

Draft Report

THIRD INFORMAL GROUP ON “COMMON TASKS”
08 – 09 October 2001

Mr. Onoda welcomed the participants to the third meeting of the group

Mr. Ramos explained the practical arrangements for the meeting

1. Adoption of the agenda

Agenda adopted: sees document CT3-1

2. Adoption of the report of the second meeting on “Common Tasks” and of the Tokyo small meeting

The draft reports are published on the ECE website. No suggestions for corrections were raised

3. Discussion on vehicle categories

Documents CT3-1 to CT3-10

The Chairman informs the meeting of the discussions held on the topic of vehicle categorisation in a small meeting in Tokyo. The secretary gives then details on the reasons for holding such a meeting: to have a free exchange of opinions on various approaches for categorisation and to prepare for a good discussion in this CT3 meeting.

The Czech Republic explains their input (see CT3-3). In their country, categories are now (since 1 July) aligned with those of the EU. They suggest (but could live without) an additional differentiation based on 3.5 T because of a.o. driving licence.

Japan explains doc CT3-4

OICA explains doc CT3-5. OICA thinks that sub-categories are certainly necessary. OICA suggests also using 7.5 t instead of 12 t as a breakpoint.

Canada explains doc CT3-9 and suggests using “parameters” in the individual GTRs.

The results of all these discussions can be found in the documents CT3-6 and 7. Japan explains these in great detail.

Document CT3-6: this document summarises the various options for the points raised in document CT2-6.

- For question 1 : option 1 or 3 seems the best choice
- For question 2.1. : option 2 was preferred by the majority in the Tokyo meeting
- For question 2.2. : option 1 seems most simple although the exact number still needs to be decided
- For question 3.1. : all options are still open
- For question 3.2. : option 1 is most close to current ideas

As a result of these discussions, document CT3-7 was prepared. This summarises the above.

The chairman then invites participants to give further comments:

- Hungary gives the extreme example of a big bus with a very limited number of passengers. The GRSG chairman points out that such extreme examples do not fall within the scope of the Common Tasks, but must be solved at national level
- European Union points out that they leave the choice to the manufacturer to classify vehicles as M or N, but that in certain cases (as above), criteria have been introduced to eliminate these (marginal) problems.
- A tour the table then follows in which delegates express their preferences on document CT3-7

	Page 1			Page 3			
	1.1.	1.2.	1.3.	3.1.	3.2.	3.3.	
European Union	⊗*					⊗	* but with max number of people in truck cab
United States		⊗*			⊗		* personal opinion
United Kingdom	⊗*,**					⊗	*discussion still going on in EU ** no max number on passenger in trucks
Switzerland							
Sweden		⊗				⊗	
Spain							
Russian Federation	⊗					⊗	
Romania							
Portugal							
Poland	⊗					⊗	
Norway	⊗					⊗	
The Netherlands	⊗				⊗	*	*could accept 3.3 also
Luxembourg							
Italy	⊗					⊗	
Hungary	⊗					⊗	
Germany	⊗					⊗	
France							
Finland		⊗				⊗	
Denmark							
Czech Republic	⊗					⊗	
Canada	⊗				*	*	*could accept 3.2, 3.3 also
Belgium							
P. R. China	⊗				⊗		
Japan	⊗				⊗		
IMMA							
IRU	⊗					⊗	
ISO	ISO TC22 SC6 deals with M+D and Classification. They had a meeting 2 weeks ago in Paris and will monitor the CT activity carefully						
OICA	⊗					⊗	
	15	3			4	13	

The chairman stipulates that it is his intention to have a draft regulation reflecting the above preferences by next meeting. Japan will prepare a text.

OICA refers to their CT3-8 document and offers further contribution and support to Japan.

4. Discussion on Masses and Dimensions

Relevant documents: CT3-8 (only the M and D part), CT3-12, 13 and 14

CT3-8: prepared by OICA. OICA explains that their aim with this document is to table a working draft in order to speed up the discussions in the Common Tasks meetings.
For masses of driver/passenger and luggage, the RE-3 data have been used.
For dimensions, the definition and the parts to be left out are based on actual '58 Agreement definitions. Additional definitions are given for off road vehicles. Pages 19-20 give additional information on the approach followed.

CT3-12: prepared by Japan. Items included are only those that were agreed in the second CT meeting. The content is based on RE3 definitions. A comparison with the OICA document can be found in CT3-14. Main differences are to be found for:

- unladen mass (including/excluding driver)
- vehicle dimensions (including/excluding protruding parts)

Japan is however still considering changing the approach.

CT3-13 by The Netherlands: is based on CT3-8 and suggests excluding even more items: basically those that can be added/removed to the basic body profile.
The chairman concludes that, especially for masses, the documents from OICA and Japan are based on RE3. This approach seems acceptable as no comments are raised.

On the issue of the number of passengers to distinguish small from big M and on the issue of mass to distinguish between small and big N, following opinions are expressed:

- For M: US and Japan use 10, EU-ECE uses 9. Hungary suggests accepting the widest frame, i.e. 10 persons. Same for e.g. length
- The Russian Federation warns against such approach as it would mean more severe requirements for e.g. a 10 persons vehicle
- Canada prefers to first define how to measure such issues before taking a decision on the exact number. As a general rule, the higher number (of passengers) should be preferred as this would increase the safety level for such vehicles
- OICA prefers the figure 9 as it is already in the '58 Agreement but also as it reflects the reality (10 occupant vehicles are rarely built)
- Japan could accept 9, although further thought is necessary
- The chairman suggests Japan and OICA to keep the above comments in mind when they draft their document.

Concerning the inclusion/exclusion of certain parts, the GRSG chairman points out that these definitions for dimensions need to be used for certification and that therefore these additional accessories should be left out.

Canada suggests that 2 definitions could be useful: one excluding all the parts and another one with all these parts included so that the "envelope" of the vehicle is known. The Netherlands supports the Canadian position.

Finland suggests to follow ISO 612-1978. This standard includes everything between the two planes at the front and rear of the vehicle. ISO informs that they can follow whatever the CT takes as a new direction.

OICA and Japan are requested to prepare 2 definitions.

Concerning the definitions in the OICA document (CT3-8) that were added to those already agreed in the last meeting, some delegates preferred one definition only whereas others suggested to keep more definitions and to review them periodically. This last approach was accepted and all definitions in document CT3-14 will be retained.

Canada suggests to include also definitions on "payload" and on the ratio between occupant mass and payload. This will be done in the part on vehicle categories.

The chairman asks OICA and Japan to sit together and to prepare a joint document on the basis of their individual documents. Japan will prepare a document on the basis of the OICA document.

Mr. Ramos reminds everybody of the short timeframe still available for the Common Tasks work. The chairman requests therefore everybody to give constructive input on CT3-8, as he would like to stay within the period granted by WP29. The following approach is therefore fixed:

- Comments can be sent to the Secretary until beginning December 2001. Email: bva@hme-a.be
- A newly prepared document can be sent out by end January 2002. This will need to be prepared by Japan as only contracting parties can present documents.
- In case many or diversified comments would be received, a special session to discuss them might be necessary.
- The next CT meeting in April 2002 should then take final decisions.

Canada questions the need to define already now the level of detail contained in “subcategories”.

US support the Canadian comments.

IMMA is concerned that the denominations for categories (A, B, ...) as used in CT3-8, are already used in the Vienna Convention. Other symbols should be used (e.g. continue with M, N, ...)

IRU suggests revising the 68-kg figure for an occupant.

5. Any other business

IMMA informs that they started work on L category and intend to have a document ready for next CT Meeting. IMMA will distribute a document by beginning 2002 on which all delegates can then give comments. L category will then be on the agenda of next CT meeting.

Next CT meeting: 29 (PM)-30 (AM) April 2002

Depending on comments received a special meeting may be organised earlier.