

**Draft meeting minutes**  
**8th Session of the Subgroup 6 (Fuel & Energy Cycle)**  
of the IWG on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment  
(IWG on A-LCA)

**Online:**

<https://meet.google.com/sgk-tivu-kah?authuser=0&hs=122>

**Meeting documents available at:**

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG6+-+8th+meeting>

**Agenda**

<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG6+-+8th+meeting>

Meeting info	
Date	December 1 <sup>st</sup> 2023
Time	12:00noon until 01:30pm CET
Link	Online: <a href="https://meet.google.com/sgk-tivu-kah?authuser=0&amp;hs=122">https://meet.google.com/sgk-tivu-kah?authuser=0&amp;hs=122</a>

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose or Target
12:05 ~	1	Welcome and introduction >Potential co-leader or SG6	Chair	NA	Introduction
~ 12:10	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-08-01	Agreement
~ 12:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-07-03	Agreement
~ 12:25	4	SG4 Guidelines – quick review of last meeting	Chair	A-LCA-SG6-08-02	Information
~ 12:50	5	CONCAWE: Proposal for LCA for infrastructure >Discussion	CONCAWE	A-LCA-SG6-08-03	Proposal
~ 12:15	6	ICCT: Proposal for Indirect land use change emissions >Discussion		A-LCA-SG6-08-04	Proposal
~ 13:25	7	Any other business & next meeting	Participants	NA	Notification
~ 13:30	8	Closing	Chair	NA	Closing

**Meeting Minutes**

**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.

The chair announced that Japan have indicated that they are willing to provide a co-leader for this SG. The chair will meet Dr. Kawaharada and see for next steps by next meeting.

## **Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was approved by the participants.

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

The last meeting minutes have been approved.

## **Agenda item 4: SG4 Guidelines – quick review of last meeting**

Present of chair

- JRC is still reviewing it and will come back on the general scope. Deciding if they believe inclusion of hydrogen would be relevant or not.
- Chair invited CP's to also review this internally and come up with a position.

The chair then reviewed the outstanding SG's points to discuss

- Levelling concept
- Functionnal Unit
- How to account for allocation and co-products
- ILUC and the level of inclusion of attributional and consequential LCA

## **Agenda item 5: CONCAWE: Proposal for LCA for infrastructure**

CONCAWE presented their view on how to include LCA for infrastructure. They assumed a cradle to grave analysis which is based on the ISO 14040 standard as defined with specific life cycle steps. CONCAWE also underlined the importance of including a review of the methodology over time.

- CONCAWE mentioned the most difficult part could be the future views of infrastructure and the role of other purposes after the usage of the infrastructure. (polluters pays or avoided burdens).
- JRC sees differences in the understanding of infrastructure, as CONCAWE is focussing on the end-of-life stage of the infrastructure, which is more for SG5. In addition, JRC feels that embodied emissions are to limited in this proposal.
  - o Chair and M. Goy confirmed that SG5 is mostly focussing on end-of-life of vehicles.
  - o JRC would like to avoid doing double elements and counting.
  - o Julien Garcia (IFP Energy Renouvelles) wondered if SG3 is including infrastructure or not. If this is the case, we should align with them on what to include.
  - o JRC underlined the difference between the types of infrastructure, existing and new infrastructure (embodied emissions for new renewable infrastructure).
- CONCAWE wondered where to cut of point would be... Where do we take the cut off?
  - o JRC would like to include emissions of PV-production. (CONCAWE agrees)
  - o CONCAWE agrees but sees some challenges.

- IFP underlined the importance of including new plans, to than also include the parts and powertrains in the right subgroups.
- ICCT suggests to only include emissions that are relevant to the general count, for renewable energy this is the main part, so this should be included.
- CONCAWE believes it could be interesting to still include this for other infrastructure. Allowing to compare
- CLEPA proposed:
- ICCT believes that the scope should be the same.
- JRC agrees, but having a cut-off point at for example 5% of impact, otherwise it is considered as 0.
  - CONCAWE agrees that small contributions should be disregarded.
  - CLEPA agrees that we need a same scope, but small contributions could be disregarded.
- Importance of the 5% and the need to agree on the number and the need to define a percentage, or to take into account a general IWG agreement.
- The SG agreed on the voiced position as defined in the Draft Guidelines.

### **Agenda item 6: ICCT: Proposal for Indirect land use change emissions**

ICCT presented their proposal with regards to ILUC. They underlined several elements and scenarios linked to indirect land use change. Underlining the importance of changes in land use across the world and economies. Definitely with regards to Biofuels. ICCT indicated that ILUC should be included into the analysis with having a part of the analysis could/should be consequential attribution.

- ICCT underlined the existing models and types of models.
- ICCT numerated the existing fuels policies and analysis in the world.
- ICCT underlined the importance and differentiation of attributional versus consequential impact of direct and indirect land use change.

Comments & questions:

- JRC: I have a lot of comments and question and would like to underline some important elements. JRC highlighted that RED II does not make it mandatory but rather puts in fixed numbers, mentioning the low LUC emissions, qualifying it at a sustainable criteria. Mentioning that the RED is not at it place in this slides.
- JRC wondered where this data would come from? Very limited existing models and data today. With EU Commission having 2 models with neither obtaining the best results. So where to find the data and how to update it? These models are being economically fed. With even sometimes negative results. JRC agrees that some consequential could be included but fears the existing and usage of the right data.
  - ICCT believes it is important to include it even if the results are very uncertain. Considering it 0 is wrong, even if there are very diverging results.
- Due to a lack of time, no final agreement was made. It was decided that this would be up for discussion next time.

**Agenda item 8: AOB & next meeting**

Next meetings has been scheduled 18<sup>th</sup> December 2023 from 12h00 tot 13h30 CET.

No additional comments or remarks were raised.

**Agenda item 9: Closing**

The chair formally thanked the participants for the constructive meeting, repeated the to do's and closed the meeting.

---

## **Annexes:**

### **Participants list:**

Not available.