

Minutes of 6/R41WG meeting, Geneva, 06/04/24

Attendance:

Italy : Messrs Erario (Chairman), Alburno
Germany : Mr Steven
JASIC,NTSEL: Messrs Tanaka, Inomata, Yonesawa
United Kingdom: Mr Ainge
IMMA : Messrs Rogers, Tsujimura, Chesnel
ISO : Mr Segers
FEMA : Mr Tomlins

1. Minutes of 5/R41WG session

Agreed : The Minutes of 5/R41WG session (05-R41WG-06 of 06/02/27).

2. Overall test programme for base TA & ASEP/OCE

Document : The ASEP proposal from TUV/Germany

(06-R41WG-06-ann2.doc)

Noted : The confirmation from Germany that the proposed test protocol would be used during the measurement campaign.

: The reminder that the prescriptions for automatic transmissions of scooters had been added in the ISO362-2 and sufficiently high engine speeds were associated with CVT categories.

: An appropriate standardised test report format, covering ISO362-2, ASEP and the enforcement drive-by test with examples would be designed by TUV.

: In reply to FEMA, Germany confirmed that their ASEP would not be established for covering rural conditions but for covering a significant area in the engine's operating conditions.

: Italy's suggestion that if a good repeatability was obtained during the test programme, it might be possible to reduce the number of tests required in the final regulatory texts.

: ISO asked TUV to detail how the additional tests needed to be conducted.

: Other gears beside the 2nd gear could be used for small motorcycles.

: The 2nd gear might be the gear predominantly used for big motorcycles.

: The need to study the number of data points when using both 2nd and 3rd gears at the end of the test programme.

: Possible exemption for some vehicles would be studied in the light of the results.

: In case of low rpm vehicles –below 40 kW/t-, the current equation result in the ASEP test was exceeding the rated engine speed S.

: TUV agreed that engine speed should be limited and this could be to 85% of S.

: FEMA stated that in the context of noise control, the small motorcycles were under-represented and suggested the addition of 50cc mopeds.

: The confirmation that the sampling of motorcycles would be considered to cover all needs but that mopeds were outside the scope of R41.

: The IMMA outline of a pre-selection of vehicles

(Annex1.ppt)

: 30 vehicles had been confirmed so far.

: Japan added that they had a unique category of 50cc they planned to add to the testing.

: TUV explained that BAST intended to test 8 motorcycles as follows:

- 1 x Supersport
- 1 x Touring
- 1 x Chopper (V2)
- 1 x Boxer-engine (BMW)
- 1 x 74kW motorcycle (ZZR-600)
- 1 x Beginner-motorcycle (CBF 600)
- 1 x 125cc automatic transmission
- 1 x 125cc gearbox

- Agreed : The test protocol procedure for the correlation/verification testing would be updated with the missing elements and with the discussed recommendations. *(Annex2.zip)*
- : The final version of the test protocol and the associated data-entry sheets would be produced by TUV and sent to the R41WG Secretariat by the 06/05/05 for circulation to the group.
- : Comments would be required at the latest by the 06/05/12.
- : Results should be generated by the end of July.
- : They would be analysed and presented first in this group and then in time for the next full GRB meeting of September.

3. The roadside enforcement testing

Document : The drive-by test proposals from TUV/Germany *(06-R41WG-06-ann1.doc)*

- Noted : The possible new test to make enforcement testing more effective was presented by Germany
- : The estimation of engine speeds seemed to be correct.
- : IMMA asked TUV how this practical testing would be implemented into the legislation: would it be done through Reference values associated to TA values or through limit values?
- : The reminder that the group had agreed to consider how to use the WOT test part of the ISO 362-2 for roadside enforcement testing, in a simplified form along the road side.
- : There was no final German view on how the drive-by test should be integrated into the revision of Reg41.
- : As the first step, TUV would like to check the proposal in terms of feasibility.
- : The legal and practical concerns should be dealt with in a second step.
- : Legal aspects should be at the first consideration from the FEMA standpoint
- : FEMA asked what would happen if the rider did refuse to ride the test
- : FEMA asked who would be going to manage the road side test
- : TUV added that, at least in Germany, the police would be the only body allowed to run the test
- : FEMA pointed out that based on a noise control survey of 35 Countries, this sort of testing would be illegal in some countries. A pass-by road side test was not realistic from the FEMA standpoint based on the outcome of that noise control survey.
- : TRL/UK wanted to understand how the background noise in an urban environment would be dealt with.
- : TUV responded that a correction factor would be introduced in case of a high background noise level.
- : Japan supported a roadside enforcement testing but wanted to know the possible influence of road surfaces and other factors.
- : IMMA wanted to know if Germany enforced a regulation (equivalent directive to Reg92) for the type approval of replacement exhaust systems.
- : TUV would ask the German Administration to answer IMMA directly.
- Agreed : The detailed discussion would be deferred to the next group meeting.

4. Future meeting

- Agreed : The provisional date of the morning 06/09/04 would be confirmed once the documents had been received
: The reminder that comments in writing should be received one month in advance.

Philippe C. Chesnel