

Meeting minutes

18th Session of the Subgroup 4 (Usage Phase) of the IWG on Automotive Life Cycle Assessment (IWG on A-LCA)

Meeting documents available at:
<https://wiki.unece.org/display/trans/SG4+-+18th+meeting>

Agenda

Time		Agenda Item	Lead	Working Paper	Purpose or Target
11:00 ~ 11:05	1	Welcome and introduction	Chair	NA	Introduction
~ 11:10	2	Adoption of the agenda	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-18-01	Agreement
~ 11:15	3	Adoption of the last meeting minutes	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-17-05	Agreement
~ 11:50	4	Maintenance & Consumables	Chair	A-LCA-SG4-18-02	Presentation
~ 12:25	5	Representative Vehicle	OICA	A-LCA-SG4-18-03	Presentation
~ 12:30	8	Any other business & Closing	Chair		Closing

Meeting

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introduction

The chair welcomed the participants to the 18th SG4 meeting and provided some overview of the main topics for today's meeting. In addition, the chair presented 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 last meeting minutes were approved and adopted by the participants.

Agenda item 4: Maintenance & Consumables

Chair - OICA: Sam T. presented a slide deck to frame the status of discussion about maintenance parts and consumables, highlighting that the draft process is ongoing and close to be finalized. However, a database with default values has to be created and the

chair invited the participants to submit any sort of data they have and that they are willing to share inside the IWG.

- Ricardo on HV battery/FC replacement pointed out that in case the replacement happens, it has a relevant impact on the GhG emissions. Hence they see the needs to have this section in the methodology, especially for HDVs. Probably it can be treated as a different category rather than Maintenance and Consumables.
- CLEPA (Rauch M.) pointed out that at this point in time we should keep our focus on category 1.1.
- Ricardo asked about the case when OEM data are not available; the concern is if there are enough studies that cover a representative percentage of what it is expected to be included in this topic.
 - Chair replied that any independent public available reports with fixed value are welcome.
- Japan on slide 3: asked who provides data? Chair replied has to be OEMs. Then Japan again asked about the reason why OEM should/would provide data. Hence it is crucial on the methodological side to describe data requirement in case OEMs have to provide data.
- Japan on slide 6: asked how to define the frequency of maintenance.
 - Chairs replied that in case we have both frequency values by distance and by period, we adopt the worst case scenario. Chairs also pointed out that the last sentence at the bottom of the slide has to be deleted.
- Japan on slide 7: pointed out that the message is not clear.
 - Chairs highlighted that only the table at the bottom (with % of upstream emissions) will be in the guidelines, in case OEMs data are not available. In this framework, OEMs have to provide upstream CFP and the percentage comes from research data, such as literature available reports. Indeed, the main table in slide 7 is an explanation about how to retrieve the “% of upstream CFP” by literature review. Therefore, SG4 needs to create a database to fill in the methodology table.
- Ricardo on slide 3: they did not catch in the beginning that it was proposed that for a Level 3 a study may also be able to use a fixed %. However, they don't believe this is reasonable. For an OEM study shouldn't certain maintenance parts be mandatorily included (with others that have lower impact optional)? For example, in TranSensus LCA some items like AdBlue/Urea, refrigerants, tires, starter battery, brake pads (and also discussed earlier traction battery, fuel cell) are required to be included, with other items optional/recommended only. Using a default % should really only be used for Level 1 or 2 study.
- Japan asked how big is the effort for an OEM to gather these type of info. Chairs replied that probably it is something doable but further discussion in the next future is needed.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-18-02](#)

Agenda item 5: Representative Vehicle

OICA presented the updated version of the “Representative Vehicle” concept.

- JRC on slide 11: asked for level 1 where the user can find the LCA family data? They proposed to add a column with origin of data; maybe Lv 1 could be intended as completely user-defined and so shift what is now as Lev1 to Lev 2.
- UNECE (F. Cuenot) asked about the separation between classes, since the last WLTP GTR15 is based on inertia classes. OICA replied that still some regions like Korea or Brazil are using inertia approach and that is the reason why both approaches were proposed.
- CLEPA on the exclusion of 2WD/4WD in the LCA group classification since for example a 2 e-axle compared to 1 e-axle for BEVs makes a lot of difference in terms of production GhG. OICA replied that it has more impact on the downstream emissions rather than on the upstream side.

See document(s): [A-LCA-SG4-18-03](#)

Agenda item 6: AOB & Closing

The chair invited the participants to share their additional topics/remarks. No comments arose from the audience.

The chair informed the participants that comments and feedback to the draft methodology document are more than welcome and pivotal for the development of the methodology.

The next SG4 meeting dates will be communicated via email in the coming days.

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

See document(s):