5.-7. September 2005

42. GRB

Different Scenarios for the Implementation of the New Test Method



Content

- 1. Scenario I (Proposed by WP. 29)
- 2. Scenario II
- 3. Scenario III
- 4. Alternative Solutions
- 5. Conclusions



- ECE-R 51.02 stays as it is and the new test method has to be added.
- Vehicles have to be tested according two methods:
 - For type approval according ECE-R 51.02
 - For data collection according the new methods



Advantages:

- The new method is inserted into the regulation ("frozen")
- Experience with the new method
- Increase of vehicle data base
- Adoption of the new method can be done very quick



Disadvantages:

- Increase of the time delay
- Increase of costs for type approval
- No benefit for the environment



Time schedule:

Action	Date
Adoption of the new method at 42. GRB incl. a period of 24 month (data-collection)	09/2005
Adoption of GRB proposal at WP.29	03/2006
Date of entry into force	01/2007
Collection of data until	01/2009
Analysis of data (contracting parties)	07/2009
Proposals for limit values (contracting parties) 44. GRB	09/2009
Recommendations for limit values 45.GRB	02/2010
Starting point for a cost benefit analysis	04/2010
Results of the cost benefit study	07/2011
Discussion of the results and limit values (GRB)	02/2012
Proposal for WP.29	06/2012
Date of entry into force	03/2013
Transitional provisions?	24 month?



- New Series of Amendment ECE-R 51.03
- Content of ECE 51.03
 - New test method
 - New limit values (all vehicle categories)
 - Test procedure for "Off cycle emission provisions"



Advantages:

- Benefit for the environment
- Costs for testing are minimized



Disadvantages:

- Test procedure for "off cycle emissions" is <u>not</u> available
- Data base for HDV needs more measurement results
- "Informal Group" needs more time



Time schedule:

Action	Date
Informal document prepared during 42. GRB, depending on the discussion during this meeting	09/2005
Adoption of the new method incl. limit values at 43. GRB	02/2006
Discussion of GRB proposal at WP.29	06/2006
Starting point for discussion inside EU	04/2006
3 years discussion inside EU (incl. cost benefit analysis) Proposal for WP.29; Adoption in WP.29	06/2009
Date of entry into force	03/2010

- ECE-R 51.02 stays as it is and the new test method with limit values for M₁, N₁, M₂≤ 3500 kg and N₂ ≤ 3500 kg have to be inserted
- Vehicles of the above mentioned categories have to be tested according two methods and have to fulfil both limit values
- Vehicles of other categories have to be tested according ECE-R 51.02



Advantages:

- Benefit for the environment
- The new method is inserted into the regulation ("frozen")
- Experience with the new method for HDV
- Increase of vehicle data base for HDV
- Adoption of the new method can be done very quick
- ECE-R 51.02 becomes "place holder" for "off-cycles"
- Proposals for limit values (M₁, N₁,...) are available



Disadvantages:

- Additional Amendment for HDV is necessary
- Costs for type approval



Time schedule:

Action	Date
Informal document prepared during 42. GRB, depending on the discussion during this meeting	09/2005
Adoption of the new method incl. limit values at 43. GRB	02/2006
Discussion of GRB proposal at WP.29	06/2006
Starting point for discussion inside EU	04/2006
In the case where scenario III can be adopted at CATP on European level a voting during the 140. WP.29 meeting can be possible	11/2006
Date of entry into force	08/2007



Alternative solutions

- More stringent limit values in ECE-R 51.02
- Change of tyre selection in ECE-R 51.02
- Modifications of the scenarios

• ...



Conclusions

.

