

Meeting Report (3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)**Report on the third meeting of the GRRF Informal Working Group on Alternative Method Electronic Vehicle Stability Control (AMEVSC) held 7<sup>th</sup> September 2010.**

**Venue:** CLEPA Offices, 87 Boulevard Brand Whitlock; BE- 1200 Brussels, Belgium

**Chairman:** Dr. Michel LOCCUFIER (Belgium Ministry of Transport)

**Secretariat:** Mr. Paul JENNISON (CLEPA/Knorr-Bremse)

**Participants:** See document AMEVSC-03-10e

1. Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and the draft agenda (document AMEVSC-03-08e) was adopted with the addition under item 7 (any other business) “progress report for the September 2010 session of GRRF”.
2. The report of the second meeting (document AMEVSC-02-04e) was reviewed and agreed without modification.
3. New documents received for consideration:
  - AMEVSC-03-01e – process flow diagram
  - AMEVSC-03-02e – Annex 19 working document – text alignment
  - AMEVSC-03-03e – wheelbase and centre of gravity +/-20% allowance justification
  - AMEVSC-03-04e – vehicle stability function – functionality overview
  - AMEVSC-03-05e – wheelbase tolerance diagram
  - AMEVSC-03-06e – centre of gravity tolerance diagram
  - AMEVSC-03-07e – justification working document
  - AMEVSC-03-11e – vehicle type
4. In considering the process flow diagram (document AMEVSC-03-01e) the use of the wording “approval authority approval” was questioned and 2 new documents were tabled – a Daimler overview with regard to the “mutual recognition of certificates between technical services” and the German Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt “rules for designation/recognition of test laboratories”. The new documents were allocated the numbers AMEVSC-03-12e and AMEVSC-03-13e respectively.

As a result of the subsequent discussion the process flow diagram was amended – approval replaced by authorization (1 place), approval deleted (1 place) and “vehicle type-approving” added in 2 places to draw a distinction between the technical service carrying-out the vehicle type-approval and the technical service carrying-out the Annex 19 test report work.

The issue of what responsibility the “Approval Authority” is taking when signing a test report – approving the content, or certifying that the technical service is authorized to carry-out the work – as required currently in ECE R13 (e.g. Annex 11 Appendix 3) was

Meeting Report (3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

considered not to be an item for this working group and is an issue for contracting parties to the 1958 Agreement to resolve.

5. The proposed amendment draft (documents AMEVSC-02-03e and AMEVSC-03-02e) were further developed under the document number AMEVSC-03-15e as detailed below.
  - Based on the “vehicle type” proposal (document AMEVSC-03-11e) a new definition “character of vehicle” was considered appropriate, together with an adjustment to Annex 21 to clarify the “other vehicles” in paragraphs 2.1.3. and 2.2.3. of Annex 21 – see document AMEVSC-03-14e. In making these additions it was concluded that the “dynamic manoeuvres on one vehicle” requirement of Annex 21, paragraphs 2.1.3. and 2.2.3. was appropriate and that additional demonstrations were not necessary.
  - The “vehicle category/vehicle description” text of paragraph 2.4.1.1. placed in square brackets to allow reflection prior to the next meeting in light of the “character of vehicle” inclusion.
  - In discussing the anti-lock braking configurations (paragraph 2.4.1.8.) it was considered that the text was hard to understand. The Secretariat was requested to suggest an improved text for the next meeting – shown in green in document AMEVSC-03-15e.
  - In discussing the wheelbase value in paragraph 2.4.1.9. it was agreed to place the value of 1 meter in square brackets to allow reflection/justification prior to the next meeting.
  - The “suspension type” text in paragraph 2.4.1.10. was simplified by deleting the word “basic” and brackets around the example.
  - The loading requirements of paragraph 2.4.1.14. were placed in brackets to allow reflection on the need to test laden and unladen, thereby showing that the system can adapt to changes in load.
  - The inclusion of simulation as an item in the test report (Appendix 12, paragraph 5.4.2.) was explained as the need to allow the use of simulation in evaluating small changes to the software without having to repeat all the original tests. Without further detailed requirements – what is allowed and not allowed, and how the simulation/simulation tool is to be verified – it was considered that the use of simulation should not be allowed. The item was placed in square brackets pending the development of suitable defining text.
6. For the September GRRF Session a status report would be submitted by the Chairman and the Secretariat would create a document from AMEVSC-02-03 and AMEVSC-03-02 as amended by the meeting and AMEVSC-03-07 to show the current status of the proposed amendment (documents GRRF-68- 17 and GRRF-68-10 respectively).

## 7. Next meeting:

**Date:** 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2010 – starting 10.00 hrs and finishing 16.00 hrs.

Meeting Report (3<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

**Venue:** CLEPA Offices, 87 Boulevard Brand Whitlock; BE- 1200 Brussels, Belgium

**Input:** Any comments or documents relating to this meeting should be sent to the CLEPA Secretariat ([Techsec@clepa.be](mailto:Techsec@clepa.be)) with a copy to [paul.jennison@knorr-bremse.com](mailto:paul.jennison@knorr-bremse.com) in e-format as early as possible prior to the meeting.

-----