

**(DRAFT) - MINUTES**  
3<sup>rd</sup> GRB Informal Group ASEP Meeting  
Geneva 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2006

<b>0</b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	Action
	Commission EU; Germany; France; Spain; Italy; Japan; Netherlands; Sweden; United Kingdom; ETRTO; ISO; OICA; CLEPA, India;	INFO
<b>1</b>	<b><u>Opening</u></b>	Action
	The chairman welcomed the group, especially the participant from India. He expressed his satisfaction about the numerous participation.	INFO
<b>2</b>	<b><u>Agenda</u></b> Doc GRB-IG-ASEP-003-001	Action
	The proposed agenda was adopted without changes	DECISION
<b>3</b>	<b><u>Adoption of Minutes of the second meeting</u></b> Doc GRB-IG-ASEP-02-011	Action
	The minutes were adopted without any changes or comments	DECISION
<b>4</b>	<b><u>The political statement for the Task Force</u></b> Doc GRB-IG-ASEP-03-002	Action
	<p>The <b>Chairman</b> pointed out that the document shall only support the building of a mind towards the work of the Task Force (TF). It is intended to fix the starting points of the work. While the requirements for the TF have been set by the ASEP group, the TF shall translate them into a method. From the three proposed methods, the strong points shall be used for a final method. Possibly the engine speed is the easiest predictor for irrational sound behaviour. An evaluation of the Off-Cycle behaviour might be based on the TA value.</p> <p><b>Mr. Moore</b> made clear that with a projected finalization of the TF work, a very view clear would be needed. He questioned that it is possible to fulfil all of the given requirements for the test method. He asked for a clear statement, if the test method should check the validity of the Annex 3 test or if another area shall be tested. Likewise he emphasized that for the validation of a potentially proposed test method it is indispensable to identify vehicle of concern!</p> <p>The <b>Chairman</b> confirmed that he time frame is tight. However, initial testing should be done during summer 2006. The test is not intended to check the Annex 3 result but a different area.</p>	INFO

5	<b><u>Clarification paper for positioning of ASEP procedures</u></b>	Action
	Doc GRB-IG-ASEP-03-003	
	<p>The <b>Chairman</b> explained, that the document shall show the already decided main items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- several areas are identified</li> <li>- open pipe devices shall be forbidden</li> <li>- necessary accuracy of the individual areas</li> </ul> <p><b>OICA</b> asked for the purpose of the document and for a clarification of an open pipe requirement.</p> <p>The <b>Chairman</b> commented that the Terms of Reference require a test for another area. However a zone will remain, which a test does not need to cover. Yet, open pipes must be forbidden by an appropriate wording.</p> <p><b>CLEPA</b> expressed its surprise about the open pipe definition as usually only performance requirements are used.</p> <p>The <b>Chairman</b> clarified, that this is only an initial wording which is open for changes</p> <p>The representative of the <b>European Commission</b> noted that to his understanding, the requirements of the ASEP scope should go beyond urban driving, namely higher vehicle speeds must be covered. A reworked definition is needed.</p> <p><b>Mr. Moore</b> asked for clarification if the test should be able to detect open pipe status and remarked, that a ban of open pipes should be avoided. He also asked for a clarification of the range which the test shall cover</p> <p>The <b>Chairman</b> pointed out, that 'open Pipes' are treated in the ASEP core group and the TF's only task is to develop a test method covering area 2</p> <p><b>Mr. Moore</b> stated that vehicles with open pipes will not be included in validation testing</p> <p><b>NL</b> reminded the group that it was already decided not to test above the red line. A contradiction occurs between the performance criteria, the non-detection of open pipes and the red line</p> <p>The <b>Chairman</b> requested the delegates to send their proposals for a wording in the main text to ban 'open pipe devices' to himself and to the secretary. OPD means devices to bypass the muffler(s) but not devices which are only changing the gas flow in the muffler.) After a pre-selection a common proposal shall than be presented to the group during he next meeting.</p> <p><b>Mr. Moore</b> asked for a clear definition of the conditions from the European Commission.</p> <p><b>Germany</b> explained, although 95% of max engine speed appeared to be appropriate for combustion engines, it is difficult to apply this requirement to electrically powered vehicles. A requirement for acceleration should therefore be considered.</p>	DECISIONS

	<p>The <b>European Commission</b> stated that a compromise between engine speed and vehicle speed is needed.</p> <p><b>OICA</b> pointed out that limits can only be set after the development of the test</p> <p><b>Mr. Moore</b> again requested a clarification of the scope</p> <p><b>Germany</b> stated that vehicle speeds above 70km/h are dominated by tyre noise. A tested speed range between 20 km/h and 70 km/h seemed useful.</p> <p>OICA sees 70km/h as upper speed limit for a test as feasible in terms of test facilities. Testing in 2<sup>nd</sup> gear might be adequate. A guideline for the choice of engine speed might be the engine speeds reached during the 51.02 test</p> <p>The Chairman closed the discussion, as all details for the work of the TF are now fixed.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	
	none	INFO
<b>7</b>	<b><u>Next meeting</u></b>	
	The chairman proposed end of April as possible date for the next meeting of the ASEP group. During this meeting, the first results of the TF can be discussed. He asked the delegates to send proposals for date and location of the next meeting to him as soon as possible.	INFO