EMEP\\_EEA%20Guidebook.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/219316574/A-LCA-SG4-05-05%20EMISIA_Energy%20Consumption%20GHG%20EMEP_EEA%20Guidebook.pdf?api=v2)

#### **Agenda Item 6: Preliminary discussion on a proposal about the functional unit (at IWG request)**

Due to a lack of time, this discussion will be put on the agenda by next time.

- Nick-san indicated the importance of working on this at the IWG level.
- Riccardo underlined that the TransSensus-project might present results at the next IWG-meeting and this can than serve as a basis.

**Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing**

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






























































The chair invited the participants to share their AoB. None were raised.

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

---

**ANNEXES**

**Participants list:**

Contributors		20	^
	Romain Denayer (You) Meeting host		
	AECC eu		
	Alberto Castagnini		
	Christoph Baumgaertne...		
	Dirk Bosteels		
	Funda C. Ertem Kappler		
	Georg Bleker		
	George Bedenian		
	Georgios Fontaras		
	Giorgos Mellios		
	Giuseppe Di Pierro		
	Giuseppe Di Pierro		
	Giuseppe Di Pierro Presentation		
	Hee-Jeong Yim (KR)		
	Kohey		
	Nikolas Hill		
	NORIYUKI ICHIKAWA		
	OICA - Filippo Lachina		
	sam t		
	Tetsuya SUZUKI		
	UNECE - Francois Cuenot	