

Transmitted by the by the AMEVSC Chair

Informal document No. GRRF-69-20
(69th GRRF, 1-4 February 2011
agenda item 3(a))

Report of GRRF Alternative Method Electronic Vehicle Stability Control (AMEVSC) Informal Working Group

Since the 68th Session of GRRF a further meeting of the AMEVSC Informal Working Group took place on the 22nd and 23rd November 2010.

As a result of this meeting the document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2011/2 has been amended to address the outstanding square bracketed items and the amendments to Annex 20, resolve any technical issues that were highlighted during the meeting and complete the justification. These changes are shown in the informal document GRRF-69-06. However, to make it easier to understand the complete proposal, the changes in GRRF-69-06 are identified with reference to Regulation 13. Therefore, it is not necessary to refer to GRRF/2011/2, only GRRF-69-06 to understand the proposed amendment.

Document GRRF-69-06 is the finalised proposed amendment to Reg.13 from the informal working group for consideration by GRRF.

The significant new changes with regard to GRRF-69-06 can be summarized as:

- the inclusion of N2 and N3 vehicles as agreed at the 68th Session of GRRF (Annex 19 Part 2, paragraph 1.1.3.2.(b))
- selection of the more explanative text with regard to the wheelbase and centre of gravity height allowance (Annex 19 Part 2, paragraphs 1.1.3.2.(s) and 1.1.3.2.(x))
- the testing of each anti-lock configuration (Annex 19 Part 2, paragraph 1.1.4.1.7.)
- in the case of buses it is allowed to use the results of tests on trucks under specific restrictions (Annex 19 Part 2, paragraph 1.1.4.2.)
- it is allowed use a validated simulation tool to evaluate specific boundary conditions (Annex 19 Part 2, paragraph 1.1.5.)
- the deletion of any reference to Annex 20 – reference is made directly to Annex 19 in Annex 21 (Annex 21 paragraphs 2.1.3. and 2.2.3.) (this also address the GRRF Secretariat footnote in GRRF/2011/2, pages 2 and 5)
- clarification that a simulator can only be validated with regard to features for which a comparison has been made with real vehicle tests (Annex 21 Appendix 2, paragraph 2.3.)
- new paragraph added to the simulation tool test report to ensure that the test report contains details applicable to the functionality of the simulator (Annex 21 Appendix 3, paragraph 2.)

In GRRF/2011/2 there is footnote from the GRRF Secretariat (page 6) questioning the correctness of the loading condition “unladen/part laden”. The unladen condition can be achieved when evaluating directional control as there is no possibility of the vehicle rolling over and, therefore, outriggers are not required. However, outriggers are necessary when evaluating roll-over control and as they can weigh a significant amount in comparison to the unladen weight of the vehicle it may not be possible to say that the vehicle is unladen. Hence it is appropriate to use the term “unladen/part laden”.

In discussing the proposed amendments, the legality of using a test report in the vehicle type-approval process has been raised. However, as the use of a test report as proposed by this amendment is only an extension of an existing process that has been running for some time, it was felt that this was not a technical issue to be addressed by the informal working group. It is considered that if a Contracting Party has a concern, it should be address directly to GRRF or WP.29 as a number of areas in Regulation 13, and possibly other regulations, are effected.
