



The Zero Emission Vehicle Mandate in California

Model year	Conventional vehicle	TLEV	LEV	ULEV	ZEV
1994	90	10		-	
1995	85	15			
1996	80	20			
1997	73		25	2	
1998-2000	48		48	2	2
2001-2002			90	5	5
2003			75	15	10

Table 1. CARB requirements for manufacturer's fleet sales

Source: Hoogma (2000, p. 257)











Worldwide Annual Sales of Prius (Thousand units)														
1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Jan-Sep 2010	Cum. Total
0.3	17.7	15.2	12.5	11	6.7	17	59.8	43.7	48.6	58.3	73.1	208.9	254.2	826.9
			5.8	16	20.3	24.9	55.9	109.9	109	183.8	163.3	1// 3	105.9	939,1
		2			0.8	0.9	8.1							206.1
	-		0.01	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.9	2.9	5.3	7	7.7	8.4	5.8	39.7
0.3	17.7	15.2	19	29.5	28.1	43.2	125.7	175.2	185.6	281.3	285.7	404.2	401.3	2,011.8
	0.3 - -	0.3 17.7 	0.3 17.7 15.2 	0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 - - - 5.8 - - - 0.7 - - - 0.01	1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 - - - 5.8 16 - - 0.7 0.7 2.3 - - 0.01 0.2	1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 - - - 5.8 16 20.3 - - 0.7 0.7 0.8 0.8 - - 0.01 0.2 0.2	1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 - - - 5.8 166 20.3 24.9 - - 0.07 2.3 0.8 0.9 - - 0.01 0.22 0.24	1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8	1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8 43.7 - - - 5.8 16 20.3 24.9 55.9 109.9 - - 0.7 2.3 0.8 0.9 8.1 18.8 - - 0.01 0.2 0.2 0.4 1.9 2.9	(Thousan-Units) 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8 43.7 48.6	(Thousard units) 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8 43.7 48.6 58.3	(ThousanUtics) 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8 43.7 48.6 58.3 73.1	(ThousanUtic) 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 0.3 17.7 15.2 12.5 11 6.7 17 59.8 43.7 48.6 58.3 73.1 208.9	(Thousantities) 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2

ſ











ZEVM as a historical contingency

- In 1990 the Californian Air Resources Board (an independent regulatory agency) was working out a new programme of sales requirements for low-emission vehicles to deal with the problem of smog
- During the preparation of the programme there was the demonstration at the LA 1990 motor show of the Impact electric vehicle (a concept car) by GM, and announcement of GM a few months later that it would produce the Impact car suggesting that electric vehicles were economically viable
- Targets for zero emission vehicles were added, starting at 2% in 1998 (8 years from 1990)
- The programme involved biannual reviews of technologies, giving leeway to industry
- In California environmentalist are policy insiders rather than outsiders
- The policy wish to create a EV industry in California compensating for the loss of jobs in the aerospace and defence industry was an additional factor working in its favour

Source: Kemp (2005)



A new momentum from 2000 on

- Almost all major car manufacturers are developing cars with electric propulsion: BEV, (P)HEV, FCV; some (Nissan and Renault) moved from a defensive to a (prudent) offensive strategy
- The European Commission has stimulated the development of alternative powertrain technologies through R&D programs (mainly via the 7th Framework), and England, Italy, Germany, and Japan introduced subsidies for the purchase of EVs. Denmark and Israel championed the incentives for EVs by exempting them of the taxes paid for ICEs.
- Action plans for electric vehicles from local authorities (Amsterdam) and public-private-CSO alliances.
- Electric mobility **leasing model** of Better Place in California, Israel and Denmark
- Recharging and battery swapping points are being put in place
- · Electric utilities are getting involved in EV partnerships
- · Joint ventures of car manufacturers with battery developers
- Fleet owners interested. In Amsterdam car2go electric car sharing initiative
- ...



Competitive and **synergetic** effects for EVs (determining its future)

- BEV, FCV and PHEV are competing with (fuel-efficient) ICEV
- Different configuration of electric mobility are competing with each other.
 - Positive developments for all electric vehicles (battery, hybrid and fuel cell)
 - higher oil prices
 - better batteries and recharging systems,
 - new business propositions such as mobility leasing with battery swapping
 - urban policies to restrain car traffic and promote clean and silent cars
 - better systems of intermodality
 - cultural acceptance of electric mobility and organised car sharing.
- Rising oil prices will both stimulate EV and fuel efficient ICEV. The availability of cleaner ICE vehicles will slow down the diffusion of electric vehicles.
- Electrification of bicycles and scooters as a spill-over effect / neighbouring development.



Factors working *against* electric mobility

- High battery costs and short range
- The current dominance of cultural attachment to *owning* rather than renting vehicles;
- The commitment of car manufacturers to (environmentally improved) internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles;
- Increasing sales and preference for cheaper ICE cars in emerging markets such as China, as compared to more expense hybrid vehicles;
- Possibility that (hydrogen) fuel-cell technology will be ready for commercial use any time soon.

Orsato, R.J., M. Dijk, R. Kemp and M. Yarime (2010) The Electrification of Automobility. The bumpy ride of electric vehicles towards regime transition, in Automobility in Transition? pp. 205-228









