

Minutes of 10/R41WG meeting, Geneva, 08/02/19Attendance:

Italy : Messrs Erario (Chairman), Alburno, Visconti
 USA : Mr Feith
 Czech Republic : Mr Vlastimil Strnad
 France : Messrs Ficheux, Le Roux
 South Africa : Mr Bond
 Germany : Mr Steven, Mr Schade, Mr Wrobel and Me Annegret Hauschild
 India : Mr Raju
 JASIC,NTSEL: Messrs Inomata, Yonesawa, Oshino, Naito, Shirahashi, Ohno, Sakamoto
 MLIT : Mr Iwasa, Ishiguro
 IMMA : Messrs Chesnel, Nakanishi, Rogers
 ISO : Messrs Moore, Segers
 NL : Messrs Stoffels, Kortbeek, De Graaff
 ETRTO : Mr Dimitri
 EU : Mr Schneider
 AMA : Mr Robert W. Rasor
 CLEPA : Messrs Laurent, Steenackers, Valgaeren
 OICA : Messrs Gerhard, Glowczenski

1. Minutes of 9/R41WG session

Agreed : The minutes of 9/R41WG session (07-R41WG-07 of 07/11/07).

2. Outcome of 5/DEG

Noted : The minutes of 5/DEG held in January 2008 would be put on the UNECE website as well.

3. The Presentation from DEG to R41WG

Noted : The DEG Chairman's presentation (*Annex1.ppt*) to which the key conclusions were:
 : The origin of the tested vehicles would be added to a new version of the R41 noise database but the noise data itself did not change
 : The inclusion of a "target acceleration rate" requirement to be achieved during the WOT testing (the current legal text was only requiring a full opened throttle)
 : The inclusion of anti-tampering provisions.
 : The reminder that some evidence existed that RESS manufacturers could tune their systems to meet the stationary test and nothing else (ie. RESS being approved without back-to-back drive-by noise test)
 : Administrations would get the necessary additional noise information to repeat the test at the road side although some legal restrictions of what could be done by the police at the road side might complicate the implementation of such test
 : Contracting Parties might want to modify these legal restrictions to allow the police officer to do the work (ie. who should drive the vehicle? how practical problems would be solved?)
 : The question of how much tolerance on the result each Contracting Party would like to add would remain a national preference
 : The DEG Chairman thought that the DEG tasks had been achieved taking into account the comments received
 : The reminder that DEG should not deal with limits: this would be for R41WG and GRB.
 : NL wondered if a more detailed view of the road side enforcement testing could be given
 : The DEG Chairman pointed out that the road side enforcement test would remain optional, as

- an alternative to the current stationary test after the drive/pass by under load test
- : This test would give a stationary test reference value during the TA which could be used for assessing the conformity of any in use OE system or any RESS exhaust system
This would be a clear direct take from the TA, under load.
- : The new data provided would be the entrance speed, the noise level and the lowest gear from the WOT test from the base ISO test
- : NL mentioned that their police explained that a stationary test was uneasy to do with motorcycles (but easy to do with mopeds).
- : The reminder that in NL, the old national TA for mopeds was full throttle based while the EU TA for mopeds was different requesting to keep the engine speed at 3/4 S.
- : Keeping the same use of 3/4S for motorcycles would render the testing as difficult.
- : DEG replied that any modifications to make the current stationary test easier should be welcomed.
- : A proper training of future enforcement officers would be necessary
- : DEG did not suggest using the new road side enforcement testing if a country was happy with what it had currently in use.
- : The DEG Chairman proposed NL to specify what to simplify in the stationary test
- : The reminder from India of the limited correlation between the stationary test and the road side test.
- : The USA concern that the lack of direct or indirect (ie mathematical) correlation was still a continuing problem.
- : The DEG Chairman replied that DEG did not look for any correlation principle between a drive by value and the stationary value (which was in the near field)
- : USA added that enforcement would remain an important concern and recommended finding a solution to implement possibly during the periodic inspections.
- : There was no practical solution to the implementation for any valuable legal road side test to find the majority of the noise violators.
- : Germany explained that a UBA bench testing had been done successfully for mopeds in the past but running a drive/pass by test (under load) with load mobile test bench would not work for powerful MCs (ie. huge test bench with adequate acoustic insulation would be needed for motorcycles).
- : India added that mobile testing equipment as what existed for emissions might be possible to be developed.
- : IMMA reaffirmed the industry support to enforcement and reminded R41WG that IMMA had provided in the past GRB with the "Curious Silence" publication
- : NL asked for any experience on mobile bench for MCs and called Germany for providing GRB with any new elaborated information on this subject.
- : Germany explained that TUV had already demonstrated that only 1/3 of the illegal motorcycles were caught during a stationary test but 2/3 illegal motorcycles did pass it
- : The general agreement that Administrations could not rely on the stationary test by itself as long as RESS approvals were granted without necessary back-to-back testing
- : India practical concern of the implementation of any road side enforcement WOT test
- : The reminder that the proposed revision of R41 should deliver the best guarantees for noise emission control in the real world
- : The reminder of the poor correlation between the old and the new noise data as a supplementary demonstration of the justification of a revision of Reg41

3. Structure of the draft amendment of Reg41

- Noted
- : The Version 6 of the draft amendment made by DEG as *Annex2.doc*
 - : The addition of important sections in V6 such as:
 - *Section 5.9 for the reporting of additional information in the communication form & test report in relation with the content of Annex1
 - *Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 referencing the new ASEP related Annex7

*Section 6.5 for anti tampering provisions

- : DEG confirmed that Annex7 did replicate the test protocol used for measuring the ASEP data contained in the noise database
 - : The question of engine speed's tolerancing would be treated by DEG
- : The question of COP provisions would be covered under Section 8.3
- : The new drive-by TA test and WOT test reference values (noise level; entrance speed; gear) for roadside enforcement test would be covered in Annex3
- : The PMR classification in Annex6 was still under discussion
- : The R41WG Chairman's intent to present the final version of the draft amendment as a formal document to GRB
- : The R41WG Chairman proposed that all R41 participants would send their comments to Italy
- : USA suggested adding a sort of Preamble to describe why Rev41 was under revision
- : Germany asked what was the status of such DEG document and asked R41WG to review Annex2 before it became a formal approved R41WG document
- : R41WG should decide if this document as a R41WG document should be sent to GRB
- : IMMA idea was to produce a consolidation of all the comments on Annex2 to have a more productive discussion and asked R41WG how long R41WG Members would like to see the draft amendment
- Agreed : A Preamble would be written by DEG for review at 11/R41WG
- : Informal paper8 from GRB would be withdrawn because it was not a R41WG formal document
- : R41WG would comment that Annex2 document by May 31th
- : If agreed by R41WG, the draft amendment of Reg41 would be reported as a status informal document to GRB in September

4. Limit values discussion

- Noted : Japan expressed its wish to push the limit values discussion
- : The proposal from Germany to present a discussion document on limit values at 11/R41WG
- Agreed : The future presentation from Germany at 11/R41WG for starting the discussion on limit values

5. Examples of Noise models

- Noted : Germany pointed out that some noise models (such as the one from Italy) for assessing in real world traffic situations limit value reductions scenarios did not include motorcycles.
- : Including a noise model for a city the number of 2PTWs
- Agreed : Germany would present at 11/R41WG a list of scenarios to use with noise models and would deliver his own calculation using its current model & scenario(s)

6. Future meeting

- Agreed : 11/R41WG would be held on **2008/09/01 (pm)**

Philippe C. Chesnel