

**Common Tasks**  
**Second informal meeting**  
**04 April 2002**  
**Ottawa**

Mr. Derek Sweet, Director General of Road Safety, Transport Canada welcomes the Meeting to Ottawa and specifically to Transport Canada.

Mr. Onoda thanks Transport Canada for the organisation and welcomes all participants. He explains the background of the meeting and the documents introduced: the timeframe indicated by WP29 for the Common Tasks work makes it imperative to reach basic agreement on the proposal drafted by Japan with the assistance from OICA and on the comments submitted by various parties.

It is agreed to work on the basis of document CTinf2-3. This reflects all the comments introduced as well as references to the document in which the comment can be found. The column "Japanese response and justification" is a proposed draft reaction to each comment.

Summary of the discussion held in the meeting as well as the decisions reached can be found in document CT2-3 Amd. The last column in red reflects the discussions of the meeting. Action points are highlighted in green.

The following general points are still outstanding:

- ?? Title: agreed to add a footnote to clarify the intention of the document. Drafting is still necessary.
- ?? Category names: numbers or abbreviations? Decision in next CT meeting
- ?? Subcategories for Category 2: further discussion in next CT meeting on the basis of three categories (with 3.5 and 7.5t as breakpoints). Contracting parties can propose additional breakpoints, but these will only be accepted if there are good (safety and/or environmental) reasons to do so. OICA is requested to study the issue further, including a possible deletion of the 7.5 t breakpoint.  
Unclear if the breakpoint of 2t proposed by EU Commission will need to be retained in the GTR 0 or can be covered in the specific GTRs
- ?? Format: needs to be amended to reflect format as discussed (and agreed?) in last WP29. (See document 2002/25).
- ?? Definition of "Seating Position" must be added. OICA will study the issue.
- ?? Distinction between Category 1 and 2 could be expressed clearer; Residual paymass needs to be defined more clearly. OICA will see if it is possible to use a mathematical formula.
- ?? The concept of a "range of vehicles or vehicle type" in relation to a range of masses in running order needs to be studied further. OICA will present more data, explaining that it is not a matter of Type Approval and referring to what will be the consequences for the situation in Europe, ...
- ?? Formula for paymass of Category 1-2 vehicles: to decide if this should go in the GTR "0", as it seems more a requirement than a definition.

The above points need to be discussed in the Common Tasks Meeting on 29-30 April.

Ben Van Assche  
Secretary to the Common Tasks Group