

## MOTORCYCLE BRAKES GTR – ACTION LIST ON 05 – 03 – 1 (AFTER 57/GRRF)

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
1.0 Scope	In the current text there is a sentence containing “..safe braking performance under normal and emergency riding conditions.” This is similar to the contents of FMVSS 135/ECE 13H but should it be included ?	Possible options: a. Delete this sentence b. Provide definitions of “safe” and “emergency ”	Also, is the contents of Scope sufficient ?	Current text is consistent with words used in all FMVSS brake regulations w/o definition	IMMA
1.0 Scope	The description of vehicle categories are taken from SR1 that is currently being developed in AC3 and not finalised.	Action: Monitor vehicle category development.			TC
1.0 Scope	The contrasting types of vehicles in use in Europe v N.America and other regions. This issue occurs throughout the GTR. For example, comparing 3 wheelers, in Europe, a typical 3-5 is a low speed utility vehicle using car type construction and brake system – panel drum brakes and single pedal actuation. In N.America, a 3-5 could be high powered trike using motorcycle construction and single brake systems.	Action Discuss at the next GTR meeting.	This issue applies in some part to all tests in the GTR This general issue has been highlighted in a letter from TC to IMMA.		TC
1.0 Scope	The GTR currently includes vehicles with a minimum vehicle Vmax of 25 km/h. Acceptable?	Options: a. 25 km/h as ECE Reg 78 b. Another value		US agrees with Option (a)	TC
3.1.3 Brake System Requirements	This section covers 3 wheelers only and is based on the ECE text but with a modification from TC to include eg. N.American vehicles. Acceptable?	Action: GTR Group to consider current text.			TC
3.1.5 Master cylinder reservoir	NHTSA suggest that there is a statement on reservoir capacity in the GTR.	Possible option Extract from ECE 13H section 5.2.12	Group to agree this minor addition at the next meeting.	Use Std 122 requirement of 1.5 times displacement	NHTSA
3.1.6 SSB warning lamp	In the current text, the words “clearly visible to the rider” are included. This is not definable.	Options: a. Prepare a definition b. Modify the text	All the text in this paragraph should be checked.	Use “...in clear view of the driver...”	NHTSA

GTR Paragraph	Details of issue	Actions or Possible options	Comments	U.S. Comments	Project leader
3.1.7 ABS warning lamp	Same general issue as for SSB lamp plus confirmation of what the lamp is checking for.	Options: a. Text as in current document b. "...whenever there is a malfunction that affects the generation of transmission of response or control signals in the vehicle's antilock brake system."	Group to decide at next meeting.	U.S. supports its proposal in Option (b)	NHTSA
3.2 Brake System General Operation.	This section gives a general description of the layout of the overall brake system. Included in ECE 13H etc. TC wish to review the content.	Action: General review of this section of the GTR at the next meeting.		U.S. can accept	TC
3.2.3 Parking brake system	The text states that the parking brake be applied by "solely mechanical means" and "in the absence of the driver". Acceptable? TC say must be held in position by mechanical means. NHTSA want with driver.	Action Review this paragraph at next meeting.		No need to say "in absence of the driver"	TC
3.3.2 friction material thickness	For checking drum lining thickness, the text states that "a pointer device designed for that purpose" is written.	Action Group to confirm text at next meeting		US agrees with idea but need to refine text	TC
4 Tests	To ensure reasonable repeatability, all parameters should have a tolerance eg. speed, control force	Action NHTSA/TC to provide proposal	Correction factors required?	SAE J299 for speed correction or can include equation directly into text; will discuss others	NHTSA
4.1.1. Test surface friction	At GRRF meeting, it was confirmed that any values specified could only be approximate due to many variable eg. tyres, weather. Similarly, it was not necessary to specify the method of measurement.	Option Use text from Car GTR " the surface shall have an adhesion coefficient (PFC) $\geq 0.85$ unless specified otherwise.	Group to discuss at next meeting	Recommend "nominal PFC 0.9 unless otherwise specified"	NHTSA

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
4.1.4 Test speed	For vehicles that are unable to reach the specified test speed, it would be convenient to have a standard requirement of 0.8 or 0.9 Vmax. For some tests and models, it may require a long track to reach 0.9 Vmax and so manufacturers would prefer 0.8V max throughout.	Action Group to discuss the use of 0.8Vmax throughout GTR at next meeting.	Also applies to 4.4.2, 4.5.2, 4.9.5.1	US supports 0.9Vmax for dry stops; 0.8Vmax for high speed and ABS; R78 2.1 and 2.2 use 0.9Vmax	IMMA
4.1.5 Auto transmission	NHTSA wish to include the sentence “If an auto transmission has a neutral .....” currently written into the text.	Action: IMMA to check if this relevant			NHTSA
4.2.3 Control lever application point	NHTSA have proposed a clearer way of defining the front force application point based on measurement from the end of the handgrip instead of lever end – see current text for details.	Action: Group to confirm the proposal at the next meeting.	Group must ensure that the currently specified input force values in the GTR are comparable when the new proposed method is used.	Using handgrip edge vs hand lever edge as reference point for distance would be easier to enforce; US is open to 50 mm	NHTSA
4.2.4 Brake temp measurement	To date, the GTR has included 2 methods of measurement – a. Rubbing thermocouple on disc or drum surface b. Thermocouple embedded in friction material. a and b are not comparable, a is considered to have certain advantages, but b has been convention in NA. NHTSA now state that a. could be standardised.	Actions prior to next meeting - IMMA to provide NHTSA with information on the installation of rubbing thermocouples etc.. - NHTSA to consider .	Discuss at next meeting. More detail eg drgs required in text.	Do we have data on correlation between 2 methods? Will we need to revise IBT if rubbing method used?	IMMA
4.3.2 Dry Stop Test IBT	NHTSA proposes an IBT of $\geq 55^0$ - $\leq 100^0$ C for all performance tests whilst IMMA states that $\leq 100^0$ C is acceptable stating that the min. temp. inclusion does not affect brake performance results and adds time and complexity to the testing.	Action - IMMA has carried out a series of tests with a range of motorcycles and has presented the data to NHTSA/TC. - NHTSA/TC to study the data and report back to the Group.	Applies also to 4.4.2, 4.5.2, 4.7.2.2, 4.7.3.1, 4.8.2, 4.9.3.1	U.S. reviewed IMMA data; mixed results. Keep 55-100C as proposed	IMMA

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
4.3.3 Dry Stop Test – single brake control activated	TC wish to add a note “ If both braking devices are CBS, the manufacture must specify which is the dominant brake and which the secondary brake”	Action: Group to review this proposal and report	Discuss at next meeting	Should be stated in preamble but not included in regulatory text	TC
Performance Requirements	TC wish to include s. distance/MFDD requirements for split service brake systems in the table and suggest they should be the same values as for CBS.	Options: a. Same brake performance as CBS b. Other values	Group to consider at next meeting	Since R78 includes both loading conditions, don't delete until we understand basis	TC
4.4.2 Dry Stop test – all brakes Minimum test speed	Currently the value is 45 km/h for this test but this is under review. NHTSA suggest 25 km/h in line with FMVSS 122	Action: Group to review minimum speed for this test		Use 100 km/h or 0.9 Vmax; R78 Para 2.1.1 requires 0.9 Vmax	TC
4.4.2 Brake actuation force	Current values are based on FMVSS 122 : Hand $\leq$ 250N Foot $\leq$ 400N (500N for 3-5 vehicles) NHTSA propose that these are reduced to align with test 4.3 ie. Hand $\leq$ 200N Foot $\leq$ 350N (500N for 3-5)	Action: Group to consider the 2 options		U.S. can accept either; lower forces make reqmts more stringent; are actual forces anywhere close to these limits?	IMMA
4.4.3 Dry Stop Test – all brake controls activated.	This test is taken from FMVSS 122 and converting the stopping distance requirement to MFDD produces an unexpectedly high figure of 7.6 m/s <sup>2</sup>	Action Group to discuss at next meeting.			IMMA
Performance Requirements	At present, this test is applicable to all vehicle types. This should be reviewed based on the general comments made regarding categories in 1.0 Scope in this paper.	Options: a. Modify text or test procedure b. Include power/weight ratio c. Exempt certain vehicles.	Group to discuss at next meeting.		IMMA
4.5.1 High speed test Categories	At present, this test applicable to 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5 vehicle types. Is this satisfactory ?	Action Group to discuss at next meeting.		US can accept as written	IMMA
4.5.2 High speed test	TC propose 100 km/h instead of original 80 to prevent overlap with test 4.4.	Action Group to confirm at next meeting		See US proposal for speed ranges; If	TC

GTR Paragraph	Details of issue	Actions or Possible options	Comments	U.S. Comments	Project leader
Minimum speed				$V_m > 125$ & $< 200$ km/h use $0.8V_m$ ; If $V_m \leq 125$ km/h, no test ; If $V_m \geq 200$ km/h, use 160 km/h test speed	
4.6.1 Wet brake test - brake types	GTR text states that all brake types must be tested. For ECE Reg 78, category 3-5 vehicles are exempt because in Europe these are typically “car type vehicles” with panel type drum brakes. Wet brake tests are not included in car regulations. N.American trikes are 3-5 vehicles and can have exposed disc brakes that should be wet tested. How to deal with ?	Possible option: - Test all vehicle types but exempt car type drum brakes (panel brake) Propose a definition of panel brake.	Discuss at next meeting	US wants all types to be tested	IMMA
4.6.2 Wet brake test - CBS laden test	When CBS fitted, ECE (and GTR) states that it should be tested laden and unladen. The unladen test is more severe for CBS due to lower brake forces to cut through the water film etc. so review the need for the laden test.	Action Discuss at next meeting.		US does not support dropping test w/o full understanding reasons for including originally	TC
4.6.3 Wet brake baseline test	The text currently states “....measure the brake control force that will produce an average vehicle deceleration of $2.5 \text{ m/s}^2$ ” It will require more than 1 stop to produce a robust value. Further instructions may also be necessary to assist the tester.	Possible option: Modify the definition of <b>Baseline</b> to specify the no. of stops to arrive at a repeatable value eg. 6 max., 3 min.	Group to comment on this proposal and the complete paragraph. Also applies to 4.7.2 – Heat Fade baseline. See new “Baseline” definition.	US supports average of 3 stops to determine control force; also supports range of $2.5\text{-}3.0 \text{ m/s}^2$ ;	IMMA
4.7.3.1 Heat Fade heating procedure	These 10 stops are performed with a constant control force that gives $3 \text{ m/s}^2$ for the first stop. It is difficult to achieve both constant control force	Options: a. Use constant decel. but modulate control force. (but what is used for the	Group to discuss this and other possible options.	R78: 1 <sup>st</sup> stop at $3 \text{ m/s}^2$ and measure pedal/lever force;	NHTSA

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
	and constant deceleration.	remaining stops?) b. Do a pre test to find a constant force that gives an average decel of 3 m/s <sup>2</sup>		use same force for subsequent stops. Is it average or max force? Also supports range of 3.0-3.5 m/s <sup>2</sup> ;	
4.7.2.2 Heat Fade Test conditions and procedures	Should this test also apply to category 3-1 and 3-2 vehicles	Group to discuss at next meeting	All category 3 vehicles must pass this test in Canada		TC
4.8.2 Parking brake test – actuation forces	NHTSA are concerned that the specified forces of 400N hand and 500N foot may be too high and wants the group to consider reducing the forces to those as for performance tests ie. 250/400N.	Discuss at next meeting	Note that car regs FMVSS 135 specify 400N hand/500N foot	U.S. accepts current R78 forces	NHTSA
Servo failure test	Not in GTR at present. Consider the need for a new test following information from UK.	Discuss at next meeting.		US supports secondary performance if we decide to include	IMMA
4.9 ABS tests	In general the content of this section requires review	Discuss at next meeting			NHTSA
4.9.1 ABS tests – list of tests	NHTSA believe complete stops on high and low friction surfaces (a,b) are not required due to duplication.	Discuss at next meeting	Stops a+b are the only ones carried out from the test speed down to standstill. All the others are check stops or snubs.	High friction test needed to get high value for low-to-high transition test; assume wetted low friction and wetted high friction	NHTSA
4.9.1 EMF tests	NHTSA require a specific test procedure	Options: a. ECE R10 b. Manufacturers data	Discuss at next meeting	Make test requirement objective with test procedure included	NHTSA
4.9.3.2 ABS High friction stops	At 57/GRRF, UK was concerned that the ABS tests did not include any measurement of stopping performance.	Possible option: For the tests on the high friction surface, the stopping distance shall be	Should not be necessary to measure stopping performance	Agrees with option for dry surface but will be difficult for	IMMA

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
	It was agreed that the Group would consider this	$\leq$ or MFDD shall be $\geq$ the values for the relevant part of Dry Stop – single brake control activated table in 4.3.3.	on low friction surface as there is nothing to compare with and not so important as on high friction.	low friction surface	
4.9.5.1 ABS check stops	A note is included in the text stating that the test may be terminated when the speed has fallen by 20 km/h.	Action Group to discuss	Also applies to 4.9.6.1	Agrees with snubs for wheel lock checks	IMMA
4.9.7.2 ABS low to high friction check	How to check that the system responds correctly to the increase in surface friction?	Option: Prescribe that the vehicle decel rises to the MFDD value for the Dry Stop table 4.3.3 in X secs.	Group to discuss at next meeting.	US expects that IMMA and/or Test Authorities should have values for us to review since this is an existing requirement in R78	IMMA
4.10 Partial failure test	As originally agreed, the text was based on “the remaining sub system having to meet the relevant Dry Stop- single brake control activated test requirement”. TC propose that the text is based on FMVSS S7.8.2 Partial service brake system test, which is included in the current text	Action Group to consider the TC proposal Assume unladen test.	Note the inconsistencies between the proposed vehicle deceleration and the Dry stop test – single brake control actuated figures.		TC
Definitions- ABS	NHTSA have proposed an alternative to that which is in the text as follows: A portion of the service brake system that automatically controls the degree of rotational slip during braking by 1) sensing the rate of angular rotation of the wheels; 2) transmitting signals regarding the rate of wheel angular rotation to a controlling device that interprets those signals and generates responsive controlling output signals;	Action Group to agree whether to use this new proposal or that which already in the document.		ABS definition included in our brake standards; U.S. has done this to keep out “pedal pumpers” pseudo-ABS that duplicate ABS pumping and mimic operation	NHTSA

<b>GTR Paragraph</b>	<b>Details of issue</b>	<b>Actions or Possible options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>U.S. Comments</b>	<b>Project leader</b>
	and 3) transmitting those control signals to a modulator device which adjusts brake actuating forces in response to those signals.			but without wheel sensors.	
Definitions-V max	New proposal from NHTSA	Action Group to review	See definition in text	Same as proposed but with 1.6 km instead of 3.2 km	NHTSA
Definitions-PFC	In the light of a less specific method of measuring surface friction, should this definition be changed?	Action Group to review		Keep definition but without last phrase stating what method; allow use of ASTM or ISO	NHTSA
Definitions-Laden	SR1 definition is “Gross vehicle mass” which is the maximum mass of the fully laden vehicle based on its construction and design performances, as declared by the manufacture.	Action Group to review	? Change text from “laden” to “Gross vehicle mass” throughout		IMMA
Definitions-Unladen	SR1 definition is “Mass in running order” which is the sum of the nominal mass of the complete vehicle (As determined by SR1) and the driver’s mass.	Action Group to review	? Change text from “unladen” to “Mass in running order” through.		IMMA