

<p>Report of the ad-hoc GRRF meeting on EVSC Paris, 25 January 2005</p>
--

Chairman: Mr. Laszlo PALKOVICS

Secretary Mr. Roland Gillebeert

Participants: see list of participants annexed.

Point 1:

Roll call of the delegates. The delegates present themselves and their organisation. A list of participants is circulated and will be distributed to the participants.

Point 2:

Approval of the agenda:

The agenda is revised as follows:

Mr. Hörner would like to add the Danisch notification on EVSC introduction (Point 4.2)

Points 5 and 8 of the agenda will be combined

Point 3:

Approval of the minutes of the Budapest meeting:

Mr. Fontaine misses the terms of reference in the minutes and asks these to be included in the Paris report. The chair promises to send these and to be added to the minutes of this meeting.

The Japanese has 3 opinion points to be added. A document was received from the Japanese delegation, but only gives 2 points; The Japan delegation will send another paper showing the last opinion point.

The opinion points are: (QUOTE)

1. For regulating EVSC, actual vehicle test, or submission of the result of actual test is necessary. Only simulation is not enough to assure the effectiveness and a side effect.
2. To clear the needs of regulating EVSC. At the last meeting, it was not cleared. It seems that GRRF don't order to regulate EVSC. So it needs to clear the needs about that, otherwise it will be needed to discuss at next GRRF meeting. I guess there are social demands in some country but it is needed to clear and agree why we have to regulate it and make

justification in amendment. Please understand I don't mean opposing this amendment.

3. To clear the effect of EVSC for coaches. When we consider the vehicle categories, I think it needs to be cleared the effect of EVSC. I almost know the effect for tractor but unfortunately don't know that for coaches. So I can't judge to agree or not for applying EVSC for coaches. (I'm sorry not to mention it last meeting) I think roll over system at high friction road is effective for coaches but Directional control system at low friction road for coaches is difficult because of huge inertia of that. In this case, there is possibility to regulate Roll-over control system. (UNQUOTE)

Point 6:

No written list of vehicle categories is presented.

An OICA representative presents a paper (EVSC05-04) giving the industry opinion on the lead times and implementation of EVSC on Trucks and buses. The conclusion is that it is premature to give introduction dates at this time, taking in consideration the state of the art of the technique and the missing of technical solution for a large amount of vehicle types.

The equipment of vehicles with EVSC is just starting. It is a low volume option today. No resources available to cover all vehicles and variants. Test facilities are difficult. (Frozen lakes in Sweden/Finland and thus not all year available).

Actually one focuses on volume trucks. Low volume not prioritised.

Also ISO 11992 must be updated if EVSC comes in. The complexity is huge.

One should try to keep the regulation as simple as possible.

NL says these system came in about 7 years ago. It is not really new. For the NL government it is important to introduce system that improves road safety as soon as possible.

The German delegate says that the technology for trucks and buses is there.

The industry however points to the problem of defining a category of vehicles: N3 is too wide; one must be more specific and cautious towards mandatory versus category of vehicles.

The Swedish delegate says one deal with a great safety potential. We do not have much experience with trucks. It is a very early stage to start to regulate, but regulation will steer the development. We are not ready to mandate EVSC.

The chair says that one must find a minimum set of regulations.

An industry delegate refers to ABS: it was first introduced for ADR vehicles. But not all combinations were covered. Tractor – semi trailer being very popular for oil transport (domestic fuels and combustibles for vehicles); he believes it would be better to introduce EVSC on a voluntary basis and let development do its job.

The Situation of the trailers: no category decided upon, no lead time is given. The need is felt to have a test procedure in Annex 19 of R13. If mandated, the whole trailer industry would come to a halt. The Annex 19 is important. Trailers have more or less the same running gear. A presentation is given by Mr. Ross (EEVSC05-06) called “Availability of Stability Systems with respect to vehicle type.”

An important remark is made: We should restrict the installation of EVSC on the main vehicle population on the road. Complicated variants should be left out, at least in a first stage. In example: semi trailers having 4 axles are for special transports. No EVSC is needed for that kind of transport.

It would be good to know what is the proportion of “exotic” combination in road accidents?

Mr. C. Ross gives an overview with slides on the ISO 11992 position (doc. EVSC05-07) Mr. Ross says the next ISO meeting will take place on March 15 and 16. One should try to align the work in the ISO group with the EVSC group. We need feedback before the March ISO meeting. We must look at the worksheet and check if it matches.

Mr. Gaupp asks what signal is given if one axle is lifted. This is considered a good remark. The message should be transmitted to the system.

The Hungarian delegation proposes to use the ISO standard as a basis for regulation. The chair says the reason for the study is demonstration criteria and clearly measurable requirements. We should start with a minimum set of requirements.

The Russian delegation says techniques are available for type approval.

Mr. Gaupp feels the need to have representative tests to show the function.

The chair just wants a list of type of tests we could possibly envisage; We have not changed our minds on that.

Danish Regulation.

Having a Danish representative in the meeting, the Danish regulation is questioned.

In conclusion the group feels that the Danish requirements are not sufficient. One needs a definition and the group believes the outcome of the working group should be used as a basis. In example: all vehicles above tons are required to have EVSC which is not possible.

Once more the difficulties with vehicles not having pneumatic suspension is explained as well as the difficulties with air over hydraulics for which no solution is available today.

The CLCCR representatives says that not all coach builders are ready, no EVSC suppliers are available, only EBS above 12 tons is envisaged and not for all manufacturers.

This point should be reported to GRRF. Also the EU is present with a representative and one could hear if the DK notification is acceptable.

The Danish representative agreed that I.e. DK could take over the definitions of the ad hoc working group.

Revision of Document EVSC04-01

After some remarks from different delegations one concludes that the EVSC system may not make the vehicle worse. “Not worse” has not the same meaning as improve. “Improve” means something better, where “not worse” can remain the same technique. We note that the actual air suspension systems are not fast enough to stabilise the vehicle by putting more pressure in the system on one side and thus influence the roll stability. Such system is not available and will remain unavailable for a long time to come. The Russian proposal is debated while adapting the document EVSC04-01 which – at the end of the discussions – now become document **EVSC04-01 Rev.1**.

By going through the document delegations make remarks on the following points:
 Test method: many proposals and suggested are brought forward: i.e. waiting until some experience is gained, use ISO as a test basis, use EVSC in the switched on and switched off position to see the difference, simple demo's, beware not to reproduce the development tests, with the same EVSC on different vehicles the test results will be different. Relation OEM and test house to be at the base of demonstration/test. Having no tests at all until a 2 year period is passed;
 Conclusion is that this problem is not ‘ripe’ and needs to be looked upon further.
 A question raised is what about vehicles considered “off road” (i.e. N3G)
 Also tell tales are mentioned. Cab one require an audible warning in case of EVSC failure? Or when it engages? In the later case, and when a vehicle is on low friction surface (i.e. snow) the systems would continuously warn the driver while he is perfectly aware that the system is operative; This would create embarrassment more than being an assistance.

The outcome of the long debate is in document **EVSC04-01 Rev. 1**.

The chair announces his intention to give a first report on the next GRRF where he will present document EVSC04-01 Rev.1. The most important items of the 2 meetings (Budapest and Paris) will be explained.

Next meeting: On April 15 in the CLEPA Premises in Brussels

N.B. Terms of Reference:

The mandate given by the GRRF chairman to the ad – hoc group on EVSC is the following:

A. Make a consolidated concept for the future regulation clarifying the

following issues:

What to regulate (system, vehicle) definition of the EVSc system
Where to include (Reg.13, Reg. 111, separate Regulation)
How to regulate – only technical aspects, no economical or political
aspects are considered.

B. Based on the concept, prepare a text proposal for the regulation.

Roland Gillebeert
Secretary EVSC ad hoc Meeting.