

<p>TOP 1: Report from IWG EVE concerning the topics - battery durability - Hybrid System Power Determination</p>	<p>Confirmation by WLTP Subgroup EV that both topics are needed from WLTP IWG</p> <p>System Power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO draft: text not available yet. • ISO draft contains two options: JP and DE (VDA) method. • ISO procedure available in November 2017. Therefore not possible with formal document for GRPE January 2018. • WLTP needs the hybrid system power for the methods cycle classification and downscaling • There is a need to discuss about timeline. Question: Is a finalized standard procedure in November 2019 ok for the WLTP purposes? • Question to WLTP: Is peak power sufficient or is a power curve needed? Answer by IWG WLTP: Peak power sufficient <p>Battery performance and durability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the EVE meeting in Ann Arbour, there had been two presentations from industry side on this topic (one by Volvo Cars, one by Ford); in addition, OICA provided an statement supporting the message of these two presentations. • Message from the presentations: Battery technology still under development. Therefore, it is difficult to establish a standardized procedure that assesses battery performance and durability in fair and representative way at this time. • EVE discussed three possible options for assessing battery durability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish specific test profile for (accelerated) battery aging. • Establish a default deterioration factor (manufacturer can get a better factor if data show a justification for a better factor • Test with a vehicle with an artificially (by software) deteriorated battery. • EVE discussed possible durability requirement and provided a matrix of these to the IWG WLTP for consideration and bring back feedback to IWG EVE
---	--

<p>TOP 2: Discussion of questions from IWG EVE to IWG WLTP on hybrid system power determination</p>	<p>Q1: What timing is acceptable? Specifically, would a final procedure approved by November 2019 be acceptable?</p> <p>Answer from WLTP Subgroup EV on Q1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timeline according to EC should be more in the interest for industry as from regulators side; there is a solution as according to the current procedure, all EVs are classified as class 3 vehicles. - It is ok to reference to the ISO standard. Would also be possible to copy and paste the text. - Reference to ISO standard only ok, if ISO method can be verified → Validation of the ISO methods is needed. - ISO will prepare an overview of the methods to WLTP for the June meeting; WLTP will then be able to assess the method(s) provided by the standard. - System power also of interest for noise requirements. - For WLTP the timeline has no deadline, - EVE is requested to provide a robust method for system power based on ISO.
	<p>Q2: Is only peak power still okay? Is there a need for a power curve or is a power curve just a “nice to have?”</p> <p>Answer from WLTP Subgroup EV on Q2: For now, peak power should be ok for WLTP needs (cycle classification and downscaling)</p>
	<p>Q3: Would two step approach be acceptable, with the reference method developed/validated first, and then a candidate method (i.e. calculation based on component data) may be developed at a future time?</p> <p>Answer from WLTP Subgroup EV on Q3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WLTP also needs to decide if candidate method should still be considered or if reference method is sufficient - Candidate method development is depending on industry contribution and need/interest.
	<p>Q4: Is there a need for a different power value for CD mode vs CS mode?</p> <p>Answer from WLTP Subgroup EV on Q4: There should only be one peak power regardless of condition. Further discussion necessary, when we know more about the ISO method. Then a statement would be possible to say if different values are required or not.</p>

<p>TOP 3: Discussion of matrix sent for consideration from IWG EVE to IWG WLTP on battery performance criteria and requirements</p>	<p>Question from IWG EVE to IWG WLTP is: What values does IWG WLTP require in the matrix?</p> <p>JP position: No requirement on CO2 and range.</p> <p>EC position: - Range is not only of customer satisfaction, it is also a question of safety; customer should be able to rely on the performance. - Declared range values should cover both ambient conditions and durability; it is comprehensible that an aged vehicle may have a lower range, but this should be clear to the owner. - It is clear that WLTP CP will require battery durability. - Need to provide the matrix to EVE with the agreed requirement later, from EC point of view, this topic is also connected to Low Temp task force; the EC position is given there and can be shared in SG EV.</p>
<p>TOP 4: Low Temperature</p>	<p>Open points from SG EV side: - Low temp boundaries for electrified vehicles - Temperature set point(s) is/are also an open question in context of ICE. - Formulation of questions, members of WLTP SG EV need to have answered from WLTP IWG and CPs to move forward with their work</p>
<p>TOP 5: Phase 2 topics</p>	<p>Discussion necessary of the proceeding with the open phase 2 topics: what should be done by when?</p>
<p>TOP 6: Next meeting</p>	<p>Discussion of next meeting.</p> <p>Next meeting will be a web-audio conference on May 29th (9 to 12 CET)</p>