Revision of the MEErP
(Methodology for Ecodesign of Energy-related Products)

Minutes of the 1st stakeholder meeting (Webex, 24/06/2021)

Participants:

• EC DG GROW	• Eurovent	• Fraunhofer ISI
• EC JRC	• Fraunhofer IZM	• EPSON
• Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing	• German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy	• Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate
• French Ministry for the Ecological Transition	• German Environment Agency	• Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic
• Belgian Ministry of Environment	• Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic	• Netherlands Enterprise Agency
• Eurofer	• European Aluminium	• HKI
• The Danish EPA	• CEN/CLC Eco-CG	• Huawei
• AZTERLAN	• Intel	• Google
• Liebherr	• Apple	• Groupe Atlantique
• Daikin Europe	• ECOS	• BIOIS
• Swedish EPA	• Danish Energy Agency	• EHPA
• EHI	• EEB	• HP
• AGC	• Whirlpool	• Ecoinnovazione
• Lighting Europe	• iFixit	• Dell
• Energy Authority of Finland	• Japan Business Council in Europe	• Stiebel Eltron Gmbh & CO.
• Kreab	• Electrolux	• Grayling
• CLASP	• Orgalim	• maki Consulting GmbH
• BSH	• Mitsubishi Electric Europe	• Swedish Energy Agency
• BSEF	• Toshiba	• Vorwerk
• APPLiA	• Copper Alliance	• Euroleather
• EFESME	• Philips	• BEUC
• Miele	• Purever	• Ballarat Consulting
• NIBE AB	• Viegand Maagøe	•

Agenda

1. *Welcome and general aspects of the project (DG GROW)*
2. *Presentation of progress in project tasks (JRC):*
   a. *Progress in Task 1 – Presentation*
   b. *Progress in Task 1 – Q&A*
   c. *Progress in Task 2 – Presentation*
   d. *Progress in Task 2 – Q&A*
3. *Closing of the meeting (DG GROW)*
4. Next Steps and AOB (DG GROW)
5. Closing of the meeting (DG GROW)

1. **Welcome and general aspects of the project**:

DG GROW presented the aim of the meeting, as well as the general aspects, objectives and timeline of the MEErP revision project.

2. **Presentation of project Tasks**

The JRC presented Task 1 of the project.

- A participant asked the switch to Environmental Footprint EF 3.0 datasets result in a widening of scope compared to the current version. Another representative asked whether the impact on data needs intensity is considered and how can the CFF be aligned with the market? JRC responded that the changes are substantial mainly for impact categories and new datasets, and the results will not be comparable. DG GROW added that importing environmental datasets in ERT increases the quality and level of update of the ERT.

- A representative asked whether the Methodology is suited to consider ecological profile. JRC responded that additional work is need for ecological profile to prescribe the impact of manufacturing and additional tools need to be used to communicate such impacts. The ERT still working as a screening tool to highlight if life cycle stages are relevant. Ad hoc tools and rules will be considered. DG GROW added that there is an ongoing work on Carbon Footprint of manufacturing phases of photovoltaics modules. This will not be carried out by using the ERT. ERT is a streamlined LCA tool to derive assessment of environmental impacts based on base cases and design options in MEErP studies.

- A participant asked how is reparability included in the ERT and how will quality be ensured in the absence of updated datasets; what is the strategy to get such background data? JRC responded that EF database is under development and new datasets are expected to populate the database. New dedicated datasets will be implemented. This will improve the number of datasets on electronics. Future EF updates can solve limitations and data gaps in the EF database. As for the sake of transparency datasets in the ERT will have identifiers.

- A representative commented that values of electricity mix do not account for regions where renewable energy is well developed. JRC responded that average values are used. In the update of the ERT some datasets on electricity produced from renewable resources will be available and the user can add new datasets. DG GROW underlined that EU average is used.

- A participant noted that in the CFF, the assumption of Q/Q=1 everywhere seems an over-simplification. JRC responded that leaving it open to the user might be an over-complication.

- A participant asked how can Printed Circuit Boards and this kind of materials be included? JRC responded that it is possible to select in the database. On this we will rely on new datasets expected form PEF.

- A participant asked how are repair scenarios represented? Some products can be naturally repaired more frequently than others. JRC responded that the possibility of modelling repair is allowed, but scenarios of repair is a preparatory study issue to be discussed case by case. Some guidance on how possible scenarios can be modelled in the ERT will be provided in Task 2. If repair is important for a product group, it will be investigated by the preparatory study.

- On a question about alignment with other pieces of legislation for some products, e.g. air-conditioning, JRC responded that requirements and legislation on construction products are aligned with PEF. However, the ERT does not perform a full LCA.

- On a question about which datasets will be available in the future, DG GROW responded that the approach is to put into the updated ERT the most updated datasets, with the view to keep the tool for the 5-10 years.
- Questions were made about the relevance of bauxite for ErP. JRC responded that bauxite is not be relevant for ErP because it is an intermediate. But, generally, the objective of this work is not to open the list of CRM, but use what is produced in CRM2020 assessment.
- A participant asked how will new solutions related to recycling be addressed. JRC responded that EoL is addressed via recyclability and recycled content. The ERT contains default values, which can also be modified by the user. The datasets of recycled materials derived from PEF and reflect the average market and technologies to recycle the specific materials.

The JRC presented the progress on Task 2 of the project.

- A representative asked that aligning definitions with JTC10, e.g. use "parts" rather than "components" (as in the report) should generally be pursued. JRC agreed.
- A participant asked how is the impact of blocking more efficient products from the market calculated? When product lifetime increases, more efficient products may be blocked from the market and this will also impact the LCC. Furthermore, is the cost and environmental impact of electricity fixed? JRC responded that the Durability Index module will address this. Different methods can be used to make this decision, either with a focus on cost, energy consumption or other environmental aspects. This kind of analysis should be done at the level of preparatory study.
- A representative advised against making the modelling too complicated and heavily placed on expert interpretation and knowledge. JRC commented that several simplifying assumptions are made and further refinement would add significant complication.
- A representative noted that reliability indicators are proxy indicators and there is not a linear relationship of a certain options and durability. Every vacuum cleaner has a motor and the durability or reliability of products varies largely. JRC responded that the analysis starts by identifying the critical part that fails and causes the product to fail. Characterising average times of failure of those parts is not straightforward.
- A participant asked that a learning curve to anticipate the evolution of costs if the reparability scenario will change is considered. JRC responded that this can be included.
- A participant noted that the solution to promoting circular economy includes spare parts, but labour cost might deem the option not economical. This might render the analysis difficult and challenging in finding costs and data. JRC agreed that market and cost research is not easy task, but JRC has instruments to do it. There is no assumption that nothing is viable, but we would just have to come up to some incentive schemes so that manufacturers change design in a more circular way.
- A participant suggested that the definition on reliability is aligned with that in the standards.

3. **DG GROW announced that another stakeholder meeting will be held before the end of the year, thanked all participants and closed the meeting.**