

Minutes of the 4th meeting of the GRPE informal group on Environmentally Friendly Vehicles

1. The GRPE informal group on Environmentally Friendly Vehicles (EFV) held its fourth meeting in Brussels (Belgium), on 22/23 April 2009, under the chairmanship of Mr. Christoph Albus (Germany).

I. WELCOME AND ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

2. The Chairman opened the fourth informal group meeting and welcomed all participants. In particular the Chairman informed about the participation of Mr. Saroj Kumar Dash, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport & Highways and Mr. Vikram Gulati, Director, Ministry of Heavy Industries & Public Enterprises from India. The Chairman thanked Mr. Ferenc Pekár (European Commission) for the invitation and organizing the fourth informal group meeting in Brussels. The Chairman introduced Ms. Bärbel Esser (Germany) as secretariat for the fourth informal group meeting. The Chairman gave an overview about the available documents and thanked everybody who contributed.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documentation: Working paper EFV-04-01

3. The EFV group noted the draft agenda (EFV-04-01). The chairman asked to change the following items:

Change from item 7.2 to 7.1 Technical feasibility

Change from item 7.1 to 7.2 Target groups, aims, purposes.

The informal group agreed the new order and adopted the agenda.

III. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES (2nd and 3rd EFV INFORMAL GROUP MEETINGS)

Documentation: Working Paper EFV-02-07, EFV-03-02

4. The EFV group noted the minutes of the 2nd meeting held in Bonn on 30/31 October 2008 (EFV-02-07) and adopted them without an amendment. The Chairman apologized for the late finalizing and transmission due to the important further work on the feasibility statement in its several versions.

5. The EFV group noted the minutes of the 3rd meeting held in Geneva on 16. January 2009 (EFV-03-02) and adopted them without an amendment. The Chairman thanked Mr. Romain Hubert (UN-ECE secretariat) for drafting the minutes.

IV. REPORT 57th GRPE (JANUARY 2009) AND 147th WP.29 (MARCH 2009)

Documentation: Informal Documents GRPE-57-26, WP.29-147-14

6. The Chairman gave briefly an overview about the relevant content of the 57th GRPE session regarding the EFV informal group:

- Information by India about the 4th EFV Conference
- Status report with informal document GRPE-57-26
- Questions to GRPE, asking for consideration and guidance, with the following outcome:
 - Confirmation to continue work based on SWOT methodology
 - No Regulation, but addendum to Special Resolution or Consolidated Resolution
 - Document to WP.29 in form of an executive summary of the feasibility document
 - "political discussion" (target groups, purposes) in depth at next GRPE.

7. The Chairman reported briefly about the relevant content of the 147th WP.29 session regarding EFV:

- EFV Chairman gave a brief status report (no room for details)
- EFV Chairman asked for input concerning the "political discussion" (target groups, purposes) – no comment during the WP.29 session.
- India made an excellent presentation about the organization of the 4th EFV conference (Informal Document WP.29-147-14).

V. INFORMATION ABOUT 4th EFV CONFERENCE IN NEW DELHI (NOVEMBER 2009)

Documentation: Working Paper EFV-04-07

8. The expert from India presented an updated information (EFV-04-07) about the preparation of the 4th EFV Conference, scheduled to be held on 23/24 November 2009 in New Delhi, India. He informed the EFV group about the main topics to be discussed during that international conference and invited the members of the EFV group to participate in the event.

9. Furthermore India would be pleased to receive abstracts for the technical session until 23rd of June 2009. The decision about the invitation of speakers for the technical session will follow as early as possible – hopefully July 2009 – depending on number of abstracts.

10. The Chairman informed the EFV group that the 4th EFV Conference will be an agenda item on the next WP.29 session in June 2009 and thanked the indian delegation for the updated information.

VI. APPROACHES TO AN EFV CONCEPT

- PRESENTATIONS FROM PARTICIPANTS
- DISCUSSION

Documentation: Working paper EFV-04-05, EFV-04-08, EFV-04-09, EFV-04-04, EFV-04-06

11. The expert from Hungary presented a note (EFV-04-05) about urban traffic access restriction zones in the form of green zones, environmental zones, low emission zones, and similar which have rapidly spread out throughout Europe over the last years. The aim should be an unified classification of vehicles into EFV categories, which is suitable for implementing in different countries. The EFV group considered and discussed the issue and noted that an EFV definition

regarding green zones is related mainly to pollutant emissions. The EFV group agreed that the topic has to be discussed in a later stage and should be mentioned in the Feasibility Statement (chapter 5).

12. The expert from IEA presented the “IEA work on Improving Energy Efficiency in Transport” (EFV-04-08) with the following conclusions:

- Without policy interventions, CO₂ emissions and energy use in many countries will increase significantly by 2050.
- A number of effective policies and efficient technologies for CO₂ reduction are already in place
- It is important to share and implement these “Best Practices” worldwide.
- EFV would help reduction of CO₂ emissions and energy use through promotion of fuel efficient vehicles.

The EFV group considered the presentation and discussed about CO₂ regarding the air quality aspect. The Chairman asked IEA about their position concerning the Feasibility Statement. IEA gave a positive statement and suggested to continue the work on EFV. IEA will contribute with an input to chapter 3 of the Feasibility Statement.

13. The experts from The Netherlands presented “Concepts for an Environmentally Friendly Vehicle (EFV)” (EFV-04-09) with regard to the Working paper EFV-04-04 “Memo regarding Environmentally Friendly Vehicles / Guidance Paper for EFV-working group meeting”. The experts from The Netherlands pointed out, that it is not the intention to come up with a concrete proposal of an EFV concept. The paper more describes general approaches as basis for further discussion on EFV.

14. The experts from ACEA introduced the ACEA comments (EFV-04-06) with regard to the NL contribution (EFV-04-04 Memo/Guidance Paper). The expert from ACEA pointed out, that the ACEA paper is an example how in future concrete proposals for an EFV concept should be assessed by application of the SWOT analysis. After consideration and discussion the EFV group agreed to add the contribution of The Netherlands as a subchapter in chapter 5.

VII. FEASIBILITY DOCUMENT

Documentation: Working paper EFV-04-02, EFV-04-02-Rev.1, EFV-04-03, EFV-04-04, EFV-04-05, EFV-04-06

15. The Chairman described the progress of the Feasibility Statement since October 2008 (EFV-04-02). The EFV secretary will develop the next draft of the Feasibility Statement with additional input and send it to the EFV group in May 2009. The intention is to transmit the final Feasibility Statement as an informal document to the next GRPE session in June 2009.

16. The experts from ACEA pointed out, that the final ACEA input is contained in Working paper EFV-04-02-Rev.1 and therefore ACEA has finished their work for the draft Feasibility Statement. The Chairman thanked ACEA for preparing a good document of the draft Feasibility Statement and underlined, that the ACEA input does not be the Feasibility Statement of the EFV group, rather it will be the basis for the next work.

17. The Chairman proposed to look over the last version of the draft Feasibility Statement (EFV-04-02) in order to identify missing text or need for correction of chapter 1 until chapter 3. The EFV group agreed and the following list was identified and agreed by the EFV group:

Chapter	to do	contribution / correction by
1.3.	PREPARATION OF A FEASIBILITY STATEMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check after chapter 5 is finished; to bring in line with the following text 	Germany
2.2.	LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT (LCA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig. 2.2-1 has got a mistake and should be corrected 	ACEA
2.4.	FUEL EFFICIENCY, FUEL CONSUMPTION, ENERGY USE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chapter can be deleted (definition at this stage is not necessary) • the following chapters will be renumbered 	Secretariat
2.5.	ENERGY EFFICIENCY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delete brackets to get 3 bullet points 	Secretariat
2.7.	LIFETIME, USEFUL LIFE, LIFE CYCLE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addition text in table: “For ISC checking vehicles are selected up to 100.000 km or 5 years” 	Secretariat
2.9.	SWOT ANALYSIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Reference?]: delete • brackets of the second paragraph: delete • no further input/definition needed 	Secretariat
3.	EXISTING LEGISLATION, TOOLS FOR HOLISTIC APPROACHES AND ASSESSMENT CONCEPTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addition in title: [Status 2008] 	Secretariat
3.1.1.3.	FUEL EFFICIENCY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation needed • Contact Japan by IEA / Germany to get input 	Japan IEA Germany
3.1.1.4.	EFV APPROACH IN JAPAN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further input needed • Contact Japan by IEA / Germany to get input 	Japan IEA Germany
3.1.2.3.	GREENHOUSE GASES AND CAFE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addition of a footnote: “Status about the latest decision in US regarding the CAFE (EPA) and the CO₂ regulation in California” 	ACEA
3.1.4.1.	UN-ECE AND EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in line “CO₂ regulation”: change text in column “Reference” into project agreed, legislation adopted • European Commission send publication as reference 	Secretariat European Commission
3.1.4.3.	CO ₂ -EUROPEAN REGULATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig. 3.1.4.3-1 is missing proposal: use a figure of a TCMV presentation (European Commission in cooperation with TNO) 	European Commission TNO
3.1.4.4.	CO ₂ LABELLING DIRECTIVE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further input expected including “tyre labelling” • addition of a remark regarding “ranking scheme” 	Germany The Netherlands
3.1.4.5.	FUEL REGULATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chapter is needed, further input expected 	The Netherlands
3.1.4.8.	‘GREEN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT’ DIRECTIVE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in title addition of a footnote: “directive adopted” • Tab. 3.1.4.8-1: addition in title “Energy content of motor fuels according to the European Directive” 	European Commission

Chapter	to do	contribution / correction by
3.1.5.	ENVIRONMENTAL LABEL SWITZERLAND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • move to chapter 3.3.1. • check reference • addition of a footnote and input 	Switzerland
3.1.6.	INDIA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some corrections necessary 	India
3.1.10.	STANDARDS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the chapter is needed, further input expected 	Germany ACEA
3.2.1.1.	EU STUDY “WELL-TO-WHEEL” ANALYSIS FOR FUTURE AUTOMOTIVE FUELS AND POWERTRAINS IN THE CONTEXT” BY EU-CAR/CONCAVE/JRC [2] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in principle agreed, but JRC will check the text again 	European Commission (JRC)
3.2.1.2.	EU-PROJECT: CLEANER DRIVE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paragraph “Belgian Ecoscore” gets an own chapter number 3.2.1.3. The following chapters will be renumbered • Title of second Fig. is missing 	Secretariat Belgium
3.2.1.3.	CONCEPT FOR AN ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY VEHICLE (EFV) FROM TNO [BASED ON EFV-02-05] [14] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title of Fig. 3.2.1.3-1 is missing • Title of last paragraph “Conclusion:” changed to “Summary by TNO” 	TNO
3.2.1.5.	addition of a new chapter: IEA-STUDIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input expected: Important results of IEA 	IEA
3.2.2.3.	LIRECAR PROJECT [] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in title addition of Reference: [1] • delete sentence: “The description of LIRECAR is taken from []” • Title of Tab. 3.2.2.3-1 is missing • Title of Tab. 3.2.2.3-2 is missing 	Secretariat ACEA
3.2.2.4.	LCA CONCEPTS FROM VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change of title: EXAMPLES OF LCA CONCEPTS FROM VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS • further input expected by Hyundai • (opportunity to get more input from Manufacturers outside) 	Hyundai (OICA)
3.3.1.	CONCEPTS AND RANKINGS FROM PUBLIC AUTHORITIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addition of a reference remark 	Secretariat
3.3.2.2.	VCD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig. 3.3.2.2-1: german language should be changed into english language 	Secretariat

VII.1 TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

18. The Chairman proposed, that from now on the working paper EFV-04-02-Rev.1 will be the basis for the further work on the Feasibility Statement.

19. The expert from ACEA gave an overview about the changes in chapter 4 between the working paper EFV-04-02 and EFV-04-02-Rev.1. After consideration and discussion the EFV group agreed to add “regional/local governments” as an target group into the first bullet point of chapter 4.1. and should also be mentioned in chapter 5.

20. The experts from The Netherlands contributed the table from chapter 4 with colored columns of CO₂ regulations, fuel economy (MAC, CAFE), Fuel directives, Top Runner, Regulated pollutants and Noise (EFV-04-03). The EFV group exemplary compared the first and the third columns with the columns of the table in EFV-04-02-Rev.1. This comparison showed a different view on several criteria and the choice of the colours. More explanation and consideration of the criteria was needed. After discussion the EFV group agreed to decisions regarding the colours of each box in the first and third column. The further comparison of the whole table of chapter 4 will be done by bilateral considerations (ACEA, Japan, The Netherlands, IEA). The final table will be contained in the next draft of the Feasibility Statement.

21. The discussion in the EFV group lead to the conclusion, that it was possible to achieve a certain level of agreement about the color decisions in the table and the following SWOT analysis in chapter 4.3. But the current content of chapter 4 should be taken as an interim result or as an example, because other people outside the participants of the fourth EFV informal group meeting may come to different conclusions. This will be explained with a remark or footnote in chapter 4.

22. The EFV group also agreed to following amendments in chapter 4.2.:

- to add a new line “Comparability” in the criteria group “Data”
- to add as explanation “for applying the concept and need for education and experience” to the criteria “User expertise”
- to replace “A generic vehicle application” by “vehicle categories” in the table
- to change the order “vehicle model” and “vehicle categories” in the table.

23. The EFV group concluded, that from a technical point of view it is feasible to develop an EFV concept, using the SWOT analysis as an assessment tool. The EFV group talked about the risk of the practice of an iterative process which could be performed using the SWOT analysis in order to find as a result the EFV definition that was preliminary decided. It was discussed whether the process should be only linear from the criteria choice and the conclusion of the application of the SWOT analysis, or if it could be understood as a closed loop. The EFV group did not find a clear decision on this important issue yet. Need to be consider further.

VII.2 TARGET GROUPS, AIMS, PURPOSES

24. The expert from ACEA gave an overview about the changes in chapter 5 between the working paper EFV-04-02 and EFV-04-02-Rev.1. Local and regional governments should be added to the list of target groups in the table. The target group “customer” can be extended to “owner of existing cars”. The EFV group agreed that researchers and scientists are not a potential target group for using an EFV concept. The fourth column of the table should include qualified feasibility statements rather than clear “yes” or “no”. Especially concerning the third line (access restrictions) the EFV group didn’t identify a clear “no”. After consideration and discussion about the table of chapter 5 (target groups and purpose) the EFV group came to the conclusion that at the moment no

clear statement is possible regarding the feasibility to develop an EFV evaluation method, because further input and guidance is needed from a political level (WP.29, EFV-Conference). In addition GRB should consider the issue of target groups and purposes from their point of view.

25. The text in the beginning of chapter 5 should not refer to decisions or results of GRPE.

VII.3 FEASIBILITY STATEMENT

26. The EFV group discussed broadly the text in chapter 5, drafted by ACEA. The following main aspects could be identified during the consideration:

- The issue of “single score” (disclaimed by ACEA) and “one fits all-approach” needs to be distinguished.
- ACEA don’t want to exclude solutions, where several concepts or parameters are combined. With such combinations of parameters in principle it is possible to define classes or levels, which are easy understandable for customers. Disadvantages of a combination are needed weightings (local differences, political decisions) and the apparent definition as EFV, that might not reflect all real environmental aspects in certain situations.
- The consideration of the discussion paper from NL showed, that the time aspect is very important concerning possible EFV approaches, which also guides to a consideration of efforts and conditions for the development of an EFV concept.

27. The Chairman proposed to develop an amendment of chapter 5 with respect to the general points raised during discussion. The conclusion is, that for the time being a clear positive Feasibility Statement to develop an EFV concept is not possible from a political point of view. Nevertheless the EFV group agreed to propose to GRPE and WP.29 to start the next stage of EFV activities with the development of a proposal for an EFV concept, based on the guidance from the political level. The Chairman proposed to change the name of the Feasibility Statement. The EFV group agreed to the following new name: “Background document regarding the Feasibility Statement for the development of a methodology to evaluate Environmentally Friendly Vehicles (EFV)”. The intention is to send the final background document as an informal document of the EFV group for the next GRPE session in June 2009.

28. The EFV group agreed to include a subchapter in chapter 5 containing an outline of a possible schedule for the continuation of work on EFV issue:

- 1st step: A Feasibility Statement to WP.29 and to 4th EFV Conference in India (Nov 2009) - nearly finalized -. This includes first interim results regarding a possible concept.
- 2nd step: The development of a detailed concept and a proposal for an EFV evaluation method to WP.29 and to the 5th EFV conference (2011 / 2012).
- 3rd step: Based on step 2, development of a document (Special Resolution or Consolidated Resolution), and adoption by WP.29.

VII.4 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

29. The Chairman recalled the intention of the Executive Summary (Feasibility Statement). This Executive Summary will be the document which is extracted from the background document and will be submitted to WP.29 as informal document in June 2009 for consideration, and for adoption in November 2009.

30. The Chairman proposed and the EFV group agreed to the following content of the Executive Summary which will be developed by Germany (1st draft):

- brief introduction (from chapter 1) with a reference to the background document
- brief overview on chapters 2 and 3
- chapter 4 should be explained in the Executive Summary
- chapter 5 should be the main part of the Executive Summary (main outcome, main basis of political area)

VIII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

31. The EFV group noted that no new information was presented under this agenda item.

IX. NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE (NEXT MEETING)

32. The Chairman introduced the following next steps and schedule, agreed by the EFV group:
Background document:

- input from EFV group until 8th May 2009
- new draft version send out to the EFV group until 15th May 2009
- comments until 22nd May 2009
- final background paper to GRPE secretariat until 29th Mai 2009

Executive Summary and Amendment of Chapter 5:

- first drafts send out to the EFV group until 8th May 2009
- comments until 15th May 2009
- second draft Executive Summary until 22nd May 2009
- next steps depending on existing open issues
- informal document to GRPE secretariat beginning of June 2009

33. The Chairman suggested to be flexible regarding the next meeting of the EFV group on 12. June 2009 in Geneva (maybe co-chaired by India). The necessity of this meeting depends on the outcome and request of GRPE session before. In case of the adoption of the two informal documents by GRPE, the EFV group meeting will be not necessary.

34. The EFV group considered a possible outline of further work and next steps:

- transmission of the Executive Summary as an informal document to WP.29 in June 2009
- transmission of the Executive Summary as an official document to WP.29 for adoption in November 2009 (depending on the outcome of the June session)
- presentation at the 4th EFV Conference in November 2009, New Delhi (on behalf of WP.29, if agreed in November session)
- Proposal (tbc): next informal group meeting (chaired by India) in conjunction with the 4th EFV conference in New Delhi in November

35. The Chairman pointed out the unsure future of the continuation of the work of the EFV group, depending on the further consideration of the Feasibility Statement by WP.29 and the EFV Conference. He underlined that the EFV group developed a good document, useful as basis for further consideration, and it makes sense to continue the work on EFV. Finally, he thanked the experts for their active participation and excellent contributions as well as the European Commission for hosting the meeting.
