

WLTP Sub Group EV	
Date	28 th of June 2017
Time	9am to 11am CET
Title	WLTP Sub Group EV Meeting — minutes
Working Paper Number	WLTP-SG-EV-17-02

Minutes

1	Input for Low Temperature Task Force	
	<p>Discussion of table provided by JP in Bern (WLTP-18-12e) → SG EV asked to provide feedback/input on this table</p> <p>Wrap up of SG EV contribution to Supplemental Test TF which was also reported during the IWG WLTP meeting in Geneva (WLTP-19-09e)</p> <p>Revision of minutes from last Supplemental Test TF web-audio (June 1st) before this SG EV web-audio and discussion of questions/tasks for SG EV included in these minutes</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Topic: REESS preparation/conditioning in advance of test → JP will be able to report on this topic in December → JP will need to perform tests before giving an answer → JRC not planning any test up to now.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Simulations versus performing a physical test → JP is not considering simulation up to now → Feedback from some other members was that focus is for the moment on the physical test as this would have to be the reference for the simulation validation</p> <p>For a more constructive further discussion on a low temperature test procedure, T&E proposes to write down possible scenarios that consider the important and non-negligible parameters. To develop these relevant options will improve the possibility to understand the difference, e.g. to describe the scenario regarding overnight charging from the grid or not during lower temperature</p> <p>Especially manufacturers pointed out that there are still answers missing on questions that are of a high relevance. There is up to now no clear guidance from the IWG WLTP and the Low Temp TF on the temperature set point as well as the purpose of the values</p>	

	<p>There is an urgent need to give a proper guidance on these points for a constructive further discussion. Up to now, discussion have to work with premises.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u> SG EV needs more clarity regarding boundaries for supplemental test in order to give a constructive answer to the questions from the TF.</p> <p>With guidance regarding the boundary conditions, SG EV can provide scenarios and options for the further discussion on Low Temperature TF level.</p> <p><u>Next steps:</u> Although there are still open questions, several scenarios have to be developed. These scenarios have to show the importance of having answers on the still open questions. These scenarios will provide a better basis for the discussion on SG EV level. The scenarios have to consider e.g. REESS heating, cabin conditioning from the grid, etc. and should cover possible technologies which manufacturer may use in future vehicles</p> <p><u>Responsible:</u> SG EV secretary will prepare scenarios as discussion basis for the next web-audio meeting on SG EV level.</p>	
2	EVE: Hybrid System Power Determination	
	<p>Three documents have been presented on this topic during the EVE meeting in Geneva (June season)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EVE-23-03e - EVE-23-04e - EVE-23-06e <p>Proposal from IWG EVE is that the considered method will the new ISO method so a reference to new ISO method should be the way forward. It should be preferred to reference directly to the ISO method before introducing a deviation from the ISO method in the WLTP GTR.</p> <p>Concerning the purposes of WLTP (downscaling and cycle classification), Heinz Steven necessarily needs to have more information regarding ISO method. This information is not available at the time being outside the ISO working group – for the IWG WLTP (and SG EV).</p>	

	<p>WLTP has no urgent need to introduce a procedure for the determination of hybrid system power as the current WLTP procedure classifies all Annex 8 vehicles as class 3 vehicles.</p> <p>For gear shifting of manual transmission, the current procedure in the GTR (shifting on manufacturer's recommendation) shall be kept.</p>	
3	<p>Discussion of input for EVE: Battery Performance and Durability</p>	
	<p>Two documents have been presented on this topic during the EVE meeting in Geneva (June season 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EVE-23-05e - EVE-23-08e <p>Request from WLTP IWG that WLTP SG EV members specify the durability requirements for electrified vehicles. (WLTP-19-14w, slide 6)</p> <p>JP already presented this web-audio conference its position regarding vehicle durability. Concerning CO2 and fuel consumption, determination along with discussion between SG EV and EVE IWG. JP does have no plan to introduce regulatory requirements on range with an aged and deteriorated REESS.</p> <p>EU will ask the question to EU WLTP if there will be a requirement for a deteriorated range.</p> <p>JRC will discuss this topic with EC. Earliest then, further discussion of this topic in WLTP SG EV.</p> <p>If position from stakeholders is different, discussion required in WLTP IWG before submitting answer to EVE IWG.</p>	
4	<p>Drive Trace Index</p>	
	<p>Question raised in the EU WLTP meeting if there are use case possible where vehicle deviates from the prescribed driving curve and where it is allowed because these parts will in consequence not be considered in the calculation/determination of values). This may happen during the WLTP Shortened Type 1 Test procedure.</p> <p>According to T&E, not the driver deviates from the prescribed driving curve of the cycle; it is the vehicle that cannot longer follow the cycle. Propose to use the time for the deviation could as criteria.</p> <p>JP proposes to use WOT as criteria, but that will need a definition of WOT.</p> <p>SG EV will have to discuss this issue further and propose a solution.</p>	

	<p>T&E will provide comments on this issue (see attached mail from Iddo Riemersma)</p> <p><u>Next steps:</u> Further discussion in next meeting</p>	
5	Drafting Issues	
	<p>Point raised by Serge Dubuc: No clear definition for REESS is in the GTR. This caused especially in the context with the 12 V battery some confusion as a Contracting Party has interpreted REESS in a way that no monitoring of the 12 V battery is required during test.</p> <p><u>Next steps:</u> Drafting coordinator will invite to a separate web conference to discuss this issue further. Propose the 25th of July.</p>	
6	AOB	
	<p>JP asked for some clarification regarding the “run-in” of PEV and NOVC-FCHV. REESS has to be “run-in” for at least 300km, the vehicle itself 3000 to 12000km.</p> <p>Not clear in GTR according to agreement in phase 1a and might need amendment in GTR to reflect that. Understanding from JP was that, for PEVs and NOVC-FCHVs, only a 300km run-in is required. However, remark from some members of SG EV that a 300 km run-in might be too short for PEV.</p> <p>In addition to the point above, discussion regarding RLD vehicle. But RLD issue will be forwarded to new issues TF.</p> <p><u>Next steps:</u> Further discussion of this issue in upcoming meeting to propose a representative run in for PEV and NOVC-FCHV.</p>	