

Minutes of 8/R41WG meeting, Geneva, 07/02/20Attendance:

Italy : Messrs Erario (Chairman), Alburno
 Germany : Mr Steven, Mr Redmann, Mr Irnig (environment)
 JASIC,NTSEL: Messrs Tanaka, Inomata, Yonesawa, Oshino, Sakamoto, Naito, Shirahashi, Ohno
 MLIT : Mr Oketani
 MOE : Mr Negishi
 IMMA : Messrs Chesnel, Nakanishi
 ISO : Messrs Segers, Moore
 USA : Mr Feith
 NL : Mr Stoffels, Kortbeek
 ETRTO : Mr Dimitri
 EU : Mr Schneider

1. Minutes of 7/R41WG session

Agreed : The minutes of 7/R41WG session (16-R41WG-06 of 06/09/22).

2. Revision of R412.1 The Presentation from DEG to R41WG

Documents: 03-R41WG-07, the presentation from DEG

: 04-R41WG-07, the communication from India

Noted : The Chairman acknowledged the presentation made by the DEG

: The test results database had confirmed that 78.7% of the tested vehicles' emitted a noise level of 77dB.

: Tables with percentage coverage for each class separately were available

: Japan comment about the need to get more vehicle data especially on Class1 (up to 80cc)

: Japan said that these 13 extra points had been already generated and would be available to R41WG very soon:

- 4 vehicles in Class1
- 9 vehicles in other Classes 2 and 3

: Germany statement that an exchange of views on limit values could start.

: IMMA supported use of the test results database for beginning the limit value discussion.

: Italy pointed out that R41 had approved the diversity and representativity of the test results database and the discussion on limit values should begin.

: Germany added that some questions were still open such as how to detect motorcycles which were able to circumvent the existing system

: Some vehicles which did use the weakness of the existing R41 system still exhibited high noise levels with the new ISO362-2 test protocol

: A regulatory improvement should be seen from the fact that there would be no weakness in the system anymore to be "useable"

: The EU Commission question on how to identify PTWs which used the weakness of the current system

: TUEV and ISO response that appropriate filter could and would be defined to identify these vehicles so that the correlation study would be not negatively affected

: The question from the USA about the possibility of having 1 limit values for each class or 1 unique limit value for all Classes

: Germany's preference for 1 limit value for each Class.

- : Germany's proposal to amend classification per PMR instead of displacement based on the outcome of WMTC GTR 2
- : USA did foresee difficult future discussions if R41WG decided modifying the method of classification
- : The EU Commission's comment that a high quality and in-depth analysis of the noise level data base could avoid the need for double testing.
- : The USA question about possible unintended consequences on the enforcement side if the method of classification was changed
- : There should be not necessary for police officers to know the exact PMR of the PTW tested
- : A change of method of classification would require to assessing the existing vehicle overlaps between PMR and displacement
- : Italy reminder of the analysis of deviation by using 3 runs instead of 4 runs
- : Italy request to R41WG to comment use of 3 runs instead of 4 by 9/R41WG
- : DEG approval of the useability of 3 runs
- : USA interest for an analysis with 2 runs instead of 3.
- Agreed : R41 agreement that the test result consolidated database (with the addition of 13 points from Japan) represented a good suitably representative range of motorcycles for opening further discussions/decision on limit values
- : The Chairman's summary that the limit values discussion should begin with no delay.
- : Italy would provide USA with an analysis for using 2 runs instead of 3 runs by 9/R41WG

3.1.2 For the revised TUV-ASEP concept

- Noted : The presentation from TUV *(Annex 1)*
- : IMMA statement that more data for ASEP was required and that an internal industry program was starting in order to generate these extra data.
- : The focus of collecting more data points would be for the PMR range [80-150]kW.
- : Germany confirmed that more data were still required but confirmed the high degree of potential success of the ASEP test protocol as defined on today
- : The Federal High Way Institute would be asked to contribute to the German part of testing
- : Japan would contribute to the testing as well.
- : The reminder of the aim of the ASEP concept and the fact that environmental issues were not covered by principle by any type approval test.
- : Germany would like to consider ASEP as an intrinsic part of TA
- : The test protocol would be applied to the same models tested in 2006.
- : There was no need to add further CVT vehicles to the ASEP database
- Agreed : The detailed ASEP test protocol would be circulated to R41WG as soon as possible
- : The analysis of the new ASEP data test would be available by September 2007.

4. The roadside enforcement in use testing

- Noted : The German presentation *(Annex 2)*
- : Annex 3 according to the new ISO362-2 was too complicated and would not be applicable for the new German roadside enforcement testing.
- : USA confirmed that the need to come up with a standardized, simple and enforceable test
- : Screening for noisy motorcycles at the entry of US National Parks (one of the major complaints from citizens) was requiring a standardized, simple and enforceable test
- : The general agreement that writing design specifications in legislations was and would be extremely difficult
- : USA proposal to prohibit designs that offered a possible removal of internal dB eaters
- : A new dynamic drive by test was still the target for Germany
- : EU Commission thanked Germany for the presentation but confirmed the legal problem for having Police Officers riding a PTW through Europe.
- : Japan considered that pass-by roadside enforcement testing was not the solution due to traffic constraints.

- : Japan would like to improve enforcement through easily identifiable markings
 - : The Police would not need any detailed test results database because elements such as entrance speed, Gear, Lwot should be part of Registration documents.
- Agreed : Any future drive by enforcement legislation at National level in Germany would have to be based on data collected in the course of TA testing based on the new R41
- : IMMA and DEG would continue cooperation with Germany about the use of new reference values from the new R41 test protocol for enforcement purposes.

5. Limit values discussion

- Noted : The Chairman asked DEG to analyze the database of test results with the aim to present by September07 a technical report on the correlation between the old and the new method.
- : USA reminder of the impossibility for the car industry to obtain any correlation between the old and the new test method without being forced to do extensive testing (e.g. the WP29 requirement for some double testing period starting July2007).
 - : TUV confirmed that the revision of R41 would produce the same lack of correlation between the old and the new test methods.
 - : TUEV, IMMA and ISO point out that this lack of correlation & the amount of variations would not change over time but were perfectly explainable.
 - : DEG would present to R41WG how the new system would work in practise for all administrations.
 - : The EU Commission expressed that double testing might not be an obligation based on the future data the motorcycle industry would provide to GRB/WP29
 - : The EU Commission could not vote on new limit values without any cost effectiveness of changing the limit values (impact assessment) and asked DEG to start looking at elements to be used for that cost effectiveness.
 - : USA wanted to see quantified the increase of cost associated to the new testing.
 - : USA reaffirmed the need to achieve the most cost effective testing
 - : USA asked IMMA to provide R41WG with average cost of testing
 - : When we began to speak on limit values, a cost benefit analysis for the Global community would be difficult to perform but a cost effectiveness study (e.g. cost per dB reduction) could be effectively done
 - : TUV considered that cost effectiveness should be done at the regional level
 - : The possible use of road noise simulation models to support any cost effectiveness analysis.
- Agreed : DEG would provide by 9/R41WG the group with:
- * an extensive technical analysis of the new R41 test protocol with the right screening/explanations on data
 - * The average cost of testing
 - * Ideas for assessing cost effectiveness

6. Future meeting

- Agreed : 9/R41WG would be held on the 2007/09/03 **in the afternoon** (This is now confirmed)

Philippe C. Chesnel