

<p>MINUTES 10th meeting of GRB Informal Group 'ASEP' Geneva, February 18th 2008</p>

0	<u>Attendance</u>	
	<p>NL: Boudewijn Kortbeek (Chair), Erik de Graaf, Theun Stoffels; Italy: Amedeo Visconti; Germany: Annegret Hausschild, Frank Wrobel, Christian Theis, Lars Schade, Heinz Steven; India: Srinivason Raju; Japan: Ichivo Sakamoto, Ishiguro Yoshimitsa, Hideo Ohno, M. Iwasa, Yoshihiro Shirahashi; France: Serge Ficheux; USA: Ken Feith; EC: Wolfgang Schneider; CLEPA: Piet Steenackers, Rudi Valgaeren; ETRTO: George Dimitri; OICA: Florence Berthet, Stu Showler, Francois Guichard, Manfred Klopotek, Dirk Volkenborn, HM. Gerhard, Hanns-Peter Bietenbeck (Secr.); ISO: Doug Moore; SEMA: Andrea Pinkerton</p>	Info
1	<u>Opening of the meeting</u>	
	The Chairman of the working group welcomed the participants	Info
2	<u>Approval of the agenda</u>	
	The agenda was adopted without changes	Info
3	<u>Housekeeping</u>	
	N/A	Info
4	<u>Revised OICA method</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-10-002</p> <p>The Chairman clarified the ToR do only represent a direction whereas the real work of the Informal Group can go further. The group can therefore also propose a limit. D supported with the hint to the motorcycle group that had changed the terms of reference.</p> <p>D expressed the difficulty to evaluate the proposal as the data format as made available is not adapted to the proposal. OICA explained that the presented proposal was an improvement to the former version. It was elaborated and verified for vehicles that have a PMR ≤ 120 kw/t. The method is applicable to extreme vehicles with a higher PMR as well but that should be looked at separately. D sees no need for another method as long as the D/F proposal works.</p> <p>The difficulty of CVT gearboxes was also briefly discussed. The Chairman</p>	Info

	mentioned, that the current proposal were tailored for classic powertrains only and remembered that ISO had promised to treat CVT gearboxes and electrical vehicles. D told that the motorcycle group had decided to exclude CVTs from ASEP testing provided a stable engine speed occurs.	
5	<u>German/French proposal</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-10-003</p> <p>The concern as described in Ann Arbor is solved by adding a margin of 2dB (A), the slopes remain unchanged. The anchor point is based on the statistics that were used during the elaboration of Annex 3 method. OICA mentioned that the spirit of Annex 3 was to follow acceleration requirements from urban traffic, but not rpm. Modern vehicles with high torque engines driven at lower rpm get a malus when moving the anchor point towards higher rpm while vehicles with higher rpm get a bonus. D explained that the m/s^2 limitation in Annex 3 would cause problems. The advantage of not using the Annex 3 result is that you can do Annex 10 without knowing details of Annex 3 test. The boundary conditions of the proposal are not yet decided.</p> <p>US clarifies that the OICA proposal is to be seen as a filter that separates good and bad vehicles below 120 kw/h. higher powered vehicles shall all be tested. For the D/F method all vehicles are suspect. Limits must be set upon technical data and not upon emotions; limits must be reasonable and shall not be set in order to fulfill a certain quota.</p> <p>D comments that the D/F method can detect bad vehicles. If the OICA method only identifies critical vehicles but is not a proper test, we are only half way through. OICA clarifies that WP29 has to finally decide upon the test method, the IG can offer several proposals. US asked if either of the proposals would not be suitable to detect bad vehicles and if there are possibilities to for manipulation in order to beat the test. D repeats that the D/F is absolutely suitable and can be carried out with only little info about the vehicle.</p> <p>Member states requested OICA to deliver more information about the vehicle in the database. While NL is not interested in the brand name, the EC wants to check the completeness of the database, the US would be enabled to carry out economic impact analysis and D wants to be in the position to repeat tests in case of strange data. OICA expressed the AI's interest to cover the whole market, however sees a conflict in interests and the danger that conclusions are made on an emotional basis. OICA agreed to deliver additional information within 3 weeks</p> <p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-10-004</p> <p>OICA and D agreed to work together to solve the concern as described in the presentation</p>	<p>Action OICA</p> <p>Action D/OICA</p>

--	--	--

6	<u>Range of vehicle submitted to Annex 10 testing</u>	
	<p>The Chairman named three different options how to choose the vehicles that must be tested according to Annex 10:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Always in addition to Annex 3 2) Self Certification 3) In case of doubts <p>While option 2 is not possible based on existing EU legislation, option 3 cannot be handled by the authorities. Thus option 1 is the only possibility.</p> <p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-10-005</p> <p>D mentioned the need to clarify responsibilities between authorities and ministry. For the authority however a declaration of the manufacturer would be acceptable.</p>	Info

7	<u>Text for the main body</u>	
	<p>Presentation GRBIG-ASEP-10-006</p> <p>Due to contradictions with item 6.2.3.2., the Chairman proposes to delete item 6.2.3.3.</p> <p>The discussion is postponed to the next meeting.</p>	Info

8	<u>Any other business</u>	
	n/a	

9	<u>Next meeting</u>	
	The next meeting shall take place in week 24	

10	<u>Closure of the meeting</u>	
-----------	--------------------------------------	--