

Dynamic simulation of the German vehicle market

Lars Kröger*, Benjamin Kickhöfer, Francisco J. Bahamonde-Birke, Falko

Nordenholz, Marie-Sophie Bolz

Institute of Transport Research

German Aerospace Center (DLR)

*Correspondence address: lars.kroeger@dlr.de

15 March 2018

Extended Abstract

Keywords: Vehicle ownership, vehicle purchase, vehicle type choice, fleet modeling, agent-based simulation, evolutionary modeling

1 Introduction

2 Vehicle purchase decisions of today by households determine not only the short-term mode choice
3 behavior but also the size and composition of the national vehicle fleet for long periods. Modeling
4 these decisions accurately is therefore a key factor to secure sustainable transport planning and
5 policy setting. The information about car availability and usage is not only crucial for transportation
6 models as car ownership deeply influences all levels of travel behavior (i.e. trip generation,
7 destination and mode choice); it is also a prerequisite for monitoring energy consumption and for
8 capturing the resulting emission levels correctly.

9 In the literature – apart from aggregated models, which, e.g., aim to predict the total number of cars
10 in a country as a function of its GDP – there exist disaggregated models, which aim to explain the
11 behavioral driving forces behind vehicle-related decisions. These models can be differentiated by
12 their respective approach¹: (i) static vehicle holding/ownership (and use) models, and (ii) dynamic
13 vehicle transaction (and use) models. The static models minimally predict, for a given point in time,
14 the discrete number of vehicles owned by a household as a function of the explanatory variables.
15 More sophisticated models additionally provide information on the vehicle type mix and the
16 continuous number of kilometers traveled by each vehicle (see, e.g., Bhat and Sen (2006)).
17 Nonetheless, their goal is not to replicate the dynamics involved in the vehicle purchase/selling
18 decisions. Therefore, they are only appropriate to model end-state conditions and fail to replicate
19 the impact of changing exogenous conditions and/or policy measures that have a continuous impact
20 over time.

¹ For a comprehensive review of car ownership models and a more detailed classification, please refer to de Jong, G., J. Fox, A. Daly, M. Pieters and R. Smit (2004). "A comparison of car ownership models." Transport Reviews **24**(4): 379-408.

21 In contrast, dynamic vehicle transaction models explicitly predict – for every year of the simulation –
22 vehicle transactions over time where households add, replace, dispose of vehicles, or maintain their
23 current state (see, e.g., Mohammadian and Miller (2003)). Some of these models try to link the
24 decisions to so-called life-course events, such as the birth of a child, residential relocation, or a
25 change in employment status (see, e.g., Yamamoto (2008), Chen, Takami et al. (2013), Fatmi and
26 Habib (2017)). These models were often criticized as too data-intensive as they are usually built on
27 panel data, which in many cases do not exist (Bunch, Brownstone et al. (1995), Bhat and Sen (2006)).
28 However, dynamic models are needed to capture the transition phase, especially in situations where
29 major disruptions in the mobility market are expected, be it through the introduction of alternative
30 powertrains or autonomous vehicles including the resulting new business opportunities of Mobility
31 as a Service (MaaS) and their potential impact on vehicle ownership.

32 In this paper, we therefore propose a dynamic vehicle transaction model, similar to the one by
33 Mohammadian and Miller (2003). Our approach, however, differs from their model, as we do not
34 only aim at modeling vehicle transactions by households (as done by Mohammadian and Miller
35 (2003)), but additionally the entire vehicle market, including both new and used vehicles. This implies
36 modeling not only the household decisions, but also the entire vehicle fleet. This approach is
37 compulsory to model the German vehicle market. In Germany, given the tax incentives in place, a
38 large proportion of vehicles used for private purposes are user-chooser company cars, which are part
39 of the employee’s remuneration.² It represents 60% of the total vehicle transactions. It seems
40 therefore essential to consider the used vehicle market in any vehicle market model, as changes in it
41 would have large implications on the development of the entire fleet, affecting the demand for new
42 vehicles upstream, be it through direct competition or through resale prices.

43 While our extension of the model by Mohammadian and Miller (2003) is especially important to
44 capture the particularities of the German market, it is a valuable addition to any vehicle market
45 model, as new vehicles sales are presumably affected by the dynamics of the used vehicle market.
46 Hence, not considering the used vehicle market or the impact of certain policy measures on it, may
47 lead to misleading recommendations.

48 **Model Structure**

49 The model is based upon a dynamic simulation of household vehicle transactions and a longitudinal
50 model, which makes it possible to follow every vehicle entering the market over its entire life span.
51 This way, every active decision (i.e. buying or selling) by a given household in the vehicle market is
52 associated with a particular vehicle being assigned to or removed from the household. This allows
53 monitoring the entire fleet, including vehicles in possession of a given household being available for
54 sale on the used vehicle market.

55 Given this setup, the key foundation of the dynamic simulation is provided by a behavioral model of
56 the households in the vehicles market. This model, estimated on the basis of revealed preferences,
57 allows establishing purchase probabilities for the households opting for new vehicles, new user-
58 chooser company vehicles (mainly used for private purposes), or second-hand vehicles. Furthermore,

² Private use of a vehicle owned by the employer may reduce an employee’s income tax due to German tax regulations and, hence, might be less expensive than a privately owned vehicle.

59 the behavioral model allows establishing probabilities for the size class (small, medium, large) and
60 powertrain (diesel vs gasoline) of the vehicles to be acquired. These probabilities are a function of
61 the characteristics of the household as well as of the acquisition price and the operational costs. The
62 decision of selling a giving vehicle as well as the end of the life span is based on an independent
63 stochastic model (see Kickhöfer and Brokate (2017), who use a function of the vehicle age and
64 mileage as well as of the number of years that the vehicle has been in possession of the same
65 household).

66 Finally, in every step of the simulation (representing one year), purchases, sellings and vehicles
67 leaving the market are generated on the basis of the aforementioned probabilities. Vehicles are then
68 assigned to households in function of their availability. For this purpose it is assumed that the
69 availability of new vehicles is unlimited, while in the second-hand market it is limited by the vehicles
70 sold in the current year and in the previous years.

71 **Illustrative examples**

72 For illustrative purposes, we consider five different scenarios over a time horizon of 30 years. The
73 considered scenarios are the following:

- 74 a) Base-case scenario (business as usual).
- 75 b) Increment of fuel prices by 20%.
- 76 c) Increment of the diesel tax by 50%.
- 77 d) Increment of the vehicle tax for diesel vehicles produced before 2015 by 100% (i.e. not
78 complying with the emissions standard EURO 6).
- 79 e) Increment of fuel taxes by 50% starting at the end of 2025.

80 The illustrative examples exhibit the model's capability to react to changes in the current conditions
81 and exhibit the transition phase before a stationary state is reached. Furthermore, they confirm that,
82 given the long replacement times of the vehicle market in Germany, the effect of policy measures on
83 the vehicle fleet are not immediate and that long transition times are necessary.

84 **Conclusions**

85 The availability of vehicles is a key element in the analysis of travel behavior, as it deeply affects
86 transport demand at every possible level. Nonetheless, the analysis of vehicle purchase decisions (or
87 most long-term decisions associated with mobility tools) by households has not played a major role
88 in transport modeling yet. We propose and successfully test a simulation tool that allows considering
89 the availability of vehicles at the level of households taking market constraints into account
90 (especially the respective long replacement times).

91 While the model has been developed for vehicle purchases in Germany, it is possible to adapt it for
92 other markets or different mobility tools, such as public transport monthly cards or carsharing
93 membership decisions. Furthermore, it is also possible to extend the model to analyze the adoption
94 of electric powertrains or autonomous vehicles and their potential impact on vehicle ownership over
95 time. Moreover, it offers a powerful way to assess the impact of different policy measures on car
96 ownership.

97 **References**

- 98 Bhat, C. R. and S. Sen (2006). "Household vehicle type holdings and usage: an application of the
99 multiple discrete-continuous extreme value (MDCEV) model." Transportation Research Part B:
100 Methodological **40**(1): 35-53.
- 101 Bunch, D. S., D. Brownstone and T. F. Golob (1995). "A dynamic forecasting system for vehicle
102 markets with clean-fuel vehicles." University of California Transportation Center.
- 103 Chen, B.-W., K. Takami, N. OHMORI and N. Harata (2013). "Household car and motorcycle ownership
104 and transaction behavior through a life-course approach-A case in Taipei city." Journal of the Eastern
105 Asia Society for Transportation Studies **10**: 567-585.
- 106 de Jong, G., J. Fox, A. Daly, M. Pieters and R. Smit (2004). "A comparison of car ownership models."
107 Transport Reviews **24**(4): 379-408.
- 108 Fatmi, M. R. and M. A. Habib (2017). "Baseline Synthesis and Microsimulation of Life-stage
109 Transitions within an Agent-based Integrated Urban Model." Procedia Computer Science **109**: 608-
110 615.
- 111 Kickhöfer, B. and J. Brokate (2017). " Die Entwicklung des deutschen Pkw-Bestandes: Ein Vergleich
112 bestehender Modelle und die Vorstellung eines evolutionären Simulationsansatzes." Technical
113 report, DLR.
- 114 Mohammadian, A. and E. Miller (2003). "Dynamic modeling of household automobile transactions."
115 Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board(1831).
- 116 Walker, J. L., Ben-Akiva, M. and Bolduc, D. (2007). "Identification of parameters in normal error
117 component logit-mixture (NECLM) models." Journal of Applied Econometrics **22**(6): 1095-1125.
- 118 Yamamoto, T. (2008). "The impact of life-course events on vehicle ownership dynamics: The cases of
119 france and Japan." IATSS research **32**(2): 34-43.