

Date : 21/02/2018
 From : Paul Van Tichelen
 Ref. : VITO/1710436/PVT/2018/01
 Annex(es): **Powerpoint presentations of the meeting (<https://www.eco-lifts.eu/eco-lifts-en/content/documents.php>)**
 To : Cesar Santos; Stakeholders
 Copy : Project team

Minutes of stakeholder Meeting for Ecodesign Preparatory Study on Lifts - First Stakeholder meeting on 21/2/2018

DG Grow: 21/2/2018, Avenue d’Auderghem 45, B-1040 Etterbeek, Brussels

Participants

European Commission

DG GROW Cesar Santos (CS)

Project Team

ISI Fraunhofer Antoine Durand (AD)
 ISI Fraunhofer Simon Hirzel (SIM)
 ISI Fraunhofer Clemens Rohde (CR)
 ISR Joao Fong (JF)
 VITO Paul Van Tichelen (PVT)

Registered stakeholders for the meeting

Organization	firstname	lastname	acronym
Business Energy and Industrial Strategy	Adrian	Barker	AB
ANACAM	Luca	Incoronato	ANACAM
European Commission	Katajisto	Vesa	KV
ECOS	Chloe	Fayole	ECOS_NR
European Federation for Elevator Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EFESME) aisbl	Andrea-Eleonora	Masotto	EF_AM
EFESME	Luciono	Faletto	EF_LF
European Lift Association	Robert	Wright	ELA
ELCA	Luc	Rivet	ELCA
Hydroware AB	Kjell	Johansson	HYD
Kollmorgen Steuerungstechnik GmbH	Björn	Kollmorgen	Koll
Schindler Elevators Ltd.	Roger	Beuret	SC-RB

VDMA e.V.	Dieter	Unger	VD_DU
VDMA	Sascha	Schmel	VD_SAS
Viegand Maagoe A/S	Anne	Svendsen	VIEG_AS
FINLAND Member State	Juha	Toivanen	FIN

Note: Note: this table was corrected on 22/5/2018.

Objective of the meeting

The intention of the meeting was to serve as a first stakeholder meeting for the Ecodesign preparatory study for Lifts. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the initial findings on the Tasks 1 to 3 within the project and to hear the views of the stakeholders on the findings so far. Stakeholders were informed that draft reports for Tasks 1 to 3 were available to the public before the meeting on the project website (<https://www.eco-lifts.eu/>).

Note: complementary to this minutes of the meeting the meeting powerpoint presentation can be consulted

Agenda

9:45 – 10:00	Arrival of participants
10:00 – 10:15	Welcome and round of introductions Cesar Santos, European Commission
10:15 – 10:30	Background and objective of the study Cesar Santos, European Commission
10:30 – 10:50	Methodology of the study and objectives of the meeting Clemens Rohde, Fraunhofer ISI
10:50 – 11:15	Presentation of preliminary results of Task 1: Scope Antoine Durand, Fraunhofer ISI
11:15 – 11:45	Presentation of preliminary results of Task 2: Markets Paul van Tichelen, Vito
11:45 – 12:45	Discussions on Task 1 and 2
12:45 – 13:45	Lunch break
13:45 – 14:05	Presentation of preliminary results of Task 3: Users Simon Hirzel, Fraunhofer ISI
14:05 – 15: 05	Discussions on Task 3
15: 05 – 15:45	Further proceeding and schedule, other issues Clemens Rohde, Fraunhofer ISI
15:45	Closing Cesar Santos, European Commission

Minutes

Welcome and Short presentation of participants (all)

The project officers Cesar Santos opened the meeting. He said that the study took place because it was identified as relevant in the Ecodesign working program. The study will follow a standardized process (MEErP). The final aim is to end up with Ecodesign Implementing Measures and normally industry is supportive. After this study the EC takes over and does an Impact Assessment study. Better regulation principles will have to be followed. I am aware that Germany has already labels. The role of stakeholders

is important and their help is welcome. The role of harmonized standards is also crucial. We see that there are already standards, ideally they are available at the time of the regulation.

Rohde Clemens presented an introduction to the MEERp process (see powerpoint). This is the first of three stakeholder meetings during the preparatory study. The study follows a structured process, MEERp, which contains 7 Tasks. He also referred to the questions in the task documents, providing replies will make the study better.

Antoine Durand (AD) presented Task 1 (see powerpoint).
Afterwards a discussion took place:

abbr	Comment/answer
ELA	Question on slide 7: are only lifts above 0,15 m/s included?
AD	Yes, scope of the prep study will exclude lifts with less than 0,15 m/s
KV	<p>Commented:</p> <p>In Ecodesign we are looking at products before they are placed on the market, this means also assessing their energy efficiency prior to be in service, which is a challenge.</p> <p>The Lifts Directive and especially its application, is currently in revision¹ and therefore the old document should not be used as reference. It is not clear yet which products will be covered in the revision as we are in a transitional period.</p> <p>It will be important to define what are new lifts.</p> <p>After having been entered in service, the lift directive doesn't apply anymore only Member States Regulation.</p> <p>Before there was the lift directive there were national standards, Lifts in service are not covered.</p>

¹ <https://ec.europa.eu/docsroom/documents/15350/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/native>

Koll	Statement: When lifts are installed where there was already a existing lift it is not always clear when it is a new Lift.
EF	Commented: The interpretation is ongoing. The old guide is still available on the EC website but it is subjective to interpretation. It needs to be further clarified.
ELCA	Commented on slide 19: Mentioned that there are 2 LCAs available within EPD(Environmental Product Declarations) and in his opinion they are in contradiction with the E4 project results. The EPD showed that outcome depend on the amount of trips and hydraulic elevators can be a good environmental choice for low usage elevators under 300 trips/year.
EF	Commented: Within EPBD taking lifts into account is not compulsory. However in Italy a new standard is being developed for EPBD, including the energy use of lifts in non-residential buildings. Also he noted that there are in Italy Lifts which have lower usage than in the initial table ISO25745-2, which was changed to accommodate these differences. Finally, CEN is developing a new standards, that also includes home lifts. This is a growing market. Please do not forget this.
ECOS	The study could discuss what exemptions of the Lift Directive can have potential significant environmental impact and should be included in the scope of the study.
CR	We assume that home lifts consume less because they have low usage and can therefore be left out of scope
KV	Commented: The scope is important. It is also important to monitor any later legislation. It is important that consistency among different directives within the same product group is maintained. The safety first principle should not be disregarded for energy efficiency sake. Other aspects, accessibility, lighting and contrast, etc. should also not be disregarded. Regulation should be technology neutral. issues. Fair treatment of innovative technologies should also be respected. The machinery Directive also covers dismantling. The official statistics are not very useful and specific, for example PRODCOM.
EF	VDI4707 this is a document prepared in Germany. It opened the way for the ISO standard but it is not applicable to all countries and market players. The correct document is the ISO standard.
AD	We mainly based our work on ISO but for completeness, we presented also VDI. The proposed product categories in the preparatory study are based on ISO usage categories We do not want to be contrary.
SC	Confirmed that we should work with the ISO standard and said that VDI is harmonising with the ISO in the next revision.

Paul Van Tichelen(PVT) presented Task 2 (see powerpoint).

Afterwards a discussion took place:

abbr.	Comment/answer
ELA	why do we need the product price?
PVT	Replied that it is needed because in later tasks 5 and 6 we will do a life cycle cost (LCC) analysis and it will take into account the least life cycle cost (LLCC) solutions for recommendations on any later regulation.

R	in the end it is rental cost and therefore we should know the overall cost.
ELA	Questioned on how to weight the environmental impact against cost?
CS	said that regulation will be should be set at the minimum LLCC. Therefore he stressed that it will be important to know the impact on the product price? Manufacturers should say this, especially what is the extra cost for improving the product.
EF	Commented: A lot of data comes from PRODCOM but according to them there might be everything in this category and it should also be noted that data for example from Denmark is not consistent. In their opinion there no reason to categorise into bottom and top supported but it can be done according to technology. Upgrading and partial renovation is a parallel market where maintenance companies play a big role.
VIEG	Suggest to consult maintenance companies to understand the structure of the market in terms of age of installation. They also suggest to check other building regulations to see if there are other aspects that require to install an elevator e.g. in Denmark every building over 3 stories has to have an elevator for each staircase entrance.
KV	Commented: Modernization can provide statistics but only when there is a big change. Prices seem low from PRODCOM The installation must be considered. The price is an important issue because it is a question about investment.
AB	PRODCOM is far too low.
Clem	we have an issue with price data and there are methods to work. We will improve it along the study. We need an achievable range.
ELCA	Commented: It comes always back to the same statistics. The same lift will cost less for example in Bulgaria vs Sweden. For the total life cycle cost one should look at the investment cost of the and the maintenance. According to him the potential energy savings are very low per year lift and hence the cost saving.
EF	Question: (4) of the Energy labelling Regulation (ELR) stress that Lift don't fall under that regulation and as a stakeholder they support that idea, can this be confirmed?
CS	Confirms that (4) of Energy labelling Regulation excludes lifts

Lunch Break

Simon Hirzel (SIM) presented Task 3: Users (see powerpoint)

Afterwards a discussion took place:

abbr.	Comment/answer
VIEG	Question: You calculated the energy consumption from the ISO standard but does it reflect the reality because there are many deviations possible.
SIM	The real challenge is to have usage category but the ISO standard seems a good

	approximation to deal with the complexity of reality.
SC-RB	Commented: It is also important to consider legal aspects. There are legal requirements that influence the energy consumption (e.g. alarm is required and consumes energy or special illumination requirements for handicapped). These requirements may differ from country to country.
SIM	Legal aspects are in principle in Task 1. Raised the question: Do stakeholders expect safety equipment to substantially affect energy demand?
KV	Commented: Safety must be there and it is not an issue of more or less safety. But accessibility requirements have an impact on the energy consumption.
SC-RB	There are still local regulation on accessibility that make a difference in energy consumption. They can differ per country. They are sometimes regardless of use, e.g. the power consumption of alarms.
ELA	Commented on slide 45: The statement on policy should be removed from the report as it seems premature.
SIM	Project team will take this into consideration.
EF_LF	Commented: You insist mentioning a label. The correct information in Italy not the label and in his opinion the label has no useful information. Rather absolute consumption estimates in kWh should be used. The ISO standard is based on a lot of calculation but apart from that also trip counter could measure traffic and can be a useful tool, and a trip counter is not part of the standard.
KV	Commented: The label calculation is useful because it can be calculated when the lift is placed on the market. Refers to the Lift directive, the building interaction can be taken into account.
SC-RB	Commented: 800 to 1000 kWh measurement value are mentioned. Lift consumption has improved by a factor 5 as compared to the values indicated in E4, thus it is not the state of the art.
SIM	Replied: The state of art will be dealt with in task 4.

Joao Fong (JF) presented on introduction to Task 4 .

abbr.	Comment/answer
HYD	Commented: You did not mention modularity, please also look at this. This means also standardisation, it is difficult but if you do not do it you will lose a lot of improvement potential. It should also be taken into account that different components have different life time and the functional unit should reflect this, it should be for the life time of the building. In his opinion modularity is the most important part in LCA for improvement.
CS	Commented: The directive mentions modularity. Raised the question: What is on you mind?
	A simple example is the door panel, this can be standardized.
CS	What do manufactures?
ELCA	There is already some modularity

HYD	Commented: Automotive is already ahead of that and it is important for products with such long life time.
KV	Commented: For the new lifts covered by CE marking. Manufacturer should take into account maintenance but it is not obliged to put is product in modular form. Inspection and maintenance is national legislation.

Antione Durand explained the next steps. The deadline for comments on Tasks 1-3 is 15th of March. The updated tasks 1-3 and first draft tasks 4 and 5 are scheduled for autumn. There will be two more stakeholder meetings, the next is scheduled for September.

Cesar Santos thanked the participants and closed the meeting.

Annex

The powerpoint presentation of the meeting are available at the project website: <https://www.eco-lifts.eu/eco-lifts-en/content/documents.php>