



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

Deputy Director-General

Brussels,
GROW C4

**Subject : Minutes - Mr Erik Jonnaert ACEA Secretary General (BASIS 4251)
meeting with A. Peltomäki on 09/03/2016**

Participants:

ACEA: Erik Jonnaert, [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

COM: Antti Peltomäki, [REDACTED]

1. RDE

- ACEA recognises the need to implement the 3rd and 4th package according to the schedule. AP explained that due to the complexity of the matter and other tasks (in particular WLTP) there might be a small delay.
- ACEA emphasises that a fast solution for the RDE testing of hybrid vehicles must be found. Currently no comprehensive test procedure for these vehicles exist. While it is true that they can in principle be tested according to the general RDE procedure, not taking into account the specificities of hybrids, there is the risk that no "valid" RDE test can be driven due to their particular operation mode. This effect could limit during the "RDE monitoring phase" (starting probably in April 2016) the type approval of hybrids. [REDACTED] explained that this is certainly not in the intention of the Commission, a comprehensive hybrid RDE test procedure will be developed for the 3rd RDE package, also considering specific air quality issues that may arise from future diesel hybrids. [REDACTED] acknowledged that in theory there might be some problems to generate "valid" PEMS trips with hybrids using the currently available, "general" PEMS protocol, however no such concrete example has been brought to the attention of the Commission services yet. Before entering into the discussion of finding a possible "very quick" fix, such examples should be provided.
- ACEA suggested to postpone the application of particle number (PN) RDE testing at type approval to the 2nd RDE step, since manufacturers would need more lead time. [REDACTED] explained that this would be very difficult, if not impossible, since Regulation (EC) 459/2012 explicitly mandates such PN RDE testing of gasoline direct injection (GDI) vehicles for September 2017/18, according to a political compromise of December 2011. PN RDE testing therefore must be part of the 3rd RDE package, manufacturers had sufficient time to get their vehicles prepared (and they could always install a gasoline particle filter (GPF), which solves the problem but creates of course some additional costs...).

2. WLTP

- ■ briefly introduced the main features of the WLTP (with respect to the NEDC) and complained, well-tempered, about the additional testing burden etc. for industry – highlighting at the same time ACEA's own efforts for bringing the WLTP into being.
- There are however a number of technical elements creating worries for ACEA: number of type 1 tests required (1), NEDC-WLTP correlation (2), evolution factor for CoP testing (3). ■ explained that for issues (1) and (3) the Commission maintains its current position in its proposal, but the issues will be discussed at TCMV with Member States.
- ■ strongly suggested a shift of the application date of the WLTP to all new types to a "later date" (from September 2017) and to all new vehicles by September 2019 (from September 2018). The reason for the first shift is "to ease the administrative burden" for Member States, the reason for the second shift is to avoid an effective, early application of the RDE requirements to all new vehicles. ■ explained that the suggested first shift will be discussed at TCMV. The second shift is much more difficult from a political perspective.

3. Decarbonisation strategy

- ACEA recognises the different EU targets for decarbonisation, the one for 2050 probably the easiest to accept
- EJ criticised the strong focus of the EU decarbonisation strategy on alternative powertrains. The problem is the market uptake: if users do not want an electric car it cannot be sold. "Decarbonisation" should be discussed in a technologically neutral way, i.e. should also include a role for conventional vehicles.
- EJ announced the imminent submission of an ACEA policy paper on decarbonisation
- ■ highlighted the role of ITS (intelligent/connected cars etc.) to the CO2 emission reduction potential. Manufacturers can however only be held responsible for the in-car technology, the potentially needed infrastructure on the road is in public hands
- ■ also raised concerns about different and inconsistent national schemes, e.g. for vehicle scrapping, company cars, tax incentives in relation to decarbonisation
- AP mentioned the role of GEAR 2030 in this respect. It can serve for exchanging best practices between Member States and possibly achieving a certain degree of alignment.