

Meeting Minutes of 15th A-LCA session

DAY1 (April 18, 2024)

Agenda Item 0: Summary

Outline:

- The chair reminded the overall timeline(A-LCA-15-03e) and the need to initiate drafting group(SG7) soon. A representative of OICA offered to be the part of leadership of SG7 which had been vacancy.
- A-LCA IWG reviewed the current status of overarching aspects table and SGs' activities. As the outstanding topics, "infrastructure" and "secondary database" were identified.
- Breakout session was held to facilitate communications between SGs.

The next steps have been identified:

Secondary database:

- Dedicated SG1 meeting to be set to discuss that secondary database criteria including listing currently available secondary database.

Infrastructure:

- During the discussion of system boundary, treatment of "infrastructure" as the A-LCA methodology was questioned. "infrastructure" is a commonly related to all SGs and then it was confirmed to set another dedicated SG1 meeting on this issue.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair welcomes the participants to the 15th A-LCA meeting. Then meeting start with a welcome speech from the ministry of Transport in Korea.

Organizational issue in the leading team:

- Avere secretary representative change from Romain Denayer to Banita Fidyova
- Unfortunately, Erik is not able to attend this meeting in person

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the agenda

The chair reviewed the agenda with the participants for this session. OICA requests to have some time slots to be able to discuss some topics between the Subgroups. The agenda will be updated by the secretariat for the 2nd day to accommodate inter SG meetings.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of last meeting minutes

The chair presented and reviewed the meeting minutes of last session (14th session). The chair slowly reviewed all the points of the minutes and invited the members to share their comments in the coming days. At this stage, no remarks were made and the minutes were thus adopted.

Agenda Item 4: Overarching aspects

Overarching aspect table from the 13th meeting was presented. Feedback requested from the SGs on the overarching aspects. No additional comments or inputs on the overarching aspects table – all CPs and NGOs are welcome to send their comments on the table.

Agenda Item 5: Status of each Subgroup

Subgroup 2: Material (Japan)

SG2 provided more updates on its progress. Due to difficulties in obtaining all primary data for GHG emission calculations, there's a need to discuss which data sources to prioritize. Harmonizing different datasets is challenging, leading SG2 to propose specific existing datasets for consideration (level 2). SG2 discussions have looked into linking databases at different levels, suggesting choosing a single database for level 3. Level 4 is particularly challenging as it involves creating new databases. Discussions are ongoing to decide on material classification and database selection.

Comments & questions:

- US EPA: Should we use each option or pick just one? If it's a choice, it leads to allowing users to select what's most convenient. => SG2: Currently, having a single database is challenging, though it may not seem entirely fair. The goal is also for industries to assess their progress in decarbonization.
- Chair: Users need to declare how they choose the database. => SG2: Data quality may be a concern, but SG2 hasn't talked about it yet. Planning to address it later. On this Chair suggested to also include data quality in the overarching aspects
- Ricardo: Supply chains are global, so it would be helpful if SG2 could offer guidance on selecting databases. => SG2: Boundaries vary between different databases. Suggest starting with level 2 for decarbonization efforts. Proposal from chair: This topic is related to overarching topics and impact the other SGs as well.
- US EPA: It's preferable to have a database with standardized boundary conditions. It's advantageous to prioritize a database with a high level of transparency and robustness.

- Chair of GRPE suggests: Instead of setting requirements for each level, why not establish criteria for databases, and each party can then find a relevant database that meets these criteria? OICA backs this idea of establishing criteria.
- CLEPA: Some of these DBs are commercial and not all the parties have the possibility to access these DB, unfair. We should maybe focus on not commercial DB. => SG2: Currently the data quality is not good enough to select one public DB.
- OICA: OICA suggests that it would be beneficial to have one globally harmonized database available for free, given the harmonized nature of the supply chain. As a first step, the database provider should specify the level of data they are offering.
- Korea: CP should be in the position to choose specific DB to be used. We need workable DB and depend on the level we should be able to choose global or regional data.
- US EPA: Suggests establishing a set of criteria and verifying whether the database meets those criteria to enhance transparency. It's all about ensuring comparability. When mention a small deviation, need to specify what exactly qualifies as a small deviation. => Chair: It's preferable to have criteria to minimize deviations, but achieving zero deviation is challenging at this stage.
- CLEPA: How can we verify materials not listed in the database? => SG2: Select a similar material.
- **Action item:** This overarching topic should be discussed in a separate session of SG1, asking the SG leaders how to consider this topic in the individual SGs. Later the outcome to be reviewed in the IWG.

Subgroup 3: Production Phase

- a. Korea presented tables detailing the topics, positions of stakeholders and list of topics requiring interactions with other SGs.
- b. OICA presented Level concept: It is required to have a breakout session to discuss overarching topics between the SGs. Each level does not necessarily have different solution. For some topics a single solution can be used for different levels.
- c. OICA presented representative vehicle: It would be preferred to conduct LCA calculations using a harmonized methodology at the fleet or vehicle level. Vehicles are intricate products, and their individual configurations make each vehicle unique. Providing LCAs for each individual vehicle would impose a significant administrative burden on OEMs and authorities. Therefore, opting for a 'Representative Vehicle' that offers LCAs for a group of vehicles, referred to as an "LCA group," seems reasonable. The selection of the representative vehicle should be globally harmonized. Discussions on defining the representative vehicle have already been initiated by SG3, and SG4

has also begun discussions. Both SGs need to engage in discussions and reach an agreement on this concept.

- d. CLEPA presented implication of 'end of life' allocation on SG3 activities.
- e. Japan: Presented overall system boundary. Proposal to set the boundaries as shown in the slide. Discussion on the scope until 2025 and exclude some aspects of the infrastructure. It is important to discuss what is included and what is excluded for energy infrastructure. At later stage after 2025 the topics can be further discussed and determined. This topic to be further discussed in the SG1 and prepare for the decision.

Comments & questions:

- Korea: we should distinguish between foreground and background data. Some DB are including this background automatically, so it is not possible to extract this data from the DB. Depend on the DB the background is included but there is no necessary to intend including background data.
- Ricardo: Why are certain items suggested for exclusion (such as loads related to energy infrastructure)? => Japan: Temporary exclusion until 2025, but not complete exclusion. It's a sort of compromised approach. Some datasets are accessible, while others are not, making it challenging to include certain parameters.
- GRPE chair: The impact of autonomous vehicles is significant. The presentation from NL highlighted that data centers handling large volumes of data also consume energy. This topic should be considered if it's included in the boundary conditions. These are new factors emerging, and perhaps they should be considered for the second stage of discussion (post-2025).

Subgroup 4: Usage Phase (JRC)

The SG4 chair indicated what has been discussed and how far the discussions are going.

- Representative vehicle discussion triggered in the group and further discussion with SG3 is required.
- Service life topic is under discussion : different values to be defined by region but not distinguish between powertrains.
- Maintenance: Two types of maintenance (consumables and replacement parts). Two approach, one scenario that maintenance should be assumed or the other scenario to have detailed lists of consumables & expected maintenance.
- System boundaries: deliver to customer as handover betw. SG3 & SG4 (showroom).ELV is the handover point to SG5.

Comments & questions:

- Ricardo: Transensus is voting for functional unit as person /km considering occupancy of 1 person per vehicle.
- Japan (Tabushi san) : Dynamic energy modeling is still under discussion. It's better to consider as the energy density will decrease significantly.
- OICA: Occupancy rate and dynamic modeling should be considered. But for OEM prospective it's better to go for worst case approach for verification. Future projections are not easy to use. For level 3/4 it needs to be verifiable by 3rd party.

Subgroup 5: End of life (Japan)

Presentations of SG5 activities.

Comments & questions:

- No comments are made.

Subgroup 6: (Japan)

The chair presented the status of work in SG 6. Different proposal from different stake holders provided on Indirect land use change emission. Chair introduced Banita Fidyova as SG6 co-chair.

Comments & questions:

- EU commission: IPCC report AR6 , at the moment no H₂ included so EC does not support to include. On 'energy modeling' mentioned that car will be used for a longer period, hence dynamic modeling is very useful as we are moving towards clean energy. At the moment ILUC no accurate data available, hence does not support to include. However, recognize it's an important issue. Can refer to the alternative presented in RED.
- OICA: onsite electricity generation or guarantee of origin topic discussed? => SG6: no discussion yet
- US EPA: We don't have a perfect database. It's a compromised DB. It's better to clearly mention criteria for an ideal database.
- **Action Item:** Chair requested SG6 to come up with a proposal on selection of database criteria.

DAY 2 (April 19, 2024)

Agenda Item 6: Recap of Day 1

Chair make statement on recap of day 1 discussion with following main issues:

- List of the secondary databases, if data is impossible to use primary data overall. SG2 proposed some database to be used, this list to be checked and approved. It was discussed to agree on harmonized rules and criteria about the selection of the database.
- SG6 discussion on the infrastructure, it is required to distinguish between the different scenarios and the databases that include or exclude the infrastructure.

Agenda Item 7: Interaction of different SGs

OICA proposed to have different sessions to discuss the handover points between the SGs. the plans prepared & organized by OICA.

Main objectives of the interactions are:

- Collect the joint topics among the SGs.
- Fix the date for a joint appointment for further discussion.

The results of the inter sessions has been presented by OICA after the lunch.

Agenda Item 7: Interaction of different SGs

There is several options about the implementation of the level concept

- Case 1 all SGs work on all levels to work on the methodology in the different levels
- Case 2 IWG collect the defined methodology based on the levels and the Leading team can mix and match the levels between the subgroup
- Case 3 IWG will choose the level for each SG and combine it to one methodology
- Case 4 SGs can decide the levels and it will be agreed by IWG
- Case 5 make methodology for all the levels and the users can use what they want.

Comments & questions:

- OICA: support case 1 approach
- Japan: IWG is developing the methodology as complete system, set the criteria e.g. for the DB because no DB is existing yet and the implementation of level 4 in 2025 is not possible but maybe in the future the date for level 4 can't be set now.
- We need as group a working plan to develop this methodology. We need to agree on something is working in the time being (also if it is a lower level) and we should work on the definition of the higher levels.

- The group shouldn't work on the limitation which we have today but we should focus on the future possibility. The deadline in 2025 can be seen as milestone and further development on the methodology is required. Until end 2025 it can be seen as half way of the methodology with the focus on level 2 or level 3. DB can be developed in the next years afterwards and the conditions will be available to be prepared for finishing the methodology.

Agenda Item 8: Korea Green NCAP presentation

Korea presented the proposal of 'Korea Green NCAP'. Intention of Korea is to harmonized with IWG outcome. EU Green NCAP is more of level 1 at this stage and Korea will decide later but will let OEM to declare better data if possible.

Agenda Item 9: SG7 drafting

Chair presented the approach and structure of the guideline. OICA propose Bill Coleman in the leading team.

Next meetings:

Two face to face meeting has to be planned until end of this year, in addition to some online meetings.

- Next in-person meeting potentially in September, preferably in Europe after GRPE. September 26th and 27th in Europe. Open request to COM if the meeting Brussels is possible or to UN secretary if Geneva. European Commission will check the possibility of organizing in Brussels.