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

Minutes of the 2nd stakeholder meeting (Webex, 23/06/2022)

Participants:

• EC DG GROW	• Eurovent	• Fraunhofer ISI
• EC JRC	• Fraunhofer IZM	• Swedish Energy Agency
• Danish Centre for Energy Efficiency	• Netherlands Enterprise Agency	• Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate
• French Ministry for the Ecological Transition	• German Environment Agency	• Danish Ministry of Environment
• Norwegian Environment Agency	• Technology Industries of Finland	• Stiebel Eltron Gmbh & CO.
• SEPA	• Finnish Energy Authority	• HKI
• Lighting Europe	• Cefic	• Mitsubishi
• IMMERGAS S.p.A.	• VHK	• Panasonic
• Liebherr	• European Aluminium	• Oeko-Institut
• Daikin Europe	• ECOS	• BIOIS
• EPEE	• European Copper Institute	• EHPA
• EHI	• EEB	• Feica
• EuriC	• Whirlpool	• Ecoinnovazione
• EFESME	• EIKA	• maki Consulting GmbH
• CONTANCE	• Pré	• ArcelorMittal
• Kreab	• Electrolux	• ANEC/BEUC
• CLASP	• Huawei	• Toshiba
• NIBE AB	• APPLiA	• BSEF
• Signify	•	•

Agenda

1. *Welcome and general aspects of the project (DG GROW)*
2. *Presentation of progress in project tasks (JRC):*
    a. *Task 1 – Presentation*
    b. *Task 1 – Q&A*
    c. *Task 2 – Presentation*
    d. *Task 2 – Q&A*
    e. *Task 3-5 – Presentation*
    f. *Task 3-5 – Q&A*
3. Next Steps and AOB (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 about the link between ERT and PEF. JRC responded that the links are made with regards to the impact categories in the revised ERT, the background datasets and in terms of modelling a simplified version of the circular footprint formula. Modifications are still permitted by the user.

- With regards to datasets used in ERT, a user highlighted the importance of having the freedom to use the data, the fact that some datasets, e.g. for electronics, are still missing, and also the relevance of the data when it comes to production outside the EU. JRC responds that it will be possible to use the datasets, but only for the selected impact categories of the ERT. JRC would welcome suggestions on data missing but availability is limited. Geographical representativeness can be assessed on dataset by database basis.

- A participant what is the approach with regards to Recyclability rates. JRC mentioned that the values would be taken from PEF based on current practices, but the user (practitioner conducting preparatory study) still has freedom to change the recyclability rate, and justify why there is deviation from default values.

- A participant asked whether air freight is being considered in the data. JRC responded that it is not considered currently but could be reconsidered based on data availability.

- A representative asked whether there could be more guidance on what values to use for the Weibull distribution parameters used in Task 1.f. JRC responded that the user could take those from the literature or calculated from raw data; some bibliographic references are provided in Task 2.

- For Task 1.f., a participant noted that for some products the reverse of what is proposed for the sales/stock model, i.e. knowing the stock and estimating the sales. JRC responded that this is possible.

- A participant asked about the availability of the ERT. GROW responded is that a similar approach will be used on, meaning being able to freely download it from the EU website.

- How does recyclability affect LLCC. GROW responded that within this review, the LLCC principle from end-user perspective remains unchanged, i.e. the curve calculation remains the same. How to calculate societal cost is offered as auxiliary.

- A participant commented that beside primary energy, the final energy use for production and product use should also be considered, in order to account for cases where an average factor may not be representative. GROW responded that it is well noted, but not possible to respond for the moment.

- A participant asked how the recycled content and its availability, is linked with recyclability and recycling efficiency. JRC responded that a product-based approached is used and that the default values are still subject to decisions of each study team.

- A participant noted Circular Footprint Formula only considers recycling rate at end of life, meaning that if recycling goes up then the impact goes up, whereas the avoidance of incineration is not accounted for. JRC responded that this is done for the sake of the Tools simplicity, but if recyclability goes down, less credit is given.

- A participant commented that although the reliance on PEFCRs for the ecological profile consideration is understandable, there are limited PEFCRs, so what happens when there is no PEFCR for a product. GROW responded that the ecological profile approach is underdeveloped as presented, but the work on Photovoltaic products provides an example of a product-specific application.

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

- A participant asked how the Task 2 model considers a user decision to retire (rather than repair) a product even if still functioning. JRC responds that if there is no failure event, this is not in the model.
- A participant asked why the model is based on average cost of repair and not on a component by component basis. JRC responded that the study team would consider an average cost for repairing priority parts, but the model would become very complex if this was incorporated ex ante. Values of repair times and costs can also be added in the ERT for simplicity, but standardising the calculation of costs on a component basis could be considered based on stakeholder comments.
- A representative noted that only one repair during lifetime is considered in the model and self-repair is not taken into account. JRC responds that considering those points would increase again the complexity of the model, but a study team still would have the freedom to consider more operations with another model.
- A participant asked whether learning curves can be used for the modelling of repair cost, considering that policies move towards reducing the cost of repair. JRC responded that considering this would increase the complexity of the analysis; this difficulty could be flagged in the text and a sensitivity analysis using two different costs could be inserted in the ERT spreadsheet. Having said that, a preparatory study team has the freedom to consider this.
- A representative advocated for not making the LLCC calculation more complex, and also for not being too prescriptive in the depth of consideration of durability and reparability, but rather allow for product-specific aspects to be accounted for in study teams. A question was also posed on why repair and upgrade are considered accumulatively with regards to their impact on lifetime in the model. JRC responded that repair and upgrade are complementary that is why the effect of both is considered.
- A participant asked whether the spare part production is taken into account and why data for failure frequency are not taken into account. JRC responded that the methodology is general and failure frequency data are product-specific that is why they cannot be used. Furthermore, if failure frequency were used, lifetime extension effects and strategies could not have been modelled.

The JRC presented Tasks 3-5 of the project:

- A participant noted that the burden placed on SMEs with regards to the processes and information provision requirements is not considered. GROW noted that the impact on SMEs is considered in Impact Assessments rather than in the MEErP.
- A participant asked whether types of products that are installed in buildings should be treated differently compared to consumer products.

3. **DG GROW thanked participants and concluded with next steps and final points:**
    - Written comments are welcome within the next month.
    - The final review report will be produced, and potentially, if possible, a preparation of a practical guide on how to implement the new method.
    - The revised ERT would need to be delivered with real data.
    - These actions are planned to be done by indicatively October 2022 and stakeholders will be informed. The new revised MEErP will then be the referene methodology to be used under the Ecodesign Directive.