

## “Avoided Emissions” – Recent Activity

- ❑ A key issue in Japan – Workshop organized by METI and JISC in December 2018, in parallel with ISO/TC207/SC5/TG1 meeting
  - Animation by Pr. Atsushi Inaba – Kogakuin University
  - **“Guidelines for quantifying GHG emission reductions of goods or services through Global Value Chain”** [http://www.meti.go.jp/english/press/2018/pdf/0330\\_002.pdf](http://www.meti.go.jp/english/press/2018/pdf/0330_002.pdf)
  
- ❑ Publication of WRI in March 2019 of a Working Paper
  - **“Estimating and Reporting the Comparative Emissions Impacts of Products”** [https://wriorg.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/estimating-and-reporting-comparative-emissions-impacts-products\\_0.pdf](https://wriorg.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/estimating-and-reporting-comparative-emissions-impacts-products_0.pdf)
  
- ❑ A potential task for a JWG between SC5 & SC7 – Workshop to be organized during the plenary of ISO/TC207 in June 2019
  - On-going exchanges between France (Romain Poivet – ADEME) and Japan (Pr. Atsushi Inaba – Kogakuin University)
  - French contribution: **“Quantifying the impact of an emission reduction action on GHGS”** [https://www.ademe.fr/sites/default/files/assets/documents/exe\\_guide\\_impact\\_ges\\_interactive.pdf](https://www.ademe.fr/sites/default/files/assets/documents/exe_guide_impact_ges_interactive.pdf)

## Avoided Emissions

- ❑ Strong incentive towards integration of this concern
  - “**Positive communication**”, when LCA shows “impacts”...
  
- ❑ Concerns – some discussions topics for the June 2019 workshop at ISO/TC207
  - Need to evaluate the “consequences”... what about standardization at ISO level of “**prospective LCA**”? Which **data** to assess prospective situations?
  - “Avoided Emissions” is a “**positive**” **terminology**... This terminology looks “strange” if the emissions **increase** after the evaluated actions! The terminology “quantifying the impacts of an emission reduction action” looks better... since both reduction and increase are covered
  - At corporate level, communication should be **resulting of positive and negative impacts throughout the overall portfolio of actions**... The focus on positive impacts only, “hiding” the negative ones, would be **greenwashing!**
  - How to **share the impacts** (positive and/or negative) between actors of the Life Cycle?
  - What about “**pollution transfer**” between media? If the action is “positive” on GHG, and “negative” on some other aspects, what is the resulting communication? Which choice of multicriteria approach?
  - What about **verification**?