

### TASKS PRESENTATION

Webinar

12/11/2020

Joint Research Centre

## TASKS

- Task 1: Updating of the EcoReport tool
- Task 2: More systematic inclusion of material efficiency aspects and of environmental footprint/ecological profile aspects in the design options and in the LLCC curve
- Task 3: More systematic inclusion of societal life cycle costs
- Task 4: More refined evaluation of the economic impacts in task 7 of the MEErP
- Task 5: Other updates and integrations





#### Task 1: Updating of the EcoReport tool



## Task 1: Updating of the EcoReport tool

- General principles for the updating:
  - Need for the update of the environmental impact data contained in the EcoReport tool, as well as an evaluation of the relevance of the various input categories / indicators
  - Relevance of the development of the Product Environmental Footprint method to the MEErP and the EcoReport tool for assessing life cycle impacts
  - Current format of EcoReport tool shall be maintained
  - Selecting the input data and calculating the impact categories/indicators should become fully 'open' and transparent
  - Datasets should be of an appropriate degree of complexity and refinement, and generally at an "average EU level"



## Task 1: Subtasks breakdown – 11 subtasks

a) Update of underlying data sets of EcoReport tool by:

- keeping the current format of the data sets and input categories/indicators

- choosing different data sets and/or input categories/indicators, including those from the PEF guidance documents and PEF compliant datasets

b) introduction of new materials, also considering the possibility to provide regular updates

c) preparation of instructions for ecodesign preparatory studies' contractors on how to use the EcoReport Tool;



## Task 1: Subtasks breakdown

d) identification, among the various indicators, of those related to the quantification of material efficiency 'features'

- regarding aspects such as durability, reparability, recyclability
- aiming of making the EcoReport tool an effective instrument for the identification of environmental hotspots linked to material efficiency aspects
- if relevant and possible, adding further material-related indicators

e) identifying and proposing which of the various input categories/indicators should be part of the 'Ecological profile' of a product

- the approach for the identification of the most relevant life cycle impact categories in the PEF should be explored.



## Task 1: Subtasks breakdown

f) implementing, when feasible, a finer modelling of annual sales, including the possibility to calculate or insert a dynamic stock model in the tool

g) critically revising the current approach to end-of-life (Recyclability, Recycled content):

- enable the proper comparison of design options related to recyclability and/or use of secondary raw materials
- explore circular footprint formula of the Product Environmental Footprint method

h) critically revising the current approach for Critical Raw Materials



## Task 1: Subtasks breakdown

i) procedure for future updates (of the input categories, indicators, datasets, materials, etc..) of the EcoReport tool

j) Discussing the potential use of a more sophisticated IT infrastructure (web based) for the next version of the MEErP tool,

- to allow more flexibility,
- while keeping a user-friendly interface

**k) other aspects raised by stakeholders** (subject to the agreement of the Commission)



## Task 1: cross cutting issues

- Several sub-task are interrelated and mixing methodological changes and data needs
- Relevance of providing transparency and robustness for dataset and impact categories and indicators
- Explorative nature of some tasks (e.g. on new impact categories and indicators; EoL modelling), and compatibility with other methods (PEF)
- Guidance to be provided on the practical application
- Liaising with stakeholders concerning previous experiences (e.g. from former preparatory studies) and new proposals.





#### Task 1 Questions / Comments?





Task 2: More systematic inclusion of material efficiency aspects and of environmental footprint/ecological profile aspects in the design options and in the LLCC curve



## Task 2: Subtasks breakdown

a) Guidelines for systematic inclusion of design options related to ME and EF/EP

- > e.g., increased durability / reparability / recyclability
- > e.g., recycled content
- > e.g., improved ecological profile
- > e.g. social impacts of raw material sourcing
- b) Guidelines on the LCC of the design options developed at a)
  - Factoring of each cost category and, if feasible, introduction of degradation factors
  - > Minimum data quality on costs/prices
  - How to deal with costs which could significantly vary across the EU
  - Systematic inclusion of lifetime in the LLCC ranking by normalization of costs per year
- c) Other options for inclusion of lifetime in the LLCC ranking



## Task 2: Proposed approach 1/2





## Task 2: Proposed approach 2/2







#### Task 2 Questions / Comments?





# Task 3: More systematic inclusion of societal life cycle costs



## Task 3: Subtasks breakdown

a) Critically review and update the current MEErP approach for the inclusion of societal life cycle costs, as well as the underlying data

**b)** Propose in which part of the MEErP this information should appear (task 7 is a strong candidate) and how it should contribute to the decision-making process



## Task 3: Proposed approach 1/2



## Task 3: Proposed approach 2/2





#### Task 3 Questions / Comments?





# Task 4: More refined evaluation of the economic impacts in task 7 of the MEErP



## Task 4: Subtasks breakdown

a) Develop a refined model for the evaluation of impacts on employment including, when feasible, redistribution effects between sectors or countries

(Impact of increased repair and maintenance operations on employment will be explicitly considered. The redistribution effect of postponed replacement due to increased lifetime on the demand for new purchases will also be estimated)

b) Systematically introduce the evaluation of societal costs under task 7 of the MEErP (refer to Task 3 of this study)

(Automatically done with the proposed approach)

- c) Evaluate differences between the analysis required for task 7 of the MEErP and that required for an IA report. Formalize which indicators/outputs of the EcoReport tool should be reported
- d) Develop a proposal for a modified task 7 of the MEErP





#### Task 4 Questions / Comments?





#### **Task 5: Other updates and integrations**



## Task 5: Subtasks breakdown

a) Update:

- > Energy prices, respective growth rates and primary energy factor
- **Escalation rate, discount rate, Present Worth factor and inflation rate**
- Propose a formal rule when ad-hoc deviations are possible

b) Propose a standard approach for review studies, i.e., which tasks of the MEErP should or should not be systematically updated during review studies

c) Explore synergies with EU Ecolabel and EU GPP





### Task 5 Questions / Comments?

