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Trucks were responsible for nearly 40% of the growth in global oil demand since 2000; they are the fastest growing source of oil demand, in particular for diesel.
A modern truck sector is still a long haul away

Without further policy efforts, trucks will account for 40% of the oil demand growth, and 15% of the increase in global energy-sector CO₂ emissions, to 2050.
The Future of trucks
Implications for energy and the environment
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Vehicle stock is one of the key determinants of road freight activity. Relevance of different modes not uniform across global regions.
Energy use

- Although it accounts for only 20% of global tkm, road freight consumes more than 70% of energy in freight modes.
- At around 17 mb/d, road freight transport is the second largest consumer of oil products (after passenger cars).
- Most of this fuel goes to medium- and heavy-duty trucks.
- LCVs are – by far – the least efficient road freight transport mode.
Projecting activity

Freight activity is strongly correlated with income growth
The truck market is shifting to emerging economies; by 2050, the United States and the European Union are expected to account for only 10% of the global truck sales, down from 20% today.
An IEA vision for a modern truck future

• The IEA proposes a vision for modernising truck transport, in light of the increasing relevance of the sector for future oil demand & emissions growth

• The **IEA Modern Truck Scenario** requires near-term efforts across three central areas:
  - *Fuel economy policies* to increase the efficiency of trucks through standards and differentiated taxes
  - *Improvements of logistics*, enabled by data gathering and sharing, to realise some of the potential that underlies system-wide improvements
  - *Support to the use of alternative fuels*, such as through RD&D and support to the build-up of infrastructure
An achievable, yet ambitious, vision for the future of trucks

Modernising trucks and systems operations could reduce fuel demand from trucks by 50% in 2050 and emissions by up to 75%, with benefits for energy security and environmental goals.
Modernising trucks and systems operations could reduce fuel demand from trucks by 50% in 2050 and emissions by up to 75%, with benefits for energy security and environmental goals.

Policy action is key to enable the transition between MTS and RTS.
Policy priorities

• **Adopting policies targeting vehicle efficiency, including fuel economy standards and differentiated taxes on vehicle purchase**

The two policies complement each other: the former regulatory policy ensures that all new truck sales achieve minimum efficiency performance, and the latter fiscal measure favours the best performing models, pushing further improvements.

For MFTs and HFTs taken together, the fuel use per kilometre of new vehicle registrations needs to be progressively reduced by 35%, relative to a 2015 baseline, by 2035.

• **Supporting widespread data collection and information sharing in logistics**

Data gathering and information sharing are key prerequisites to realising some of the potential that underlies systemic improvements of freight logistics, including the sharing of assets and services.

Policy makers should take a proactive role in supporting data collection and sharing platforms by promoting closer collaboration among all stakeholders.

• **Promoting the deployment of alternative fuels and the vehicles that use them**

This typically requires support across four areas: RD&D, market uptake of alternative fuel vehicles, adequate access to charging or refuelling infrastructure and the availability of alternative fuels.
Only four countries have fuel economy standards in place on heavy-duty trucks. Such standards cover nearly 50% of new heavy-duty vehicle sales, as compared with light-duty fuel economy standards, which cover more than 80% of new LDV sales.
Vehicle efficiency

Vehicle and powertrain technologies allowing to reduce consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Range of energy savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved aerodynamics</td>
<td>Up to 3-5% of energy use,* retrofit possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower rolling resistance tyres</td>
<td>10% to 30% reduction of rolling resistance and about 3-5% of total energy use,* retrofit possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light weighting/material substitution</td>
<td>1-3% in near term, up to 7% in the long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission and drivetrain improvements</td>
<td>1 to 5% from automatic transmission (mission profile matters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine efficiency</td>
<td>4 to 18% (long haul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing idling</td>
<td>Up to 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybridization</td>
<td>6% to 35%, range depends on mission profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* excluding engine power adjustments
Systemic measures in logistics (1/2)

Measures requiring little or no co-operation across stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Range of energy savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route optimization</td>
<td>5%-10% intra-city, 1% long haul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Vehicles (HCVs)</td>
<td>Up to 20%, primarily in long haul, risk of rebound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver training and feedback</td>
<td>3% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platooning</td>
<td>5% to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last mile delivery optimization</td>
<td>5% to 10%, depends on degree of implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples
- Delivery booking and re-timing to optimize use of available facilities
- Changing delivery frequency
- Consolidating orders and suppliers
- Manage waste, reduce volumes and collection frequencies
- Promote the use of efficient and zero emission vehicles
Systemic measures in logistics (2/2)

Measures requiring closer collaboration, including sharing of assets and services between and among companies and more radical re-envisioning of how logistics systems operate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Range of energy savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain collaboration/co-loading</td>
<td>Up to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching cargo and vehicles via IT</td>
<td>5% to 10% in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes freight exchanges, digital freight matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links with crowdshipping and co-modality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban consolidation centres</td>
<td>20%-50% in urban centres (all measures combined, including vehicle techs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical internet</td>
<td>Up to 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency and collaboration can drive major changes leading to reduced GHG emissions – this conflicts with “just-in-time” and same- or next-day deliveries
Alternative fuel truck technologies come at higher cost today

Heavy-duty freight vehicle & fuel costs over five years of use, including infrastructure cost, 2015
Sustained policy commitment can change the current context...

Heavy-duty freight vehicle & fuel costs over five years of use, including infrastructure cost, 2060
Projecting vehicle technology uptake (MTS)

- MTS embeds major changes in the vehicle technology mix
• Mileage tends to be larger in countries with lower fuel prices
• Fuel taxation tends to be lower in low-density countries (longer transport distances)
• Vehicle speed also matters: poorer conditions of the road network in developing regions lead to lower speeds, thereby limiting mileage
Vehicle activity

- China catching up fast against Europe and United States, primarily because of HFT and LCV vkm growth
- India still half of China, and with much greater relevance of MFTs
Loads

- Loads decline with income growth for medium trucks
- Carrying capacities of heavy trucks increase with income growth

Sources: Grütter (2016); BTS (2016); Eurostat (2016).
• Combined effect of stock growth (and structural shifts), mileage and load dynamics
• Road freight activity is stagnating in developed countries, reflecting limited economic growth, while it is growing rapidly in developing economies
• In 2015, the volume of tkm in road freight in China was roughly similar to total activity in the United States and the European Union. Road freight activity in India was only about one-third these levels
Fuel economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>LCVs Ide/100 km</th>
<th>Payload (tonnes)</th>
<th>MFTs Ide/100 km</th>
<th>Payload (tonnes)</th>
<th>HFTs Ide/100 km</th>
<th>Payload (tonnes)</th>
<th>tkm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Differences in vehicle attributes, such as engine size and power, the availability of auxiliaries, and the mission profiles and vehicle size distributions in each category, complicate the comparison of average fuel economy and load across regions
- Trucks are most efficient in Europe
- Higher payloads on LCVs and MFTs lead to lower fuel use per tkm in China and India
Energy use and emissions were largely boosted in recent years by growth taking place in China, Latin America, India and other rapidly developing global economies.

By 2015, China’s CO$_2$ emissions in road freight caught up with the EU.

India’s road freight emissions were still only about one-third of China’s.
Caveats

- Data availability limitations required the use of estimations
- The main rationale used in our assessment builds on the information flow that links vehicle sales with energy use (through survival rates, stocks, mileages, vkm and fuel economies)

\[ A \sum_i S_i I_i = F \]

- Bottom up estimations of energy use require data on fuel economies
  - Our work relied primarily on research developed by the ICCT for the GFEI, complemented by information on the fuel consumption of vehicles reported by communities of vehicle users
- Tkm are linked to vkm by the share of empty running and average load on laden trips
  - Surveys focused on developing regions (Grütter, 2016) and available data points from the United States (BTS, 2016) and the European Union (Eurostat, 2016) were the main basis for this assessment
  - This information was then used as the basis for defining the average loads of medium- and heavy-freight trucks as functions of income and used to estimate the loads
The share of LCVs and heavy trucks grows with increasing income levels due to an improving road network and increasing use of LCVs for services and urban deliveries.

The existing policy gap leads to limited uptake of fuel-saving technologies in the reference scenario. Despite this, hybrids and EV stock shares grow in light commercial vehicles and in vehicles with mission profiles requiring frequent stops.
Energy use projections (RTS)

- Combining freight activity growth with mileages and vehicle stock structures that broadly reflect historical development and vehicle technology development that does not act in major changes leads to nearly 50% growth in energy use from road freight by 2060.
- India catches up with China by 2035, and accounts as much as North America by 2060 in this scenario.
The Great European Data Dilemma

- Annual commercial vehicle registrations > 3.5 tonnes GVW  
  ACEA
- Data gaps interpolated; vehicle stock estimated via aging function; calibration of road diesel consumption to national statistics (IEA energy balances)
- MoMo estimate of total heavy-duty truck stock in 2015: 4.0 million vehicles
  - Stock split: ~38% 3.5t – 16t / ~62% >16t
- This corresponds to the sum of all vehicle registrations over between 11-12 years

Road goods transport in the EU-28 by age of vehicle, 2011 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eurostat</th>
<th>MoMo</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>million vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empty running</td>
<td>15%-30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>share vkm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vkm</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>billion vkm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tkm</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>billion tkm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average load</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>tonnes (tkm/vkm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average mileage</td>
<td>33,088</td>
<td>71,265</td>
<td>km/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>