Working Paper No. STD-02-07

2nd STD meeting, 31 August 2009

Draft

Report on the 2nd Meeting of the GRB/GRRF Joint Informal Working Group on Special Tyre Definitions Geneva, 31 August 2009

Present:

Contracting Parties: - European Commission (chairing), France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, Russian Federation, UK

NGO's: - ETRTO, OICA, ISO

A summary of the main points discussed is given below in Agenda item order (see document STD-02-01). All documents referred to are available on the following website:

http://www.unece.org/trans/main/wp29/wp29wgs/wp29grrf/grrf-std2.html

1. Report of the 1st meeting

Copies of the draft report of the 1st meeting were distributed. This document has now been placed on the UNECE website as STD-01-06.

2. Review of tyre definitions

The revised tyre definitions were discussed in the context of the updated proposal from ETRTO on Regulation No. 117 (see item 4).

3. Discussions on Test methods.

a) Snow tyres

Proposals for a snow test to discriminate between standard tyres and tyres that could qualify for additional allowances for rolling resistance and noise are set out in Annex 7 to document STD 02-02. This Annex calls up two alternative ASTM test procedures (the snow braking method and the spin traction method). Germany asked if standardisation to one method was possible. ETRTO said that both methods were equivalent (though might require different threshold values) and there was no justification for standardisation towards a single method. This might anyway prove difficult as different methods were currently favoured in different regions.

ETRTO presented a document summarising the snow performance of a range of tyres produced by one manufacturer (STD 02-05), to illustrate that the proposed threshold

was set at a level that would adequately discriminate between normal tyres and snow tyres. UK suggested that the performance threshold value for snow tyres (currently 7% higher than the 14 inch reference tyre and 15% higher than the16 inch reference tyre for the snow braking test) should be set higher to encourage greater improvement. Norway said that it would examine available tyre data before the next meeting to see if this indicated that a higher threshold value would be realistic.

b) Rolling resistance

ETRTO gave a further presentation on the issues of comparability between different test methods and different laboratories. It showed data which seemed to indicate that tyres measured on the same machine but using different test methods produced equivalent results. However, the differences between different test labs (or machines) were more significant. ETRTO still supported the concept of a reference laboratory to be used as the basis for calibration of other test laboratories, although this had largely been rejected by Contracting Parties at the previous meeting.

France (UTAC) gave a presentation (STD 02-04) on the concept of a 'virtual' reference laboratory which would create a calibration standard based on the average results obtained by testing reference tyres across a range of laboratories and machines. For this to work in practice, an effective scheme for comparing the measurements within and between laboratories would need to be put in place. France explained that ISO standard 17025, the standard that is already required for test laboratories under the EU Framework Directive and in the UNECE guidelines includes provisions for proficiency testing programmes. A further standard, ISO DIS 17043, expected to be published by the end of 2009, will set out the general requirements for proficiency testing schemes.

There was general support for examining this idea more closely, and France was asked to come up with more detailed proposals (possibly following discussions with ETRTO) by the next meeting.

4. Review of Regulation No. 117 document

The proposed document (STD 02-02) had been revised by ETRTO following the previous meeting, and delegates were asked for comments on the new version. The main comments were as follows:

2.1(g) 'Type Definition': This concerned the question of whether a change of tread pattern should represent a change in tyre type with respect to rolling resistance. ETRTO claimed that tread pattern had very little, if any, effect on rolling resistance. So a change in tread pattern should not result in a change in tyre type with respect to this parameter. However, the consensus among Contracting Parties was that a change in tread pattern should always trigger a change in type and the text in square brackets was deleted.

2.10 'Traction Tyre': The definition proposed by ETRTO was still design-based rather than performance-based and the Commission recalled that at the last meeting some discussion had been taken place about using manufacturers' internal standards to define traction performance. ETRTO said that they normally used customer standards. The OICA representative said that the customer (OEM) standards would differ from one manufacturer to another. The issue was unresolved. ETRTO was asked to come up with new information in the next meeting.

With regard to marking there was some discussion on whether it was necessary to put 'M+S', 'TRACTION' or 'M+S TRACTION' on the tyre. It was agreed that 'TRACTION' was more informative than M+S and it seemed pointless to require both markings, but the requirement to put 'M+S' on the tyre appeared to be set within EU type-approval by the General Safety Regulation. The Commission said it would check if it was legally acceptable to delete the 'M+S' requirement in this case.

2.12 'Special Use Tyre': The UK considered that the 'or' in square brackets (two places) should be replaced by 'and' to avoid e.g. tyres with high void-to-fill ratios but low tread depth from being defined as 'special use'. ETRTO responded that this might cause a problem in the case of some genuine 'special use' tyres. They were asked to present examples for the next meeting to illustrate how the use of 'and' might create a problem.

2.13 'Professional Off-Road Tyres': The speed limit for such tyres in categories C1 and C2 (category Q = 160km/hr) is still in square brackets for the time being. The Commission considered that it should be lower. ETRTO was asked to come up with new information in the next meeting.

5. **Next meeting:** Provisionally arranged for 16/17 November in Geneva, with a view to finalise a document for agreement at GRB/GRRF in February 2010 and WP.29 in June 2010.

Attendance list – Second meeting of GRB/GRRF joint informal WG on STD

NAME	COUNTRY/ ORGANISATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Wolfgang Schneider	European Commission	wolfgang.schneider@ec.europa.eu
Ian Knowles	European Commission	ian.knowles@ec.europa.eu
Meinhard Boenning	ETRTO	meinhard.boenning@fr.michelin.com
Jean Claude Noirhomme	ETRTO	info@etrto.org
Stefan Köppen	ETRTO	stefan_koppen@goodyear.com
Italo Funaro	ETRTO	italo.funaro@bridgestone.eu
Luca Rocco	Italian Ministry o Infrastructure an Transport	luca.rocco@mit.gov.it
Robert Falk	UK Department o Transport	robert.falk@dft.gsi.gov.uk
Christian Theis	BMVBS Germany	christian.theis@bmvbs.bund.de
Serge Ficheux	UTAC France	serge.ficheux@utac.com
Jun Makino	ETRTO (JATMA)	makino-j@bridgestone.eu
Hiroyuki Nonaka	JASIC (JATMA)	nonaka-h@bridgestone.eu
Hidenobu Kubota	JASIC Geneva	kubota@jasic.org

Dominique Lescail	UTAC France	dominique.lescail@utac.com
Jan Boe Kielland	STF	jan.kielland@stf.no
Manfred Klopotek	OICA	manfred.klopotek@scania.com
Hans-Martin Gerhard	OICA	Hans-Martin.gerhard@porsche.de
Lars Schade	UBA/Germany	lars.schade@uba.de
Yury Galevko	Russian Federation	Yu.galevko@rambler.ru
Douglas Moore	ISO	Douglas.b.moore@gm.com
Jean-Paul Lambotte	Goodyear	Jean-paul.Lambotte@goodyear.com
Georges Dimitri	ETRTO	Georges.dimitri@fr.michelin.com
Truls Berge	Sintef/Norway	Truls.berge@sintef.no
Ingunn Milford	Norwegian Public Roads Administration	Ingunn.milford@vegvesen.no
Makoto Ishiyama	ETRTO	Makoto.ishiyama@bridgestone.eu