



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2008/70
10 April 2008

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

World Forum for Harmonization of Vehicle Regulations

One-hundred-and-forty-fifth session
Geneva, 24-27 June 2008
Item 5.2.2 of the provisional agenda

1998 AGREEMENT (GLOBAL)

Consideration of new draft global technical regulations

Report on the development of draft global technical regulation
on electronic stability control systems

Submitted by the Working Party on Brakes and Running Gear (GRRF) */

The text reproduced below was adopted by GRRF at its sixty-third session (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/63, paras. 45 and 46). It is based on Annex IV to the GRRF report and the consensus decision of the Executive Committee to the 1998 Agreement (AC.3) at its March 2008 session (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1066, para. 65). It is submitted to WP.29 and AC.3 for consideration.

*/ In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2006-2010 (ECE/TRANS/166/Add.1, programme activity 02.4), the World Forum will develop, harmonize and update Regulations in order to enhance performance of vehicles. The present document is submitted in conformity with that mandate.

PROGRESS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF
A GLOBAL TECHNICAL REGULATION ON
ELECTRONIC STABILITY CONTROL (ESC) FOR LIGHT VEHICLES

A. OBJECTIVE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide details on the progress made on the development of a global technical regulation (gtr) for Electronic Stability Control systems for Light Vehicles (ESC) and seek guidance on the last few remaining issues that could not be resolved at GRRF. It also makes recommendations concerning adoption of the regulation should the issues be resolved by the Executive Committee of the 1998 Agreement.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGULATION

The Executive Committee of the 1998 Agreement (AC.3) tasked GRRF to develop the regulation following its acceptance of the formal proposal from the United States of America (United States) seeking to establish a gtr in this area. The document, which contains the safety rationale, consulted regulations and standards, etc., can be found under the following reference: ECE/TRANS/WP.29/AC.3/16 dated on 2 May 2007. AC.3 further instructed GRRF to plan its work expeditiously so that the regulation can be adopted by mid 2008.

Under the guidelines governing the development of a gtr, GRRF immediately began work through an informal working group that met June 2007. The ESC informal working group deliberated further at a second meeting in September 2007 before providing a progress report to the GRRF September session. GRRF accepted much of the work, provided guidance on the remaining parts, and further tasked the informal working group to meet for a third time to address the open issues (this meeting took place in January 2008). The informal working group presented its second progress report to GRRF at its February 2008 session, where the updated latest draft was accepted with just a few issues still remaining. GRRF is now seeking guidance from AC.3 to help resolve the last outstanding issues.

C. DESCRIPTION OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Informal document No. WP.29-144-05 is the latest complete draft of the gtr on ESC. That draft contains bracketed alternatives on two areas of disagreement in the text of the regulation. These are:

1. Paragraph 5.5.1.: The last paragraph in the paragraph requires the default mode of an ESC system for a particular drive configuration (for the rare cases when there are multiple ESC modes available that all satisfy the requirements of the regulation) to be the one with the highest margin of compliance relative to the stability requirement described in paragraph 5.1. The manufacturers and several Contracting Parties (CPs) argue that the best default modes for each drive configuration are not necessarily the ones with the highest margin of compliance relative to the stability performance requirement in paragraph 5.1., but the ones that manufacturers specify based on their own analysis. As such, they have proposed alternative text that allows each manufacturer to specify the safest mode for each vehicle drive configuration.

2. Paragraph 5.5.3.: This paragraph requires multipurpose controls that have the function of deactivating the ESC system to be labelled with either the text "ESC OFF" or the ISO ESC symbol in conjunction with the word "OFF". Industry and most CPs have opposed this as unnecessary (with regard to safety) since there is also a tell-tale that indicates when ESC has been deactivated. The alternative text offered simply requires that the control be labelled with either "ESC" or the ISO symbol for ESC.

D. GUIDANCE, BY CONSENSUS DECISION OF AC.3

At its March 2008 session, AC.3 considered the above mentioned pending issues (WP.29-144-05) and agreed by consensus decision with the proposal by the GRRF Chairman (WP.29-144-28). The secretariat was requested to incorporate the amendments adopted into the draft gtr, for its consideration and vote at the June 2008 session. AC.3 invited the GRRF Chairman, in connection with the technical sponsors, to provide the secretariat, in due time, with an updated text of the preamble taking into account the decisions made during the session.
