

**REPORT of the 2<sup>nd</sup> MEETING of the INFORMAL PASSENGER VEHICLE GTR WORKING GROUP taking place at the OICA offices in Paris on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> February 2004.**

Chairman, Mr Ian Yarnold, opened the meeting with thanks to OICA for providing the facilities and welcomed new delegates from Europe and India.

The Secretary thanked delegates who had sent their contributions as agreed at the first meeting. He presented doc. PVGTR Inf. 2004/6 that outlined the proposed process of how documents would be dealt with. Initially documents would be circulated to the group of delegates only, they would be numbered, according to year and numerical sequence, and labelled "informal" (Inf.). After discussion, the amended document would retain the same number and be lodged on the GRRF web-site but without the "Informal" label. Later in the meeting, it was agreed that each informal document would include the source/author, but this would be removed on the agreed version as it becomes a document from the Ad-hoc Group.

The minutes of the first meeting Doc. PCGTR 2003/6 were approved with only a minor change to the scope being considered.

The Chair had raised the difficulty concerning the GTR Scope with AC3 and was informed that there was a general difficulty being faced by other groups. Senior WP.29/AC.3 officials are debating this problem but urge groups to continue with their stated objective and concentrate on the technical matters.

The main consideration at this time was the Justification document, which is given the following timing:

The formal document for WP29/AC.3 requires completion by June for submission by August 04.

This document should be presented to the Sept. GRRF for information but not for comment as the Ad-hoc Working Group has been asked to deal with the GTR on their behalf.

The formal submission of the case for the GTR Braking with justification must be made at the November WP.29/AC3.

**Contenders. (Japan)**

Japan had been tasked with providing an up to date list of contenders to go with earlier doc. PCGTR 2003/5.

PVGTR Inf. 2004/2, P1 is a list of existing Regulations and Directives as based on the model provided in the 'Door Locks GTR' while P2 is a Summary table of the areas where Reg.13-H, FMVSS 135 and National Regulations are in force.

This document, being simpler, was selected for inclusion into the Justification document though it was accepted that PCGTR 2003/5 has more technical content.

Voluntary, ISO and SAE test Standards and Japanese National Standards are to be added to PVGTR Inf. 2004/2 by Mr T Ishihara.

India announced an intention to adopt Reg.13-H in 2007 and therefore will be ready for the GTR once it is completed. Thailand is believed to be in a similar situation.

**Cost – Benefits. (OICA – Europe)**

The report PVGTR Inf. 2004/3 had been produced by OICA with some help from CLEPA and was introduced by the OICA representative. As a qualitative document this made several important and useful observations but the Chair believed that a quantitative section was a necessity.

Actual figures were reported as being difficult to produce and were often regarded as confidential by vehicle manufacturers.

UK was convinced that manufacturers had figures for development, proving and approval costs, which were essential to making the case for this GTR.

USA would expect figures for costs and benefits to be included to supplement the case for safety improvement when introducing new requirements.

Given the similar performance levels of the 2 standards, the safety improvement is difficult to quantify unless substantial changes are made to existing regulations. As OICA reported, the area of resulting costs depends upon where the final compromises are made between these 2 standards.

Germany raised the case for including N<sub>1</sub> vehicles into this GTR as this could be expected to generate a sizeable safety improvement and their Government was troubled by differences in the braking performance between cars and vans. This is especially the case for car derived vans but perhaps more understandable for large vans. However, it emerged that some countries have very light vans, which would not meet the service brake performance requirement for passenger cars.

In the light of these facts, the Chair said that the Passenger Vehicle category 1-1 must remain as this had been set by AC3 and it was at this administrative level that any alteration would have to be made. Japan confirmed their preference for this Category 1-1 but felt that at National or even at Regional level this could be extended to include N<sub>1</sub> vehicles.

The conclusion was reached that the benefits are mainly in cost savings for the vehicle manufacturers resulting from reduced homologation costs and the engineering costs associated with bringing fully developed vehicles, which are accepted universally, into production.

The Chair urged OICA to collect data that the above benefits could be expected to generate and urged all delegates to give OICA as much help as possible. He emphasised that the major vehicle manufacturers are key to solving the problem of future monetary saving estimates.

It was generally seen that a single market, in place of 3 or 4 market areas, must be beneficial but the costs will depend upon the amount of change which each regional industry has to accept in the rationalisation process.

**The Justification** is needed by June 2004 in order to meet schedule for the Application set out above.

### **Intention, Process and Structure (USA)**

Document PVGTR Inf. 2004/4 prepared by USA was discussed in detail and changes were made in several areas. In the Scope issue, it was accepted by AC3 and the US DOT, that the category being addressed is based on weight in USA and on the number of passengers in Europe and Japan. The definition in TRANS/WP29/2004/25 Annex1 for Category 1-1 was studied and was adopted although some reservation expressed at the loss of the previously agreed 3.5t weight limit, as it is not the intention to include large buses in the passenger carrying vehicles being covered.

The Format selected by USA from TRANS/WP29/883 is, as expected, Option II designed for those Regulations, such as braking, which have many different requirements and corresponding test procedures. This is believed to lead to a structure as follows:

## Introductory Statement of Technical Rationale

Regulation:	Scope, Application and Definitions. Constructional and Operational requirements. Performance overview and general test conditions.
For each element of Performance:	Detailed test conditions. Defined test procedure.

The agreed document will now be included on the GRRF Web site under reference PVGTR 2004-4.

### **Contentious Issues (from UK)**

Document PVGTR 2004 Inf.7 outlined these and, in discussion, drew the attention of delegates to the differences in philosophy between the agreed main contenders, Reg.13-H and FMVSS 135. These were considered and Mr Soodoo pointed out the presence (unknown to many delegates) of a large document, TP 135, available from NHTSA which explains in detail, the testing procedures which have to be conducted whenever a vehicle is being examined for conformity with FMVSS 135.

In performance assessment, the advantage of using Mean Fully Developed Deceleration will need to be explained if this method of evaluating braking performance is to be accepted for the GTR.

Several delegates expressed concern relating to the current R.13-H - Annex 6 methods of evaluating ABS performance. This is an area where some research might be necessary.

When discussing the requirements for Dynamic Parking braking, a European belief emerged that this still has a real value. Initially it was introduced as a means of requiring the use of a friction brake and to prevent the use of 'dog clutch' (peg-in-slot) mechanisms, which would only have a static holding capability. The friction clamping designs now in universal use form a very useful 'third brake' and can be decisive in the case of an extreme emergency such as the blocking or breakage of the service braking control pedal.

Braking performance of vehicles with Electric Regenerative Braking, whilst having some comparable features in the Contending Standards, also have substantial differences which may require detailed consideration.

These issues clearly need to be resolved and it was generally agreed that the most efficient means of achieving this would be for a smaller working Sub-Group to concentrate on the conflicting details in the contenders.

The Chair asked for volunteers to serve on this Sub-Group, several delegates agreed to take part in the task of obtaining agreement and defining the text of the GTR.

Dr Bräuninger agreed to be Chairman of the Sub-Group with support of Mr Brearley as Secretary. This was accepted as it allowed the detailed work of ranking and resolving to be commenced. A preliminary date of April 29<sup>th</sup>/30<sup>th</sup> was tabled for the first meeting but this will depend on the arrangements being finalised for the Motorcycle GTR Informal Group meeting. It would be convenient to follow this meeting to reduce travel costs for delegates travelling to Europe.

In an effort to assess the size and nature of the task of the Sub-Group in ranking the topics needing alignment, in terms of importance and perceived difficulty, the earlier documents PCGTR 2003/4 p6 and p7 were examined in general discussion.

Some points of disagreement were seen as relatively easy to resolve whilst others such as ABS and Regenerative braking are clearly going to be a challenge.

German Government delegate observed that even if common requirements could be agreed, there was still the problem of authorisation differences. He also expressed the belief that, unless N<sub>1</sub> vehicles were included (with the intention of lifting the braking specifications of these vehicles to achieve parity with M<sub>1</sub> cars), the task was not worth the effort. Of course, such a move would generate more benefits but would incur substantial costs in many cases.

The Chair suggested that Europe would be free to opt for a wider application for the GTR if this view was supported by a majority of Member States, but this was an issue for Brussels not the GTR group

### **Time Plan. (UK)**

The UK DfT presented the timing chart proposal which was a first attempt to show the steps that will be required to achieve the set target. It included work of Main Informal and Sub-working Groups.

Having in mind the likely difficulties which would be encountered by the Sub-working Group, the Chair considered it more realistic to indicate the need for a further year, meaning that the first GTR working draft would be called for in mid 2006 giving the chance for a reasonable number of Sub-working Group meetings. The delegates thought this to be a prudent move but it was emphasised that the submission to AC3 remains as planned for August 04.

A revised version of PVGTR Inf.2004/5 will be produced and will be posted on the GRRF web-site as PVGTR 2004/5 since it will reflect the result of the discussion which took place in this meeting.

### **Terms of Reference of the Sub-working Group**

The Sub-Group comprises Chairman, Secretary and 7 working members, 3 from Government and 4 from Industry and the Terms of Reference are as follows:

- To review the differences between UN ECE Reg.13-H and FMVSS 135 and rank these in order of importance and expected difficulty of achieving harmonisation.

- To consider the key aspects of each issue identified and make proposals to address these areas giving a time-to-solve estimate.

- To prepare a summary paper for discussion at the next GTR meeting in September.

Initial Sub Working Group members are:

A Mendelson, J Stockreef, G Soodoo, T Hirai / T Ishihara, P Böhm, O Fontaine and C Wilde.

This list of members may change as the work progresses and different experience is sought.

The provisional date for the next Passenger Vehicle GTR Informal Group meeting is following on from the 56<sup>th</sup> GRRF at the UN in Geneva on 23<sup>rd</sup>/24<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

Secretary will ask the UN ECE Secretariat to amend the web page under the GRRF section to refer to PVGTR working documents.