Note from the Small Working Group on the Cyber Security paper GRVA-05-05rev1

- Webex meeting on 26 March 2020 -

Outcome

The small working group did not resolve any of the issues concerning 5.3 or 7.3 nor did they agree any new text for GRVA. Participants were invited to send any updated text to GRVA 6 as informal documents, noting the conversation had in the group.

Discussion

These notes provide a summary of the conversation held in the small working group. Representatives from EC, UK, FR, DE, JPN, China, US, OICA, aftermarket and others were on the call.

Topic 1: paragraph 5.3.1 to 5.3.4

- All parties putting forward proposals were invited to state if their position had changed. FR, JPN and EC/DE stated that theirs had not and gave explanations for their position.
- The proposals from the European Commission and Germany were studied in more depth. It was noted that:
    - The aim is to assess the criteria and methods used by Technical Services/Approval Authorities (as defined in 5.3.1) and also to assess their application to specific applications in order to help harmonise approaches and outcomes.
    - It was noted by representatives from France that any assessment of another type approval authority would use incomplete information. The process of type approving cyber security is complex. It will involve both an appraisal and audit of the information and processes used and that this may happen several times. The process described in 5.3 does not provide for another approval authority to conduct an audit activity and so, without arranging one, is will be very difficult to appraise the outcome of a type approval
    - It was noted by Japan that the type approval process may take 90-100 days to complete. The time allowed in 5.3 is far shorter and would not enable a full evaluation of the information to a similar level.
    - A representative from OICA iterated that the information provided alone in the type approval documentation is generally not enough for a technical service to reach a decision. They will also need a discussion (the audit part) to be able to judge whether the approach taken by a manufacturer can be justified.
    - It was debated what criteria would be used for assessing the methods and processes used by a technical service. It was further noted that both France and the Russian Federation had provided suggestions for how to harmonise these before type approval begins, with one looking at requirements for technical services and the other the application of an ISO standard for performing an evaluation. It was also noted that harmonising approaches is the objective of the interpretation document
    - The representative from the UK suggest that it might be worth considering decoupling the requirements for harmonising the processes and methods used from the assessment of their application.

- o It was noted that there are regional processes for exchanging information between technical services in order to harmonise processes but no equivalent at the UN.
- o The implementation of 5.3.3. was discussed.
  - It was noted that when the start of the 14 days begins was not stated.
  - It was noted that the requirement relies on self-reporting by the contracting party that others have an issue with.
  - It was noted that the effect of 5.3.3. would be that the self-reporting contracting party would be unable to issue type approvals until an objection was resolved at either WP29 or GRVA and this could be indefinite. This would have impact on that CP and any associated manufacturers. The EC representative did consider limiting how long GRVA/WP29 may have to consider a dispute. It was unclear what would happen if the issue were not resolved after such a time period.
  - The capacity and capability of WP29 or GRVA to resolve such disputes was questioned.
- The proposals from France and the Russian Federation had some support but were not discussed in depth.

Topic 2: 7.3.1

The revised text from OICA was discussed.

It was noted that it contains two criteria for the exemption. The first is that a manufacturer can demonstrate why it should be used and the second that it is within the qualifying time.

It was noted that the vehicle type is the electrical architecture of a vehicle. The representative from OICA stated that it can take 48-72 months to develop such an architecture.

There was some support for the proposal from Germany but the representatives from the EC and France wanted to reflect more on the wording and the time derogation.

Topics 3: 7.3.4

Proposals from Germany and OICA were discussed.

It was noted that the DE proposal refocused the requirement onto the vehicle type and provided for manufacturers propose an alternative mitigation for a limited time if that described in annex 5 was "technically not feasible" within a current architecture and this could be explained.

Representatives from France and the European Commission stated they would need time to reflect on the second paragraph and the time derogation.

The OICA proposal was not supported by the contracting parties that spoke as it weakened the original requirements too much and therefore would not be acceptable to them.

A.O.B

It was noted that OICA wished to propose further amendments to the text of the regulation.