M I N U T E S
11th meeting of GRB Informal Group 'ASEP'
Tokio, June 11th – 13th 2008

0	**Attendance**	
	NL: Boudewijn Kortbeek (Chair), Theun Stoffels; **Germany**: Christian Theis, Lars Schade, Heinz Steven; **Japan**: Y. Toba, T. Tanaka, K. Mizokami, Ichivo Sakamoto, Y.Ishiguro, Hideo Ohno, M. Iwasa, Yoshihiro Shirahashi; **Spain**: M. Cruz; **USA**: Ken Feith; **EC**: Wolfgang Schneider; **CLEPA**: Piet Steenackers, **ETRTO**: George Dimitri, U. Saemann; **OICA**: Stu Showler, Francois Guichard, HM. Gerhard, Hanns-Peter Bietenbeck (Secr.); **ISO**: Doug Moore	**Info**

1	**Opening of the meeting**	
	The Chairman of the working group welcomed the participants and thanked JAMA and JASIC for the invitation.	**Info**

2	**Approval of the agenda**	
	The agenda was adopted without changes.	**Decision**

3	**Approval of minutes from 9th and 10th meeting**	
	The minutes are approved without changes	**Decision**

4	**Execution of actions agreed during 10th meeting**	
	Reference : GRBIG-ASEP-10-007 1. Germany has no document NL has drafted alternative 2. done 3. done, but not yet circulated 4. tbd 5. Germany: will partly be circulated later OICA: done 6. no change 7. done 8. done, but not yet circulated 9. done, but not yet circulated 10. Issue is resolved, no changes 11. solved 12. done	**Info**

	13. done 14. no paper available 15. no paper available 16. part of OICA/CLEPA document	

5	**Status of work presented by chairman**	

	Presentation **GRBIG-ASEP-11-006** Comments: • While it is clear, that all vehicles must fulfill ASEP requirements, it still remains to be clarified, if the COP shall include ASEP testing. 'Always testing' is under discussion for Type Approval only • Tire noise is currently not excluded from the calculation, but shall not explicitly be determined via individual testing. • Normal vehicle change in future. Today's standard is a propulsion engine with manual or x-speed automatic gearboxes. • 3 dB(A) per 1000 rpm has never been proposed to be the normal slope	**Info**

6	**Discussion of the anchor point**	
	Presentation **GRBIG-ASEP-11-007** Comments OICA pointed out that n urban was not the target of ISO 362. The base is but a $_{urban}$ as calculated from real world statistics, design neutral and independent of type of transmission. D replied that engine speed is part of statistics. The acceleration limit of $2m/s^2$ is a problem within the ISO362 method. This can be resolved with Annex 10. ISO clarified that n_{urban} does statistically not exist. The K_p-factor may adjust L_{urban} of vehicles with a WOT $>2m/s^2$ so that L_{urban} may be higher than $L_{wot\ i}$. OICA reminded that anchor point must be senseful. It may not be determined so to only produce a stringent limitation. Germany explained that Annex 10 is not intended to correct Annex 3 but shall detect bad vehicles. For information about the individual vehicle, the anchor point must be based on L_{WOT}.	**Info**

7	**OICA Method**	
	Presentation **GRBIG-ASEP-11-002** OICA confirms that the proposal determines and limits individual slope of vehicles. It is based on total noise as agreed in GRB. A slope of 2.5 dB(A) is technically just as unnormal as a slope of 12 dB(A). The proposal is more	**Info**

	stringent than the F/D/J proposal as it limits the slope in two ways. If both of those kinds of slope shall be seen as illegal is a political decision. For the manufacturer the final slope is not a development target but a result of many different sources. Only high power vehicles are expected to fail. Normal vehicles will not be concerned by the boundary conditions as proposed.	

8	**D/F proposal**	
	D again presented **GRBIG-ASEP-09-008** for new participants. No questions were raised. The chairman proposed to delay the final choice for the measurement procedure to the next meeting	

9	**Measurement uncertainty from tire influence**	
	The subject will be kept on the action list. D proposed to postpone the elaboration until D has come to a position about the measurement procedure. ISO and D volunteer to take care of this matter in future.	**Info**

10	**Alternatives to always testing**	
	GRBIG-ASEP-11-005 It was made clear that the responsibility and final decision is with the TA authorities. A technical service may neither issue an approval nor prescribe any specific test. The group discussed the roles and responsibilities of the involved partners manufacturer, technical service and type approval authority. D presented an extract of the GTR on OCE **GRBIG-ASEP-11-009** as an example for a wording. OICA volunteered to adapt this to the subject of noise. Beside this, three subjects are under discussion: 1. Declaration by manufacturer + TAA to require physical testing on demand 2. Declaration by manufacturer + technical service to decide fort necessity of testing 3. Always testing J prefers always testing. However, provided J accepts the proposed GTR on OCE included the wording as presented by D, J may change its mind. Also the possibility to generally exclude some types of powertrains was discussed, e.g. electrical vehicle. NL volunteered to prepare a wording that covers this idea. A decision is postponed to the next meeting.	**Info**

11	**Formal proposal for ECE R 59**	
	GRBIG-ASEP-11-011 After short discussion CLEPA agreed to make some minor extensions incl. a clear reference to Annex 10.	**Info**

12	**Cycle beating**	
	The subject is skipped	**Decision**

13	**JAMA study**	
	GRBIG-ASEP-11-012 Comments On request of D, J clarified that the used engine speed was N_{Lmax}. In a general discussion about pros and cons of the proposed test methods OICA made clear that the D/F proposal indeed required less testing as it is mainly based on statistical analysis, however the accuracy is questionable. On the chairman's proposal that with some adjustments to the tire noise part, the D/F proposal would become acceptable, the US replied that tire noise is a minor contributor to the Annex 10 result and should for that reason completely left out of the consideration. This proposal was widely accepted by the participants.	**Info**

14	**Elaboration of Database**	
	GRBIG-ASEP-11-014 Comments The overall outcome of the presentation from D is that vehicles may pass the OICA method but clearly fail the D/F proposal. OICA replied that the applied limit curve according to the OICA calculation is not interpreted correctly. If only the theoretical maximum noise level is regarded ($L_{wot\ I}$ + 3dB(A)+ 6 (or 7) dB(A)/1000 rpm), a misleading picture is drawn. PC may not be evaluated in the some way as HDVs, as WOT is routine for HDVs but exceptional for PCs. When limiting the noise slope with the proposed ± 3dB(A) fitting curve, many vehicles would also fail the OICA method. After this discussion the chairman concluded that both methods are capable to detect bad vehicles. However the group has to urgently to ensure that good vehicles are not punished. OICA pointed out that based on the results from the JASIC analysis, this was still an issue at least with the D/F methods.	**Info**

15	**Proposed wording for ECE51.03**	
	GRBIG-ASEP-11-013	**Info**

	Comments US questioned the handling of cooling fans. ISO explained, that the vehicle must be tested under normal driving conditions, thus even with the fan on. CLEPA pointed out that the proposed wording of item 6.2.3.2. would not allow any valve operated exhaust systems. After a controversy discussion ISO and OICA volunteered to draft a new wording that will subsequently be evaluated by representatives of the technical services of Spain and the NL.	

16	**<u>Next meeting</u>**	
	The next meeting will be held subsequent to the next GRB session on Thursday September 4 in Geneva.	**Decision**