

<p><b>MINUTES</b>  12<sup>th</sup> meeting of GRB Informal Group 'ASEP'  Geneva, September 4<sup>th</sup> 2008</p>
--

<b>0</b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	
	<b>NL, Germany, Japan, USA, Poland, India, Italy, EC, CLEPA, ETRTO, OICA, ISO</b>	<b>Info</b>

<b>1</b>	<b><u>Opening of the meeting</u></b>	
	The Chairman of the working group welcomed the participants	<b>Info</b>

<b>2</b>	<b><u>Approval of the agenda</u></b>	
	The agenda was adopted without changes.	<b>Decision</b>

<b>3</b>	<b><u>Approval of minutes from 11<sup>th</sup> meeting</u></b>	
	The minutes are approved without changes	<b>Decision</b>

<b>4</b>	<b><u>General Information on the future development of ASEP</u></b>	
	<p>In view of the development of ASEP for Motorcycles, the chairman reported that the Informal Group of ECE R-41 has already advanced further than this group and stated the group should try to benefit from that progress. For the next meeting in Feb 09, GRB expects a decision for a test procedure. If the IG should fail to find a decision, GRB would do so during its next meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Schade (D) gave a short overview about the proceeding in the IG R-41. The task similarly is to define ASEP. Against the following background the first R-41 proposal was identical with the original D/F proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the agreement was to define an additional limit value for <math>L_{wot, i}</math>,</li> <li>• the COP shall be verified against the type approval value ilo limit value,</li> <li>• The acceleration shall not be limited.</li> </ul> <p>The reason for the additional limit was to cover typical rural driving behavior. As the boundary conditions differ significantly from those applied to R-51, the results from IG R-41 cannot be copied to ASEP for R-51.</p>	<b>Info</b>

5	<b><u>Text proposal for cycle detection requirements</u></b>	
	<p>OICA presented <b>GRBIG-ASEP-12-005</b></p> <p>The aim of the proposed change, namely to turn the second paragraph into a subparagraph of 6.2.3.1, is to emphasize that either content is strictly related to each other and not independent.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Although it was mentioned that the exceptions as named in 6.2.3.1.1. were not applicable for the subject of noise and therefore the paragraph should completely be deleted in order to avoid possible loopholes, it became clear that these exception were necessary to be incorporated in order to be in line with other regulation, e.g. exhaust emissions. A tour-de-table came to the result, that the proposed change to the text shall be accepted.</p>	<b>decision</b>
6	<b><u>Development of proposed test methods</u></b>	
	<p>The chairman proposed to go away from the test method being titled by their originator and rename them to method 2 (formerly D/F) and method 3 (formerly OICA) respectively. Method 1 will be the title of the final method. Besides this, there are no changes to the methods.</p>	<b>Decision</b>
7	<b><u>Uncertainties</u></b>	
	<p>During a short discussion it became clear, that the existing uncertainties must closely be looked at, once a final choice for a test protocol is made. However, the known uncertainties are not influencing the decision for one or the other method.</p>	<b>Info</b>
8	<b><u>Fundamental discussions</u></b>	
	<p>For those participants that were new or only irregularly attending the IG meetings, OICA and D gave short overview of the methods 2 + 3. The measurements for both methods are identical. The difference in evaluation is that the limitation within method 2 is based on the legal limit value. Method 3 depends on the individual TA value and also has two kinds of limitation. Beside a tolerance band for the deviation from a strict linear increase of noise emission, the maximum slope also is defined. Method 2 evaluates the propulsion emissions only. As method 3 also covers the tire-road noise, a higher slope is reasonable. The necessary margin depends on the value of slope. All parties agreed to reassess the available data for further elaboration in preparation of the next meeting.</p>	<b>Info</b>

	<p>Method 2 allows a setting of the limitation based on statistical calculation without additional measurements whereas method 3 fulfills the general requirement based on Annex 3 and cannot be carried out independently.</p> <p>OICA showed papers</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>GRBIG-ASEP-12-006 &amp; GRBIG-ASEP-12-007</i></b></p> <p>The slides revealed that when evaluation the same vehicles according to both methods, more vehicles are rejected by 3 than by 2. The reasons for this obvious higher stringency of method 3 still remain to be identified.</p> <p>Another tour-de-table showed that there is preference to determine the anchor point based on method 3. Though it became also clear that further improvements to both methods are still necessary before a definite choice can be made.</p> <p>In view of replacement silencers, the general impression is that method 3 is more stringent.</p> <p>It was clarified that in view of method 3, for COP the individual anchor point will be used as the basis of the method is to prove the linearity of the noise increase.</p> <p>A general preference for method 3 is obvious.</p>	
--	--	--

<b>9</b>	<b><u>Alternatives to always testing</u></b>	
	<p>J present paper GRBIG-ASEP-012-004. The proposal was accepted with minor changes.</p> <p>NL promised to circulate within the next two weeks a proposal for a text that allows the exclusion of certain types of vehicles, e.g. electrical vehicles. The wording covering variable silencing systems remains unchanged.</p>	<b>Info</b>
<b>10</b>	<b><u>Formal text</u></b>	
	OICA volunteered to prepare a consolidated version of the text covering all the changes as made so far.	<b>Decision</b>
<b>11</b>	<b><u>Formal proposal for ECE R 59</u></b>	
	CLEPA has finalized the wording. No further word is necessary	<b>Decision</b>

12	<u>Next meeting</u>	
	The next meeting will take on November 6 & 7, location is the OICA office in Paris. Starting time is 10 am	<b>Info</b>

\*all documents are available from the UNECE Web-Page [http://www.unece.org/trans/main/wp29/wp29wgs/wp29grb/ASEP\\_8.html](http://www.unece.org/trans/main/wp29/wp29wgs/wp29grb/ASEP_8.html)