

Från: Jan Dornoff
Till: [Serge M. Dubuc](#); [Naegeli, Matthias \(K-GEAG/1\)](#)
Kopia: [Iddo Riemersma](#)
Ärende: EV Sub Group meeting - Paragraph 2.2 of Appendix 2 of Annex 8
Datum: den 30 augusti 2017 12:58:14

Dear All,

as a follow up to yesterdays meeting, Iddo and I discussed bullet point (e) of paragraph 2.2 of Appendix 2 of Annex 8.

As an outcome we agreed to propose the following amendment of the GTR:

- Before amendment:
 - (e) The difference in MCO_{2,CS} between the test with the highest negative electric energy change and the mid-point, and the difference in MCO_{2,CS} between mid-point and the test with the highest positive electric energy change shall be similar and preferably be within the range defined by (d).
- Proposed amendment:
 - (e) The difference in M_CO_{2,CS} between the test with the highest negative electric energy change and the mid-point, and the difference in M_CO_{2,CS} between mid-point and the test with the highest positive electric energy change shall be similar. The mid-point is defined as the test with an electric energy change between the highest positive and highest negative electric energy change.
 - (f) The mid-point shall be within the range defined by (d).

We are proposing this amendment based on the following rationale:

- The text of the GTR in its current version describes the calculation of two delta CO₂-mass values and requires that these delta values shall be in the range defined by (d). However, the range defined in (d) is related to a ratio of electric energy change and fuel energy.
- According to the technical report (GRPE-74-05), the thought was that the ratio of electric energy change and fuel energy of the mid-point should be in the range defined by (d). Since this requirement is independent of the delta CO₂-mass calculation, a separate bullet point (f) was added covering this requirement.
- The term 'mid-point' is nowhere defined in the GTR. Hence the definition was added under (e).
- The fragment 'preferably be within the range defined by (d)' was replaced by 'shall be within the range defined by (d)'. We consider this reasonable for the following reasons:
 - (c) - (f) are an additional set of requirements to allow only 3 measurements for the K_CO₂ determination (instead of 5). Therefore, there is no need for additional flexibility.
 - The manufacturer may change the SOC of the battery prior to the test, in order to pursue a certain delta SOC over the test. The manufacturer should know for which starting SOC value the delta SOC over the test would hit the objected region.
 - As shown in the picture of the Technical Report, this region specified by (d) is wide enough, so it should not be a problem to place one measurement in there

Since I don't have all the e-mail addresses of the EV sub-group, I would like to ask you to

forward the proposal. Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jan

Jan Dornoff
Senior Researcher ICCT Europe
Neue Promenade 6, 10178 Berlin
+49 (30) 847129-124
j.dornoff@theicct.org

<http://www.theicct.org>

ICCT - International Council on Clean Transportation Europe gemeinnuetzige GmbH
Managing Director: Dr. Peter Mock, Amtsgericht Charlottenburg HRB 143557, VAT-
IdNr. DE284186076
EU Transparency Register identification number: 06250094777-73