

#### CARBON FOOTPRINT GAS EMISSIONS



All rights reserved

Figure 1. Share of EU-27 economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions in 2018 by transport subsector, including domestic and international components. Land use, land-use change, and forestry are included in the other sectors

## AGENDA

EUROPEAN EMISSIONS STANDARDS

ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS

BSFC / ENGINE MAP

DRIVING CYCLES

HYBRID CONFIGURATIONS

SERIES VS. PARALLEL



### EURO 6

#### Euro 6 standards for petrol engines

<ul> <li>Carbon monoxide:</li> </ul>	1.0g/km
<ul> <li>Total hydrocarbon :</li> </ul>	0.10g/km
<ul> <li>Nonmethane hydrocarbon :</li> </ul>	0.068g/km
<ul> <li>Nitrogen oxides:</li> </ul>	0.06g/km
<ul> <li>Particulate matter:</li> </ul>	0.005g/km
•CO2 emissions	98g/km

#### Euro 6 standards for diesel engines

•Carbon monoxide:	0.50g/km
•Hydrocarbons and Nitrogen oxides:	0.17g/km
•Nitrogen oxides:	0.08g/km
<ul> <li>Particulate matter:</li> </ul>	0.005g/km
•CO2 emissions	<mark>98g/km</mark>

#### **ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS OF CONVENTIONAL VEHICLES**



#### **ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS OF CONVENTIONAL VEHICLES**

Source	Energy density [MJ/kg]		
Lead acid batteries	0.0792		
Nickel cadmium (NiCad) batteries	0.158		
Lithium ion batteries	0.468		
Lithium sulfur batteries	0.792		
Methanol combustion	22.7		
Ethanol combustion	30.5		
Heating oil combustion	42.5		
Diesel combustion	45.3		
Gasoline combustion	45.8		
n-Octane combustion	48.2		
n-Butane combustion	49.6		
Propane combustion	50.3		
Methane combustion	55.5		
Hydrogen combustion	142		

#### **ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS OF CONVENTIONAL VEHICLES**

- $1 liter \cong 10 km$
- $\Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{1} \, kg \cong \mathbf{15} \, km$   $1 \, liter \cong 700 \, gr$

 $1 kwh \cong 5 km$   $(200 wh \cong 1 km)$   $\Rightarrow 1 kg \cong 1 km$   $200 wh \cong 1 kg$ 

# bsfc

Brake specific fuel consumption is a parameter that reflects the efficiency of a combustion engine which burns fuel and produces rotational power (at the shaft or crankshaft)

#### **ICE MAP**



**Fig. 3.6.** Efficiency conto with an EPA Tier 2 fuel.

All rights reserved

#### **ICE MAP - v increases at constant partial pressure**

- **1** *f*\_*mep*  $\mathbf{1} \eta_{comb}$  ( $\mathbf{1}$  burning velocity) BMEP (Ba *h* (convection coefficient.) **1** comb duration, deg ↓ heat losses/cycle
- ↓ pumping losses



**Fig. 3.6.** Efficiency contours of Honda 1.5 L turbocharged engine when tested with an EPA Tier 2 fuel.

# PARAMETERS AFFECT bsfc

**bsfc** = 
$$f\left(n_{v}, n_{m}, n_{comb}, w_{loss}, r_{c}, T, P, RH, ign, N, valve, \frac{A}{F}...\right)$$

# PARAMETERS AFFECT bsfc

$$bsfc = f\left(n_{v}, n_{m}, n_{comb}, w_{loss}, r_{c}, T, P, RH, ign, N, valve, \frac{A}{F} \dots\right)$$
$$\frac{1}{bsfc \cdot E_{fuel}} \cdot 100\% = \% \ efficiency$$
$$\frac{1}{0.24 \ kG/kWh \cdot 11.8 \ kWh/kG} \cdot 100\% = 35\%$$

#### **UDDS** URBAN DYNAMOMETER DRIVING CYCLES

The cycle simulates an urban route of 7.5 mi (12.07 km) with frequent stops. The maximum speed is 56.7 mph (91.25 km/h) and the average speed is 19.6 mph (31.5 km/h).





Figure 1.3 Engine operation points under UDDS driving cycle



#### FIRST ELECTRIC VEHICLE



#### HYBRID CONFIGURATION

- 1.Series
- 2.Parallel
- 3.Series Parallel





Figure 1.7 System architecture of series hybrid drivetrain



FIGURE 8. Series hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 8. Series hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 8. Series hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 8. Series hybrid electric vehicle



Figure 1.8 System architecture of parallel hybrid drivetrain



FIGURE 10. Parallel hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 10. Parallel hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 10. Parallel hybrid electric vehicle



FIGURE 10. Parallel hybrid electric vehicle

#### SERIES VS. PARALLEL

	Pros	Cons	
Series	Simple drive train	All 3 driving components (ICE, Generator, motor) need to be sized for long-distance high-speed driving	
	ICE working point can be optimized	Cannot run with ICE only	
	Control strategy has low constraints	Additional losses due to more components	
Parallel	Good efficiency at low speed	The ICE may not always work at the best working point	
	Better sizing	Complex mechanical parts	
		Control strategy has more constraints	

#### DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL, ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF GENOVA

	Vehicle Feature	Series/Parallel	Parallel	Series		
	Vehicle mass (Kg)	1450	1450	1450		
	Rolling coefficient	0.01	0.01	0.01		
	Drag coefficient	0.25	0.25	0.25		
	Vehicle front area (m <sup>2</sup> )	2.3	2.3	2.3		
	Wheel radius (m)	0.3	0.3	0.3		
	Differential gear ratio	3.45	10.8	8		
	Differential efficiency	0.97	0.97	0.97		
	Gear efficiency	0.95	0.95	0.95		
	Air density $(kg/m^3)$	1.22	1.22	1.22		
	ICE power (kW)	72	72	40		
	ICE maximum torque (Nm)	142	142	79		
	MG2 maximum torque (Nm)	163	163	230		
	MG2 base speed (rpm)	3000	3000	3000		
	MG2 maximum speed (rpm)	17,000	17,000	12,000		
	MG1 maximum torque (Nm)	43	-	400		
	MG1 base speed (rpm)	5000	-	1750		
	MG1 maximum speed (rpm)	1000	-	5500		
	DC-link voltage (V)	650	650	650		
Missions	Average Speed (km/h)	Maximum Speed (km/h)	Length (km)	Time (min)	Change of Altitude (m)	
US06	78	130	13	10	_	
UDDS	31	90	12	23	-	
HW/FET	78	90	165	13	-	
Urban	24	57	11.4	25	-	
Fast-urban	27	68 80	22	52	62	
Mountain mission 1	43	85	24	30	500	
Extra-urban 2	62	96	57	55	190	
Mountain mission 2	51	90	60	70	710	
Highway-mountain	87	125	480	330	1700	

29

#### DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL, ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF GENOVA



Figure 27. ICE power profile, comparison between parallel and series architectures (Urban).

#### UNIVERSITY OF GENOVA,



Figure 28. Series architecture: ICE working points.

Figure 29. parallel architecture

# Thank you