China's plug-in hybrid electric vehicles transition: an operational carbon perspective

Yanqiao Deng¹, Minda Ma^{2*}

- School of Management Science and Real Estate, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 400045, PR China
- School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 400045, PR China
- Corresponding author: Prof. Dr. Minda Ma, Email: minda.ma@cqu.edu.cn Homepage: http://chongjian.cqu.edu.cn/info/1556/6706.htm

Graphical Abstract



Graphical abstract. (a) Total energy use and (c) carbon emissions of the top twenty selling PHEV model operations; (b) operational carbon emissions released by electricity and gasoline from each model of these PHEV models among various geographical regions from 2020-2022.

Highlights

- A bottom-up approach was created to monitor the operational carbon change of top-selling PHEV models.
- The actual electricity intensity of samples (0.20-0.38 kWh/km) surpassed the NEDC values by 30-40%.
- The actual gasoline intensity of samples (0.05-0.24 L/km) was 3-6 times greater than the NEDC estimates.
- Energy in southern China (1.3 GL of gasoline equivalent) was double that of other regions in 2020-2022.
- Samples emitted 4.9 MtCO₂ nationwide in 2020-2022, with 1.9 Mt from electricity and 3 Mt from gasoline.

Abstract

Assessing the energy and emissions of representative plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) model operations is crucial for accelerating carbon neutrality transitions in China's passenger car sector. This study makes the first attempt to create a bottom-up model to measure the real-world energy use and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions of China's top twenty selling PHEV model operations across different geographical regions during 2020-2022. The results indicate that (1) the actual electricity intensity for the best-selling PEHV models (20.2-38.2 kilowatt-hour [kWh]/100 kilometers [km]) was 30-40% higher than the New European Driving Cycle (NEDC) values, and the actual gasoline intensity (4.7 to 23.5 liters [L]/100 km) was 3-6 times greater than the NEDC values. (2) The overall energy consumption of the best-selling models exhibited variations among various geographical regions, and the total gasoline equivalent was twice as high in southern China (1283 mega-liters, 2020-2022) than in northern China and the Yangtze River Middle Reach. (3) The top-selling models emitted 4.9 mega-tons (Mt) of CO₂ nationwide from 2020-2022, 1.9 Mt from electricity and 3 Mt from gasoline. In northern China, carbon emissions per vehicle were more than 1.2 times greater than those in other regions. Furthermore, targeted policy implications for expediting the carbon-neutral transition within the passenger vehicles are proposed. Overall, this study reviews and compares national and regional benchmark data and performance data for PHEV operations. Its objective is to bolster national decarbonization initiatives, ensuring low emissions and expediting the transportation sector's transition toward a net-zero era.

Keywords

Plug-in hybrid electric vehicles; Electricity demand; Fuel consumption; Passenger car decarbonization; Bottom-up model

Abbreviation notation

AER – All-electric range

AVKT - Annual vehicle kilometers traveled

 $BE-Battery\ energy$

CD-Charge-depleting

CS – Charge-sustaining

LCA –Life cycle analysis

NEDC - New European driving cycle

PHEV – Plug-in hybrid electric vehicle

 $\operatorname{SOC}-\operatorname{Battery}$ state of charge

Nomenclature

 $AVKTE_{i,j}$ – Annual electric vehicle kilometers traveled of vehicle model *i* in region *j* (unit: 100 km)

 $AVKTG_{i,j}$ – Annual gasoline vehicle kilometers traveled of vehicle model *i* in region *j* (unit: 100 km)

 $BE_{i,k}$ – Battery energy of the k-th vehicle model i

 CEE_j – CO₂ emissions in region *j* stem from the electricity

 CEG_i – CO₂ emissions in region *j* directly generated by gasoline combustion

 $EC_{i,j}$ – Total AVKT-based energy consumption of vehicle model *i* in region *j*

 EI_i – Electricity intensity of vehicle model *i* (unit: kWh/100 km)

 f_{co_2} – Conversion factor of electricity to gasoline equivalent

 GI_i – Gasoline intensity of vehicle model *i* (unit: L/100 km)

 μ_{fi} , μ_{gi} – Electricity-to-gasoline ratio of vehicle model i

 $NAER_{i,k}$ – AER of the k-th vehicle model i under the NEDC condition

 ω_k – Model popularity ratio of the k-th vehicle model

 ρ_{ej} – Carbon emission factor of electricity in region j

 ρ_a – Carbon emission factor of gasoline

 $Sal_{i,i}$ – Sales of vehicle model *i* in region *j*

1. Introduction

The number of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs), which nearly doubled annually to 6.6 million in 2021, as reported by the International Energy Agency [1], has the potential to contribute to reducing carbon emissions given renewable power generation profiles [2, 3]. China's electric vehicle development has been particularly remarkable, and PHEVs are presumed to have a development window of at least 10 years during the transitional period of new energy vehicle development in China.

Although PEHVs are thought to be more eco-friendly than internal combustion engines are and have grown in popularity in recent years, their effect on emission mitigation remains controversial [4]. Several recent studies have shown that real-world emissions could exceed official emissions [5, 6], as the energy and emissions from PHEV operations are sensitive to several potential factors, such as complicated road conditions [7], vehicle weight and speed [8, 9], and individual driving behavior [10]. In particular, the energy use and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions of PHEV operations exhibit significant regional variations across geographical regions in China, influenced by ambient temperatures [11, 12] and the power generation mix [13]. However, the majority of current studies have focused on either the national level or a specific region. Onat et al. [14] and Requia et al. [15] carried out comparative carbon emission analyses on the United States and on city-level emissions in Canada, demonstrating variations among different regions. To date, few studies have assessed the trends in energy and emissions released by the operation of PHEVs across various geographical regions, especially in China. Additionally, the various PHEV makes and models prevalent in fierce automotive market competition in recent years were not included. To address these gaps, this study proposes the following three issues for top-selling PHEVs in the passenger car sector of China:

- How can a real-world end-use energy model be established for top-tier PHEV makes and models?
- What is the heterogeneity in the energy use of PHEV operations across geographical regions?
- How can operational carbon trends of PHEVs be measured at the nationwide and regional scales?

To address the questions above, this study is the first to create a bottom-up framework dedicated to estimating the real-world energy use and CO₂ emissions of top-selling PHEVs across three distinct geographical regions—North China, Yangtze River Middle Reach, and South China—from 2020 to 2022. Specifically, this work focuses on assessing the energy intensity (electricity and gasoline consumption per 100 kilometers [km]) for real-world PHEV model operations, considering vehicle model performance, driver behaviors, and other parameters. In addition, a bottom-up approach is developed for estimating total energy consumption adaptable to different geographical regions for PHEV operations, mainly considering model sales, annual vehicle kilometers traveled (AVKT), the electricity-to-gasoline ratio, operational energy intensity, and climate conditions. Finally, this study evaluates operational CO₂ emissions, distinguishing between electricity and gasoline consumption in PHEV operations across different geographical regions. This assessment incorporates varying emission factors from gasoline and power grids in China.

To make the most significant contributions, this study pioneers the development of a standardized bottom-up end-use framework specifically tailored to assess the energy (electricity and gasoline) use and corresponding emissions of PHEV operations. By establishing a robust foundation of credible data from current PHEV energy use, this study sets a baseline. This baseline not only enables the modelling of future demand and emissions for PHEV operations in the coming years but also serves as a valuable tool for decarbonizing the passenger vehicles up to 2060. This study evaluates the spatial-temporal transition features of both the total and intensity of energy demand and associated emissions in PHEV operations across different geographical regions in China. This effort is aimed at expediting the transportation sector's move towards carbon neutrality.

The rest of this paper follows this structure: a literature review is presented in Section 2. Section 3 describes the methodology employed for estimating the energy demand and associated emissions of PHEV operations and the datasets used. Section 4 provides the results and discussion. Section 4.1 features the energy intensity of the operation of top-selling PHEVs. Section 4.2 measures the energy consumption of top-selling PHEVs. Section 4.3 assesses the carbon emissions of top-selling PHEVs. Then, Section 5 provides the targeted policy implications for expediting the carbon-neutral transition within the passenger car sector. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the core findings and proposes future studies.

2. Literature review

In the field of assessing the energy and emissions of PHEV operations, a diverse array of assessment methodologies has garnered increasing attention in recent years, mainly focusing on the perspectives offered by simulation methods [16, 17], life cycle analysis (LCA) [18, 19], statistical regression analysis [20, 21], and the application of top-down [22, 23] and bottom-up frameworks [24]. First, a series of energy and emission assessments of PHEVs based on simulation methods have been carried out in recent years, mainly focusing on factors such as average speed [25], battery current and battery state of charge (SOC) [26], charging mode [12], cold start and hot stabilized operation [27], driving behavior and trip condition effects [28], type of vehicle and size of the city [29]. However, these studies have focused mainly on limited PHEV models from a microscopic perspective and exhibited significant variability in terms of methodology, assumptions, data quality, and model design [30, 31]. Moreover, these models are not representative of various PHEVs from different vehicle makes with distinct configurations. At the national level, the literature on PHEV energy and emissions have employed LCA and statistical regression analysis to assess holistic realworld performance across different regions and countries. On the one hand, the LCA is a wellestablished and extensively used systematic tool for comparing the environmental impacts of transportation options across the entire life cycle phases of a PHEV, including material extraction, manufacturing, transport, use, and end-of-life [32, 33], and the energy and emissions estimations with the LCA vary greatly in terms of location [15, 19], energy mix for electricity generation [34, 35], type of PHEV [36, 37], and driving or charging habits [38]. On the other hand, studies of empirical gasoline consumption and CO₂ emissions of PHEVs based on statistical regression analysis, including regression analysis in Canada and the United States [39], quantile-on-quantile regression approaches in eight leading countries [40], cointegration regression methods for five countries [41], emphasizing associations between PHEV adoption and CO₂ emissions, and these studies on regression analysis, as well as LCA, have largely dominated the assessments of fewer carbon emissions by PHEVs mainly associated with economic [41, 42] and environmental benefits [43, 44].

The top-down and bottom-up frameworks are effective approaches for assessing the energy and emissions of PHEVs. Hofmann et al. [45] developed a top-down framework to assess the reduction in CO₂ emissions from electric vehicles in China at a nationwide scale. However, the utilization of a top-down approach that relies on annual data to explore the interplay between PHEVs and CO₂ emission outputs introduces a notable bias in emission estimations. This bias arises from a lack of detailed information, with a disproportionate emphasis on observed macroeconomic trends. Conversely, the bottom-up approach tends to use micro input data to construct a more systematic energy and emission estimation model from the ground up, starting with detailed information such as vehicle makes/models and fuel types, in China's road transport sector. For instance, Lu et al. [46] developed a bottom-up approach to measuring the CO₂ emissions of high-frequency passenger car sales data from 2016 to 2019 in China, effectively reducing the uncertainty of carbon emission accounting. According to the state of the art on the methods for assessing the energy and emissions of PHEV operations, the following two points are worth noting:

Regarding the assessment of energy and emissions of PHEV operations, there are two primary approaches: the macroscopic approach involves estimating CO₂ emissions using annual data from nationwide statistical yearbooks or exploring the relationships between macroscopic influencing factors in different countries, resulting in biased estimates without considering specific technical details of PHEVs [4, 40, 41]. Furthermore, the microscopic approach primarily focuses on carbon emission intensity but neglects total PHEV vehicle sales and AVKT, leading to an incomplete overview of total emissions in spatial and temporal scopes [47]. Importantly, these studies focus on several types of PHEV models [10, 31], which are less practical at representing the general carbon emissions trend of the current prevalent PHEVs with different configuration engine modes and individual consumer choices [48]. To date, few studies have systematically assessed the overall carbon emissions of a series of prevalent PHEVs in various geographical regions in China with micro-accounting details.

Regarding the methodology of assessing the carbon emissions of PHEV operations, Lu et al. [46] reported that the bottom-up framework is effective at assessing the overall CO₂ emissions from high-frequency passenger car sales. However, various PHEV models may lack adaptability to diverse geographical regions and detailing. Specifically, estimating the total CO₂ emissions associated with specific PHEVs equipped with complex electricity and gasoline propulsion modes may not be optimal [49]. To estimate the real-world energy and emissions of PHEVs, real-world data should be incorporated into assessment models [50]. However, studies based on simulation approaches exhibit significant variability in terms of methodology, assumptions, data quality, and other factors; these approaches are not representative of PHEV models with distinct configurations; and real-world simulations under complicated road conditions for different PHEV models are costly and impractical. To date, none of the existing works have systematically estimated the real-world carbon emissions of more than twenty PHEV models with various configurations across different geographical regions.

Therefore, to overcome the above limitations, this study creates a bottom-up framework for measuring the real-world emissions and energy of the operation of the top twenty selling PHEV models in different geographical regions across China for the first time. The main contributions of this work include the following:

- This work is the first to develop a bottom-up energy model for the top-20 selling PHEV models in China. To measure the energy intensity, encompassing both electricity and gasoline, of the top-selling PHEVs, a bottom-up approach is employed. This approach takes into account various variables like road conditions, vehicle model performance, and driver behavior. This contribution provides a robust foundation for reliable real-world data sourced from current PHEV energy demands, establishing a benchmark. This benchmark serves as a valuable tool for simulating future operational demand of PHEVs in the coming years.
- This work is also the first to assess the operational carbon emissions of PHEVs among various geographical regions. To track the operational carbon transition of leading PHEV models, the proposed bottom-up model is developed further. This extension assesses the carbon emissions resulting from both electricity consumption and gasoline combustion across various geographical regions in China. The bottom-up emission model considers key parameters such as PHEV model sales, AVKT determined by the electricity-to-gasoline ratio, real-world energy intensity, climate conditions, and emission factors from both gasoline and power grids. This comprehensive approach enables the evaluation of spatial-temporal transition features of the total energy use and total emissions of PHEVs at the nationwide and regional scales. The primary goal of this effort is to expedite the carbon-neutral transition within the transportation sector. By shedding light on the dynamic patterns of energy and emissions, this study contributes valuable insights for sustainable advancements in PHEV technology.

3. Methods and materials

This work developed a bottom-up estimation framework to measure the energy use and corresponding emissions of operations of top-selling PHEV models in various geographical regions of China. Section 3.1 introduces the bottom-up energy consumption model for PHEVs adaptive to three geographical regions, incorporating a real-world energy intensity estimation that considers comprehensive road conditions and diverse vehicle models. Section 3.2 develops a CO₂ emission estimation model that separately considers electricity and gasoline consumption for PHEV operations. At last, Section 3.3 outlines the datasets and parameter assumptions used in this work.

3.1. Bottom-up energy consumption assessment for PHEV operations

The annual total energy consumption of the top-*n* PHEV sales models in region *j* (including North China, the Yangtze River Middle Reach, South China and the nation, abbreviated as EC_N, EC_Y, EC_S, EC_T , respectively) is estimated by:

$$EC_j = \sum_{i=1}^n EC_{i,j} \times Sal_{i,j}, \qquad (j = N, Y, S, T)$$
(1)

where $EC_{i,j}$ represents the total AVKT-based energy consumption of vehicle model *i* in region *j* and $Sal_{i,j}$ represents the sales of vehicle model *i* in region *j* based on the National New Vehicle Compulsory Traffic Insurance.

Given the assumption of charge-depleting (CD) mode priority when the PHEV is fully charged and charge-sustaining (CS) mode or blended modes when the SOC reaches the lowest values, $EC_{i,j}$ can be formulated as:

$$EC_{i,j} = (EI_i \times f_{co_2}) \times AVKTE_{i,j} + GI_i \times AVKTG_{i,j}$$
⁽²⁾

where EI_i represents the electricity intensity (unit: kilowatt hours/100 km [kWh/100 km]) of vehicle model *i*, with only the electric engine propelling the vehicle, and GI_i is the gasoline intensity (unit: liter/100 km [L/100 km]) of vehicle model *i* under comprehensive real-world road conditions. $AVKTE_{i,j}$ and $AVKTG_{i,j}$ (unit: 100 km), respectively denote the annual electric and gasoline vehicle kilometers traveled of the vehicle model *i* in region *j*. According to the Conversion Methods for Energy Consumption of Electric Vehicles (GB/T 37340-2019)^a in China, the electricity consumption of PHEVs should be correspondingly converted to gasoline equivalent consumption to assess comprehensive energy consumption. Therefore, $EI_i \times f_{co_2}$ in Eq. (2) represents the electricity consumption (expressed by gasoline equivalent) per 100 km (unit: L/100 km), and f_{co_2} is the conversion factor of electricity to gasoline equivalent, which is defined as:

$$f_{co_2} = \frac{T_{\rm E} \times T_{\rm c} \times \varphi}{T_{\rm F} \times t_{\rm M} \times i_{\rm ch} \times (1 - i_{\rm tr})}$$
(3)

where $T_{\rm E}$ represents the standard coal consumption for thermal power generation [kg/(kWh)], $T_{\rm c}$ stands for the carbon dioxide emission factor of coal, φ denotes the proportion of thermal power generation in the power sector (%), $T_{\rm F}$ indicates the carbon dioxide emission factor of fuel, $t_{\rm M}$ represents the conversion coefficient of coal to standard coal, $i_{\rm ch}$ denotes the charging efficiency (%), and $i_{\rm tr}$ stands for the line loss rate (%). More information is detailed in GB/T 37340-2019.

For estimating EI_i and GI_i , there are diverse models with distinct vehicle configurations (i.e., battery energy [BE], all-electric range [AER], 0-100 km/h acceleration and other features), and exhibit different levels of popularity in real-world sales and usage. Therefore, an average EI_i is estimated considering the diversity of vehicle models and is formulated as follows:

$$EI_{i} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \omega_{k} \frac{BE_{i,k}}{\eta NAER_{i,k}} \times 100 \quad (i = 1, 2, ..., n)$$
(4)

where ω_k represents the model popularity ratio of the *k*-th vehicle model, which is determined by the ratio of the actual users of the *k*-th model to the total users of all *i* models with various configurations, and *m* is the number of all the vehicle models *i* on sale in that year. $BE_{i,k}$ denotes the battery energy of the *k*-th vehicle model, and $NAER_{i,k}$ is the AER under the New European Driving Cycle (NEDC) conditions; that is, the car relies only on the power in the battery to support the maximum driving range of the vehicle in CD mode. The real-world range loss coefficient η is considered in this work since the real-world AER is often shorter than the official AER under the NEDC condition [51].

^a https://openstd.samr.gov.cn/bzgk/gb/newGbInfo?hcno=59FFD3D8B126FD2D44F79251566145B1

For GI_i , the gasoline consumption under the NEDC condition significantly deviates from that in the real-world situation. Additionally, information on gasoline consumption when the battery SOC reaches its lowest value is incomplete for most vehicle models, especially in blended modes. Therefore, the average GI_i of vehicle model *i* is estimated as follows:

$$GI_i = \sum_{k=1}^m \omega_k \, GI_{i,k}, \qquad (i = 1, 2, ..., n)$$
 (5)

where $GI_{i,k}$ is the real-world comprehensive gasoline consumption per 100 km of the *k*-th vehicle model belonging to vehicle type *i*, as publicly measured by the users of the BearOil app under comprehensive road conditions, which can relatively reflect the actual comprehensive gasoline consumption level.

To estimate the corresponding AVKT of electricity consumption and gasoline consumption of vehicle model *i* in region *j*, $AVKTE_{i,j}$ and $AVKTG_{i,j}$ can be obtained by:

$$AVKTE_{i,j} = \mu_{ei} \times AVKT_j$$

$$AVKTG_{i,j} = \mu_{gi} \times AVKT_j$$
(6)

where μ_{ei} and μ_{gi} are the electricity-to-gasoline ratio and the ratio of the cumulative electricity consumption to the cumulative fuel consumption for all samples in all vehicle models *i* with distinct configurations.

3.2. Bottom-up emission assessment for PHEV operations

The CO₂ emissions released by PHEV operations are distinct from those released by electricity and gasoline consumption. It is imperative to estimate these components separately, avoiding reliance on a comprehensive energy consumption approach, as there are significant variations in the mechanisms of emissions generation and the carbon emission factors between electricity and gasoline. Consequently, the CO₂ emissions in region *j* (abbreviated CE_j) are expressed as:

$$CE_{i} = CEE_{i} + CEG_{i}, \qquad (j = N, Y, S, T)$$

$$(7)$$

where CEE_j and CEG_j represent the CO₂ emissions generated by electricity and gasoline, respectively, during the operation of top-selling PHEVs, and CEE_j is calculated as:

$$CEE_{j} = \rho_{ej} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} (EI_{i} \times AVKTE_{i,j}) \times Sal_{i,j}$$
(8)

where ρ_{ej} is the carbon emission factor of electricity in region *j*. In addition, CEG_j is formulated as:

$$CEG_{j} = \rho_{g} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} (GI_{i} \times AVKTG_{i,j}) \times Sal_{i,j}$$
(9)

where ρ_g is the carbon emission factor of gasoline.

3.3. Datasets

To evaluate the emissions and energy in China's PHEV operations, the top twenty selling PHEV models were established across northern China, the Yangtze River Middle Reach, and southern China from 2020 to 2022. The top-20 selling PHEV models were accessed from the *2022 New Energy Vehicle Sales* in China (https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/J3oY6JntC3BSL227TucZzQ), which includes BYD Qin, BYD Song PLUS, BYD Han, BYD Tang DM, BYD Song pro DM, Li Auto Inc ONE, AITO M5, BYD destroyer 05, Li Auto Inc L9, Buick Velite, Mercedes-Benz E-class, AITO M7, BMW 5-Series, Li Auto Inc L8, Chang'an UN I-K, LYNK&CO 09, Passat, EMGRAND L HiP, ROEWE eRX5, and Magotan. It's worth noting that extended-range EVs, a type of PHEV models, such as Li Auto Inc ONE, L8, and L9, as well as AITO M5 and M7 included in this study, are also classified as PHEV models in this study.

To estimate the real-world energy intensity of each PHEV model operation, the real-world gasoline consumption per 100 km was sourced from the BearOil app (www.xiaoxiongyouhao.com, accessed on October 18, 2023). Data on BE and AER under the NEDC conditions, used to calculate electricity intensity, came from Autohome (https://www.autohome.com.cn/), and official data on NEDC electricity consumption, NEDC comprehensive gasoline consumption, and minimum charging state fuel consumption were also included for comparative analysis. In addition, annual sales data for the top twenty selling PHEV models spanning from 2020 to 2022 were collected from the Passenger Car Sales Tracker app in China according to the National New Vehicle Compulsory Traffic Insurance, and the AVKT was referenced based on Ou et al. [52] from Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

For the model coefficients in this study, the real-world range loss coefficient η was assumed to be 75%, as detailed in the research conducted by Plötz et al. [53]. The conversion factor of

electricity to gasoline equivalent f_{co_2} was equal to 0.31 according to the *Conversion Methods for Energy Consumption of Electric Vehicles* (GB/T 37340-2019). The model popularity ratios of the *k*-th vehicle model ω_k , the electricity-to-gasoline ratios μ_e , and μ_f of each PHEV model were collected from the BearOil app. Additionally, the carbon emission factors of electricity ρ_e (unit: kilograms CO₂/kWh [kgCO₂/kWh]) in different regions were converted from the Environmental Protection Agency.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Energy intensity of the top-selling PHEV operations

4.1.1. Operational electricity intensity of the top twenty selling models

Fig. 1 shows an overview of the electricity intensity among the top twenty selling PHEV models. In general, the electricity intensity, characterized by our estimated electricity consumption per 100 km, demonstrated a considerable range and varied among the different models with BE and AER configurations, from the most electricity-efficient BYD Destroyer 05 at 20.2 kWh/100 km to the higher intensity AITO M7 at 38.2 kWh/100 km. On average, the estimated electricity intensity of the most popular PHEV models in China ranged from 21.1 to 31.5 kWh/100 km. In detail, the compact sedans BYD Destroyer 05 and EMGRAND L HiP stood out for their notably low electricity intensity, with values of 20.2 and 20.7 kWh/100 km, respectively. Occupying a moderate range, the compact sedan Buick Velite and compact SUVs such as the BYD Song pro DM and BYD Song PLUS maintained a balance between electricity efficiency and performance, with electricity intensity ranging from 21.1 to 23.0 kWh/100 km. On the other hand, BYD Han, BMW 5-Series, BYD Qin, BYD Tang DM, and ROEWE eRX5 exhibited high-intensity values, ranging from 24.1 to 28.4 kWh/100 km. PHEV models developed from internal combustion engines, such as the Mercedes-Benz E-class, Magotan, and LYNK&CO 09, demonstrated relatively higher electricity intensities, ranging from 29.0 to 31.5 kWh/100 km. Notably, the specific extended-range EVs with large BE and long AER, including the Li Auto Inc ONE, L9, and L8, and AITO M5 and M7, showed the highest electricity intensity levels, ranging from 29.6 to 38.2 kWh/100 km. Regarding the time period, the electricity intensity of BYD Song pro DM, BYD Han, BMW 5-Series, BYD Tang DM, and Mercedes-Benz E-class improved after 2020, with a reduction ranging from 0.9 to 8.8 kWh/100 km, demonstrating advancements in electric drivetrain technology. Models such as the Buick Velite, BYD Song PLUS, BYD Qin, Magotan, and LYNK&CO 09 have maintained stable electricity intensity, as no new vehicle models were released for sale during the years 2020 to 2022. In addition, the BYD Destroyer 05, EMGAND L HiP, Li Auto Inc L8 and L9, and AITO M5 and M7 were all newly released PHEV models in 2022. Among these newly released models, BYD destroyer 05 and EMGAND L HiP exhibited the lowest electricity intensity, while the other models showed the highest electricity intensity.



Fig. 1. Comparison of estimated and official operational electricity intensities for the China's top twenty selling PHEV models from 2020 to 2022. Note: the green bars represent the estimated electricity intensity, while the khaki bars represent the official electricity intensity under the NEDC condition.

By comparing the estimated electricity intensities with the official electricity intensities under the NEDC condition, a new finding emerges: real-world estimates consistently show a 30-40% increase over the official NEDC values, despite the lack of electricity intensity information under the NEDC condition for several PHEV models, especially in 2020 and 2021. The above findings reveal that the energy intensity tested by the NEDC may not be adaptive to the real-world situation in China's passenger car sector and may not fully capture the complexities of everyday usage. Factors such as terrain, climate, traffic patterns, road conditions, and driving habits affect the realworld electricity intensity of PHEV operations well [54]. Consequently, relying solely on the NEDC conditions to assess the electricity efficiency of PHEV operations will lead to misunderstand of vehicle performance. For instance, the real-world AER of the BYD Qin PHEV reported on the *Energy Conservation and New Energy Vehicle Technology Roadmap 2.0* issued by the China Society of Automotive Engineers was 54.7 km, while the official AER under the NEDC condition was 80 km. In terms of the BE and AER, variations in the SOC, influenced by driving modes and charging behavior, directly affect the AER values and, consequently, the estimated electricity intensity values. Most PHEV drivers have range anxiety and charge whenever a charger is available, regardless of the SOC, and they keep charging until the battery is fully or almost fully charged^b, leading to shorter real-world AER compared to the official values. Furthermore, the nominal BE released by the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology was utilized in this work given that all of the PHEV models were within their first few years of operation. However, battery degradation over time contributes to changes in energy intensity with shorter real-world AER. Moreover, extreme temperatures, especially low ambient temperatures, have adverse impacts on the efficiency of battery systems, leading to shorter real-world AERs and higher electricity intensity. Therefore, PHEV manufacturers should proactively provide consumers with real-world performance data, and the Chinese government urgently needs to introduce more realistic and reliable electricity efficiency standards that are more adaptable for the development of electric vehicles nationwide.

Considering the electricity intensity associated with the estimated average BE and real AER of the top-20 selling PHEV models, as shown in Fig. 2, models with lower levels of BE and AER tended to exhibit lower electricity intensity levels. Conversely, with an increase in BE and the corresponding increase in AER, the electricity intensity level continued to increase. This correlation aligned with expectations for most models, where a larger battery capacity facilitates greater energy storage, potentially extending the electric driving ranges and, consequently, resulting in relatively higher electricity intensity. For instance, the specific extended-range EVs AITO exhibited the highest energy intensity at 36.9 kWh/100 km, with an average battery of 40 kWh and an average AER of 108.7 km. Li Auto Inc achieved an impressive energy intensity of 31.6 kWh/100 km, with an average AER reaching 131.4 km. In particular, despite possessing a substantial BE, the Li Auto Inc ONE model exhibited an energy intensity comparable to that of several PHEV models with lower BE and AER, such as the LYNK&CO 09, BYD Tang DM, Mercedes-Benz E-class, and Chang'an UNI-K models, revealing an efficient electric powertrain. However, PHEV models developed from traditional internal combustion engines with lower BE and AER, including the ROEWE eRX5, Passat, and Magotan, exhibited considerably greater energy intensities than did

^b https://theicct.org/publication/pv-china-real-world-performance-apr23/

other PHEV models and were even more similar to the Li Auto Inc ONE model. As a result, realworld electricity intensity estimations reveal that most of the current PHEV models should make great efforts to optimize electricity powertrains or energy management systems to meet the slogan "efficient electric vehicles". Furthermore, 60% of the top-selling PHEV models held BE ranging from 10 kWh to 20 kWh to maintain a moderate electricity intensity, so that the PHEVs were not favored due to concerns about being "not electric enough" for a long time in China. Therefore, developing PHEV models equipped with enhanced electricity efficiency technology and BE capacity that are more adaptive to the current charging infrastructure in China should be a priority for automotive manufacturers aiming to bolster the adoption of these vehicles in the evolving landscape of sustainable transportation.



Fig. 2. Operational electricity intensity associated with the average BE and estimated real-world AER of the top twenty selling PHEV models in China (2022).

4.1.2. Operational gasoline intensity of the top twenty selling models

Fig. 3 provides an overview of the gasoline intensity among the top-20 selling PHEV model operations in China. Overall, the estimated real-world gasoline intensity, as indicated by the gasoline consumption per 100 km, varied among the different PHEV models, from the most fuel economy model—Buick Velite—at 4.7 L/100 km to the highest fuel consumption model—Li Auto Inc L9—at 23.5 L/100 km. The gasoline intensity of the top twenty selling PHEV models was

mainly distributed at three levels. The most efficient level, ranging from 4.7 to 5.9 L/100 km, included models such as the Buick Velite, Passat, Magotan, BYD Destroyer 05, BMW 5 Series, and EMGRAND L HiP, which exemplify fuel-efficient internal combustion engines closely aligning with the envisioned ideal gasoline intensity scenario for PHEV development in China. The moderate level, spanning from 6.0 to 7.5 L/100 km, encompasses models such as the ROEWE eRX5, BYD Qin, BYD Song Pro DM, BYD Song PLUS, BYD Tang DM, and LYNK&CO 09 and reflects the acknowledged gasoline intensity in real-world PHEV automotive development. Finally, the high gasoline intensity level, ranging from 8.9 to 23.5 L/100 km, contained models such as the Li Auto Inc ONE, Mercedes-Benz E-Class, Chang'an UNI-K, AITO M5, AITO M7, Li Auto Inc L8, and Li Auto Inc L9, and appeared more akin to internal combustion engines than fuel-efficient PHEVs. Notably, the specific extended-range EVs models, including AITO M5 and M7, and Li Auto Inc L8 and L9 (except Li Auto Inc ONE), had the highest gasoline intensity levels ranging from 15.5 to 23.5 L/100 km, which were even greater than those of some internal combustion engine vehicles. From the time period perspective, the gasoline intensity of most PHEV models has only changed slightly from 2020 to 2022, except for the BYD Tang DM with a 1.8 L/100 km and BYD Song pro DM with a 0.8 L/100 km decrease.



Fig. 3. Comparison of estimated and official gasoline use intensities for the China's top twenty selling PHEV models from 2020 to 2022. Note: the red bars represent the estimated gasoline consumption intensity, the yellow bars represent the official gasoline intensity under the NEDC condition, and the orange bars represent the minimum state of charge gasoline consumption intensity.

The gasoline intensity was estimated by the total gasoline consumption per 100 km under comprehensive road conditions, providing insight into the real-world gasoline economy of the top-20 selling PHEV models. However, a notable disparity exists between the gasoline intensity values under the NEDC condition provided by manufacturers and official agencies, typically ranging within 3 L/100 km. Several vehicle models even reported values lower than 1 L/100 km. In contrast, the real-world gasoline intensity was three to six times greater than the official NEDC value, and this difference can extend to ten times greater than that of specific extended-range EVs, such as those from AITO and Li Auto Inc. Essentially, the official gasoline intensity under the NEDC condition for PHEVs was calculated based on the national standard *Test Methods for Energy Consumption of Light-Duty Hybrid Electric Vehicles* (GB/T 19753-2013) under the assumption that the vehicle operates its engine for 25 km to recharge after depleting the battery. However, this scenario is evidently overly idealized and significantly diverges from real-world conditions in China,

as civil charging infrastructure construction in most regions currently makes it challenging to ensure convenient charging demand within 25 km for most drivers. On the other hand, the real-world gasoline intensities of most PHEV models were close to the minimum state-of-charge gasoline intensity, except for those of specific extended-range EVs, such as AITO and Li Auto Inc. Influenced by real-world road conditions, different driving mode preferences under various road conditions (e.g., urban commuting in CD, highways in CS mode and other situations in blended mode), and driving behaviors (e.g., driving in a state of partial discharge, acceleration and high-speed driving, heating, and air conditioning usage) make it challenging for current PHEV models to reach gasoline intensity at 5.3 L/100 km under the 2025 Scenario.

The above energy intensity estimation suggests that PHEVs may not be as fuel-efficient as anticipated. Nevertheless, fuel economy is influenced mainly by consumer preferences and demand for a suitable driving range. To achieve better fuel efficiency, drivers with a commuting distance demand of approximately 60 km or less and access to private chargers or public charging stations can achieve significantly lower fuel consumption in the nearly pure electric mode. Under these conditions, the energy intensity of the PHEV models approximates that of the official NEDC test results, with models from BYD, Buick Velite, BMW 5-Series, and ROEWE eRX5 demonstrating fuel-efficient features, making them favorable choices for consumers. However, if charging is inconvenient, particularly in situations with complex road conditions and specific power demands, several PHEV models developed from internal combustion engines, such as Passat and Magotan, may be more suitable for achieving improved gasoline economy. Notably, specific extended-range EVs, including the makes of AITO and Li Auto Inc, are oriented toward electric vehicles with higher BE and AER and exhibit higher gasoline costs than internal combustion engines when the battery SOC reaches the lowest values and transitions to gasoline power. Therefore, it is recommended that PHEV automobile manufacturers enhance collaboration to advance the development of PHEVs with heightened electricity efficiency and fuel economy.

Overall, the results above portray the energy intensity of the operation of the China's topselling PHEV models and address Issue 1 posed in Section 1.

4.2. Operational energy use of the top-selling PHEVs

4.2.1. Total operational energy use of the top twenty selling PHEV models

Fig. 4 presents the comprehensive energy consumption estimates of the top twenty selling PHEV model operations in 2020-2022 across the regions of North China, Yangtze River Middle Reach, and South China, along with vehicle sales in Fig. 4 a; comparisons of the energy consumption estimated by this study and the BearOil app in Fig. 4 b; and the corresponding AVKT powered by electricity and gasoline in Fig. 4 c.



Fig. 4. PHEV development in different regions of China from 2020 to 2022: (a) trends in the top twenty selling PHEV models; (b) comparison of estimated and official total energy consumption for the operation of the top twenty selling PHEV models; (c) AVKT powered by electricity or gasoline in the operation of the top twenty selling PHEV models.

In general, the comprehensive energy consumption in southern China was approximately double that in the other two zones for 90% of the top twenty selling PHEV models. Northern China and the Yangtze River Middle Reach exhibited relatively similar energy consumption patterns

according to these models. Specifically, the ROEWE eRX5 model was more prevalent in the Yangtze River Middle Reach and southern China than in northern China, where the comprehensive energy consumption was only 0.74 mega-liters (ML) in northern China in 2022, contrasting with 8.3 ML and 9.1 ML in the Yangtze River Middle Reach and southern China, respectively. In contrast, PHEV models developed from internal combustion engines, such as Passat and Matogan, exhibited relatively greater energy consumption in northern China (4.7 ML and 5.2 ML, respectively) and southern China (4.3 ML and 3.1 ML, respectively) than in the Yangtze River Middle Reach (2.7 ML and 1.9 ML) in 2022. On the other hand, 80% of the top twenty selling PHEV models showed significant increases in energy consumption in all geographical regions after 2020, accompanied by a noteworthy increase in vehicle sales, as shown in Fig. 4 a. Notably, the comprehensive energy consumption of BYD Qin experienced a noteworthy increase from 15.9 ML in 2020 to 151.7 ML in 2021, reflecting an approximately 9.5-fold increase. The upward trend continued in 2022, reaching 323.5 ML, indicating a further 113% increase from 2021 to 2022. Ascending trends were also evident in the other PHEV models, except for the BMW 5-Series and Passat models, which exhibited decreasing trends over these years. From a detailed aspect of different PHEV models, the comprehensive energy consumption revealed notable variations among different models affected by the model energy intensity, vehicle sales, and the corresponding AVKT powered by electricity or gasoline. BYD Qin has been the model with the highest energy consumption since 2020, with 491.1 ML, followed by BYD Song Plus and BYD Han, with 400.1 ML and 373.3 ML, respectively; these results are consistent with the sales of the top three selling vehicles. With a comprehensive energy consumption of 307.9 ML since 2020, Li Auto Inc ONE has surpassed BYD Tang DM, and BYD Song pro DM, which have relatively less vehicle sales. Despite being preferred by consumers for its large BE and long AER, the estimated results indicate that the Li Auto Inc ONE failed to stand out as an energy-efficient model when compared to other SUV models with similar vehicle sales and AVKT. Moreover, the other specific extended-range EVs released in 2022, including the Li Auto Inc ONE, L9, and L8 models and the AITO M5 and M7 models, also exhibited relatively elevated levels of energy consumption within the top-20 PHEV models. For PHEV models derived from internal combustion engines, such as the Buick Velite, Mercedes-Benz E-Class, BMW 5-Series, Passat, ROEWE eRX5, and Magotan, as well as models released in 2021 and 2022, including the Chang'an UNI-K, LYNK&CO 09, BYD Destroyer 05, and EMGRAND L HiP, the

comprehensive energy consumption has remained relatively low since 2020, mainly attributed to fewer vehicle sales and shorter AVKT, ranging from 13.8 ML to 71.7 ML.

4.2.2. Robustness of the bottom-up approach for PHEV operations

In this study, the comprehensive energy consumption estimated by the proposed bottom-up approach for PHEV operations in Section 3.1 offers a standardized tool for cross-model comparisons. To test the robustness of the bottom-up energy model, the energy consumption estimates derived from our model are compared to those calculated by the BearOil app (https://www.xiaoxiongyouhao.com/). The comparison reveals a close alignment between the estimated values and the BearOil app's recorded values across different geographical regions for the top twenty selling PHEV models, suggesting the accuracy and reliability of the proposed bottomup framework for energy consumption estimation of PHEV operations. In detail, the energy use of the top twenty selling PHEV models based on the proposed method was slightly greater than the energy consumption values recorded by the BearOil app, especially for the models with higher realworld estimated energy intensity and sales, such as BYD Song, BYD Han, BYD Tang DM, AITO M5, and Li Auto Inc L9. This may stem from the different perspectives on the estimation between our model and the BearOil app. In this study, the energy consumption was estimated separately, including the gasoline equivalent consumption converted from the electricity consumption and gasoline consumption within the separate AVKT determined by the real-world electricity-togasoline ratio. More detailed results on the gasoline equivalent consumption per 100 km converted from the electricity consumption per 100 km are provided in Appendix B. However, the energy consumption estimations according to the BearOil app were calculated based on a comprehensive energy intensity, including both equivalent electricity and gasoline aspects and the total AKVT, without distinguishing between AVKT powered by electricity or gasoline. However, there are limitations to our proposed model, as separate estimations may ignore the blended mode and energysaving hybrid engine technology for some PHEV models, which may result in overly estimated energy consumption.

4.2.3. Spatial distribution of energy consumption of the top twenty selling PHEVs

During the last three years, considering the top twenty selling PHEV models, as depicted in Fig. 5, the cumulative energy consumption, encompassing both gasoline and electricity consumption,

totaled 2579 ML of gasoline equivalent. Within this total, gasoline consumption accounted for 1252 ML, while electricity consumption amounted to 4281 gigawatt-hours (GWh), equivalent to 1327 ML.



Fig. 5. (a) Spatial distribution of total energy consumption, measured by gasoline equivalent consumption, for the operation of top twenty selling PHEV models; (b) electricity, gasoline, and overall energy consumption for the top twenty selling PHEV model operations among various geographical regions from 2020-2022.

In the period from 2020 to 2022, various factors, such as the increased adoption of energyintensive technologies, economic growth, and shifts in consumer behavior, notably influenced energy consumption across all geographical regions. Observations indicate a consistent and significant upward trend in energy consumption, with an approximately two-fold increase in 2021 and a 1.5-fold increase in 2022. This suggests that the future energy demand in PHEV development is expected to continue growing in the short term.

Given the escalating energy consumption trend of the top 20 PHEV models, policymakers should prioritize expanding charging infrastructure and implementing measures to ensure energy

security as part of ongoing energy conservation efforts. Analysis of energy consumption in different geographical regions reveals that the top-selling PHEVs in southern China consumed 1283 ML, which was twice as much as the consumption in northern China (626 ML) and the Yangtze River Middle Reach (670 ML). This trend was consistent for both electricity and gasoline consumption, with total electricity consumption occurring in southern China, the Yangtze River Middle Reach, and northern China at 2151, 1107, and 1023 GWh, respectively. Similarly, total gasoline equivalent consumption stood at 617, 327, and 308 ML in the same respective zones.

The higher consumption in southern China can be attributed to factors such as positive charging infrastructure construction, greater reliance on PHEVs, long AVKT, incentive policy measures, etc. According to the 2022 annual report on electric vehicle charging infrastructure in major Chinese cities^c, the overall charging infrastructure in southern China, with an average public charging station density of 24.3 per square km, has surpassed that of northern China, which has a density of 15.2 per square km. This has led to a greater preference for PHEVs and longer AVKT in southern China, as evident in the sales of the top 20 PHEVs in southern China (1,321,798 sales), which were nearly twice as high as those in northern China (670,416 sales), and in the Yangtze River Middle Reach (722,768 sales) in 2022, along with an AVKT 12,915 kilometers longer than the other two regions.

Overall, the results above analyze the total energy consumption and its spatial distribution of the China's best-selling PHEVs and respond to Issue 2 in Section 1.

4.3. Operational carbon emissions from the top-selling PHEVs

4.3.1. Operational carbon of the top twenty selling PHEV models

Fig. 6 illustrates the CO₂ emissions, encompassing both electricity and gasoline emissions, of the top twenty selling PHEV models among various geographical regions from 2020 to 2022. First, the distribution of emissions exhibited significant disparities among the PHEV models, with notable emissions originating from high-ranking sales models such as BYD Qin, BYD Song PLUS, BYD Han, Li Auto Inc ONE, and BYD Tang DM, registering CO₂ emissions of 1087, 731, 662, 500, and 422 kilotons (kt) since 2020, respectively.

[°] https://tech.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202206/17/WS62abef5ea3101c3ee7adb0a9.html



Fig. 6. Operational carbon emissions released by electricity and gasoline use from each of the top twenty selling PHEV models among various geographical regions from 2020-2022.

In terms of the time period, there was a consistent upward trend in emissions from 2020 to 2022 for most PHEV models in the three geographical regions and nationwide, which was primarily attributed to increased sales during this period. For instance, the CO₂ emissions of the BYD Qin PHEV model increased from 36 kt in 2020 to 337 kt in 2021 and further rose to 715 kt in 2022. Notably, specific extended-range EVs such as the Li Auto Inc ONE and PHEV models derived from internal combustion engines, such as the BMW 5-Series, Passat, and ROEWE eRX5, exhibited decreasing emission trends due to a decrease in sales in 2022. From a regional perspective, the majority of the top-selling PHEV models showed higher carbon emissions in southern China, surpassing those in northern China and the Yangtze River Middle Reach by an average of 40 and 47 kt, respectively. For instance, PHEV models such as BYD Qin, BYD Song PLUS, BYD Han, BYD Tang DM, and Li Auto Inc ONE were more prevalent in southern China, with carbon emissions of 214, 100, 130, and 68 kt higher than those in northern China. Additionally, their

emissions were 260, 145, 125, and 95 kt higher than those in the Yangtze River Middle Reach. On the other hand, 70% of the PHEV models demonstrated relatively similar total carbon emission levels in northern China and the Yangtze River Middle Reach. The exceptions included BYD Qin, BYD Song PLUS, and Li Auto Inc ONE, with 46, 44, and 62 kt higher emissions in northern China, respectively, and ROEWE eRX5, which displayed a 47 kt increase in emissions in the Yangtze River Middle Reach.

4.3.2. Energy sources of emissions from the top twenty selling model operations

As discussed in Section 3.2, the evaluation of PHEV CO_2 emissions should encompass both fuel and electricity consumption. This holistic approach is essential because PHEVs integrate a traditional internal combustion engine with a rechargeable battery and an electric motor. Therefore, this study considered the emission factors of both gasoline and electricity among various geographical regions, analyzing the CO_2 emissions released by electricity and gasoline for the bestselling vehicles.

Fig. 6 illustrates the distributions of carbon emissions released by electricity and gasoline for the operation of the top twenty selling PHEV models. This distribution closely aligns with the electricity and gasoline AVKT determined by the real-world electricity-to-gasoline ratio (see Fig. 4 c). It shows that PHEV models with higher electricity intensity, characterized by larger BE and AER, such as Li Auto Inc ONE, Li Auto Inc L8, AITO M5, AITO M7, and Chang'an UNI-K, exhibited relatively higher emissions generated by electricity, constituting 70% of all carbon emissions. In contrast, PHEV models with smaller BE and lower AER, such as BYD Qin, BMW 5-Series, Passat, ROEWE eRX5, and Magotan, were typically used as gasoline-dominated vehicles. These municipalities had longer AVKT powered by gasoline and tended to generate more emissions from gasoline than from electricity, covering 70% of all carbon emissions.

Considering the geographical regions for almost all the considered PHEV models, the CO₂ emissions released by electricity were highest in northern China, primarily due to the intense emission factor of electricity and the less advanced charging infrastructure. Additionally, it is evident that the emissions released by gasoline consistently increased and were greater than the emissions from electricity in the Yangtze River Middle Reach and southern China. Consequently, substantial progress is required for PHEVs to decarbonize, emphasizing the need to optimize

charging infrastructure construction in northern China. Moreover, employing PHEV models with higher BE and AER in the Yangtze River Middle Reach and southern China is crucial for aligning and balancing energy demands and charging requirements.

4.3.3. Spatial distribution of operational carbon of the top twenty selling models

In terms of the overall operational carbon trend of PHEVs, nationwide carbon emissions from the top twenty selling PHEVs amounted to 4882 kt since 2020, with emissions increasing from 426 kt in 2020 to 1318 kt in 2021 and further surging to 3138 kt in 2022. Combining the information illustrated in Fig. 5 a and Fig. 7 a, it can be concluded that the ascending trend in CO₂ emissions consistently corresponds with overall energy consumption, revealing a significant increase in both over the three-year period, which is primarily attributed to the growing prevalence of new PHEVs in the market.

According to our detailed analysis, southern China, owing to the prevalence of the PHEV automobile market, exhibited significantly greater levels of energy and emissions than did the other two regions. Specifically, emissions in southern China were 198 kt in 2020, 600 kt in 2021, and 1409 kt in 2022. In comparison, the emissions in the corresponding years in northern China were 116, 375, and 915 kt, respectively, and the emissions in the Yangtze River Middle Reach were 112, 342, and 814 kt, respectively. Interestingly, the CO₂ emissions in the Yangtze River Middle Reach were slightly lower than those in northern China, despite the relatively high energy consumption in the Yangtze River Middle Reach. This phenomenon can be attributed to the comparatively lower emission factors of power grids in the Yangtze River Middle Reach than in northern China.

30



Fig. 7. (a) Spatial distribution of the total operational carbon emissions released by the top twenty selling PHEV models; (b) trends in carbon emissions released by gasoline and electricity use from the top twenty selling PHEV models among various geographical regions from 2020-2022.

Through a detailed examination of the energy and emissions generated separately from electricity and gasoline, as depicted in Figs. 5 b and 7 b, it becomes evident that despite PHEVs being primarily characterized by electricity consumption, which was nearly three times that of gasoline consumption, the relatively high emission factor of gasoline results in significant CO₂ emissions, and its gasoline reduction potential is still substantial. Emissions from fuel combustion exhibited higher levels than those from electricity consumption in different climatic regions, with this trend being particularly apparent in southern China. Fuel emissions surpassed electricity emissions by 57, 195, and 441 kt, respectively, from 2020 to 2022, suggesting that despite the increasing popularity of PHEVs, the overall environmental impact has not decreased as significantly as anticipated. This emphasizes the importance of continuous efforts to enhance the efficiency of electric power usage and reduce reliance on traditional fuel sources.

In terms of the CO₂ emissions released by electricity use in PHEV operations, in southern China, electricity consumption was twice that in the other two regions. However, the emissions from electricity consumption in the three different geographical regions were almost the same. This indicates that the level of low-carbon development of electric vehicles in the southern region is relatively significant. The next inline is the Yangtze River Middle Reach. This finding is consistent with the results mentioned in Section 4.2.3, where the average level of charging station construction in these two regions was greater than that in northern China. Therefore, there is a need to improve charging station infrastructure and the electrification process for PHEVs in northern China. Simultaneously, efforts should continue to enhance the nationwide electrification process of the passenger car sector, aiming to reduce reliance on fossil fuels while calculating energy savings [55]. It is crucial to effectively promote low-carbon transitions in different regions.

Overall, the above results analyze the operational carbon emission trend and its spatial distribution of the China's top-selling PHEV models and address Issue 3 posed in Section 1.

5. Policy implications

In recent years, the global discourse surrounding the prohibition of internal combustion engine sales has gained significant prominence. Numerous European nations have eagerly introduced competitive "phasing-out schedules" [56, 57]. In contrast, China remains resolute in its commitment to the strategic direction of pure electric propulsion. However, given several existing challenges, it is not advisable for China to follow the approach of other countries in setting a specific timetable for banning the sale of internal combustion engines. These challenges encompass issues in battery technology and endurance across diverse geographical conditions, the inconvenience of charging, insufficient public charging infrastructure, a predominantly coal-fired power structure, and pressure on urban distribution grids [58-60]. Therefore, it is imperative to persist in simultaneously promoting both transition and transformation. This involves advancing a dual strategy that embraces both battery electric vehicles and PHEVs.

Targeting PHEV manufacturers, the envisioned gasoline consumption levels for hybrid passenger vehicles are set at 5.3, 4.5, and 4.0 L/100 km by 2025, 2030, and 2035, respectively. This projection takes into account the combined effects of advancements in energy-saving technology and changes in testing conditions. However, despite these limitations, the energy intensity estimations, shown in Section 4.1, reveal a significant disparity between real-world energy consumption under complex road conditions and the official data released by manufacturers and regulatory agencies. This discrepancy aligns with the findings of marketing slogans introduced by automotive manufacturers, which emphasize features such as "long range, low fuel consumption, energy conservation, and environmental friendliness". Consequently, some drivers in China express concerns about PHEVs not being "electricity enough" for an extended period. In light of this, it is crucial for automobile and parts manufacturers to prioritize the application and improvement of energy efficiency and thermal control technology in PHEVs [61, 62]. Taking a proactive approach to provide consumers with vehicle performance data that closely reflect actual road conditions can help reconcile the contradiction between battery prices and increased mileage. This strategy aims to enhance consumer acceptance of electric vehicles, ultimately leading to lower purchase costs and alleviating range anxiety.

Addressing the government, the overarching goal for the next decade in China's automotive industry is to achieve carbon peaking by 2030, in line with the objectives outlined in the Energy Conservation and New Energy Vehicle Technology Roadmap 2.0. A pivotal aspect of this endeavor is the indispensable and crucial role that hybrid power systems play, emerging as a significant technological solution in the domestic market [63]. The findings shown in Section 4 underscore that the emissions and energy of PHEVs fueled by gasoline remained notably high, particularly in northern China, where charging infrastructure was less advanced. Consequently, it is imperative to bolster the development of charging infrastructure in diverse geographical regions across China, paying special attention to the northern regions. This strategic move aims to effectively address the charging demand of electric vehicles and balance the relationship between charging demand and the power supply [64]. Simultaneously, China's heavy reliance on coal-dominated power generation has resulted in an excessive dependence on the power grid. This not only jeopardizes national energy security but also amplifies coal consumption, posing a significant threat to environmental conservation. Therefore, an urgent need arises to expedite the optimization of PHEV charging schedules and enhance vehicle-to-grid interactions. These measures are essential for minimizing carbon emissions and promoting a sustainable and environmentally conscious approach to energy consumption [65].

6. Conclusion

This work created a bottom-up approach to measuring the real-world energy and emissions of China's top twenty selling PHEV model operations among various geographical regions from 2020 to 2022. The study focused on assessing the energy intensity, total energy consumption, and operational carbon emissions of PHEV operations at the nationwide and regional scales, considering variables like PHEV model sales, model performance, AVKT, climate conditions, driver behaviors, and emission factors of gasoline and power grids. Furthermore, targeted policy implications were provided for expediting the transportation sector's move towards carbon neutrality. The core findings are attached as follows.

6.1. Core findings

- The actual electricity intensity of the operation of top-selling models (20.2 to 38.2 kWh/100 km) surpassed the corresponding NEDC values by 30-40%. In addition, the actual gasoline intensity (4.7 to 23.5 L/100 km) was three to six times greater than the NEDC estimates. Among the top twenty selling PHEV models, 60% of the samples have BE capacities ranging from 10 to 20 kWh, with an AER below 80 km. Notably, PHEV models developed based on internal combustion engine platforms (e.g., Passat and BMW 5-series) exhibited higher fuel efficiency in terms of gasoline intensity than did recently released models such as Chang'an UNI-K. However, influenced by road conditions and driver behaviors, the estimation of energy intensity suggests that PHEVs may not be as fuel efficient as initially anticipated. This notable discrepancy has a profound impact on the scientific accuracy of real-world carbon emission accounting. Consequently, there is a need for both vehicle manufacturers and governmental bodies to provide consumers with real-world performance data for informed decision-making.
- The overall energy consumption of the best-selling models exhibited variations among various geographical regions: the total gasoline equivalent was twice as high in southern China (1283 ML, 2020-2022) than in northern China and the Yangtze River Middle Reach. This difference can be attributed to the greater density of charging stations in southern China, which contributed to the increased PHEV incidence and longer AVKT in this region. Nationally, the energy consumption reached 2579 ML of gasoline equivalent during 2020-2022, within a

total electricity consumption of 4281 GWh (equivalent to 1327 ML) and a total gasoline consumption of 1252 M GL. Furthermore, the robustness of the proposed bottom-up energy model was tested by comparing the results with those generated by the BearOil app. The comparison shows a close alignment between the estimated values and the BearOil app's recorded values across different geographical regions for the top-selling PHEV models. This finding suggests the accuracy and reliability of our proposed bottom-up energy model for PHEV operations.

• The cumulative CO₂ emissions from the operation of the top-selling models nationwide amounted to 4882 kt in 2020-2022. Notably, emissions from electricity use contributed 1938 kt, while emissions from gasoline combustion accounted for 2945 kt. In northern China, carbon emissions per vehicle were more than 1.2 times greater than those in other regions, mainly due to the high emission factors of power grids and limited charging infrastructure. Top-selling models aligned emissions with the AVKT determined by the electricity-to-gasoline ratio. PHEV models with higher electricity intensity and longer AER powered by electricity emitted less CO₂ than gasoline-focused PHEV models. Strategically deploying PHEVs with optimized BE capabilities and AER, customized for regional charging demands is essential for advancing sustainable development and decarbonizing the future of the passenger car sector.

6.2. Future work

This study identified several gaps that warrant further investigation, pointing toward potential future research directions. One key aspect involves expanding the model samples beyond the top-selling PHEV models to incorporate considerations such as vehicle stocks and national penetration rates. This approach ensures a more comprehensive analysis of China's PHEV landscape. Moreover, it is imperative to delve into the intricate relationship between electric vehicle emissions and the development of residential charging infrastructure, and this exploration should consider variations in building energy systems and power grids in different regions. Incorporating these elements into future research endeavors will significantly contribute to enhancing the depth and breadth of insights into energy and emissions analysis of electric vehicles in China.

Appendix

The appendix is included in the supplementary materials (e-component) of this submission.

Acknowledgments

N/A.

References

[1] IEA. Global EV Outlook 2022. Paris: https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2022; 2022.

[2] Burchart-Korol D, Jursova S, Folęga P, Korol J, Pustejovska P, Blaut A. Environmental life cycle assessment of electric vehicles in Poland and the Czech Republic. Journal of Cleaner Production 2018;202:476-487.

[3] Yan R, Chen M, Xiang X, Feng W, Ma M. Heterogeneity or illusion? Track the carbon Kuznets curve of global residential building operations. Applied Energy 2023;347:121441.

[4] Squalli J. Greening the roads: Assessing the role of electric and hybrid vehicles in curbing CO2 emissions. Journal of Cleaner Production 2023:139908.

[5] Plötz P, Moll C, Bieker G, Mock P. From lab-to-road: Real-world fuel consumption and CO2 emissions of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Environmental Research Letters 2021;16:054078.

[6] Tansini A, Pavlovic J, Fontaras G. Quantifying the real-world CO2 emissions and energy consumption of modern plug-in hybrid vehicles. Journal of Cleaner Production 2022;362:132191.

[7] Wang H, Zhang X, Ouyang M. Energy consumption of electric vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing. Applied Energy 2015;157:710-719.

[8] Zhang S, Wu Y, Liu H, Huang R, Un P, Zhou Y, et al. Real-world fuel consumption and CO2 (carbon dioxide) emissions by driving conditions for light-duty passenger vehicles in China. Energy 2014;69:247-257.

[9] Zhou B, Wu Y, Zhou B, Wang R, Ke W, Zhang S, Hao J. Real-world performance of battery electric buses and their life-cycle benefits with respect to energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions. Energy 2016;96:603-613.

[10] Ehrenberger SI, Konrad M, Philipps F. Pollutant emissions analysis of three plug-in hybrid electric vehicles using different modes of operation and driving conditions. Atmospheric Environment 2020;234:117612.

[11] Li W, Stanula P, Egede P, Kara S, Herrmann C. Determining the main factors influencing the energy consumption of electric vehicles in the usage phase. Procedia Cirp 2016;48:352-357.

[12] Hasselwander S, Galich A, Nieland S. Impact of Climate Change on the Energy Consumption of Passenger Car Vehicles. World Electric Vehicle Journal 2022;13:146. [13] Wu Y, Yang Z, Lin B, Liu H, Wang R, Zhou B, Hao J. Energy consumption and CO2 emission impacts of vehicle electrification in three developed regions of China. Energy Policy 2012;48:537-550.
[14] Onat NC, Kucukvar M, Tatari O. Conventional, hybrid, plug-in hybrid or electric vehicles? State-based comparative carbon and energy footprint analysis in the United States. Applied Energy 2015;150:36-49.

[15] Requia WJ, Adams MD, Arain A, Koutrakis P, Ferguson M. Carbon dioxide emissions of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles: A life-cycle analysis in eight Canadian cities. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 2017;78:1390-1396.

[16] Dauphin R, Prevost V, Degeilh P, Melgar J, Fittavolini C, Smith A, et al. Evaluation of plug-in hybrid vehicles in real-world conditions by simulation. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 2023;119:103721.

[17] Degeilh P, Prevost V, Kermani J, Dauphin R. Evaluation of plug-in hybrid vehicles in realworld conditions: Concawe; 2022.

[18] Wu Z, Wang M, Zheng J, Sun X, Zhao M, Wang X. Life cycle greenhouse gas emission reduction potential of battery electric vehicle. Journal of Cleaner Production 2018;190:462-470.

[19] Franzò S, Nasca A. The environmental impact of electric vehicles: A novel life cycle-based evaluation framework and its applications to multi-country scenarios. Journal of Cleaner Production 2021;315:128005.

[20] Torres JL, Gonzalez R, Gimenez A, Lopez J. Energy management strategy for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. A comparative study. Applied Energy 2014;113:816-824.

[21] Xin L, Ahmad M, Khattak SI. Impact of innovation in hybrid electric vehicles-related technologies on carbon dioxide emissions in the 15 most innovative countries. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2023;196:122859.

[22] Da P, Tao L, Sun K, Golston LM, Miller DJ, Zhu T, et al. Methane emissions from natural gas vehicles in China. Nature Communications 2020;11:4588.

[23] Peng L, Liu F, Zhou M, Li M, Zhang Q, Mauzerall DL. Alternative-energy-vehicles deployment delivers climate, air quality, and health co-benefits when coupled with decarbonizing power generation in China. One Earth 2021;4:1127-1140.

[24] Wang S, Chen K, Zhao F, Hao H. Technology pathways for complying with Corporate Average Fuel Consumption regulations up to 2030: A case study of China. Applied Energy 2019;241:257-277. [25] Panagiotidis M, Delagrammatikas G, Assanis D. Development and use of a regenerative braking model for a parallel hybrid electric vehicle. SAE transactions 2000:1180-1191.

[26] Liu K, Wang J, Yamamoto T, Morikawa T. Modelling the multilevel structure and mixed effects of the factors influencing the energy consumption of electric vehicles. Applied Energy 2016;183:1351-1360.
[27] Xiang X, Zhou N, Ma M, Feng W, Yan R. Global transition of operational carbon in residential buildings since the millennium. Advances in Applied Energy 2023;11:100145.

[28] Al-Wreikat Y, Serrano C, Sodré JR. Driving behaviour and trip condition effects on the energy consumption of an electric vehicle under real-world driving. Applied Energy 2021;297:117096.

[29] Zhao X, Zhao X, Yu Q, Ye Y, Yu M. Development of a representative urban driving cycle construction methodology for electric vehicles: A case study in Xi'an. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 2020;81:102279.

[30] Brunelli L, Capancioni A, Canè S, Cecchini G, Perazzo A, Brusa A, Cavina N. A predictive control strategy based on A-ECMS to handle Zero-Emission Zones: Performance assessment and testing using an HiL equipped with vehicular connectivity. Applied Energy 2023;340:121008.

[31] Millo F, Rolando L, Fuso R, Mallamo F. Real CO2 emissions benefits and end user's operating costs of a plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle. Applied Energy 2014;114:563-571.

[32] Gómez Vilchez JJ, Jochem P. Powertrain technologies and their impact on greenhouse gas emissions in key car markets. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 2020;80:102214.

[33] Velandia Vargas JE, Falco DG, da Silva Walter AC, Cavaliero CKN, Seabra JEA. Life cycle assessment of electric vehicles and buses in Brazil: effects of local manufacturing, mass reduction, and energy consumption evolution. The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 2019;24:1878-1897.
[34] Stephan CH, Sullivan J. Environmental and energy implications of plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles. Environmental science & technology 2008;42:1185-1190.

[35] Donateo T, Licci F, D'Elia A, Colangelo G, Laforgia D, Ciancarelli F. Evaluation of emissions of CO2 and air pollutants from electric vehicles in Italian cities. Applied Energy 2015;157:675-687.

[36] Ribau JP, Silva CM, Sousa JMC. Efficiency, cost and life cycle CO2 optimization of fuel cell hybrid and plug-in hybrid urban buses. Applied Energy 2014;129:320-335.

[37] Qiao Q, Zhao F, Liu Z, Hao H, He X, Przesmitzki SV, Amer AA. Life cycle cost and GHG emission benefits of electric vehicles in China. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 2020;86:102418.

[38] Yuksel T, Tamayao M-AM, Hendrickson C, Azevedo IM, Michalek JJ. Effect of regional grid mix, driving patterns and climate on the comparative carbon footprint of gasoline and plug-in electric vehicles in the United States. Environmental Research Letters 2016;11:044007.

[39] Mandev A, Plötz P, Sprei F, Tal G. Empirical charging behavior of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Applied Energy 2022;321:119293.

[40] Xu B, Sharif A, Shahbaz M, Dong K. Have electric vehicles effectively addressed CO2 emissions? Analysis of eight leading countries using quantile-on-quantile regression approach. Sustainable Production and Consumption 2021;27:1205-1214.

[41] Sun D, Kyere F, Sampene AK, Asante D, Kumah NYG. An investigation on the role of electric vehicles in alleviating environmental pollution: evidence from five leading economies. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 2023;30:18244-18259.

[42] Xu L, Yilmaz HÜ, Wang Z, Poganietz W-R, Jochem P. Greenhouse gas emissions of electric vehicles in Europe considering different charging strategies. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 2020;87:102534.

[43] Wang L, Yu Y, Huang K, Zhang Z, Li X. The inharmonious mechanism of CO2, NOx, SO2, and PM2. 5 electric vehicle emission reductions in Northern China. Journal of Environmental Management 2020;274:111236.

[44] Deng F, Lv Z, Qi L, Wang X, Shi M, Liu H. A big data approach to improving the vehicle emission inventory in China. Nature communications 2020;11:2801.

[45] Hofmann J, Guan D, Chalvatzis K, Huo H. Assessment of electrical vehicles as a successful driver for reducing CO2 emissions in China. Applied Energy 2016;184:995-1003.

[46] Lu Q, Duan H, Shi H, Peng B, Liu Y, Wu T, et al. Decarbonization scenarios and carbon reduction potential for China's road transportation by 2060. npj Urban Sustainability 2022;2:34.

[47] Huo H, Zhang Q, He K, Yao Z, Wang M. Vehicle-use intensity in China: Current status and future trend. Energy Policy 2012;43:6-16.

[48] Davies J, Kurani KS. Moving from assumption to observation: Implications for energy and emissions impacts of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Energy Policy 2013;62:550-560.

[49] Poullikkas A. Sustainable options for electric vehicle technologies. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 2015;41:1277-1287.

[50] Wang A, Xu J, Zhang M, Zhai Z, Song G, Hatzopoulou M. Emissions and fuel consumption of a hybrid electric vehicle in real-world metropolitan traffic conditions. Applied Energy 2022;306:118077.
[51] Tietge U, Mock P, Franco V, Zacharof N. From laboratory to road: Modeling the divergence between

official and real-world fuel consumption and CO2 emission values in the German passenger car market for the years 2001–2014. Energy Policy 2017;103:212-222.

[52] Ou S, Yu R, Lin Z, Ren H, He X, Przesmitzki S, Bouchard J. Intensity and daily pattern of passenger vehicle use by region and class in China: estimation and implications for energy use and electrification. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 2020;25:307-327.

[53] Plötz P, Funke SA, Jochem P, Wietschel M. CO2 Mitigation Potential of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles larger than expected. Scientific Reports 2017;7:16493.

[54] Ma M, Pan T, Ma Z. Examining the Driving Factors of Chinese Commercial Building Energy Consumption from 2000 to 2015: A STIRPAT Model Approach. Journal of Engineering Science & Technology Review 2017;10.

[55] Ma M, Yan R, Cai W. A STIRPAT model-based methodology for calculating energy savings in China's existing civil buildings from 2001 to 2015. Natural Hazards 2017;87:1765-1781.

[56] von Brockdorff P, Tanti G. Carbon emissions of plug-in electric vehicles in Malta: A policy review.Case Studies on Transport Policy 2017;5:509-517.

[57] Yan R, Ma M, Zhou N, Feng W, Xiang X, Mao C. Towards COP27: Decarbonization patterns of residential building in China and India. Applied Energy 2023;352:122003.

[58] Ma M, Ma X, Cai W, Cai W. Low carbon roadmap of residential building sector in China: Historical mitigation and prospective peak. Applied Energy 2020;273:115247.

[59] Xiang X, Ma M, Ma X, Chen L, Cai W, Feng W, Ma Z. Historical decarbonization of global commercial building operations in the 21st century. Applied Energy 2022;322:119401.

[60] Ma X, Deng Y, Ma M. A novel kernel ridge grey system model with generalized Morlet wavelet and its application in forecasting natural gas production and consumption. Energy 2024;287:129630.

[61] Karanam V, Davis A, Sugihara C, Sutton K, Tal G. From shifting gears to changing modes: The impact of driver inputs on plug-in hybrid electric vehicle energy use & emissions. Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives 2022;14:100597.

[62] Silva SFd, Eckert JJ, Silva FL, Silva LCA, Dedini FG. Multi-objective optimization design and control of plug-in hybrid electric vehicle powertrain for minimization of energy consumption, exhaust emissions and battery degradation. Energy Conversion and Management 2021;234:113909.

[63] Zou C, Ma M, Zhou N, Feng W, You K, Zhang S. Toward carbon free by 2060: A decarbonization roadmap of operational residential buildings in China. Energy 2023;277:127689.

[64] Yan R, Ma M, Pan T. Estimating energy savings in Chinese residential buildings from 2001 to 2015:A decomposition analysis. Journal of Engineering Science & Technology Review 2017;10.

[65] Hoehne CG, Chester MV. Optimizing plug-in electric vehicle and vehicle-to-grid charge scheduling to minimize carbon emissions. Energy 2016;115:646-657.