

## **Twelfth Plenary meeting of the Working Group On Off-Cycle Emissions 18 January 2006 Palais des Nations, Geneva**

### **Agenda Item 1**

- A. The draft agenda was reviewed and approved by the plenary group.

### **Agenda Item 2**

- A. The minutes of the Eleventh Plenary Meeting were reviewed.
- B. Japan and the United States had submitted comments on the minutes prior to the meeting which will be incorporated into the final draft of the minutes.
- C. There being no other corrections or revisions to the minutes, they were adopted by the Plenary Group and will be submitted the GRPE secretary for posting.

### **Agenda Item 3**

- A. The Chairperson advised the group that the Editorial Committee ("EC") does not keep meeting minutes.

The Chairperson stated that a 1½ day EC meeting was held in September after the 11<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting. The EC was able to review the draft GTR through Section 7. Though substantial progress was made by the EC, the Chairperson stated that he is less optimistic at this point that the original timeline will be met for submitting a draft GTR to GRPE and thus the timeline will have to be revised.

### **Agenda Item 4**

- A. JASIC made a presentation which outlined a proposal on expanding the WNTE Control Area Zone to a lower speed range, based on the cumulative speed frequency distribution from the WHTC test cycle. JASIC recommend a 25% WHTC frequency speed accumulation be considered rather than the 30% which is in the current draft of the GTR. There were no questions by the plenary group at the end of the presentation, but the Chairperson asked the group to be prepared to comment on JASIC proposal at the next plenary meeting.

OICA made a follow-up presentation to the presentation made by them at the Tenth Plenary meeting. Data was presented on four engines, which were tested over the WHTC, to help determine how the WNTE Control Area Zone should be shaped. It is OICA's recommendation to stay at a WHTC cumulative speed of 30% as the lower speed limit for the WNTE Control Area Zone.

OICA stated that the data presented by Japan did not include idle speed so it may be hard to compare the JASIC data with the OICA data. The behavior is the same at 25% cumulative speed regardless of the engine size. OICA's believes that their 30% recommendation, which includes the WHTC idle speed points, is consistent with the JASIC data which recommends a WNTE lower speed limit of 25% of the cumulative speed distribution from the WHTC, which does not include the WHTC idle speed points.

The Netherlands made a presentation on the size of the WNTE Control Area and concluded that the Control Area as currently defined in the draft GTR (i.e., 25%) is wide enough. The Chairperson asked if this conclusion is based on a 25% cumulative frequency and was the data gathered/analyzed in the same manner as OICA and JASIC. The Netherlands responded the engines were tested on the WHDC, which should include idle speed, but will verify that idle is included in the data presented.

The European Commission will be interested to look at the Dutch results to see if a simplification of the zone can be designed based on the results. Looking at slide 11, dealing with the PM carve out, it is possible that a simpler concept can be considered as the 30% power line is cutting

across a higher emission level. The Chairperson stated that in the context of the current GTR the PM carve out has been eliminated for engines at low levels (i.e. with filters), so the carve out does not apply. For future technology engines would not have access to this carve out in the zone, but it is a valid comment for non-filtered engines.

The Chairperson stated that all three presentations are helpful in trying to look at the context of the GTR to see if we can reshape the WNTe Control Area Zone in context of the WHDC. The group has to come up with a specific definition of the WNTe Control Area Zone. The group does not appear to be far apart on a cumulative frequency of approximately 30%, including idle. The Chairperson asked the group to look at the material to determine how similar the data is between JASIC, OICA and The Netherlands. This could be discussed at the next plenary meeting or at the next GRPE, so that a recommendation can be provided to the Editorial Committee.

## Agenda Item 5

- A. The Chairperson provided a brief overview of the work done on the draft GTR and stated that the first half of the document has been changed substantially.

The Netherlands made a presentation for a revised WNTe Compliance Statement. The Netherlands asked the group if there is a need to include an example of a Compliance Statement in the GTR, perhaps in an Annex? Canada said this is something the group should consider, because there is some benefit to having a common statement, to set a level playing field and to ensure that some authorities will not accept a statement that puts less burden on some manufacturers. Germany agreed that this presentation raises a very important issue, and it is something the group has to consider going forward.

The Chairperson stated that this proposal will be put to the group for consideration to see if an agreement can be reached on a common compliance statement. This new proposal should be worked into the draft GTR as a concept, leaving in the current language, so that the two may be compared. There may be value in having a specific compliance statement or maybe the group will decide to provide a level of detail and the Contracting Parties will then decide how to proceed.

The Chairperson made a presentation on the significant progress the Editorial Committee had made in establishing working definitions for a number of terms which have to be defined in the GTR. The draft definitions still require further discussion because they are not necessarily in a final form which is satisfactory to the group. The draft definitions are a combination of EU, USEPA and EMA recommended language. The Chairperson reminded the group that the GTR will have two primary requirements: a prohibition against defeat strategies, and emission limits based on the WNTe, therefore definitions will remain a key part of the GTR.

The Chairperson presented some graphs to illustrate the two options in the GTR for ambient conditions. In the current GTR, an engine manufacturer has to show that the engine meets the requirements over defined ambient conditions for altitude and temperature. This is a carryover of the current US EPA regulations. There are two Options available in the draft GTR at Section 6. Graph 1, which represents Option A in the draft GTR, was developed in the US in the '98/'99 timeframe when the NTE was first discussed. Graph 2, which represents Option B in the draft GTR, is also part of the US EPA regulations. It has the same upper altitude limit as Option A, but for lower temperatures, it is a higher temperature at sea level where the NTE applies without correction factors. The US EPA is interested in eliminating one of the Options in the draft GTR and is neutral on the two options.

US EPA has consulted with EMA and EMA advised that in the US, manufacturers will be using Option B. Therefore, for simplification in the GTR, EPA wants to recommend that Option A be eliminated at this time. OICA supports this recommendation.

Going forward the group will also have to discuss any other ambient conditions which should be considered for inclusion in the GTR. To date, only OICA has provided comments to the group on what the full range of ambient conditions should be.

OICA made a presentation on WNTF Factors to illustrate the differences between alternative multiplicative and additive factors. OICA raised the idea of having an additive factor for very low emissions.

### **Agenda Item 6**

The Chairperson stated he hoped the group would be in a position to present a draft of the GTR to GRPE this June. This is an unrealistic goal at this time and thus the timeline will have to be revised. A new date for presenting a draft GTR to GRPE cannot be predicted at this time.

In April the group will have a Plenary and Editorial Committee meeting and perhaps the group will have a better idea if a draft GTR can be presented to GRPE in January 2007.

### **Agenda Item 7**

The Chairperson wanted to thank OICA for posting all of the group's documents on its website. The material from this meeting will also be forwarded to OICA for posting, to ensure that it is available for review prior to the next meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Off-Cycle Working Group and Editorial Committee will be held in April 2006 in the Netherlands, with details to follow in the coming weeks.

Joanna Vardas, Secretariat  
Dated February 27, 2006