

Addendum to the **2018** **EPA Automotive** **Trends Report:** _____

Greenhouse Gas Emissions,
Fuel Economy, and
Technology since 1975



Addendum: Nissan and Mitsubishi Data

This addendum to the 2018 Automotive Trends report provides additional data on Nissan and Mitsubishi. EPA is publishing this additional content to provide data that aligns with a determination by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) that the two companies be treated as separate entities for compliance.

In late 2016, Nissan purchased 34% of Mitsubishi, thus bringing Mitsubishi into the Renault–Nissan–Mitsubishi Alliance. The change in the relationship between Nissan and Mitsubishi triggered a review by NHTSA to determine if the two manufacturers should be treated as one entity for the purposes of compliance with the CAFE program, with EPA following NHTSA's determination for the corresponding light-duty GHG program. NHTSA's initial input to EPA was that the two companies would be combined for regulatory purposes, beginning with model year 2017. However, after additional consideration, NHTSA determined that Nissan and Mitsubishi would remain independent for CAFE and, thus, the GHG program.

When EPA released the 2018 EPA Automotive Trends Report, Nissan and Mitsubishi data were combined and reported as "Nissan-Mitsubishi" throughout most of the report, with the acknowledgement that the review process was not yet complete. At the time, EPA committed to provide an update if, in fact, the two companies were not combined for regulatory purposes. This addendum provides separated Nissan and Mitsubishi data, in accordance with EPA's commitment to provide the most accurate data that reflect the current regulatory configuration of the industry. This addendum does **not** include any updates to the underlying data presented in the 2018 Trends report and is limited to Nissan and Mitsubishi data. Both estimated **real-world data** and **compliance data** are presented below, as in the full report. For an explanation of these terms or more information about the data, please see the full report.

A. Estimated Real World Fuel Economy and CO₂ Emissions

Nissan has a much larger presence than Mitsubishi in the U.S. light duty vehicle market. For model year 2017, Nissan produced 1,688,689 vehicles, compared to 123,495 vehicles produced by Mitsubishi. The vehicles produced by Mitsubishi are, on average, smaller and more fuel efficient than those of Nissan, as show in the updated Tables 2.2 and 3.3. The values in these two tables show estimated **real-world** fuel economy and CO₂ emission data. The combined Nissan-Mitsubishi values originally reported are shown for comparison purposes only.

Throughout the Trends report, many tables and figures only include manufacturers that produced over 150,000 vehicles for sale in the united states. Mitsubishi does not meet this threshold. However, we have chosen to provide Mitsubishi-specific data here to illustrate the impact of separating Nissan and Mitsubishi.

Table 2.2. Manufacturer Estimated Real-World Fuel Economy and CO₂ Emissions for Model Year 2016-2018 - Updated

Manufacturer	MY 2016 Final		MY 2017 Final				MY 2018 Preliminary	
	Real-World FE (mpg)	Real-World CO ₂ (g/mi)	Real-World FE (mpg)	FE Change from MY 2016 (mpg)	Real-World CO ₂ (g/mi)	CO ₂ Change from MY 2016 (g/mi)	Real-World FE (mpg)	Real-World CO ₂ (g/mi)
Nissan-Mitsubishi	27.8	318	27.1	-0.7	327	9	26.8	329
Nissan	27.9	318	26.9	-1.0	330	12	26.6	331
Mitsubishi	27.1	328	30.4	3.3	292	-36	29.0	306

Table 3.3. Model Year 2017 Vehicle Attributes by Manufacturer - Updated

Manufacturer	Real-World CO ₂ (g/mi)	Real-World FE (mpg)	Weight (lbs)	HP	0 to 60 (s)	Footprint (ft ²)
Nissan-Mitsubishi	327	27.1	3,770	201	8.9	47.6
Nissan	330	26.9	3,815	206	8.7	48.0
Mitsubishi	292	30.4	3,160	134	10.6	42.3

B. Manufacturer GHG Compliance

In accordance with NHTSA's determination, Nissan and Mitsubishi will remain as separate entities for compliance with the CAFE and GHG programs. Both manufacturers ended the 2017 model year with a positive credit balance and are thus in compliance with the model year 2017 and all previous years of the GHG program. The three tables below summarize the **compliance** data for Nissan and Mitsubishi beginning with model year 2017 (Tables 5.5 and 5.11), and then show the manufacturers' overall credit status (Table 5.17). The combined Nissan-Mitsubishi values originally reported are shown for comparison purposes only.

Table 5.5. Manufacturer Performance in Model Year 2017 (g/mi) - Updated

Manufacturer	2-Cycle Tailpipe	Credits					CH ₄ & N ₂ O Deficit	Performance Value
		FFV	TLAAS	A/C	ATVs	Off-Cycle		
Nissan-Mitsubishi	256	-	-	7.7	1.2	2.9	0.0	244
Nissan	258	-	-	8.0	1.3	3.2	0.0	246
Mitsubishi	224	-	-	5.3	0.0	-	-	219

Table 5.11 Credits Earned by Manufacturer in Model Year 2017 - Updated

Manufacturer	Performance Value (g/mi)	Standard (g/mi)	Net Compliance (g/mi)	Production	Credit Surplus/ Shortfall (Mg)
Nissan-Mitsubishi	244	243	1	1,812,184	-504,236
Nissan	246	244	2	1,688,689	-753,157
Mitsubishi	219	224	-5	123,495	124,720

Table 5.17 Final Credit Balance by Manufacturer for Model Year 2017 (g/mi) - Updated

Manufacturer	Early Credits Earned 2009-2011	Credits Earned 2012-2016	Credit Earned 2017	Credits Expired	Credits Forfeited	Credits Purchased or Sold	Final 2017 Credit Balance
Nissan-Mitsubishi	19,580,536	21,305,077	-504,236	-8,773,270	-	-3,539,063	28,069,044
Nissan	18,131,200	20,331,440	-753,157	-8,190,124	-	-3,539,063	25,980,296
Mitsubishi	1,449,336	973,637	124,720	-583,146	-	-	1,964,547