

<p>Report of the ad-hoc GRRF meeting on EVSC Brussels April 15 2005.</p>

Chairman: Mr. Laszlo PALKOVICS

Secretary Mr. Roland Gillebeert

Participants: see list of participants annexed.

Point 1:

A participants list is distributed; Copy enclosed.

Point 2:

Adoption of the agenda.

The secretary announces his intention to make the position of secretary vacant. Due to workload and responsibilities it is no longer possible to do the secretariat for the EVSC ad-hoc working group. For the next meeting, a new secretary should be nominated. In the mean time Roland Gillebeert will continue the work.

Candidates are kindly requested to inform the chairman and the secretary of their candidature.

The agenda is adopted.

Point 3

Approval of the Paris minutes

The minutes are approved without remarks.

Point 4

Feedback of the 57th GRRF meeting.

The chairman gives some comments by means of a few slides. The group was formed with the goal to regulate.

The Swedish delegate believes no regulation should see the light of day unless thoroughly motivated.

As a general remark we note that the governments in general are in favour of performance criteria. One is not in favour of design criteria. There is no alternative, we all know EVSC is beneficial for road safety although it is not 100% perfect.

The question if a regulation is really needed is answered by the chairman in saying that WP29 send 2 documents to GRRF requiring EVSC mandatory on certain categories of vehicles. Also USA and New Zealand have started to look into this; thus regulating EVSC is the coming thing.

Mr. Broch presents his document (EVSC05-13) on advantages and benefits of using ESP in hazardous goods transports. No one doubts about the positive effects of EVSC in traffic and everywhere a significant reduction of accidents is noted where vehicles are equipped with EVSC. The economical aspects of an accident should not be underestimated. For statistical reasons an accident cost is estimated to cost around 1 million €. One takes in consideration the traffic jams, ecological aspects of an accident a;s.o.

This presentation is very specific; it only deals with one accident, but is representative for a lot of similar accidents. In case of an accident with a ADR vehicle, the investigation is always more severe. I.e. leakage creates great costs and danger. And there are also the secondary effects of an accident: the queuing up of vehicles in the opposite direction because people want to see the accident. Which again creates economical loss.

Since EVSC is on the market since a short time (2001) not much is available on statistics. However, Mr. P. Jenisson says that accident statistics are today concentrated on passenger cars and that accident data is not collected in the same way all over Europe.

This makes it even more difficult to come to correct figures.

The chair believes the figures can be somewhat extrapolated to some extent.

Again the question pops up if we should regulate or not. But if mandate is desired we must come up with criteria. In fact it was “single accidents” involving a truck or bus without a second vehicle that triggered the regulation 111.

It is recognised that some data would be beneficial;

The chair asks the participants to look for data on accidents. We know the data will be limited but something is available somewhere.

Mr. Ross presents doc EVSC05-12 in which is demonstrated that vehicles must be equipped in a special manner to ensure safe use, but these transformations cause the vehicle no longer to comply with a “standard vehicle”. It also is not possible to create criteria to judge upon “pass/fail”.

The Dutch delegate reminds the meeting on the idea to use simulation.

The chair says that with the transformations needed to test the vehicles, the tests become inadequate.

CLEPA announces a demonstration in the presence of as many government representatives (Contracting parties ECE) as possible. The demonstration will be organised in BOXBERG (North of Heilbronn) in Germany and will be combined with the next session of the GRRF ad hoc group on EVSC. Dates chosen are 6 and 7 of July 2005. Further details to be communicated later. Also Mr. Yarnold should be invited. The demonstration would start at 10:00 preceded by information. The meeting would then take place after the demonstration and be continued on July 7. Further details will be send later.

Mr. Gaupp presents doc; EVSC05-19 which is a comparison of old and new ECE Regulation R13 Annex 13.

Mr. Gaupp believes it is better to start with less knowledge than to come too late with solutions. This is comparable with the introduction of ABS braking systems where also a

development time was needed. One should get the time to gain experience by assessing and testing new stability systems. Otherwise we will gain no experience at all.

The meeting then concentrates on the refinement of document EVSC04-01 Rev. 2 which will become EVSC04-01Frev.3.

Further presentations:

Mr. Ross presents doc. EVSC05-11 on ISO 11992. It will become doc; EVSC05-11 Rev.1 after correction.

Mr. G. Brett presents doc EVSC05-14 “ Choice of ISO standards for demonstration”

Mr. G. Brett also demonstrates an EVSC Simulation exercise doc. EVSC05-15 .

The conclusion of the demonstration is that simulations can be helpful but standardised test should be studied. A common simulation environment should be defined as well as validated parameters. Further details can be found in doc EVSC05-15.

The chair says the simulation can be a procedure for homologation. Interface to simulation requires a lot of know how. The simulation issue must be examined, how could it be practically used? The NL delegate asks if OEM's could offer simulations. The problem is not to give a simulation to the authorities, the problem is more to make sure the simulation is representative for the vehicle.

Mr. C. Ross adds that the simulation must be validated by a physical test.

The simulation and physical tests must be compared with the development of ABS brakes: tests and simulations need development time. We better start with a limited test, and allow time to develop tests further. One should not stop development over tests, which are not perfect today. Only experience will show the way to go.

The chair

The chair presents doc EVSC05-18 in absence of the Russian federation delegation.

Next meeting: to be held in BOXBERG (Germany) July 6 and 7 2005.

Details will be sent out as soon as available and government representatives from the contracting parties will be invited.

Roland Gillebeert

Secretary ad-hoc GRRF EVSC meeting.

Documents of the meeting:

EVSC04-01Rev. 02	Proposed amendments to R13 (Industry proposal)
EVSC05-09	Combinations compatibility (Industry)
EVSC05-10 Rev.1	Agenda (secretariat)
EVSC05-11	ISO 11992 developments (Industry)
EVSC05-12	Practical tests for vehicles (Industry)
EVSC05-13	Accident costs analysis (Industry)
EVSC05-14	Choice of ISO for demonstration
EVSC05-15	VIDEO (Mr. G. Brett)
EVSC05-16	How to handle the feed back from GRRF (Chairman)
EVSC05-17	Status report informal group on EVSC (Chairman)
EVSC05-18	EVSC performance Evaluation (Russian federation)
EVSC05-19	Comparison of old and new R13 (German delegation)
EVSC05-20	VIDEO (Industry)
EVSC05-21	Report of the Brussels meeting
EVSC05-22	Justification for EVSC