

Minutes of 7/R41WG meeting, Geneva, 06/09/04Attendance:

Italy : Messrs Erario (Chairman), Alburno
 Germany : Mr Steven, Mr Redmann, Mr Gehard
 JASIC,NTSEL: Messrs Tanaka, Inomata, Yonesawa, Morita
 UK : Mr Ainge
 IMMA : Messrs Rogers, Tsujimura, Chesnel, Nakanishi, Jaeger
 ISO : Mr Segers
 FEMA : Mr Tomlins
 USA : Mr Feith
 France : Mr Ficheux, Mrs Papes
 NL : Mr Stoffels
 ETRTO : Mr Dimitri
 South Africa : Mr Bond
 India : Mr Raju

1. Minutes of 6/R41WG session

Agreed : The minutes of 6/R41WG session (09-R41WG-06 of 06/05/04).

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

Documents: The presentation from IMMA

(Annex 1)

: The presentation from TUV

(Annex 2)

Noted : The R41WG data collection experts' summary of the outcome of the data collection group meeting held on the 2006/09/01 in Geneva:

- The repeatability and practicability of the new ISO362-2 test procedure was confirmed
- The consolidation of the DB would be done with the latest received results from BAST
- The need to confirm through the analysis of the test result consolidated DB if it represented a good suitably representative range of motorcycles for:
 further discussions/decision on limit values
 validation of any ASEP final proposal
- If not, more testing should have to be possibly done
- The data collection group was unable to consolidate the test result DB on time for that R41WG session.
- Initial graphs would not be sufficient on today to answer all the remaining technical questions
- R41WG should decide if ASEP would be a procedure that administrations could use if needed or if it should be part of TA as a principle.
- The existing ASEP draft procedure was not solid as it should be and should be more clearly detailed in order to avoid any interpretation problem.
- A revised ASEP approach based on an adaptation of the French/German proposal on ASEP for M1 vehicles.
- The need to confirm if the group had enough test data to be able to assess/validate the new ASEP concept or if extra testing was required.
- The recommendation to R41WG to continue monitoring R51 ASEP TF discussions for any relevance to R41WG discussions

: The need to assess the relative role (and efficiency) of COP in TA testing and in roadside enforcement testing.

- : USA wanted to know if IMMA anticipated having different classes with different limit values
- : The IMMA SG replied that there was still some hope to have 1 limit value applied right across the range of motorcycles.
- : Italy added that repeatability of the testing should be good enough and should be assessed in order to assess if there was any room for reduction of number of tests
- : Personal opinion of the USA delegate was that the roadside test was far more important than TA related testing.
- : IMMA stated that administrative structures for supporting enforcement had to be assumed to exist.
- : The need to clarify the role of limit values vs reference values
- : The reminder from the IMMA SG to the group that it would be more productive to deal with the TA+ASEP and start subsequently a discussion on limit values.
- : The enforcement question should be discussed separately from the IMMA viewpoint.
- : FEMA supported the decoupling of issues presented by IMMA.
- : The need to discuss whether Reg41 or Reg92 should be used as an enforcement tool and if so how : this should become a policy level discussion.
- : There would be no resolution of the German problem through TA but there is a need to relate TA and roadside enforcement testing.
- : Germany added that roadside enforcement, TA and ASEP should be part of one single package.
- : USA confirmed that states and locals had great difficulties in prosecuting noise violations.
- : FEMA question about how do we determined someone was in violation.
- : Test values for any “in use roadside test” should be different from the ones for TA and COP.
- : ASEP would set up a box defined by vehicle condition/engine condition.
- : Instead of having 1 single check for the maximum engine speed in the all area, the ASEP would check the noise emission behaviour through a range of speeds around an ISO reference value (which came from Annex3).
- : Germany wanted to have ASEP testing to be done where WOT should be stable.
- : Japan asked Germany for explaining their exact concern.
- : Typical riding behaviour that would affect the civil population was above the ISO reference point when the engine went faster.
- : The ISO/WG16 Chairman reminded that what was below the ISO reference point was already taken into account by WG16 when defining ISO362.
- : IMMA stated that the burden of new testing was important and how new testing could be incorporated into the system would be an important issue.
- : There might be a more consistent way of organising things.
- : IMMA did not think it would be appropriate to add new testing under the ISO reference point if no evidence of any problem.
- : USA wanted the data collection group to be comfortable with the data and analysis before eliminating any option of testing.
- : Germany’s explanation that their concern was that the mapping of noise emission behaviour might be not covered enough (very low gear with very high engine speed).
- : Japan’s request to Germany to show more evidence of the problem.
- : BASt results said that engine speed range is an area where to look at
- : The reminder that due to the fact that engine speed S was much wider for a motorcycle than for a car, expressing engine speed variations in absolute values instead than in percentage normalized values might create some artificial problems.
- : IMMA opinion that normalized engine speeds worked better in the use of equations
- : The Chairman’s summary:
 - the new ISO362 test was practical
 - the suitability of the consolidated test result DB needed to be confirmed
 - the first ASEP text had given different ways of achieving results and could not be retained as a workable solution

Agreed

- the ASEP would be simplified by Germany, based on a possible adaptation of the current work made in the ASEP TF for cars, and circulated for checking in the data group.
- the data collection group would validate the revised ASEP proposal.
- the data collection group would provide R41WG with recommendations on time for the next R41WG session

3. The roadside enforcement testing

- Noted : IMMA reminder of the current process:
- when a new vehicle was presented to TA, a drive by test is conducted
 - If it failed, this was the end of it
 - If it passed: ok, you were allowed to do the next test which was the stationary on the day it was approved
- : If you repeated the stationary test at the road side, you should get the same result
- : The reminder that there was no possible physical connection between drive by and stationary.
- : The reminder that the stationary test was implicitly designed for road side checking.
- : The target of any roadside test was that to check if the bike stopped was in conformity with the one you had originally tested.
- : In the ECE system, based on Reg92, TA of RESS devices had to do the drive by test (e.g. a RESS device passed or failed according to the drive by testing).
- : Instead of taking a reference value (stationary), setting a limit value has pluses and minuses
- : It might be necessary to have a range of values for all vehicles.
- : The need to be careful since the very quiet vehicles would be tested against the limit value set up for the most noisy vehicles
- : Use of any universal limit value seemed extremely doubtful.
- : IMMA stated that the burden of new testing was important and how new testing could be incorporated into the system would be an important issue.
- : IMMA questioned where the leak was in the German system and why there was a leak
- : Germany replies were:
- 1) Only 1/3 illegal systems were detected by the stationary test
 - 2) Just doing the stationary test was not effective enough
- : IMMA request for clarification: if those systems were tested according to the drive by test, they should be automatically detected.
- : if you didn't TA the RESS device, there was no way to do any stationary testing, then there was no need of any further testing
- : IMMA requested Germany to answer why the drive back to back test was not enough
- : USA stated that even if you TA after market systems, illegal non certified systems created after market are not caught (baffles removed).
- : The recognition that some sophisticated silencers with certified modes and another mode still under stationary modes but under load conditions produced different answer
- : FEMA acknowledged that some baffles systems (e.g. by lane key or screw) could be removed and had been designed to be modified.
- : Making sure that under TA, removing the baffling system could not be easily done might be part to the answer
- : Put a label on the frame of the bike might be part of the answer.
- : Any form of potential adjustment could be covered at TA, by the worst case procedure.
- : Application of an enforcement scenario was as important as the need to be simple
- : "Enforcement provision" has no correlation with COP or TA
- : FEMA reminded the question of legality and practicality (See document 10RW41-06)
- : FEMA reminded the very high risk associated with any road side enforcement testing
- : Finding a suitable site where to test would be possibly difficult
- : FEMA reminded that such a rolling noise test was not legally permissible in many EU countries

- : FEMA reminded that safe guards for riders were necessary for any road side moving rolling test procedure.
- : The general agreement that a “technically reasonable” solution had to be found
- : USA proposed to adapt the stationary test as a possible realistic solution.
- Agreed : There was no agreement on a new drive by test procedure
- : Any final procedure would have to be enforceable to be effective

4. Future meeting

- Agreed : Documents would be circulated to the data group by the 06/10/31
- : Data of evidence of problems below the ISO reference point would be produced by Germany by the 06/11/22
- : Next meeting for the data collection group would be a half day meeting in Ann Arbor on the 06/11/22.
- : **The morning of 20th February 2007 for a possible R41WG session in conjunction with GRB**

Philippe C. Chesnel