

MINUTES

9th meeting of GRB Informal Group 'ASEP'
Ann Arbor, January 23rd to 25th 2008

0	<u>Attendance</u>	
	NL: Boudewijn Kortbeek (chair), Erik de Graaf; Italy: Amedeo Visconti; Germany: Christian Theis, Lars Schade, Heinz Steven; Spain: Miguel Cruz; Sweden: Sören Hedberg; Japan: Takeharu Tanaka, Yoshihiro Shirahashi; France: L. F. Pardo; USA: Catrice Jefferson, Ken Feith; EC: Wolfgang Schneider; CLEPA: Piet Steenackers; OICA: Dirk Volkenborn, HM. Gerhard, Angela Fletcher-Cook, Ken McAlinden, Akiyoshi Morita, Hanns-Peter Bietenbeck (Secr.); ISO: Doug Moore; NFB: John Pare, Gary Wunder, Van Wilber;	Info
1+3	<u>Opening of the meeting & Housekeeping</u>	
	The Chairman of the working group welcomed the participants. Ken Feith announced the attendance of members from the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) who intend to draw the attention to special needs of blind people. He also explains the role of the EPA Ann Arbor test lab in the development of US legislation in view of exhaust emission.	Info
2	<u>Approval of the agenda</u>	
	On request of Germany, items 5 and 8 will be combined Additional presentations: - GRBIG-ASEP-09-006 – CLEPA - GRBIG-ASEP-09-007 - NL	Decision
4	<u>Approval of Minutes of the 7th meeting</u>	
	The draft minutes were corrected and will be made available via the UN website	Info
5	<u>Status of the proposals</u>	
	For all three proposals that are in discussion (D/F/J, OICA NL expert), the limits need to be fixed. The NL proposal, that currently is speed based, might be adapted after the analysis of data. The OICA proposal requires a strict format in order to be analyzed. Only a part of the proposal is available in that format, the other data needs to be transformed prior to analysis. OICA therefore requests more time. After some discussions that included the proposal to drop the OICA method due to the lack of results, it was decided to postpone the evaluation of that	

<p>method. The Chairman decided that data shall be transformed and made available until February 11th; otherwise the method would be given up.</p> <p>D presents GRBIG-ASEP-09-005</p> <p>D added that the limitation could either be based on the dedicated limit value or on the individual TA value. The basic idea was to give a benefit to silent vehicles. The accuracy of the method partly depends on the value for tire noise. That value however is critical as the tire noise emission is influenced by the temperature during the measurement. As no explicit determination of the tire noise shall be carried out, the value must either come from the tire manufacture in a generic form or must be calculated from the measured pass by test. The accuracy of that value is subject to a later presentation coming from France. Another critical item is the definition of the anchor point that fixes the limitation curve. It can either be based on $L_{wot\ high}$ or from the limit value. OICA proposes to use the individual TA value. An anchor point based on the limit value, this would decouple the sound emission in higher engine speeds from the behavior in the Annex 3 test and leave an unregulated range for aftermarket. As ECE-R 59 is intended to use the same test procedure, a political decision about the use of an extra margin is needed. Before making up an opinion, J must analyze the new D/F proposal.</p> <p>D informed the group that 125 sets of results were now in the database. OICA remarked that some results came from vehicles that have not correctly been tested according to Annex 3. Those results should be reviewed. D will correct the data and distribute to the group.</p> <p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-008</p> <p>The Chairman summarized that is good to see that even with two different approaches the final result was similar. He proposes that D and F should propose a decision for one of the approaches. CLEPA remarks that it is difficult to find a decision when always new proposals or changes to the existing proposals are presented. S prefers an anchor point based on the limit as a TA value based limit would be a driver for technology. This however is not the intention of Annex 10. At the suggestion of D, the Chairman repeated the strong points of each method and asked the group to make a decision for one of the method that shall indicate the further proceeding. D remarked that even for its specialist it would be difficult to decide for one of the methods. An intense analysis of the data is necessary. It must be ensured that eventually only the rejection of vehicles must technically be founded. CLEPA returned that a final choice would not be necessary, however a concentration n one method would be beneficial. OICA proposes to prepare a list that compares pros and cons of each method. This can be the base for a decision for one of the methods. D has difficulties in evaluating the result as the vehicles behind the data are not known and asked OICA to deliver more details about the vehicles. D wants to avoid that 'wanted' vehicles are discriminated. OICA returns that pure</p>	<p>Action OICA</p> <p>Action: D</p>
---	---

	data should enable to develop the method. Members must be asked if they agree to deliver more data. D, F and NL agreed to deliver more details until Feb 4 th . US repeats its reservations against a too sophisticated regulation that risks failing its goals.	Action OICA D/F/NL
6	<u>Contribution from CLEPA</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-006</p> <p>CLEPA underlines its interest to not only fulfilling legal requirements but furthermore to deliver results that are identical to original parts. CLEPA also repeats the information that an exhaust system that is equipped with a valve has the potential for a positive effect on the noise emission. CLEPA propose that only vehicles with variable geometry are tested to according to Annex 10. NL expresses the concern that vehicles with a slope of 12 dB(A) would not be tested. CLEPA answers that such a behavior was only possible with a system containing valves.</p>	Info
7	<u>Latest version of D/F proposal</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-004</p> <p>OICA remarked that the used engine speed curve was not guidance for the development of Annex 3. The scope for Annex 3 is acceleration +kp. The proposal is based on a legal limit that is not known. As potentially every vehicle can be close to the limit, it is therefore impossible to evaluate the proposal.</p>	Info
8	<u>Tour de table – Choice of test method</u>	
	<p>The Chairman asked all members for their opinion on the currently available proposal. The result is that the majority favors the D/F method. Reservations were expressed that the method should not be tailored to discriminate a certain percentage of vehicles. As well most participants welcomed the approach to concentrate on one method. While the NL proposal was completely dropped, the OICA concept shall prosecuted. OICA expressed the advantage of the OICA concept that this would prohibit aftermarket exhaust systems to be louder than original parts.</p>	Decision
9	<u>Presentation of the National Federation of the Blind - NFB</u>	

	<p>A delegation of the NFB presented the specific concerns of blind people in urban traffic. Vehicles with too low sound emission become invisible for blind pedestrians. This is valid for bicycles as well as for cars, specifically electric driven ones. Typical sound pattern is needed in order to recognize the exact traffic situation. While this is obvious for blind people, it is also valid for people other people. One of the consequences of low noise vehicle is the reduced mobility of blind people. One already existing problem are permanent and nor moving sound emitters such as jackhammers as they hide other noise sources.</p> <p>The US proposed to forward these issued to WP29 for further consideration, D in the function as Chairman of GRB invited the NFB to present the concern to GRB during the next meeting.</p>	
10	<u>Analysis of Database</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-007</p> <p>The following discussion ended with the proposal from OICA to concentrate on normal vehicles when developing the test method and leave the extreme vehicles aside for the time being.</p>	Info
11	<u>Evaluation of uncertainties</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-002</p> <p>ISO announced to present an analysis of data from the database in view of tolerances during the following meeting. F clarified that the uncertainty of 1.8 dB(A) of the F/D method would be under-run in 95% of all cases. F, ISO and OICA agreed to discuss the concern of uncertainties</p>	Action ISO
12	<u>Reproducibility of NL method</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-009</p> <p>ISO concluded that consistent behavior is needed for low uncertainties. Modern engine management is very sophisticated so that every rpm can be treated individually under the aspect of optimized fuel consumption. This may lead to accelerations depending on the actual rpm.</p>	Info
13	<u>Opportunities for integration of the methods</u>	
	<p>This subject is postponed. Members are invited to deliver contributions at any time.</p>	Decision

14	<u>Conclusion, Choices follow up</u>	
	<p>OICA announced to analyze the available data according to the OICA concept prior to the next meeting</p> <p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-09-010</p> <p>OICA explained the possible conflicts arising from the D/F proposal. The current status of the proposal would enable the possibility that a measurement value used for the determination of the Annex 3 result might with hindsight become illegal. This possibility should be excluded. The likelihood of an L_{woti} lying above the Annex 10 limit curve is influenced by the Annex 3 limit, l_{crs}, slope of the Annex limit curve, base margin and Delta N. D proposed the use of low noise tires to resolve the problem. D announced to analyze the available data in view of this concern, OICA will work on a solution.</p>	Action D OICA
15	<u>Any other business</u>	
	<p>D asked OICA about the possibilities for cheating within the new Annex 3 test. US named the opportunities of recalls as an effective manner to prevent cheating. OICA proposed to give ISO the mandate to develop a roadside enforcement check.</p>	Info
16	<u>Text proposal for ASEP</u>	
	<p>The Chairman will prepare a text for the next meeting</p> <p>In terms of the scope of vehicles to be tested it was again stated, that it is not intended to apply the Annex 10 test to all vehicles. However it is difficult to define the range of concerned vehicle. OICA proposes only to vehicle that have an exhaust system with variable geometry, EC refuses this proposal with the remark that potentially every vehicle could be tested.</p>	Action NL
11	<u>Next meeting</u>	
	<p>Next meeting will take place on Monday Feb 18th, starting 13.00</p>	
12	<u>Closure of the meeting</u>	