

# *Department for* **Transport**

Members of the Tyre GTR informal group.

Working paper No. : TYREgtr-01-04  
Issued by I. Yarnold  
(Chairman of the Informal Group TYRE gtr)

Ian Yarnold  
Head of Primary and eSafety Branch  
Transport Technology & Standards  
Department for Transport  
Zone 2/06  
Great Minster House  
76 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DR  
Direct Line: 020 7944 2086  
Divisional Enquiries: 020 7944 2078  
Fax: 020 7944 2069  
GTN No: 3533 2086  
E-mail: [ian.yarnold@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ian.yarnold@dft.gsi.gov.uk)

Web Site: [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)

7 July 2005

Dear Colleague,

## **Progress with the Tyre GTR**

Many of you will be aware that I have been holding informal discussions with contracting parties to the 1998 agreement on the tyre GTR. You will have seen my brief note a couple of weeks ago that reported on progress while I was in Washington.

At our Brussels meeting in April we agreed the idea of a modular approach to the GTR as this seemed the only solution to allow the different regional requirements currently in place (or being finalised) to be used by those authorities as required. I agreed to take forward the idea and content of the modules to AC3 and I am now in position to report progress.

I discussed the modular approach with M. Gauvin (as the GTR sponsor) and he presented the outline concept to AC3 on 23 June. I am pleased to report that there was general agreement from the contracting parties to the principle of a modular GTR. This is an important step for our work and we should be encouraged by AC3's general approval of the preferred way forward.

The second issue concerning the content of the modules is equally important. You will recall that we set out a 3-module approach. This proposal remains but two tests have moved within the modules as a result of my discussions with contracting parties. To explain this better I attach a diagram (which is similar to that developed during our April meeting) from which you will see that Module 1 has a broader range of tests than before. There are no additional requirements just a shifting between the modules.

Obtaining agreement on the content of the modules is a fundamental point, and one that we must secure before we start work on the technical detail. To start without this agreement could raise false expectations and waste time and resources. I know you will agree that this must be avoided but I also appreciate that some delegates to the informal group will be unhappy with further delays and be understandably concerned that the 3-year timetable appears to be slipping away. I discussed timescales with M. Gauvin and he is content to reconsider the timetable once we have agreement on the content of the modules both from industry and from contracting parties. We both agree that agreement from the senior levels of industry must be secured to ensure that the necessary resources

will be put into developing the GTR, and to have this before we start work on the technical detail.

What this means in practice is that the preliminary 3-year timetable is suspended while these high level discussions are undertaken and we will agree a new delivery date later in the year. It also means that we will postpone further informal group meetings until we have secured the necessary agreement of industry and our proposed approach has been ratified by WP29/AC3. We can agree the formal submission by email.

It is worth noting by all delegates that the informal group's work has been recognised in AC2 and AC3 as being a valuable contribution to the development of GTRs and the 1998 agreement - especially the group's willingness to look for alternative solutions to apparently intractable problems.

I would find it very helpful if the industry members could consider with their senior managers the issues connected to the modules and the tests for each - and to do this as a matter of urgency over the summer period. If we are to obtain formal approval for the GTR in November 2005 then I will need to have their positive agreement so that I can present this information to AC3. It will also be imperative for the national tyre/rubber associations or individual manufacturers to liaise with their Government representative to AC3 to ensure that full support is provided at the meeting. If we delay this process now, the next opportunity to obtain formal approval will be March 2006.

If you need further information on any of the issues raised then please contact me.

Best wishes,

**Ian Yarnold**

## Proposed GTR structure

<p>For GTR Compliance at least the mandatory requirement plus either module 1 or 2 are required. (Compliance with both modules is permitted.)</p>	<p><b>Mandatory Minimum Requirement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 Marking</li><li>1.2 Dimensions</li><li>1.3 Harmonised High Speed Safety Test</li><li>1.4 Endurance/Low Pressure Test</li><li>1.5 Tyre Wet Grip Adhesion</li></ul>
	<p><b>Module 1 – Permissive Requirement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>2.1 Plunger Energy Test</li><li>2.2 Bead Unseating test</li></ul>
	<p><b>Module 2 – Permissive Requirement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>3.1 Tyre rolling sound</li></ul>