

Who adopts where and when? Electric vehicle diffusion with building-level localization in Germany

Moritz Raab^{*,} Max Kleinebrahm^{id}, Jonathan Vogl^{id}, Tim Signer, Jannik Braun, Wolf Fichtner^{id}

Institute for Industrial Production (IIP), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Hertzstr. 16, Karlsruhe, 76187, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Technology diffusion
Electric vehicle adoption
Synthetic population
Spatially explicit modeling
Household-level adoption

ABSTRACT

The electrification of private vehicles is a central element of decarbonizing transport and energy systems. Accurately anticipating when and where electric vehicles will be adopted is critical for charging infrastructure planning, distribution grid planning, and energy system operation, yet most diffusion models represent adoption at aggregated spatial scales. Here we introduce an open, scalable, high-resolution technology diffusion framework that links household-level electric vehicle adoption with georeferenced building-level residential locations. The framework combines a synthetic population, household-to-building matching, car ownership modeling, and a national Bass diffusion trajectory to translate aggregate electric vehicle growth into localized adoption pathways. We apply the framework to Germany from 2025 to 2050 and evaluate its main components using Census marginals, household-to-building consistency metrics, and registered vehicle counts, demonstrating its suitability for spatially explicit electric vehicle diffusion analysis. The results reveal substantial spatial heterogeneity in electric vehicle diffusion across regions, municipalities, grid cells, and buildings. Differences in household income and the share of single-family houses shape local adoption trajectories, leading to higher adoption in West Germany than in East Germany and slightly higher adoption in rural than urban municipalities in aggregate. The framework provides an open and transferable basis for spatially explicit modeling of household technology diffusion. Future research can build on these findings by applying the framework to other technologies or by linking electric vehicle diffusion at georeferenced building-level locations to charging demand, system operation, and infrastructure planning.

1. Introduction

In 2024, global electric vehicle (EV) sales climbed to a record 17 million units, an increase of 25% compared with 2023 [1]. This growth is expected to persist, with the global EV fleet projected to expand from about 58 million vehicles in 2024 to around 235 million by 2030 [2]. While this rapid deployment substantially contributes to transport decarbonization, it simultaneously poses challenges to distribution grid infrastructure [3–5], including potential overloads occurring before transformers reach their capacity limit [6–8].

At the same time, EVs can provide flexibility services through controlled charging [9,10]. Thereby, EVs can contribute to peak shaving, voltage and frequency regulation [11,12], grid resilience, reduced requirements for stationary battery storage and costly grid reinforcements [13,14], and facilitate the integration of renewable energy [15–19]. However, realizing these potentials requires an appropriate integration of EVs into the local energy system.

Consequently, regional planners and distribution system operators require spatial and temporal visibility into the evolution of electric vehicle adoption to ensure adequate system sizing and operation. This need for spatial detail is particularly relevant at the distribution grid level, where overloads may be triggered by a small number of households with coincident charging peaks. While aggregation at the transformer or municipal level smooths these peaks, georeferenced building-level resolution reveals localized stress patterns that are crucial for grid planning (see Fig. 1). More broadly, the same need for high-resolution diffusion modeling applies to other distributed technologies such as heat pumps and rooftop photovoltaic systems, whose uptake and operation likewise shape local electricity demand and flexibility.

Existing studies demonstrate that heterogeneous households, spatial context, and EV adoption can be represented jointly at fine spatial resolution. Agent-based models have represented heterogeneous consumers in spatially explicit settings, while more integrated urban

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: moritz.raab@kit.edu (M. Raab).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adapen.2026.100313>

Received 9 July 2026; Received in revised form 25 September 2026; Accepted 1 October 2026

Available online 9 October 2026

2666-7924/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Open access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.




Fig. 1. Smoothing effect through spatial aggregation. The lower panel shows exemplary single-household load profiles with pronounced EV charging peaks relative to baseline residential demand, whereas the upper panel shows an aggregated profile for the average German household, in which charging peaks are substantially attenuated. This illustrates how georeferenced building-level, household-level resolution can reveal localized stress patterns that may be relevant for line overloads. Household profiles are based on [3,27,28], and the average German household profile is based on [29,30].

frameworks additionally combine synthetic populations, residential locations, and individual EV adoption within detailed city-scale environments [20–23]. However, these highly resolved approaches are predominantly developed for specific urban case studies or synthetic spatial environments, whereas broader-scale EV diffusion models generally represent residential locations more coarsely [24–26]. What remains insufficiently addressed is an open, scalable, and transferable framework that links national diffusion pathways with empirically calibrated household-level adoption and localization in an observed georeferenced residential building stock.

To address this gap, we develop an open and data-driven technology diffusion framework that integrates annual temporal dynamics, georeferenced building-level spatial resolution, household sociodemographics, and residential characteristics. The framework combines three components: (i) the generation of a synthetic population calibrated to multi-level spatial marginals; (ii) the assignment of synthetic households to georeferenced buildings; and (iii) a hybrid diffusion-adoption module that links a national diffusion pathway with household-level adoption probabilities derived from observed adoption determinants. We demonstrate the framework in a case study of EV diffusion in Germany.

By linking national diffusion pathways with household-level adoption and georeferenced building-level locations, the proposed framework enables a differentiated analysis of EV adoption dynamics at distribution-grid-relevant scales. It thereby provides a foundation for assessing grid impacts and flexibility potentials across spatial scales, from the national to the building level. At the same time, the household-level sociodemographic resolution allows adoption patterns to be linked to questions of charging infrastructure access, energy poverty, and distributional equity in the diffusion of low-carbon technologies.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a literature overview. Sections 3 and 4 describe the methodology and data. The results are presented in Section 5 and discussed in Section 6. In Section 7, conclusions are drawn, and an outlook is provided.

2. Literature review

The electrification of mobility and heating, together with the expansion of residential photovoltaics, increasingly reshapes electricity demand and generation at the low-voltage level, where detailed grids are often highly heterogeneous [37,38]. The impact of technology deployment depends strongly on local grid characteristics, building stock, and the spatial concentration of new electricity demand [7, 39]. Geographically disaggregated analyses show that network upgrade costs and the value of flexibility can vary substantially between local areas, indicating that targeted flexibility deployment may reduce reinforcement needs more effectively than untargeted approaches [39]. Complementary studies of German low-voltage grids show that electric vehicles, heat pumps, and photovoltaics jointly affect transformer loading and that local coordination of flexible demand can mitigate distribution-grid constraints [7,38]. These findings imply that distribution grid and local energy system analyses require adoption scenarios that are not only temporally resolved, but also spatially explicit at the level where loads and generation emerge.

However, existing demand-side analyses often rely on aggregated technology deployment assumptions [26,39]. More broadly, technology adoption and diffusion models increasingly account for spatial [25, 40–45], temporal [40–47], and sociodemographic heterogeneity [25, 41–43,45–47] through agent-based models [41–43], machine-learning methods [43–45], econometric models [25], and household-level adoption and use models for residential cooling technologies [46,47]. In the EV context, approaches range from aggregate regional diffusion models [24–26] to household- and agent-level models that explicitly represent heterogeneous consumers and their spatial environment [20,21,33]. More spatially integrated urban models combine synthetic populations, residential locations, social networks, and EV adoption at fine spatial resolution [22,23]. However, these highly resolved approaches are predominantly developed for specific urban case studies or synthetic spatial environments, whereas broader-scale approaches generally represent residential locations more coarsely [22–26]. This motivates a closer review of the three methodological components required to link national EV diffusion with household-level adoption and georeferenced residential buildings: synthetic population generation, household-to-building localization, and EV adoption and diffusion modeling.

Synthetic population. Agent-based models commonly rely on synthetic populations representing households and individuals with attributes that drive behavioral decisions. Synthetic population reconstruction aims to reproduce observed sociodemographic distributions across geographic areas while preserving household-level dependencies [48,49]. A widely used approach is Iterative Proportional Updating (IPU), which assigns weights to households from representative microdata such that the weighted population matches known aggregate control totals [48,50]. Because relevant control variables may be available at different spatial resolutions, multilevel extensions of IPU allow

Table 1

Overview of spatio-temporal EV diffusion and adoption models. Studies are compared by temporal and spatial resolution, diffusion and adoption modeling approach, inclusion of sociodemographic determinants, adoption data source, and sample size. The final row summarizes the configuration of this work for direct comparison.

First author and year	Temporal resolution	Spatial resolution	Diffusion	Adoption	Sociodemographics	Adoption data	Size
Paevere 2014 [24]	Quarterly	LAU	×	Multi criteria decision	✓	Mobility Survey 2011	2k
McCoy 2014 [20]		Grid-level	ABM	Threshold-based	✓	Smart-meter survey	3k
Wolf 2015 [21]		District-level	ABM	Behavioral model	✓	Berlin survey	675
Heymann 2017 [31]	×	LAU	×	Multi linear regression	✓	Mobility Survey 2016	30
Ensslen 2019 [32]	Yearly	×	Bass	Logit regression	✓	Mobility Survey 2016	171
Zhuge 2019 [22]	Yearly	Synthetic facility-level	ABM	Utility-based choice	✓	Beijing surveys	
Klein 2020 [33]		Postal-code level	ABM	Utility-based choice	✓	Conjoint survey	552
Liu 2022 [23]	Yearly	Synthetic facility-level	ABM	Behavioral model	✓	Beijing survey	402
Sheng 2022 [25]	Yearly	LAU	×	Binomial regression	✓	National Statistics 2020	
Cao Van 2023 [34]	Yearly	×	ALADIN	×	×	Mobility Survey 2023	17k
Arnold 2024 [26]	Yearly	NUTS3	Bass	×	×		
Mascherbauer 2025 [35]	Yearly	Building-level	×	Random	×		
Sica 2025 [36]	×	×	×	Discrete choice	✓	Mobility Survey 2023	17k
This work	Yearly	Building-level	Bass	Logit regression	✓	Mobility in Germany 2023	420k

NUTS3: regional district level, LAU: municipal level, ABM: agent-based model.

synthetic populations to be calibrated simultaneously to controls at multiple geographic levels [51,52].

In this paper, we use a two-level IPU procedure that calibrates household weights to German Census controls at both the municipal and 100×100 m grid-cell levels. This allows variables relevant for EV adoption available at different spatial resolutions to be combined within a consistent synthetic population (see Section 4).

Household-to-building matching. To enable geographically explicit analyses, synthetic households must be assigned to physical, georeferenced buildings. Such linkage is particularly relevant in transport modeling, as residential location influences individual mobility behavior and travel demand [53,54]. This linkage is also relevant for energy system applications, for example, when analyzing EV charging, building electrification through heat pumps, or local load patterns, where coupling households with building-specific attributes such as construction age or dwelling size is essential.

Assigning synthetic households to buildings can be formulated as a generalized assignment problem, in which households are allocated to suitable residential buildings under compatibility and capacity constraints. Related studies in spatial microsimulation and urban modeling have addressed this problem through probabilistic or rule-based allocation procedures. Antoni et al. [55] generate synthetic households from aggregated sociodemographic and geographic data for French cities and subsequently assign them to buildings to create a population database for multi-agent and activity-based urban models. Thomson et al. [56] simulate geolocated synthetic households in Namibia by classifying household types and linking them to building coordinates using probability surfaces estimated from spatial covariates. These studies demonstrate the relevance of household-building linkage for spatial population modeling, but their assignment procedures are primarily designed for demographic, survey, or urban modeling applications rather than for allocating technology adoption and energy demand to individual buildings.

In this paper, we build on this idea and assign households to buildings using an optimization-based matching procedure that minimizes unused living area and can additionally account for building attributes such as construction age and building type. The procedure is applied separately within each Census grid cell and therefore only determines the final building-level localization of households whose broader spatial location is already defined. It is not intended to represent residential choice or an equilibrium allocation. Instead, the optimization provides a transparent and reproducible way to generate a constraint-consistent assignment subject to available building capacity and household-building characteristics. These characteristics are relevant for subsequent applications, as building type can affect private EV charging and rooftop photovoltaics, while construction age and

dwelling size are relevant for heating demand and heat-pump adoption. Constrained probabilistic allocation represents a valid alternative, but would require assumptions about household-to-building assignment probabilities that cannot be reliably estimated from the available data and would therefore be subject to substantial uncertainty.

EV adoption and diffusion. EV adoption is shaped by heterogeneous household, individual, and spatial characteristics. Previous studies show that adoption is associated with sociodemographic factors such as income, education, age, gender, and household size [57–62], as well as with behavioral and attitudinal factors including environmental concern and innovation affinity [57,58,63]. Spatial context also matters, as adoption patterns differ by region type and can be reinforced by neighborhood effects [57,61,62]. These findings motivate models that represent individual households as decision makers and link their characteristics to spatially explicit adoption decisions.

A broad range of modeling approaches has been developed to represent these heterogeneous adoption processes and their evolution over time (Table 1). Agent-based models (ABMs) are well established in EV diffusion research and allow heterogeneous consumer characteristics, social interactions, and spatial effects to be represented at the individual or household level. Existing approaches range from nationally representative household populations and spatial microsimulation to empirically grounded urban models based on individual survey data [20,21,33]. More spatially integrated frameworks additionally combine synthetic populations, residential locations, social networks, and EV adoption within detailed urban environments [22,23]. Zhuge et al. [22], for example, integrate synthetic households, dynamic residential locations, social networks, and agent-level vehicle-purchase decisions within an integrated urban model for Beijing.

More generally, adoption models describe which households, individuals, or vehicle users are more likely to adopt an EV, whereas diffusion models describe how EV uptake develops over time at the fleet or market level. Existing approaches can broadly be distinguished as bottom-up, top-down, and hybrid models. Bottom-up approaches derive adoption or vehicle choice from household- or individual-level characteristics using regression [25,31,32], discrete-choice [24,36], utility-based, or agent-based models [20–23,33]. Top-down approaches instead project aggregate fleet development using diffusion models such as the Bass model [26,32]. Hybrid approaches combine both perspectives by linking aggregate diffusion trajectories with heterogeneous micro-level adoption probabilities [32].

Highly resolved agent-based approaches demonstrate that household heterogeneity, residential location, and EV adoption can be represented jointly. However, these models are predominantly developed for specific urban case studies and often rely on location-specific survey

data or synthetic spatial environments, whereas broader-scale diffusion models generally represent residential locations more coarsely. A remaining gap is therefore an open, scalable, and transferable framework that combines national-scale household coverage and sociodemographic heterogeneity with empirically calibrated adoption and explicit localization in an observed georeferenced residential building stock.

This study addresses this gap using a hybrid approach that combines a national Bass diffusion trajectory with a logistic regression adoption model. The Bass model determines the aggregate temporal diffusion pathway, while household-level adoption probabilities are estimated from observed sociodemographic and residential determinants and applied to a Census-calibrated synthetic population linked to georeferenced residential buildings. This design reflects that the synthetic population provides detailed observable household characteristics but does not include all behavioral and attitudinal drivers of EV adoption, such as environmental concern or innovation affinity. The framework therefore does not aim to derive aggregate EV diffusion entirely from the bottom up, but instead spatially allocates a given national diffusion pathway to heterogeneous households and residential buildings. Additional adoption drivers could be integrated where they can be linked to synthetic households through sociodemographic proxies, spatial indicators, or additional data sources. In this way, the framework generates national-scale household- and building-level adoption trajectories without requiring a fully specified urban agent-based simulation.

3. Methodology

In the following, we describe the three methodological steps in detail, namely synthetic population generation, household-to-building matching, and adoption modeling. Fig. 2 provides an overview of the methodological pipeline and the required input data.

3.1. Microsimulation of the synthetic population

Microdata are large, representative surveys that contain information on individuals and households, including income, age, gender, household size, and education [64–66]. Due to privacy constraints, microdata are typically only available for large spatial units (e.g., national or federal-state level). As a result, analyses at very high spatial resolution are not directly possible without microsimulation. To identify which households from the microdata are most relevant for a given region, aggregated marginal distributions at higher spatial resolution are required. Such marginals for selected attributes, for example, household size, employment status, or education, are available at different spatial levels, for instance, at the municipal level or at the grid level [67].

We simulate the synthetic population using IPU [50] and extend it to a two-level procedure that calibrates household weights simultaneously to marginal distributions available at both a macro level and a grid level. Let N denote the number of households in the microdata sample and G the number of spatial grids. For each IPU iteration t , a weight $w_{ig}^{(t)}$ is assigned to each household i in grid g . Initially, all weights are set to one, i.e., $w_{ig}^{(0)} = 1$.

Macro-level calibration. For each control variable $j = 1, \dots, J$, the current weighted total across all grids is computed as

$$S_j^{(t, \text{macro})} = \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} w_{ig}^{(t)}, \quad \forall j \quad (1)$$

where a_{ij} denotes the value of attribute j for household i . Let c_j^{macro} denote the corresponding macro-level marginal total. Weights are then adjusted proportionally across all grids according to

$$w_{ig}^{(t+1/2)} = w_{ig}^{(t)} \cdot \frac{c_j^{\text{macro}}}{S_j^{(t, \text{macro})}}, \quad \forall i, g \text{ with } a_{ij} > 0, \forall j. \quad (2)$$

Grid-level calibration. Subsequently, for each grid g and control variable j , the weighted total is computed within the grid:

$$S_{jg}^{(t+1/2, \text{grid})} = \sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} w_{ig}^{(t+1/2)}, \quad \forall j, g. \quad (3)$$

Let c_{jg}^{grid} denote the corresponding grid-level marginal total. Weights are then updated within each grid as

$$w_{ig}^{(t+1)} = w_{ig}^{(t+1/2)} \cdot \frac{c_{jg}^{\text{grid}}}{S_{jg}^{(t+1/2, \text{grid})}}, \quad \forall i \text{ with } a_{ij} > 0, \forall j, g. \quad (4)$$

An iteration t consists of sequential macro-level and grid-level adjustments over all control variables.

Convergence criterion. After each iteration, the average relative deviation across all macro- and grid-level constraints is computed as

$$\delta^{(t)} = \frac{1}{K} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{\text{macro}}} \rho_j^{(t, \text{macro})} + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_g^{\text{grid}}} \rho_{jg}^{(t, \text{grid})} \right], \quad (5)$$

with

$$\rho_j^{(t, \text{macro})} = \left| \frac{S_j^{(t, \text{macro})} - c_j^{\text{macro}}}{c_j^{\text{macro}}} \right|,$$

$$\rho_{jg}^{(t, \text{grid})} = \left| \frac{S_{jg}^{(t, \text{grid})} - c_{jg}^{\text{grid}}}{c_{jg}^{\text{grid}}} \right|,$$

$$\mathcal{J}^{\text{macro}} = \left\{ j \in \{1, \dots, J\} : c_j^{\text{macro}} > 0 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{J}_g^{\text{grid}} = \left\{ j \in \{1, \dots, J\} : c_{jg}^{\text{grid}} > 0 \right\},$$

$$K = |\mathcal{J}^{\text{macro}}| + \sum_{g=1}^G |\mathcal{J}_g^{\text{grid}}|,$$

where K denotes the number of active constraints, and $\mathcal{J}^{\text{macro}}$ and $\mathcal{J}_g^{\text{grid}}$ denote the sets of control variables with strictly positive targets at the macro and grid level, respectively.

The algorithm terminates when the improvement Δ falls below a predefined threshold ε

$$\Delta = \left| \delta^{(t-1)} - \delta^{(t)} \right| < \varepsilon. \quad (6)$$

Household sampling. After convergence of the two-level IPU, a calibrated weight w_{ig} is available for each household i and grid cell g . The resulting weights do not directly define a synthetic population, because they are generally non-integer and cannot be represented as discrete household records. An additional sampling step is therefore required to convert the fractional weights into an integer set of households for each grid cell. In the spatial microsimulation literature, a common procedure for this transformation is the Truncate–Replicate–Sample (TRS) method [48,68,69]. TRS first extracts the integer part of each calibrated weight (truncate) and deterministically replicates households accordingly (replicate). The remaining fractional parts are then interpreted as sampling probabilities to stochastically allocate the residual households (sample) [69]. Because in our high-resolution setting, grid-level populations are small compared to the microdata sample, the weights w_{ig} are typically less than 1. Therefore, TRS provides no advantage over direct Monte Carlo sampling.

For this reason, we draw the observed number of households N_g in each grid cell g with replacement according to the probability p_{ig} , which is calculated by:

$$p_{ig} = \frac{w_{ig}}{W_g}, \quad \text{with } W_g = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{ig}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N p_{ig} = 1. \quad (7)$$

This yields an initial Monte Carlo realization. To further improve the reconstruction of grid-level characteristics, we apply a random search




Fig. 2. Schematic overview of the methodological pipeline of this paper. In the first step, a synthetic population is generated for each grid cell using microsimulation (IPU) based on microdata and high-resolution marginal distributions. In the second step, synthetic households are assigned to georeferenced residential buildings, thereby providing building-level spatial localization. In the third step, a logistic regression model is calibrated on adoption data to estimate household-specific adoption probabilities from sociodemographic determinants. Macroscopic diffusion is represented by a Bass diffusion model calibrated to the historical stock of battery electric vehicles (BEVs), and the annual rollout is stochastically allocated to households using their estimated adoption probabilities as relative sampling weights.

step: (i) we remove one randomly selected household, (ii) propose a set of candidate replacements sampled from the same probability distribution, and (iii) accept the replacement that yields the largest reduction in the total grid-level reconstruction error. Optionally, the objective function can include a normalized excess-demand term that

penalizes cases in which the aggregate living area demand of the sampled households exceeds the available residential living area in the building data for grid cell g . The procedure terminates after a fixed number of attempts or once no further improvement is observed for a predefined number of consecutive steps.

3.2. Household-to-building matching

In the second step, synthetic households are assigned to georeferenced residential buildings. Because the synthetic population is already localized to individual Census grid cells, the household-to-building procedure does not determine the broader spatial location of households. Instead, matching is performed independently within each grid cell and determines only the final residential building within that cell. The procedure should therefore be understood as constrained spatial disaggregation rather than as a model of residential location choice.

The allocation of households to buildings belongs to the class of Generalized Assignment Problems (GAP). Households correspond to items with resource demands (e.g., required living area), whereas buildings represent capacity-constrained agents providing limited living space. Assigning a household to a building consumes capacity and incurs a cost defined by an attribute-based mismatch function. The formulation extends the classical GAP in two directions. First, households may remain unassigned at a penalty cost, which corresponds to a GAP with rejection. Second, unused building capacity is explicitly penalized in the objective, which, together with the penalty for unassigned households, favors the allocation of available households subject to the building-capacity constraints, but does not imply efficient occupancy of individual buildings. The resulting optimization problem is NP-hard and is solved as a binary integer linear program (BILP).

Let H denote the set of households i and B the set of buildings j . Each household i requires living area $A_i \geq 0$, and each building j provides living area capacity $C_j \geq 0$. In addition, each household carries an attribute a_i (e.g., the residential building type associated with the household), and each building is characterized by the corresponding observed attribute b_j .

The binary decision variable $x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether household i is assigned to building j , and $u_i \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether household i remains unassigned. To explicitly represent unused living area, we introduce a nonnegative slack variable $s_j \geq 0$ for each building.

Mismatch between household attribute a_i and building attribute b_j is penalized via an arbitrary, user-defined nonnegative function $g(a_i, b_j) \geq 0$, which is treated as a parameter. The objective minimizes (i) unused area, (ii) unassigned households, and (iii) attribute mismatch penalties:

$$\min \quad \omega \sum_{j \in B} s_j + \lambda \sum_{i \in H} \sum_{j \in B} g(a_i, b_j) x_{ij} + \beta \sum_{i \in H} u_i, \quad (8)$$

where $\omega, \lambda, \beta \geq 0$ are the penalties for unused living area, attribute mismatches, and unassigned households, respectively.

Each household must be assigned to exactly one building or remain unassigned:

$$\sum_{j \in B} x_{ij} + u_i = 1 \quad \forall i \in H. \quad (9)$$

Building capacities are enforced through the living-area balance with slack:

$$\sum_{i \in H} A_i x_{ij} + s_j = C_j \quad \forall j \in B. \quad (10)$$

This approach yields a building-level assignment that is consistent with the specified capacity and compatibility constraints. Because multiple assignments may satisfy the available information equally well, the resulting locations should be interpreted as one synthetic realization consistent with these constraints, which is then used to stochastically allocate EV adoption according to household-level adoption likelihoods.

3.3. EV adoption

In the third step, EV adoption is modeled using a hybrid approach that combines a macroscopic diffusion perspective with a microscopic household-level adoption model. At the macroscopic level, the temporal rollout of EVs is represented by a Bass diffusion model, which determines the cumulative EV stock over time. At the microscopic level, an empirically calibrated logistic regression model estimates household-specific adoption likelihoods based on sociodemographic and residential characteristics, which are then used to allocate the macroscopic EV rollout to individual synthetic households.

The temporal diffusion of EVs is described by an adapted Bass model [70]:

$$N(t) = N_{base} + (M - N_{base}) \frac{1 - e^{-(p+q)t}}{1 + \left(\frac{q}{p}\right) e^{-(p+q)t}}, \quad (11)$$

where $N(t)$ denotes the cumulative EV stock at time t , N_{base} is the observed BEV stock in the base year, M is the market potential, p is the coefficient of innovation, and q is the coefficient of imitation. Time t is measured in years since the base year. In our case, $t = 0$ corresponds to 2014, such that $N(0) = N_{base}$.

The macroscopic EV rollout is then allocated to households based on their estimated propensity to adopt an EV. Previous literature has identified several sociodemographic determinants of EV adoption, including education [57–59], income [58,59], age [57,60–62], gender [57], and household size [57,61], among others [63]. Building on these findings, the adoption likelihood of each synthetic household is estimated using a weighted logistic regression model calibrated on observed adoption data. For household i , the probability of EV adoption is given by

$$\pi_i = \Pr(Y_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\beta_0 + \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})]}, \quad (12)$$

where Y_i is a binary indicator of EV adoption, $\mathbf{x}_i$ is the vector of sociodemographic characteristics, β_0 is the intercept, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the vector of regression coefficients.

To determine the number of vehicles available for potential electrification at the household level, a car ownership model is additionally applied. Specifically, a multinomial logistic regression model, which is commonly used in vehicle ownership analysis [71], is estimated on vehicle ownership data to predict the probabilities that a household owns zero, one, two, or at least three cars. These categories follow the ownership classes reported in the empirical mobility data used for the case study.

Let p_{ik} denote the predicted probability that household i owns k vehicles for $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3+\}$. The conditional probabilities used for the sequential assignment of the first three vehicles are given by

$$q_{i1} = 1 - p_{i0}, \quad (13)$$

$$q_{i2} = \frac{p_{i2} + p_{i,3+}}{p_{i1} + p_{i2} + p_{i,3+}}, \quad (14)$$

$$q_{i3} = \frac{p_{i,3+}}{p_{i2} + p_{i,3+}}. \quad (15)$$

Since the multinomial model does not distinguish between exactly three and more than three vehicles, additional vehicles beyond the third are assigned using a constant continuation probability

$$q_{ik} = \delta, \quad k \geq 4, \quad (16)$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ implies a geometrically decaying tail for households with more than three vehicles.

These conditional probabilities are used to assign vehicles sequentially to households until the total market potential M is reached. The resulting synthetic vehicle stock defines the household-specific capacity for subsequent electrification. The household-level allocation starts in 2025, corresponding to $t = 11$ in the Bass diffusion model. Because no EVs are allocated to households for earlier years, the complete

cumulative EV stock $N(11)$ is allocated across eligible households in this initial simulation year. For each subsequent model year $t > 11$, only the additional EV stock

$$\Delta N(t) = N(t) - N(t-1) \quad (17)$$

is allocated. The household-level adoption probabilities π_i obtained from the logistic regression are held constant over the simulation horizon and are used as relative sampling weights rather than as annual adoption probabilities. For each additional EV, an eligible household is sampled with probability

$$P_i(t) = \frac{\pi_i}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}(t)} \pi_j}, \quad i \in \mathcal{E}(t), \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(t)$ denotes the set of households that still have at least one non-electrified vehicle available. After selection, one of the household's remaining non-electric vehicles is assigned as an EV. The household remains eligible in subsequent draws until its assigned vehicle stock is fully electrified, after which it is removed from the sampling pool. This procedure is repeated until the cumulative number of assigned EVs matches the Bass diffusion target for the respective year. Thus, the Bass model determines the aggregate EV stock over time, while the logistic regression determines its relative allocation across heterogeneous households. Because household characteristics and the estimated π_i remain fixed over time, temporal changes in the spatial distribution arise from the sequential exhaustion of household vehicle capacities and the increasing aggregate EV stock rather than from changing household adoption preferences.

This yields a high-resolution representation of EV adoption with yearly temporal, georeferenced building-level spatial, and household- and person-level sociodemographic detail. More generally, the proposed framework is transferable to other household technologies, such as photovoltaic systems and heat pumps.

4. Input data

This section describes the input data used for the case study of EV diffusion in Germany. The main input parameters are summarized in [Table B.6](#).

4.1. Microdata and marginals

The synthetic population is based on the 2022 German Microcensus [64] and the 2022 German Census [67]. The Microcensus is representative for Germany, comprises approximately 680,000 persons, and provides household- and person-level microdata for constructing the synthetic population. Specifically, we consider three groups of variables: person-level attributes, including age, gender, education, and employment status; household-level attributes, including household size, household type, and net household income; and building-related attributes, including residential building type, building age, and living area (see [Table 2](#)). The selected attributes are required to estimate household-level EV adoption likelihoods. In addition, the building-related variables are used in the subsequent assignment of households to buildings. To preserve regional representativeness, the Microcensus is filtered by federal state so that each municipality draws its donor households from the corresponding state-level sample.

The marginal distributions required for the microsimulation are obtained from the 2022 German Census [67]. Marginals are used at two spatial levels, namely the municipal level and the 100×100 m grid-cell level. At the municipal level, the Census provides information on education, gender, and employment status. At the 100×100 m grid-cell level, it provides household size, household type, living area, building type, and age as household- or person-related control totals. The municipal and grid-cell marginals are used as control totals in the two-level iterative proportional updating (IPU) procedure to weight households within each grid cell of a municipality (see [Table 2](#)). Owing

Table 2

Attributes included in the synthetic population and their use as IPU control marginals, building-matching variables, and EV adoption determinants.

Attributes	Marginals	Matching	Adoption
Age	Grid cell		✓
Gender	Municipality		
Education	Municipality		✓
Employment	Municipality		
Household size	Grid cell		✓
Household type	Grid cell		
Household income			✓
Living area	Grid cell	✓	
Building type	Grid cell	✓	✓
Building age		✓	

The Census marginal column indicates whether the attribute is available as a Census control total at the municipal level or at the 100×100 m grid-cell level. Gender and employment status are available in Mobility in Germany 2023, but are not included in the EV adoption model due to collinearity with other variables. Federal state is additionally included as a regional parameter in the EV adoption model.

to confidentiality restrictions, some grid cells do not contain the full set of attributes or include modified values. Net household income is not available at either the municipal or the grid-cell level and is therefore weighted indirectly through the remaining control variables. Building age is available at the grid-cell level only as building counts and therefore cannot be used as a direct household-side IPU constraint.

To spatially link municipalities to grid cells and obtain the geographic location of each municipality, we use the 100×100 m grid data provided by the German Federal Agency for Cartography and Geodesy [72]. The data are available in INSPIRE [73] format and assign each grid cell to its area-dominant municipality as of 2019.

4.2. Building data

To represent the residential building stock, we combine two global building datasets: the Global Human Settlement Open Building Attribute Table (GHS-OBAT) [74] and the Global Building Atlas (GBA) [75]. GHS-OBAT contains information on approximately 2.3 billion buildings worldwide, including use type, construction period, footprint area, height, and location. The GBA covers more than 2.75 billion buildings globally and provides building polygons and height information. In the GBA, building heights are derived at a spatial resolution of 3×3 m [75].

Both datasets were selected because they are globally available and can therefore be adapted to regional contexts beyond the German case study. For the present analysis, both datasets are filtered to Germany. Residential buildings are first identified using GHS-OBAT, and the resulting residential building set is spatially linked with the GBA to add building height information. Heights are primarily taken from the GBA and supplemented with GHS-OBAT values where GBA height information is missing. Building height is required to estimate the number of stories and, in turn, the total living area of each building.

To estimate the number of stories, we assume an average story height of 3.0 m, consistent with typical German residential building geometries and standard construction practice as represented in the IWU building typology [76]. Combined with the building footprint area, this yields an estimate of the total living area for each building. Together with building age and the inferred building type, this information is used in the subsequent household-to-building matching ([Table 2](#)).

Since estimated building height directly affects the available residential capacity, we assess the sensitivity of the household-to-building matching to uncertainty in building height. For this purpose, we use the building-height uncertainties provided by the GBA and repeat the matching using the baseline height estimate and height estimates increased by one, two, and three standard deviations ($+1\sigma$, $+2\sigma$, and $+3\sigma$). For each scenario, the number of stories and resulting building capacity are recalculated, while all other matching assumptions remain

unchanged. Based on this sensitivity analysis, the $+1\sigma$ scenario is used for the subsequent analysis, as it substantially improves household coverage and building-type consistency, while larger height adjustments provide only limited additional improvements (see Fig. A.6 and Table B.5).

For building type, GHS-OBAT only identifies residential buildings and does not distinguish single-family from multi-family houses. The building type used in the matching is therefore inferred from the assignment itself: buildings occupied by exactly one household are treated as single-household buildings, whereas buildings occupied by two or more households are treated as multi-family buildings. A penalty is added if this occupancy-based building type is inconsistent with the expected residential building type of the assigned household.

For building age, households and buildings are represented by age classes that are translated into year intervals. If the household-side and building-side intervals overlap, no penalty is applied. Otherwise, the penalty increases linearly with the temporal distance between the two intervals. Missing information for building type or building age does not generate a penalty. Additional details are provided in Appendix A.

4.3. Adoption data

The Bass diffusion model is calibrated using empirical stock data on battery electric vehicles (BEVs) in Germany for the period 2014–2025, obtained from the German Federal Motor Transport Authority [77]. For the present case study, the market potential M is set equal to the current German passenger-car stock, assuming a constant total fleet size and eventual full electrification. This represents one plausible long-term diffusion scenario. The use of the current fleet size as the market potential is motivated by the comparatively stable German passenger-car stock in recent years [78], while recent German energy-transition and fleet scenarios indicate that battery-electric vehicles are expected to become the dominant passenger-car technology in long-term decarbonization pathways [79,80]. Alternative market potentials or national diffusion pathways can be specified without changing the household-level allocation procedure.

The household-level EV adoption model is estimated using data from Mobility in Germany 2023 (MiD 2023) [81]. Overall, the MiD comprises approximately 420,000 individuals and reflects a weighted EV share of around 7%. This is higher than the current German passenger-car stock, in which battery-electric vehicles account for 4.1% of registered cars as of 1 January 2026 [82]. Since EV adoption is modeled at the household level, individual-level characteristics are aggregated to the household level and used to estimate household-specific adoption likelihoods. The model includes the following sociodemographic and residential determinants, selected to be consistent with the attributes available in the synthetic population: education, age, building type (single-family or multi-family house), household size, household income, and federal state (Table 2).

MiD also provides information on household car ownership in the categories zero, one, two, and at least three cars. These data are used to calibrate the multinomial car ownership model. Based on the predicted category probabilities, household-specific conditional probabilities are then derived for the sequential assignment of vehicles. For households with more than three vehicles, additional vehicles are represented by assuming a constant conditional continuation probability of $\delta = 0.25$, chosen as a conservative assumption informed by the high vehicle-count categories in the 2022 US National Household Travel Survey [83].

5. Results

The synthetic population reproduces the empirical population characteristics with reasonable accuracy, given the partial inconsistency of the available Census controls. Across municipalities, the average relative deviation from the Census marginals decreases from 27% after

Iterative Proportional Updating (IPU) to 14% after household sampling (Fig. 3a). This metric should be interpreted as a conservative discrepancy measure, because it averages relative deviations across marginal categories whose target totals are not always mutually consistent. In particular, the aggregated comparison in the Appendix B (Fig. B.8) shows that the published household-level marginals do not sum to the same total as the overall household-count target. Since the synthetic population assigns household size, household type, building type, and living-area information to all households, while the corresponding Census marginals cover fewer households, matching the total household count necessarily produces positive deviations for these household-level attributes, especially for living area. The detailed national-level comparison in the Appendix B (Fig. B.7) nevertheless shows that the drawn households largely preserve the empirical distributional patterns across categories. Sampling reduces the municipal-level deviation because households are drawn independently for each grid cell, allowing the required number of households to be matched locally and limiting the accumulation of small deviations across the larger number of grid cells relative to municipalities. The final sample further incorporates the optional living-area demand penalty, which discourages samples whose aggregate living-area demand exceeds the available residential living area in the building data. Compared with sampling without this penalty, the resulting living-area distribution is shifted toward smaller dwellings, reducing the overrepresentation of large flats and improving compatibility with the subsequent household-to-building matching. Based on the 2019 municipal structure, the analysis covers 11,007 municipalities across Germany; for 231 municipalities, no synthetic population could be generated because the corresponding areas are either uninhabited or lack the required Census information. Overall, the remaining deviations mainly reflect inconsistencies and incomplete coverage in the available Census controls rather than a failure of the synthetic reconstruction, while the main empirical distributional patterns are retained.

The household-to-building assignment is sensitive to the residential capacity derived from estimated building height. Increasing building heights by one standard deviation raises the household matching rate by 3.30 percentage points relative to the baseline, while larger height adjustments provide only limited additional improvements (Fig. A.6 and Table B.5). Similarly, building-type and building-age consistency improve only marginally beyond the $+1\sigma$ scenario, while the additional increase in the share of occupied residential buildings becomes smaller. We therefore use the $+1\sigma$ building-height scenario for the subsequent household-to-building matching and diffusion analysis.

Households can be spatially assigned to residential buildings with high coverage across Germany. The household-to-building matching reaches a mean matching rate of 99% across grid cells (Fig. 3b), compared with 95.7% using the baseline building-height estimates and 83.7% when additionally omitting the living-area demand penalty. This corresponds to approximately 39 million of 39.5 million households and about 84 million individuals matched to buildings. To avoid excessive computation time in individual grid cells, the optimization was solved with a 5% optimality gap and a time limit of 20 s per grid cell, after which the best available solution was retained. The solver was initialized with a feasible starting solution obtained by solving a simplified assignment problem based only on living-area capacity, without building-type or building-age compatibility penalties. Under these settings, the solver reached optimality for 99% of grid cells. The remaining grid cells were either not solved to optimality within the time limit or could not be solved because no building information was available. The assignment retains key building characteristics, although mismatches remain: about 4% of matched households differ from their expected building type and 27% from their expected building age. These mismatches indicate that the matching prioritizes household coverage and living-area feasibility over perfect agreement in all building attributes. For the EV diffusion analysis, the building-type mismatch is




Fig. 3. Validation of the synthetic population, household-to-building matching, and car ownership model. The synthetic population is evaluated against Census marginals using the average relative error after sampling for each municipality in Germany (a), calculated according to Eq. (5). The household-to-building matching is assessed by the share of households successfully matched to residential buildings by municipality (b). The spatial distribution of vehicles assigned by the car ownership model is shown at the municipal level (c). The car ownership model is validated at the federal state level by comparing modeled vehicle counts with registered passenger cars in 2025 reported by the German Federal Motor Transport Authority [84] (d). White municipalities indicate areas without a synthetic population, either because they are uninhabited, such as nature reserves, or because required Census information is missing.

particularly relevant because single-family houses enter the adoption model.

The car ownership model provides the vehicle stock used as the basis for subsequent electrification. The model training and evaluation summary and the direction and significance of the determinants are reported in Tables B.7 and B.8, respectively. The resulting municipal distribution of assigned vehicles is shown in Fig. 3c. For validation, the modeled vehicle counts are aggregated to the federal state level and compared with registered passenger cars in 2025 reported by the German Federal Motor Transport Authority [84] (Fig. 3d). In this comparison, the model reproduces registered passenger car counts with a vehicle-weighted average error of 4.0%. The assigned vehicle stock then serves as the basis for subsequent electrification by the household-level adoption model.

The household-level adoption model identifies clear sociodemographic, residential, and regional determinants of electric vehicle adoption, while also reflecting the limited observability of household-level adoption drivers. The logistic regression model reaches an adjusted McFadden pseudo- R^2 of 0.101 (Table 3). Since this metric measures improvement in model likelihood relative to an intercept-only model rather than the share of variance explained, the value indicates a meaningful but incomplete ability to distinguish adopting from non-adopting

households. This is consistent with the absence of several potentially relevant behavioral and attitudinal drivers, such as environmental concern, innovation affinity, and charging access. The model nevertheless shows clear and statistically significant associations: household net income and residence in single-family houses are positively associated with electric vehicle adoption, while age structure and education also influence adoption probabilities (Table 4). Federal state effects remain relevant after accounting for observed household characteristics, indicating that regional differences are not fully captured by the available sociodemographic and residential variables.

The spatial allocation of electric vehicles is further validated against observed registrations of battery electric vehicles (BEVs) in 2025 at the vehicle registration district level. While the national BEV penetration in 2025 was 3.3%, observed penetration across registration districts ranged from approximately 1% to 20%, indicating substantial spatial heterogeneity [84]. Across districts, the vehicle-stock-weighted mean absolute error between modeled and observed BEV penetration is 0.77 percentage points (Fig. B.9). The Spearman rank correlation of 0.53 indicates a moderate correspondence in the spatial ordering of local BEV penetration. In addition, the total variation distance between the modeled and observed spatial distributions of BEVs is 0.086, implying

Table 3
EV adoption model: training and evaluation summary.

Measure	Value
Sample composition	
Households after vehicle-ownership filter	189,562
Households dropped due to missing building type	7234
Households dropped due to missing EV ownership status	451
Households used for model estimation	181,877
Households with EV	19,217
Households without EV	162,660
EV share in model sample, unweighted	10.6%
EV share in model sample, weighted	7.7%
Training fit (80% split)	
McFadden pseudo- R^2	0.102
Adjusted McFadden pseudo- R^2	0.101
McKelvey–Zavoina pseudo- R^2	0.240
Test-set predictive performance (20% split)	
AUC-ROC	0.741
Log loss	0.242
Accuracy	0.891
Precision	0.215
Recall	0.167
F1-score	0.188

Table 4
Determinants of EV adoption based on the logistic regression EV adoption model.

Feature	Coefficient	Odds ratio	Standard error
Constant	-5.895***	0.003	0.083
Household net income	0.541***	1.717	0.012
Building type: single-family house	0.453***	1.573	0.027
Household size	0.086***	1.090	0.012
Age: 0–9 years	-0.201***	0.818	0.047
Age: 10–19 years	-0.273***	0.761	0.042
Age: 20–29 years	-0.347***	0.707	0.032
Age: 30–39 years	-0.236***	0.790	0.023
Age: 50–59 years	-0.044	0.957	0.022
Age: 60–69 years	-0.092***	0.912	0.025
Age: 70–79 years	-0.230***	0.795	0.032
Age: 80+ years	-0.609***	0.544	0.051
Education: no degree	0.102**	1.107	0.038
Education: lower level	0.090**	1.094	0.028
Education: upper level	0.335***	1.398	0.027
State: Baden-Württemberg	0.288***	1.334	0.064
State: Bavaria	0.289***	1.335	0.063
State: Berlin	-0.206*	0.813	0.102
State: Brandenburg	-0.105	0.900	0.091
State: Bremen	-0.191	0.826	0.169
State: Hamburg	-0.123	0.884	0.108
State: Hesse	0.146*	1.157	0.069
State: Lower Saxony	0.178**	1.195	0.067
State: Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania	-0.363**	0.695	0.117
State: North Rhine-Westphalia	0.224***	1.251	0.062
State: Rhineland-Palatinate	0.208**	1.232	0.074
State: Saarland	0.182	1.199	0.109
State: Saxony	-0.230*	0.794	0.090
State: Saxony-Anhalt	-0.063	0.939	0.102
State: Thuringia	-0.262*	0.769	0.104

Age and education variables are measured at the household level and indicate the number of household members in the respective age or education category. The reference category for age is 40–49 years; the reference category for state is Schleswig-Holstein.

* Significance level: $p < 0.05$.

** Significance level: $p < 0.01$.

*** Significance level: $p < 0.001$.

that 8.6% of the modeled BEV stock would need to be reallocated between registration districts to exactly reproduce the observed spatial distribution. Overall, the validation shows that the model captures the broad spatial allocation of BEVs, while deviations remain at the local level.

The spatially resolved diffusion model shows that national electric vehicle growth translates into markedly different local adoption trajectories. Fig. 4 illustrates this heterogeneity for Germany, Berlin, and two selected 500×500 m grid cells in Berlin (Fig. 4a–c). At the national level, the temporal development follows the Bass diffusion trajectory fitted to historical vehicle-stock data from the German Federal Motor Transport Authority [77] (Fig. 4d). The adoption trajectories for Berlin and the selected grid cells demonstrate how this national diffusion pathway differs across spatial scales (Fig. 4e–f). In the selected example, grid cell A at the urban fringe shows a faster increase in electric vehicle share than the city center grid cell B, particularly between 2030 and 2040. This difference is consistent with the sociodemographic and residential structure of the two grid cells: grid cell A has a higher average net household income and, in particular, a substantially higher share of single-family houses than grid cell B (Fig. B.10).

Beyond the selected Berlin examples, the model reveals strong East–West differences in electric vehicle diffusion across Germany. The spatial distribution of the electric vehicle share in 2035 shows higher diffusion levels in West Germany than in East Germany (Fig. 5a). This difference persists over time, with East Germany lagging behind West Germany throughout the diffusion pathway (Fig. 5c). The regional contrast is more consistent with variation in income and residential building structure than with age (Fig. B.11). The synthetic population is only slightly older in East Germany than in West Germany, with average ages of 45.0 and 43.0 years, respectively, closely matching the corresponding Census 2022 pattern of about 46 and 44 years [67]. In contrast, differences in household net income and single-family house share are more pronounced. Average net household income is approximately 11% higher in West Germany than in East Germany, which is close to the corresponding Microcensus difference of about 14% [64]. The single-family house share is about 23% higher in West Germany than in East Germany, exceeding the corresponding Census difference of about 14% [67]. This residual discrepancy reflects that the Census constraint is not reproduced exactly after joint calibration and household sampling. Because both income and single-family house residence increase adoption probabilities in the household-level adoption model, these determinants likely contribute substantially to the lower diffusion levels observed in East Germany.

A further spatial contrast emerges between urban and rural municipalities, with rural municipalities slightly ahead in electric vehicle adoption. Fig. 5b shows the electric vehicle share in 2035, with urban municipalities indicated by dots. The highlighted examples of Berlin, Bremen, Frankfurt, Munich, and their surrounding municipalities illustrate that adoption levels differ considerably across urban regions. When all urban and all rural municipalities are aggregated into two temporal pathways, rural municipalities maintain slightly higher electric vehicle shares throughout most of the diffusion pathway (Fig. 5d). This aggregate pattern is consistent with the higher share of single-family houses in rural municipalities, which increases adoption probabilities in the household-level adoption model (Fig. B.12).

6. Discussion

This study addresses the need for a scalable framework that links national EV diffusion with empirically calibrated household-level adoption and georeferenced residential buildings. The results show that national EV growth can be translated into highly localized adoption trajectories when synthetic population modeling, household-to-building matching, car ownership modeling, and household-level adoption probabilities are combined in one framework. This combined approach makes it possible to move beyond aggregate EV stock projections by estimating not only how many vehicles are likely to be electrified, but also where these vehicles are located, enabling analysis of adoption trajectories across spatial scales from the national to the building level. The evaluation and validation results show that the synthetic




Fig. 4. Spatial and temporal distribution of electric vehicles across different spatial scales. The spatial distribution of the electric vehicle share in 2035 is shown at the municipal level for Germany (a), at the 500×500 m grid-cell level for Berlin (b), and at the building level for two selected example grid cells in Berlin (c). The temporal development of electric vehicle diffusion from 2025 to 2050 is shown for Germany, Berlin, and the selected grid cells, respectively (d–f). White buildings in the grid-cell examples indicate either buildings occupied by households without vehicles or buildings without matched households.

population reproduces the main Census distributions, the household-to-building matching achieves high coverage while maintaining consistency with key residential characteristics, and the car ownership model reproduces the observed vehicle stock. In addition, the comparison with observed BEV registrations in 2025 shows that the resulting model captures the broad spatial allocation of EVs across vehicle registration districts. At the same time, the diffusion results demonstrate why this level of spatial detail matters: EV adoption differs substantially between regions, municipalities, and grid cells, as well as within individual grid cells. These differences are strongly shaped by sociodemographic and residential characteristics, particularly household income and single-family houses. The framework therefore contributes a national-scale, data-driven implementation that connects aggregate diffusion dynamics, empirically calibrated household-level adoption, and georeferenced residential buildings within an open and transferable modeling framework.

The EV adoption model shows comparatively strong explanatory power for a household-level model based primarily on sociodemographic and residential characteristics. Studies with a comparable information set report McFadden pseudo- R^2 values of about 0.04–0.07 [36,86–89], whereas models that additionally include detailed vehicle attributes, policy variables, mobility indicators, or latent attitudinal factors report higher values, ranging approximately from 0.15 to 0.50 [90–93]. The adjusted McFadden pseudo- R^2 of 0.101 obtained here is therefore toward the upper end of models relying mainly on sociodemographic and residential characteristics, which may partly reflect the large MiD sample, while remaining below models with richer behavioral or choice-experiment information. This supports the hybrid modeling approach, in which the Bass model defines the aggregate diffusion pathway and the adoption model allocates this pathway across households and residential locations based on observed sociodemographic and residential characteristics.

The empirical validation shows that the framework reproduces the broad spatial pattern of EV penetration across Germany with relatively

small average deviations. Despite substantial heterogeneity in observed EV penetration across vehicle registration districts, the vehicle-stock-weighted mean absolute error is 0.77 percentage points, compared with a national EV penetration of 3.3%. The Spearman rank correlation of 0.53 indicates a moderate correspondence in the spatial ordering of local penetration, while the total variation distance of 0.086 shows that 8.6% of the modeled EV stock would need to be spatially reallocated to reproduce the observed distribution exactly. Taken together, these metrics indicate that the model captures the broad spatial distribution of EVs but does not fully reproduce local variation. One source of this remaining deviation is the scope of the adoption model, which represents EV adoption at the household level, whereas the observed registration data also include commercially registered EVs. Local concentrations of commercial vehicle fleets can therefore affect observed EV penetration independently of the household characteristics represented in the model.

The spatial patterns identified in this study are consistent with the broader literature on EV adoption, but add a more spatially explicit interpretation of these mechanisms. Household income emerges as one of the strongest determinants of adoption, in line with previous studies [60–62,94]. Residence in a single-family house is another important determinant in our adoption model. Previous studies emphasize related factors such as home ownership [60,62] and charging access [62]. Single-family houses are likely to capture part of these mechanisms because they more often provide private parking and easier access to home charging. Other significant determinants in our model, including education, age, and household size, are also consistent with earlier findings [57,60–62]. These determinants help explain the local heterogeneity observed within Berlin: the selected grid cell with higher income and a substantially higher share of single-family houses shows faster EV diffusion than the city center grid cell. This interpretation refers to the selected grid-cell comparison and should not be generalized to all urban-fringe areas, because the spatial distribution of building types remains heterogeneous within Berlin.




Fig. 5. Spatial and temporal heterogeneity of electric vehicle diffusion in Germany. The electric vehicle share is shown for each municipality in 2035, distinguishing East and West Germany by the indicated East–West boundary (a). Urban and rural differences are shown for the same year, with urban municipalities marked by dots (b). Panel (b) additionally highlights selected urban examples, including Berlin, Bremen, Frankfurt, Munich, and their surrounding municipalities. The temporal development of the electric vehicle share from 2025 to 2050 is shown for East and West Germany as a whole (c) and aggregated across all urban and all rural municipalities (d). Municipalities are defined as urban if classified as large cities or medium-sized towns, based on the classification of the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs, and Spatial Development [85].

The East–West difference in EV diffusion is partly consistent with the sociodemographic and residential structure identified in the results. East Germany shows both lower average household income and a lower share of single-family houses than West Germany, two determinants associated with lower adoption probabilities in the household-level model. Similar regional disparities in EV uptake have also been reported by Speth et al. [95], indicating that the lower diffusion levels observed in eastern Germany are consistent with previous regional analyses. However, the East–West difference should not be interpreted as a purely sociodemographic effect. The federal state information included in the adoption model may also capture unobserved regional characteristics beyond income and residential structure. Previous adoption studies show that EV uptake is associated not only with sociodemographic variables, but also with environmental concern, innovation affinity, and other behavioral or attitudinal factors [57,58,63]. However, although such variables can improve the explanatory power of adoption models, they are not available for the synthetic population generated from Microcensus and Census data [64,67]. The estimated federal state effects should therefore be interpreted as composite spatial effects that may reflect differences in charging infrastructure availability, technology affinity, political preferences, or attitudes toward climate protection, rather than as direct causal effects of administrative location.

The urban–rural contrast further illustrates that settlement structure affects EV adoption, but not in a uniform way. In our results, rural municipalities are slightly ahead of urban municipalities in the aggregate diffusion pathway. This pattern is plausible in the German context

because rural municipalities tend to have a higher share of single-family houses. At the same time, the results show substantial heterogeneity across municipalities and urban regions. This mixed pattern is consistent with previous literature, which does not identify a uniform urban effect: while some studies report higher EV adoption in urban areas [61], others find higher adoption probabilities in rural regions or small towns [57]. The urban–rural distinction should therefore be interpreted as an aggregate pattern rather than as a deterministic predictor of local EV adoption.

The results have direct implications for distribution grid and charging infrastructure planning. Since EV adoption is spatially concentrated in households and residential environments with higher adoption probabilities, grid impacts are unlikely to follow the national diffusion pathway uniformly. Instead, local areas with high household income, high share of single-family houses, and favorable regional conditions may experience faster EV uptake and therefore earlier charging-related grid stress. This is particularly relevant for low-voltage grids, where a small number of households with coincident charging demand can already create local constraints. The building-level resolution of the proposed framework can therefore help identify where charging demand is likely to emerge first and where grid reinforcement, public charging infrastructure, or smart charging strategies may become relevant earlier. At the same time, the results show that aggregated spatial units can mask substantial heterogeneity. Municipal or regional EV shares may appear moderate even when individual grid cells or residential clusters already reach much higher adoption levels. High-resolution diffusion modeling

therefore provides an important link between national EV scenarios and locally actionable planning information.

The open framework is flexible and transferable to other countries and other household technologies, provided that comparable input data are available. Its core requirements are household microdata, spatially disaggregated census marginals, building data, and technology adoption data. Such data are available in many contexts. National microdata and census sources exist, for example, for the United States [96–98], the United Kingdom [99,100], Australia [101,102], France [103,104], and the European Union [105,106]. Internationally harmonized sources, such as IPUMS [107,108], the Luxembourg Income Study, and the Demographic and Health Surveys [109,110], further support cross-country applications. Ton et al. [48] demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale synthetic population generation by constructing a global synthetic population of approximately seven billion individuals based on Luxembourg Income Study and Demographic and Health Surveys microdata. Building data are increasingly available through global datasets such as GBA and GHS-OBAT [74,75]. For EV adoption, comparable travel surveys exist for countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and France [111–113]. Beyond EVs, the same modeling logic could be applied to other household technologies, such as heat pumps, residential photovoltaics, or air conditioning, if adoption data can be linked to sociodemographic and building characteristics, such as rooftop area or building age. Examples include the German Microcensus and the KfW Energy Transition Barometer for Germany [64,114], as well as the Residential Energy Consumption Survey for the United States [115]. In addition, recent work on global AC diffusion highlights the importance of linking adoption to income, service access, and energy-poverty concerns [45,47,116,117]. Rather than requiring a fully specified integrated urban simulation, the framework combines modular population, spatial Census, georeferenced building, and technology-adoption data, supporting applications across different regional and national contexts. Thus, the proposed approach is not limited to EV diffusion in Germany, but provides an open and transferable basis for spatially explicit modeling of household technology diffusion.

Despite this flexibility, several limitations should be considered when interpreting the spatial diffusion results. First, the framework uses a static representation of the population, building stock, and household-to-building assignment. The synthetic population captures the sociodemographic structure at the baseline year, but it does not dynamically simulate demographic change, such as aging, births, deaths, household formation, separation, or changing household composition. Similarly, the building stock is treated as fixed and therefore does not account for urban development, new residential construction, redevelopment, demolition, or changes in dwelling availability [118]. The household-to-building assignment is also static, meaning that migration, residential relocation, and changing housing choices over time are not represented.

The household-to-building assignment remains uncertain at the final building level because exact household-to-building identities are unavailable and cannot be validated directly. The resulting locations should therefore be interpreted as one synthetic realization consistent with the specified capacity and compatibility constraints. Since households are already localized to Census grid cells, this uncertainty concerns only the final building assignment within each cell. The building-height sensitivity analysis shows that most of the improvement in household coverage is achieved at $+1\sigma$, with only limited additional gains at higher adjustments. Under the selected $+1\sigma$ scenario, 99% of households are assigned to residential buildings. The higher building-age mismatch likely reflects differences in the classification and temporal resolution of the Microcensus and GHS-OBAT age information, rather than uncertainty in building capacity, as it changes little across the height-sensitivity scenarios. A constrained probabilistic allocation would be a valid alternative, but would require assumptions about household-to-building assignment probabilities that cannot be reliably estimated from the available data and would therefore be

subject to substantial uncertainty. The optimization-based approach used here instead provides a transparent and transferable procedure that relies directly on observable capacity and compatibility constraints without requiring such assignment probabilities.

As a result of the static population, building stock, and household assignment, the spatial distribution of adoption determinants remains fixed, while only the electrification of the assigned vehicle stock evolves over time. This design choice reflects the aim of developing a data-driven, low-assumption framework for spatial technology diffusion. More dynamic modeling approaches could relax this assumption. Dynamic microsimulation models can update households over time through aging, births, deaths, household formation, and migration [119–122], thereby allowing adoption determinants to evolve throughout the diffusion period. Similarly, urban microsimulation models can represent where new dwellings are constructed, where existing buildings are redeveloped or demolished, and how the available housing stock changes spatially [123]. Coupling such population and building-stock dynamics with residential location choice models would allow households to move between dwellings over time rather than remain fixed at their initial building assignment [124]. These extensions could improve long-term realism, but would shift the framework from a mainly data-driven spatial allocation model toward a more scenario-dependent representation of population and housing dynamics.

Second, the temporal diffusion pathway is determined by the Bass diffusion model and therefore depends on assumptions regarding both the diffusion dynamics and the long-term market potential. In the present case study, the market potential M is set equal to the current German passenger-car stock, which assumes that the total passenger-car fleet remains constant and that the fleet is eventually fully electrified. This should be interpreted as one scenario for the national diffusion pathway rather than as a prediction of the future vehicle stock. Changes in population, mobility behavior, vehicle ownership, or transport policy could lead to a smaller or larger future fleet and therefore alter the long-term absolute number of EVs. The framework is not restricted to this assumption, however, and alternative market potentials, Bass parameters, or externally defined national diffusion pathways can be used while retaining the same household-level spatial allocation procedure. Beyond these assumptions, the Bass diffusion model abstracts from several mechanisms that may influence future EV uptake, including vehicle price dynamics, policy changes, and charging infrastructure expansion [63]. The EV adoption model is estimated from cross-sectional data and therefore cannot capture dynamic adoption processes, such as the conditional probability of purchasing an additional EV after already owning one. Estimating such transitions would require longitudinal data. Moreover, several potentially important drivers of EV adoption are not observed in the synthetic population, including environmental attitudes, political orientation, technology affinity, and actual charging access. Neighborhood effects have also been identified as relevant for EV adoption [62]. In principle, such effects could be integrated into the proposed spatial framework, but this would require data that link neighborhood-level adoption dynamics to household sociodemographic characteristics. The role of these factors may also change over time, and the determinants of early EV adoption may not fully represent the determinants of mass-market adoption in later diffusion stages. Nevertheless, although the available data do not capture all relevant behavioral and contextual drivers, the EV adoption model shows moderate explanatory power and identifies plausible determinants that are consistent with previous literature.

Future research should build on the spatial detail of the proposed framework by linking georeferenced building-level EV diffusion to charging demand and distribution grid models. While this study identifies where and when EV adoption is likely to emerge, the next step is to translate these adoption patterns into temporally resolved charging profiles, including uncontrolled, smart, and potentially bidirectional

charging. A promising direction is to generate household-level activity and mobility profiles from sociodemographic characteristics and spatial context, for example using transformer-based deep neural networks trained on time-use and mobility survey data [125,126]. These activity profiles could determine when vehicles are at home, when trips occur, and when charging demand can arise. In addition, they could be linked to residential electricity demand through a bottom-up household demand model calibrated to empirical data, enabling the assessment of local demand impacts and flexibility potentials. Conceptually, such an approach is similar to Staffell et al. [127], who translate weather-derived heating and cooling indicators into energy demand using calibrated demand coefficients. Combining spatially explicit EV adoption, activity-based mobility profiles, and residential demand modeling would enable assessment not only of where EVs are adopted, but also when and under which charging strategies they may create or relieve local grid constraints. Future work could also improve the adoption layer itself by incorporating more detailed behavioral information, such as environmental attitudes and neighborhood effects, if such data become available at sufficient sociodemographic resolution. Overall, such an extension would provide a stronger basis for locally targeted charging infrastructure planning, distribution grid reinforcement, and flexibility strategies.

7. Conclusion

This study developed an open and scalable technology diffusion framework, demonstrated through a case study of electric vehicle (EV) diffusion in Germany. By combining a Census-calibrated synthetic population, household-to-building matching, car ownership modeling, and a hybrid diffusion-adoption approach, the framework translates national EV growth into household- and building-level adoption trajectories. This enables EV diffusion to be analyzed consistently across spatial scales, from the national to the building level, providing information not only on how many vehicles are likely to be electrified and where they are located, but also which households are most likely to adopt them.

The results show that the modeling framework provides a robust basis for spatial analysis of EV diffusion. The synthetic population reproduces the main Census distributions with relatively high accuracy, the household-to-building assignment localizes 99% of households to residential buildings while maintaining consistency with key residential characteristics, and the car ownership model provides a validated vehicle stock for subsequent electrification. The additional comparison with observed EV registrations shows that the framework also reproduces the broad spatial distribution of EVs across Germany, while local deviations remain. The spatial diffusion results reveal substantial heterogeneity across scales. Within Berlin, selected grid cells show markedly different adoption trajectories, driven by differences in income and residential building structure. At the national level, EV diffusion is higher in West Germany than in East Germany, consistent with regional differences in household income and share of single-family houses. Rural municipalities are slightly ahead of urban municipalities in aggregate, although urban areas themselves show considerable heterogeneity.

These findings highlight the value of spatially resolved and scalable diffusion frameworks for household technologies such as electric vehicles, heat pumps, and residential photovoltaics, as local adoption patterns depend on sociodemographic, residential, and regional characteristics that can be masked by spatial aggregation. The methodological contribution of the proposed framework lies in providing an open and transferable link between national technology-diffusion pathways, empirically calibrated household-level adoption, and georeferenced residential buildings. Future work should connect households localized to georeferenced residential buildings and their associated technology stocks, including electric vehicles, with temporally resolved demand profiles to assess when and where local demand peaks may emerge and how they may affect system operation and planning.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Moritz Raab: Writing – original draft, Visualization, Validation, Methodology, Investigation, Conceptualization. **Max Kleinebrahm:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Methodology, Conceptualization. **Jonathan Vogl:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Tim Signer:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Jannik Braun:** Visualization, Methodology. **Wolf Fichtner:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

Code availability

The modeling framework developed in this study is written in Python and is publicly and freely available on GitHub at <https://github.com/GitMoritzraab/PySEDM>. The results presented in this study were generated using PySEDM version v0.2.0. The repository contains the code required to construct the synthetic population, perform household-to-building matching, apply the car ownership and EV adoption models, and generate the spatial diffusion results. The full Germany-wide implementation was run on the bwHPC high-performance computing infrastructure because of the large number of municipalities, grid cells, households, and buildings. However, the workflow is modular, and individual municipalities or smaller study regions can be processed on a local laptop or desktop computer.

Ethics declaration

The authors have NOT obtained informed consent from participants or their legal representatives. Informed consent was not required for the present study because it exclusively involved the secondary analysis of anonymized survey and official statistical data obtained from established data providers. The authors did not recruit or interact with participants and had no access to directly identifiable personal information. The data were used in accordance with the access and usage conditions of the respective data providers, and no identifiable individual-level information is reported.

This study was performed in compliance with relevant laws, regulatory frameworks and guidelines where the research took place. Ethics committee approval was not required under relevant laws and institutional guidelines. Ethics committee approval was not required because this study exclusively used anonymized secondary data obtained from established statistical and survey data providers. No participants were recruited or contacted, and the authors had no access to directly identifiable personal information. The data were processed in accordance with the applicable German and European data-protection requirements, institutional guidelines, and the terms of use of the respective data providers.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve the readability and language of the manuscript and to support code development. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited all generated content and code as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This paper was created in the “Country 2 City - Bridge” project of the “German Center for Future Mobility”, which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Transport.

The authors acknowledge support by the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC.

Appendix A. Soft compatibility penalties in the household–building matching

Let $i \in I$ index households and $j \in J$ index buildings. The binary variable (x_{ij}) equals 1 if household i is assigned to building j , and 0 otherwise. The full objective function (Eq. (8)) contains the unassigned-household penalty and the unused-area penalty and can additionally include soft compatibility terms, here for building type and building age.

A.1. Building type penalty

Each household has an expected residential building type (t_i), distinguishing single-family houses and multi-family houses. Since GHS-OBAT only identifies residential buildings and does not distinguish single-family houses and multi-family houses directly, the building-side type is inferred from the assignment itself. Buildings occupied by exactly one household are classified as single-family houses, whereas buildings occupied by two or more households are classified as multi-family houses.

For households with known expected type, a binary mismatch variable z_{ij} is introduced and linked to the assignment decision such that $z_{ij} = 1$ if household i is assigned to building j and the occupancy-based type of building j differs from the household's expected type.

The building-type contribution to the objective is therefore

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{type}} = \lambda_{\text{type}} \sum_i \sum_j z_{ij}. \quad (19)$$

A.2. Building age penalty

Let $[a_i^H, b_i^H]$ denote the expected building age interval of household i and $[a_j^B, b_j^B]$ the building age interval of building j . The age penalty function is defined as

$$d_{ij}^{\text{age}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } [a_i^H, b_i^H] \cap [a_j^B, b_j^B] \neq \emptyset, \\ a_j^B - b_i^H, & \text{if } b_i^H < a_j^B, \\ a_i^H - b_j^B, & \text{if } b_j^B < a_i^H. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Thus, overlapping age intervals incur no penalty, whereas non-overlapping intervals are penalized in proportion to the smallest year gap between them. The building-age contribution to the objective is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{age}} = \lambda_{\text{age}} \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in J} d_{ij}^{\text{age}} x_{ij}. \quad (21)$$

If either the household age or the building age is missing, no age penalty is applied for that household–building pair.

Appendix B. Additional figures and tables

Data availability

The input data used in this study are obtained from publicly available or restricted-access data sources. All publicly available input data required to run the workflow are accessible through the links and scripts provided in the GitHub repository associated with this study. The German Microcensus data used for constructing the synthetic population are subject to access restrictions and cannot be redistributed by the authors. To facilitate testing and adaptation of the framework, the repository provides an alternative workflow based on publicly available microdata from the American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample [96]. The EV adoption survey data used to estimate the electric vehicle adoption model are also subject to access restrictions and cannot be shared directly. However, the estimated regression coefficients and model specification are provided in the repository, allowing the adoption model to be applied within the proposed framework.




Fig. A.6. Sensitivity of the household-to-building matching to building height. Changes in the household matching rate and the share of occupied residential buildings are shown relative to the baseline building-height estimates for scenarios in which building heights are increased by one, two, and three standard deviations (+1σ, +2σ, and +3σ), based on the building-height uncertainties provided by the Global Building Atlas (GBA). The largest improvement in the matching rate occurs for the +1σ scenario, while further increases in building height provide only marginal additional gains. At the same time, the increase in the share of occupied buildings becomes smaller for the +2σ and +3σ scenarios.




Fig. B.7. Validation of the synthetic population against Census target marginals. Aggregated counts for Germany obtained from the Iterative Proportional Updating (IPU) weights and after household sampling (Drawn) are compared with the target counts from the marginal distributions (Target). Shown are all variables used as IPU constraints: age in years (a), gender (b), education (c), employment status (d), household size (e), household type (f), flat size in m² (g), and residential building type, distinguishing detached single-family houses (SFHs), semi-detached/row SFHs, and multi-family houses (MFHs) (h). Relative deviations above the bars indicate the percentage difference between the IPU or Drawn counts and the corresponding target counts.




Fig. B.8. Comparison of aggregated target and synthetic population counts for Germany. Counts obtained from the Iterative Proportional Updating (IPU) weights and after household sampling (Drawn) are compared with the target counts from the marginal distributions (Target). The comparison is shown for person-level totals, including the total population and the aggregated counts for age, gender, education, and employment status (a), and for household-level totals, including the total number of households and the aggregated counts for household size, household type, living area, and building type (b). Relative deviations above the bars indicate the percentage difference between the IPU or Drawn counts and the corresponding target counts.




Fig. B.9. Spatial validation of modeled battery-electric vehicle (BEV) allocation against observed registrations in 2025 at the vehicle registration district level. Panel (a) shows the difference between modeled and observed BEV penetration in percentage points. Panel (b) shows the difference between the modeled and observed spatial allocation of the national BEV stock across registration districts. Positive values indicate overestimation by the model and negative values indicate underestimation.

Table B.5

Sensitivity of the household-to-building matching to building height. Changes in the household matching rate and occupied-building rate are reported relative to the baseline building-height estimates for scenarios based on the building-height uncertainties provided by the Global Building Atlas (GBA). Building-type and building-age mismatch denote the shares of matched households whose assigned building characteristics differ from the corresponding household characteristics.

Building-height scenario	Matching rate change (pp)	Occupied-building rate change (pp)	Building-type mismatch (%)	Building-age mismatch (%)
+1 σ	3.30	1.75	4	27
+2 σ	3.73	1.71	4	26
+3 σ	3.87	1.46	4	26

Table B.6

Main input parameters used in the case study.

Model component	Parameter	Value	Description
Synthetic population	ϵ	10^{-4}	IPU improvement threshold
Household-to-building matching	h_{story}	3.0 m	Average story height [76]
	ω	1	Unused-area penalty weight
	β	1000	Unassigned-household penalty weight
	λ_{type}	100	Building-type penalty weight
	λ_{age}	1	Building-age penalty weight
Vehicle ownership	δ	0.25	Conditional continuation probability for households with more than three vehicles
EV diffusion	M	49,339,166	Market potential, based on current vehicle stock [77]




Fig. B.10. Residential building classification in Berlin after household-to-building matching. Residential buildings are classified as unmatched, single-family houses, or multi-family houses based on the matching outcome. The full Berlin case is shown together with two selected 500×500 m grid cells, labeled A and B, corresponding to the grid cells shown in Fig. 4c. Compared with grid cell B, grid cell A has an approximately 30% higher average net household income and a substantially higher single-family house share, 63% compared with 3%. Average age is similar in both grid cells, at 45 years in grid cell A and 42 years in grid cell B.




Fig. B.11. Spatial distribution of key electric vehicle adoption determinants in East and West Germany. The municipal-level distributions of age (a), net household income (b), and single-family house share (c) are shown for the synthetic population. The corresponding average values are additionally aggregated to the federal-state level for the same determinants (d–f).




Fig. B.12. Urban–rural differences in key electric vehicle adoption determinants. Bars show the mean values calculated separately across all municipalities classified as urban and all municipalities classified as rural. The comparison includes net household income (a), age (b), and single-family house share (c).

Table B.7
Training and evaluation summary of the car ownership model.

Measure	Value
Sample composition	
Households	218,101
Households dropped due to missing building type	8317
Households dropped due to missing vehicle ownership status	281
Households used for model estimation	209,503
Ownership class distribution, unweighted	
Households with zero vehicles	27,401
Households with one vehicle	99,883
Households with two vehicles	66,561
Households with three or more vehicles	15,658
Ownership class distribution, weighted	
Households with zero vehicles	40,353
Households with one vehicle	105,919
Households with two vehicles	49,156
Households with three or more vehicles	8791
Training fit (80% split)	
McFadden pseudo- R^2	0.266
Adjusted McFadden pseudo- R^2	0.266
Test-set predictive performance (20% split)	
Multiclass log loss	0.840
Accuracy	0.626
Precision, weighted average	0.625
Recall, weighted average	0.626
F1-score, weighted average	0.603

Table B.8

Qualitative auxiliary regression results for the car ownership model by vehicle ownership class. The main car ownership model is estimated as a weighted multinomial logistic regression using scikit-learn for predictive purposes. Since this implementation does not provide coefficient-level standard errors or p-values for the weighted multinomial model, the reported directions and significance levels are derived from auxiliary one-vs-rest weighted logistic regression models. The results are used for qualitative interpretation only and should not be interpreted as exact inference for the multinomial model.

Feature	Zero vehicles	One vehicle	Two vehicles	Three or more vehicles
Constant	***	***	***	***
Household net income	***	***	***	***
Building type: single-family house	***	***	***	***
Household size	***	***	***	***
Age: 0–9 years	–	***	***	***
Age: 10–19 years	***	***	***	***
Age: 20–29 years	***	***	***	***
Age: 30–39 years	***	–	+	***
Age: 50–59 years	***	***	***	***
Age: 60–69 years	***	***	***	***
Age: 70–79 years	***	***	***	+
Age: 80+ years	***	***	***	***
Education: no degree	***	***	***	***
Education: lower level	***	***	***	***
Education: upper level	***	***	***	***
State: Baden-Württemberg	–	***	***	–
State: Bavaria	***	***	***	+
State: Berlin	***	***	***	***
State: Brandenburg	–	***	***	+
State: Bremen	***	***	***	***
State: Hamburg	***	***	***	***
State: Hesse	+	***	***	–
State: Lower Saxony	+	***	***	+
State: Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania	–	–	***	***
State: North Rhine-Westphalia	–	***	***	–
State: Rhineland-Palatinate	***	***	***	***
State: Saarland	***	***	***	***
State: Saxony	+	***	***	+
State: Saxony-Anhalt	***	***	***	–
State: Thuringia	***	***	***	***

Age and education variables are measured at the household level and indicate the number of household members in the respective age or education category. The reference category for age is 40–49 years; the reference category for state is Schleswig-Holstein.

* Significance level: $p < 0.05$.

** Significance level: $p < 0.01$.

*** Significance level: $p < 0.001$.

References

- [1] International Energy Agency. Global EV outlook 2025: Trends in electric car markets. 2025, URL <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2025/trends-in-electric-car-markets-2>. [Accessed 11 February 2026].
- [2] International Energy Agency. Global EV outlook 2025: Outlook for electric mobility. 2025, URL <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2025/outlook-for-electric-mobility>. [Accessed 11 February 2026].
- [3] Muratori Matteo. Impact of uncoordinated plug-in electric vehicle charging on residential power demand. *Nat Energy* 2018;3:193–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41560-017-0074-z>.
- [4] Müller Mathias, Blume Yannic, Reinhard Janis. Impact of behind-the-meter optimised bidirectional electric vehicles on the distribution grid load. *Energy* 2022;255:124537. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.124537>.
- [5] Gupta Ruchi, Pena-Bello Alejandro, Streicher Kai Nino, Roduner Cattia, Farhat Yamshid, Thöni David, Patel Martin Kumar, Parra David. Spatial analysis of distribution grid capacity and costs to enable massive deployment of PV, electric mobility and electric heating. *Appl Energy* 2021;287:116504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116504>.
- [6] Protopapadaki Christina, Saelens Dirk. Heat pump and PV impact on residential low-voltage distribution grids as a function of building and district properties. *Appl Energy* 2017;192:268–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.11.103>.
- [7] Wüllhorst Fabian, Schwarz Sebastian, Fuchs Nico, Maier Laura, Monti Antonello, Müller Dirk. Impact of hybrid heat pump shares and building envelope retrofit rates on load penetration in German low-voltage grids. *Appl Energy* 2025;388:125530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2025.125530>.
- [8] Meunier Simon, Protopapadaki Christina, Baetens Ruben, Saelens Dirk. Impact of residential low-carbon technologies on low-voltage grid reinforcements. *Appl Energy* 2021;297:117057. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117057>.
- [9] Anwar Muhammad Bashar, Muratori Matteo, Jadun Paige, Hale Elaine, Bush Brian, Denholm Paul, Ma Ookie, Podkaminer Kara. Assessing the value of electric vehicle managed charging: A review of methodologies and results. *Energy Env Sci* 2022;15:466–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/D1EE02206G>.
- [10] Ensslen Axel, Ringler Philipp, Dörr Lasse, Jochem Patrick, Zimmermann Florian, Fichtner Wolf. Incentivizing smart charging: Modeling charging tariffs for electric vehicles in German and French electricity markets. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2018;42:112–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.02.013>.
- [11] Teng Fei, Ding Zhaohao, Hu Zechun, Sarikprueck Piamboom. Technical review on advanced approaches for electric vehicle charging demand management, part I: Applications in electric power market and renewable energy integration. *IEEE Trans Ind Appl* 2020;56(5):5684–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TIA.2020.2993991>.
- [12] Yao Enxin, Wong Vincent WS, Schober Robert. Robust frequency regulation capacity scheduling algorithm for electric vehicles. *IEEE Trans Smart Grid* 2016;1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TSG.2016.2530660>, (ISSN: 1949-3053, 1949-3061).
- [13] Chen Ge, Shishvan Nima Rashgi, Guo Zhaomiao, Qin Junjie. Quantifying spatiotemporal charging flexibility of electric vehicles as virtual grid assets to accelerate sustainable energy transition. *Cell Rep Phys Sci* 2025;6(11):102905. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrp.2025.102905>.
- [14] Franken Lukas, Hackett Andy, Lizana Jesus, Riepin Igor, Jenkinson Ryan, Lyden Andrew, Yu Lucy, Friedrich Daniel. Power system benefits of simultaneous domestic transport and heating demand flexibility in Great Britain's energy transition. *Appl Energy* 2025;377:124522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2024.124522>.
- [15] Kristoffersen Trine Krogh, Capion Karsten, Meibom Peter. Optimal charging of electric drive vehicles in a market environment. *Appl Energy* 2011;88(5):1940–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2010.12.015>.
- [16] Szinai Julia K, Sheppard Colin JR, Abhyankar Nikit, Gopal Anand R. Reduced grid operating costs and renewable energy curtailment with electric vehicle charge management. *Energy Policy* 2020;136:111051. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111051>.
- [17] Barman Pranjal, Dutta Lachit, Bordoloi Sushanta, Kalita Anamika, Buragohain Pronamika, Bharali Swapna, Azzopardi Brian. Renewable energy integration with electric vehicle technology: A review of the existing smart charging approaches. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2023;183:113518. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2023.113518>.
- [18] Fachrizal Reza, Shepero Mahmoud, Van Der Meer Dennis, Munkhammar Joakim, Widén Joakim. Smart charging of electric vehicles considering photovoltaic power production and electricity consumption: A review. *ETransportation* 2020;4:100056. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.etrans.2020.100056>.
- [19] Chandrashekar Sachin, Liu Yixian, Sioshansi Ramteen. Wind-integration benefits of controlled plug-in electric vehicle charging. *J Mod Power Syst Clean Energy* 2017;5(5):746–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40565-017-0296-x>, (ISSN: 2196-5625, 2196-5420).
- [20] McCoy Daire, Lyons Seán. Consumer preferences and the influence of networks in electric vehicle diffusion: An agent-based microsimulation in Ireland. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2014;3:89–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2014.07.008>.
- [21] Wolf Ingo, Schröder Tobias, Neumann Jochen, De Haan Gerhard. Changing minds about electric cars: An empirically grounded agent-based modeling approach. *Technol Forecast Soc Change* 2015;94:269–85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.10.010>.
- [22] Zhuge Chengxiang, Wei Binru, Dong Chunjiao, Shao Chunfu, Shan Yuli. Exploring the future electric vehicle market and its impacts with an agent-based spatial integrated framework: A case study of Beijing, China. *J Clean Prod* 2019;221:710–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.262>.
- [23] Liu Junbei, Zhuge Chengxiang, Tang Justin Hayse Chiwing G, Meng Meng, Zhang Jie. A spatial agent-based joint model of electric vehicle and vehicle-to-grid adoption: A case of Beijing. *Appl Energy* 2022;310:118581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.118581>.
- [24] Paevere Phillip, Higgins Andrew, Ren Zhengeng, Horn Mark, Grozev George, McNamara Cheryl. Spatio-temporal modelling of electric vehicle charging demand and impacts on peak household electrical load. *Sustain Sci* 2014;9(1):61–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11625-013-0235-3>, (ISSN: 1862-4065, 1862-4057).
- [25] Selena Sheng Mingyue, Wen Le, Sharp Basil, Du Bo, Ranjitar Prakash, Wilson Douglas. A spatio-temporal approach to electric vehicle uptake: Evidence from New Zealand. *Transp Res D* 2022;105:103256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103256>.
- [26] Arnold Fabian, Lilienkamp Arne, Namockel Nils. Diffusion of electric vehicles and their flexibility potential for smoothing residual demand — A spatio-temporal analysis for Germany. *Energy* 2024;308:132619. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2024.132619>.
- [27] Muratori Matteo, Marano Vittorio, Sioshansi Ramteen, Rizzoni Giorgio. Energy consumption of residential HVAC systems: A simple physically-based model. In: 2012 IEEE power and energy society general meeting. San Diego, CA, USA: IEEE; 2012, 22–26 July 2012.
- [28] Muratori Matteo, Roberts Margaret C, Sioshansi Ramteen, Marano Vittorio, Rizzoni Giorgio. A highly resolved modeling technique to simulate residential power demand. *Appl Energy* 2013;107:465–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.02.057>.
- [29] Tjaden Tjarko, Bergner Joseph, Weniger Johannes, Quaschnig Volker. Repräsentative elektrische Lastprofile für Wohngebäude in Deutschland auf 1-sekündiger Datenbasis [Representative electrical load profiles for single-family houses in Germany based on 1-second data]. 2015, URL <https://solar.htw-berlin.de/elektrische-lastprofile-fuer-wohnbaeude>. Available online.
- [30] California Energy Commission. California plug-in electric vehicle infrastructure projections: 2017–2025. Future infrastructure needs for reaching the state's zero-emission-vehicle deployment goal. 2018, URL <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy18osti/70893.pdf>. [Accessed 09 October 2023].
- [31] Heymann Fabian, Pereira Carlos, Miranda Vladimiro, Soares Filipe Joel. Spatial load forecasting of electric vehicle charging using GIS and diffusion theory. In: 2017 IEEE PES innovative smart grid technologies conference europe. ISGT-europe, Torino: IEEE; 2017, p. 1–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ISGTEurope.2017.8260172>.
- [32] Ensslen Axel, Will Christian, Jochem Patrick. Simulating electric vehicle diffusion and charging activities in France and Germany. *World Electr Veh J* 2019;10(4):73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/wevj10040073>.
- [33] Klein Marvin, Lüpke Lars, Günther Markus. Home charging and electric vehicle diffusion: Agent-based simulation using choice-based conjoint data. *Transp Res D* 2020;88:102475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2020.102475>.
- [34] Cao Van Tien Linh, Barthelme Lukas, Gnann Till, Speth Daniel, Kagerbauer Martin. Enhancing electric vehicle market diffusion modeling: A German case study on environmental policy integration. *Energy Strat Rev* 2023;50:101244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2023.101244>.
- [35] Mascherbauer Philipp, Martínez Miguel, Mateo Carlos, Yu Songmin, Kranzl Lukas. Analyzing the impact of heating electrification and prosumaging on the future distribution grid costs. *Appl Energy* 2025;387:125563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2025.125563>.
- [36] Sica Lorenzo, Carboni Angela, Defflorio Francesco Paolo, Fappanni Filippo, Botta Cristiana. User adoption of electrified powertrains: Identification of factors through discrete choice modelling. *Futur Transp* 2025;5(1):16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/futuretransp5010016>.
- [37] Reveron Baecker Beneharo, Candas Soner, Tepe Deniz, Mohapatra Anurag. Generation of low-voltage synthetic grid data for energy system modeling with the pylovo tool. *Sustain Energy Grids Netw*. 2025;41:101617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.segan.2024.101617>.
- [38] Candas Soner, Reveron Baecker Beneharo, Mohapatra Anurag, Hamacher Thomas. Optimization-based framework for low-voltage grid reinforcement assessment under various levels of flexibility and coordination. *Appl Energy* 2023;343:121147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121147>.

- [39] Few Sheridan, Djapic Predrag, Strbac Goran, Nelson Jenny, Candelise Chiara. A geographically disaggregated approach to integrate low-carbon technologies across local electricity networks. *Nat Energy* 2024;9(7):871–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41560-024-01542-6>.
- [40] Heymann Fabian, vom Scheidt Frederik, Soares Filipe J, Duenas Pablo, Miranda Vladimiro. Forecasting energy technology diffusion in space and time: Model design, parameter choice and calibration. *IEEE Trans Sustain Energy* 2021;12(2):802–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TSTE.2020.3020426>.
- [41] Robinson Scott A, Rai Varun. Determinants of spatio-temporal patterns of energy technology adoption: An agent-based modeling approach. *Appl Energy* 2015;151:273–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.04.071>.
- [42] Lee Minhyun, Hong Tae-hoon. Hybrid agent-based modeling of rooftop solar photovoltaic adoption by integrating the geographic information system and data mining technique. *Energy Convers Manage* 2019;183:266–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2018.12.096>.
- [43] Alderete Peralta Ali, Balta-Ozkan Nazmiye, Longhurst Philip. Spatio-temporal modelling of solar photovoltaic adoption: An integrated neural networks and agent-based modelling approach. *Appl Energy* 2022;305:117949. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117949>.
- [44] Salman Zahra Radhi A, Shehab Nooreya Sayed. Spatial-temporal machine learning analysis of solar PV adoption: Uncovering threshold effects. In: 2025 5th international conference on sustainable islamic business and finance. SIBF, 2025, p. 1–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/SIBF68061.2025.11455316>.
- [45] Falchetta Giacomo, Cian Enrica De, Pavanello Filippo, Wing Ian Sue. Inequalities in global residential cooling energy use to 2050. *Nat Commun* 2024;15(1):7874. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-52028-8>.
- [46] Daigoglou Vassilis, Van Ruijven Bas J, Van Vuuren Detlef P. Model projections for household energy use in developing countries. *Energy* 2012;37(1):601–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.10.044>.
- [47] De Cian Enrica, Falchetta Giacomo, Pavanello Filippo, Romitti Yasmin, Sue Wing Ian. The impact of air conditioning on residential electricity consumption across world countries. *J Environ Econ Manag* 2025;131:103122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2025.103122>.
- [48] Ton Marijn J, Ingels Michiel W, De Bruijn Jens A, De Moel Hans, Reimann Lena, Botzen Wouter JW, Aerts Jeroen CJH. A global dataset of 7 billion individuals with socio-economic characteristics. *Sci Data* 2024;11(1):1096. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41597-024-03864-2>.
- [49] Sun Lijun, Erath Alexander, Cai Ming. A hierarchical mixture modeling framework for population synthesis. *Transp Res B* 2018;114:199–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2018.06.002>.
- [50] Ye Xin, Konduri Karthik, Pendyala Ram M, Sana Bhargava, Waddell Paul. A methodology to match distributions of both household and person attributes in the generation of synthetic populations. In: 88th annual meeting of the transportation research board, Washington, DC. Vol. 36, 2009.
- [51] Konduri Karthik C, You Daehyun, Garikapati Venu M, Pendyala Ram M. Enhanced synthetic population generator that accommodates control variables at multiple geographic resolutions. *Transp Res Rec: J Transp Res Board* 2016;2563(1):40–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3141/2563-08>, (ISSN: 0361-1981, 2169-4052).
- [52] Moreno Ana Tsui, Moeckel Rolf. Population synthesis handling three geographical resolutions. *ISPRS Int J Geo-Information* 2018;7(5):174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijgi7050174>.
- [53] Cheng Long, De Vos Jonas, Shi Kunbo, Yang Min, Chen Xuewu, Witlox Frank. Do residential location effects on travel behavior differ between the elderly and younger adults? *Transp Res D* 2019;73:367–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.07.015>.
- [54] Wang Donggen, Zhou Meng. The built environment and travel behavior in urban China: A literature review. *Transp Res D* 2017;52:574–85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2016.10.031>.
- [55] Antoni Jean-Philippe, Klein Olivier. Generating a located synthetic population of individuals, households, and dwellings. *SSRN Electron J* 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2972615>.
- [56] Thomson Dana R, Kools Lieke, Jochem Warren C. Linking synthetic populations to household geolocations: A demonstration in Namibia. *Data* 2018;3(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/data3030030>, URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5729/3/3/30>.
- [57] Plötz Patrick, Schneider Uta, Globisch Joachim, Dütschke Elisabeth. Who will buy electric vehicles? Identifying early adopters in Germany. *Transp Res A* 2014;67:96–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.06.006>.
- [58] Nayum Alim, Klöckner Christian A, Mehmetoglu Mehmet. Comparison of socio-psychological characteristics of conventional and battery electric car buyers. *Travel Behav Soc* 2016;3:8–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2015.03.005>.
- [59] Chen Zhibin, Liu Wei, Yin Yafeng. Deployment of stationary and dynamic charging infrastructure for electric vehicles along traffic corridors. *Transp Res C* 2017;77:185–206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.01.021>.
- [60] Best Rohan, Nazifi Fatemeh. Analyzing electric vehicle uptake based on actual household distributions: A contribution to empirical policy formulation. *Transp Policy* 2023;137:100–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2023.04.011>.
- [61] Fevang Elisabeth, Figenbaum Erik, Fridstrøm Lasse, Halse Askill H, Hauge Karen E, Johansen Bjørn G, Raaum Oddbjørn. Who goes electric? The anatomy of electric car ownership in Norway. *Transp Res D* 2021;92:102727. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.102727>.
- [62] (Melrose) Pan Meiyu, Uddin Majbah, Lim Hyeonsup. Understanding electric vehicle ownership using data fusion and spatial modeling. *Transp Res D* 2024;127:104075. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2024.104075>.
- [63] Kumar Rajeev Ranjan, Alok Kumar. Adoption of electric vehicle: A literature review and prospects for sustainability. *J Clean Prod* 2020;253:119911. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119911>.
- [64] Forschungsdatenzentren der Statistischen Ämter des Bundes und der Länder. Mikrozensus 2022, scientific use file (SUF) [Microcensus 2022, scientific use file (SUF)]. 2023, <http://dx.doi.org/10.21242/12211.2022.00.00.3.1.0>.
- [65] Goebel Jan, Grabka Markus M, Schröder Carsten, Zinn Sabine, Bartels Charlotte, Beckmannshagen Mattis, Franken Andreas, Gerike Martin, Gries Florian, Halbmeier Christoph, Kara Selin, Krause Peter, Liebau Elisabeth, Nebelin Jana, Petrenz Marvin, Satilms Sarah, Siegers Rainer, Steinhauer Hans Walter, Stüttmann Felix, Wenzig Knut, Dräger Jascha, Gauer Miriam, Tchokni Yogan, Saalbach Claudia. Socio-economic panel (SOEP), data from 1984–2022 (SOEP-core, v39, EU edition). 2024, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5684/soep.core.v39eu>, Collection period: 1984–2022.
- [66] Goebel Jan, Grabka Markus M, Liebig Stefan, Kroh Martin, Richter David, Schröder Carsten, Schupp Jürgen. The German socio-economic panel (SOEP). *Jahrb Natl Stat* 2019;239(2):345–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2018-0022>.
- [67] Statistisches Bundesamt (Destatis). Zensus 2022: Publikationen [Census 2022: Publications]. 2025, URL https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Zensus2022/_publikationen.html. [Accessed 27 February 2026].
- [68] Hörll Sebastian, Balac Milos. Synthetic population and travel demand for Paris and Île-de-France based on open and publicly available data. *Transp Res C* 2021;130:103291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2021.103291>.
- [69] Lovelace Robin, Ballas Dimitris. 'Truncate, replicate, sample': A method for creating integer weights for spatial microsimulation. *Comput Environ Urban Syst* 2013;41:1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurb.2013.03.004>.
- [70] Bass Frank M. A new product growth for model consumer durables. *Manag Sci* 1969;15(5):215–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.15.5.215>.
- [71] Potoglou Dimitris, Susilo Yusak O. Comparison of vehicle-ownership models. *Transp Res Rec: J Transp Res Board* 2008;2076(1):97–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3141/2076-11>, (ISSN: 0361-1981, 2169-4052).
- [72] GeoBasis-DE / BKG. Geodaten des bundesamtes für kartographie und geodäsie [Geodata of the federal agency for cartography and geodesy]. 2025, URL <http://www.bkg.bund.de>. Open Data Datenlizenz Deutschland – Namensnennung – Version 2.0.
- [73] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Directive 2007/2/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2007 establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE). 2007, URL https://knowledge-base.inspire.ec.europa.eu/publications/directive-20072ec-european-parliament-and-council-14-march-2007-establishing-infrastructure-spatial_en. [Accessed 12 June 2026].
- [74] Florio Pietro, Politis Panagiotis, Krasnodebska Katarzyna, Uhl Johannes H, Melchiorri Michele, Martinez Ana M, Kakoulaki Georgia, Pesaresi Martino, Kemper Thomas. GHS-OBAT: Global, open building attribute data reporting age, function, height and compactness at footprint level. *Data Brief* 2025;61:111751. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2025.111751>.
- [75] Zhu Xiao Xiang, Chen Sining, Zhang Fahong, Shi Yilei, Wang Yuanuan. GlobalBuildingAtlas: An open global and complete dataset of building polygons, heights and LoD1 3D models. *Earth Syst Sci Data* 2025;17(12):6647–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-6647-2025>.
- [76] Loga Tobias, Stein Britta, Diefenbach Nikolaus, Born Rolf. Deutsche wohngebäudetypologie: Beispielhafte maßnahmen zur verbesserung der energieeffizienz von typischen wohngebäuden [German residential building typology: Example measures for improving the energy efficiency of typical residential buildings]. 2., erweiterte Auflage ed. Darmstadt, Germany: Institut Wohnen und Umwelt (IWU); 2015, Prepared within the EU projects TABULA and EPISCOPE.
- [77] Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt (KBA). Bestand an Kraftfahrzeugen und Kraftfahrzeuganhängern nach Zulassungsbezirken, 1. Januar 2025 (FZ 1) [Stock of motor vehicles and motor vehicle trailers by registration district, 1 January 2025 (FZ 1)]. 2025, URL https://www.kba.de/DE/Statistik/Produktkatalog/produkte/Fahrzeuge/fz1_b_uebersicht.html. [Accessed 20 March 2026].

- [78] Statistisches Bundesamt (Destatis). Bestand an kraftfahrzeugen und kraftfahrzeuganhängern. 2026, URL <https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Branchen-Unternehmen/Transport-Verkehr/Unternehmen-Infrastruktur-Fahrzeugbestand/Tabellen/fahrzeugbestand.html>. [Accessed 24 September 2026].
- [79] Luderer Gunnar, Bartels Frederike, Brown Tom, Aulich Clara, Benke Falk, Fleiter Tobias, Frank Fabio, Ganai Helen, Geis Julian, Gerhardt Norman, Gnann Till, Gunemann Alyssa, Hasse Robin, Herbst Andrea, Herkel Sebastian, Hoppe Johanna, Kost Christoph, Krail Michael, Lindner Michael, Neuwirth Marius, Nolte Hannah, Pietzcker Robert, Plötz Patrick, Rehfeldt Matthias, Schreyer Felix, Seibold Toni, Senkpiel Charlotte, Sörgel Dominika, Speth Daniel, Steffen Bjarne, Verpoort Philipp C. Die energiewende kosteneffizient gestalten: Szenarien zur klimaneutralität 2045. Technical report, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research; 2025, <http://dx.doi.org/10.48485/PIK.2025.003>, 106 pages.
- [80] Schulthoff Michael, Anstett Philipp, Scherzinger Marvin, Lange Jelto, Kaltschmitt Martin. Future projections of Germany's car fleet - Development of a stock-flow cohort model under CO2 performance standards and effects on annual fleet composition, energy demand and emissions. Transp Policy 2026;179:103994. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2026.103994>.
- [81] Follmer Robert. Mobilität in deutschland – MiD kurzbericht [mobility in Germany]. Technical Report FE-Nr. VB600001, Bonn, Berlin: infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH, Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V. (DLR), IVT Research GmbH und infas 360 GmbH im Auftrag des Bundesministers für Digitales und Verkehr; 2025, URL https://www.mobilitaet-in-deutschland.de/pdf/MiD2023_Kurzbericht.pdf.
- [82] Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt. Fahrzeugbestand am 1. Januar 2026 [The vehicle stock as of 1 January 2026]. 2026, Pressemitteilung Nr. 09/2026. URL https://www.kba.de/DE/Presse/Pressemitteilungen/Fahrzeugbestand/2026/pm09_fz_bestand_pm_komplett.html. [Accessed 12 June 2026].
- [83] Oak Ridge National Laboratory. 2022 national household travel survey: Codebook. 2024, Online document. URL <https://nhts.ornl.gov/assets/2022/doc/codebook.pdf>. [Accessed 12 June 2026].
- [84] Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt. Bestand an Kraftfahrzeugen und Kraftfahrzeuganhängern nach Bundesländern, Fahrzeugarten und ausgewählten Merkmalen, 1. Januar 2025 (FZ 27) [Stock of motor vehicles and motor vehicle trailers by federal states, vehicle types and selected characteristics, 1 January 2025 (FZ 27)]. 2025, URL https://www.kba.de/DE/Statistik/Produktkatalog/produkte/Fahrzeuge/fz27_b_uebersicht.html. [Accessed 12 May 2026].
- [85] Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs, and Spatial Development. Stadt- und Gemeindetyp 2019 [Urban and municipal type 2019]. 2019, https://www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/DE/forschung/raumbearbeitung/Raumabgrenzungen/deutschland/gemeinden/StadtGemeindetyp/stadt-gemeindetyp-2019.csv?_blob=publicationFile&v=2. [Accessed 19 May 2026].
- [86] Javid Roxana J, Nejat Ali. A comprehensive model of regional electric vehicle adoption and penetration. Transp Policy 2017;54:30–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2016.11.003>.
- [87] Yoon Taekwan, Cherry Christopher R, Ryerson Megan S, Bell John E. Carsharing demand estimation and fleet simulation with EV adoption. J Clean Prod 2019;206:1051–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.124>.
- [88] Nazari Fatemeh, Mohammadian Abolfazl (Kouros), Stephens Thomas. Modeling electric vehicle adoption considering a latent travel pattern construct and charging infrastructure. Transp Res D 2019;72:65–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.04.010>.
- [89] Nazari Fatemeh, Mohammadian Abolfazl (Kouros), Stephens Thomas. Dynamic household vehicle decision modeling considering plug-in electric vehicles. Transp Res Rec: J Transp Res Board 2018;2672(49):91–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361198118796925>, (ISSN: 0361-1981, 2169-4052).
- [90] Liu Yan, Cirillo Cinzia. A generalized dynamic discrete choice model for green vehicle adoption. Transp Res Procedia 2017;23:868–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2017.05.048>.
- [91] Liao Fanchao, Molin Eric, Timmermans Harry, Van Wee Bert. Consumer preferences for business models in electric vehicle adoption. Transp Policy 2019;73:12–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2018.10.006>.
- [92] Smith Brett, Olaru Doina, Jabeen Fakhra, Greaves Stephen. Electric vehicles adoption: Environmental enthusiast bias in discrete choice models. Transp Res D 2017;51:290–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2017.01.008>.
- [93] Jin Fanglei, Yao Enjian, An Kun. Understanding customers' battery electric vehicle sharing adoption based on hybrid choice model. J Clean Prod 2020;258:120764. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120764>.
- [94] Burra Lavan T, Al-Khasawneh Mohammad B, Cirillo Cinzia. Impact of charging infrastructure on electric vehicle adoption: A synthetic population approach. Travel Behav Soc 2024;37:100834. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2024.100834>.
- [95] Speth Daniel, Gnann Till, Plötz Patrick, Wietschel Martin, George Jan. Future regional distribution of electric vehicles in Germany. In: Proceedings of the electric vehicle symposium (EVS33), Portland, OR, USA. 2020.
- [96] US Census Bureau. American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS PUMS). 2026, Data source description. URL <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/microdata.html>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [97] US Census Bureau. Current Population Survey: Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC). 2026, Data source description. URL <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/data/datasets.html>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [98] US Census Bureau. Explore census data. 2026, Official U.S. Census Bureau data portal for census and survey tables. URL <https://data.census.gov/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [99] Office for National Statistics. Labour force survey. 2026, Survey information page. URL <https://www.ons.gov.uk/surveys/informationforhouseholdsandindividuals/householdandindividualsurveys/labourforcesurvey>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [100] Office for National Statistics. Census. 2026, Official Census data and documentation portal. URL <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [101] Australian Bureau of Statistics. Microdata and TableBuilder: Income and Housing, Australia. 2026, Microdata access and documentation page. URL <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/microdata-tablebuilder/available-microdata-tablebuilder/income-and-housing-australia>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [102] of Statistics Australian Bureau. Census DataPacks. 2026, Census data product. URL <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/datapacks>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [103] National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies. Labour Force Survey 2025. 2025, Micro-data access page. URL <https://www.insee.fr/en/metadonnees/source/operation/s2227/acces-micro-donnees>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [104] National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies. Population Census. 2026, Population census source description and statistical data portal. URL <https://www.insee.fr/en/metadonnees/source/serie/s1321>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [105] Eurostat. EU Labour Force Survey Microdata. 2026, Microdata access and documentation page. URL <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/public-microdata/labour-force-survey>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [106] Eurostat. Census Hub. 2026, European population and housing census data access portal. URL <https://ec.europa.eu/CensusHub>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [107] IPUMS International. Harmonized international census data for social science and health research. 2026, International census and survey microdata infrastructure. URL <https://international.ipums.org/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [108] IPUMS IHGIS. International historical geographic information system. 2026, International census summary tables and GIS boundary files. URL <https://ihgis.ipums.org/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [109] Luxembourg Income Study. Luxembourg Income Study Database. 2026, Harmonised cross-national household income microdata database. URL <https://www.lisdatacenter.org/our-data/lis-database/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [110] ICF. DHS Program Survey Updates. 2026, International household survey programme website. URL <https://dhsprogram.com/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [111] Federal Highway Administration. National household travel survey 2022. 2022, Household travel survey microdata and documentation. URL <https://nhts.ornl.gov/>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [112] Department for Transport. National travel survey: 2024. 2025, National statistics release and survey documentation. URL <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2024>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [113] Statistical Data and Studies Department. Detailed Results of the 2019 French National Travel Survey. 2021, Mobility survey microdata and documentation. URL <https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/resultats-detailles-de-lenquete-mobilite-des-personnes-de-2019>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [114] KfW Research. KfW energy transition barometer. 2026, Household survey and report series on energy transition technologies in Germany. URL <https://www.kfw.de/About-KfW/KfW-Research/KfW-Energiewendebarmeter.html>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [115] US Energy Information Administration. 2024 RECS Survey Data. 2026, Residential Energy Consumption Survey microdata and documentation. URL <https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2024/index.php?view=microdata>. [Accessed 27 May 2026].
- [116] Poblete-Cazenave Miguel, Pachauri Shonali. A model of energy poverty and access: Estimating household electricity demand and appliance ownership. Energy Econ 2021;98:105266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105266>.
- [117] Poblete-Cazenave Miguel, Pachauri Shonali, Byers Edward, Mastrucci Alessio, van Ruijven Bas. Global scenarios of household access to modern energy services under climate mitigation policy. Nat Energy 2021;6(8):824–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41560-021-00871-0>.
- [118] Ma Minda, Zhang Shufan, Liu Junhong, Yan Ran, Cai Weiguang, Zhou Nan, Yan Jinyue. Building floorspace and stock measurement: A review of global efforts, knowledge gaps, and research priorities. Nexus 2025;2(3):100075. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2025.100075>.

- [119] Münnich Ralf, Schnell Rainer, Brenzel Hanna, Diekmann Hannah, Dräger Sebastian, Emmenegger Janna, Höcker Philip, Kopp Johannes, Merkle Hariolf, Neufang Kristina, Obersneider Monika, Reinhold Julian, Schaller Jannik, Schmaus Simon, Stein Petra. A population based regional dynamic microsimulation of Germany: The MikroSim model. *Methods* 2021. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12758/MDA.2021.03>, data:23 Pages.
- [120] Maretzke Steffen, Hoymann Jana, Schlömer Claus. *Bevölkerungsprognose: Raumordnungsprognose 2045 [Spatial planning forecast 2045: Population forecast]*. Technical report 04/2024, Bonn: Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung; 2024.
- [121] O'Donoghue Cathal, Dekkers Gijs. Increasing the impact of dynamic microsimulation modelling. *Int J Microsimul* 2017;11(1):61–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.34196/ijm.00174>.
- [122] Pohl Pauline, Slepecki Philip, Spielauer Martin. STATSIM: Statistics Austria's dynamic microsimulation model for official population projections. *Stat J IAOS: J Int Assoc Off Stat* 2024;40(4):969–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/18747655241308058>, (ISSN: 1874-7655, 1875-9254).
- [123] Moeckel Rolf. Constraints in household relocation: Modeling land-use/transport interactions that respect time and monetary budgets. *J Transp Land Use* 2016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5198/jtlu.2015.810>.
- [124] Waddell Paul, Borning Alan, Noth Michael, Freier Nathan, Becke Michael, Ulfarsson Gudmundur. Microsimulation of urban development and location choices: Design and implementation of UrbanSim. *Netw Spat Econ* 2003;3:43–67.
- [125] Raab Moritz, Vogl Jonathan, Signer Tim, Kleinebrahm Max. Integration of electric vehicles into energy system models: A review. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2026;238:117078. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2026.117078>.
- [126] Kleinebrahm Max, Torriti Jacopo, McKenna Russell, Ardone Armin, Fichtner Wolf. Using neural networks to model long-term dependencies in occupancy behavior. *Energy Build* 2021;240:110879. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2021.110879>.
- [127] Staffell Iain, Pfenninger Stefan, Johnson Nathan. A global model of hourly space heating and cooling demand at multiple spatial scales. *Nat Energy* 2023;8(12):1328–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41560-023-01341-5>.