

Draft Report on 5th Common Tasks Group Meeting 15-16 October 2002

The Chairman opens the meeting; he welcomes all participants and gives an outline of the importance of the work and the issues still to be covered.

1. The agenda (CT5-1) is adopted.

2. Discussion on Draft Regulation “0”

The Secretary gives an overview of the work done in the 4th Common Tasks meeting (CT5-2) and in the Small Working Group (CT5-3, CT5-3-2 and CT5-4).

The meeting agrees with the proposal for the minimum paymass and for the formula to distinguish between category 1 and 2.

For the **seating position** issue it is suggested to use seat anchorage to determine whether there is a seat present or not until the discussion on a gtr for seats can look into the issue in detail. Until then, the national authorities will use their own criteria to define the number of seating positions on e.g. a bench seat. For removable seats, the seat itself is to be counted for the seating position.

As a result, the definition of N in CT5-7 annex 1 will be amended to read: “N= Maximum number of simultaneous seating positions excluding the driver position.”

The EU welcomes the progress and suggests that it might be linked to an obligation to have seatbelts for all seats and to forbid those seats that can not be equipped with seatbelts. The Chairman points out that this should be discussed whenever a discussion on a gtr on seats will be organised.

For **Special Purpose Vehicle**, the text of the definition is clarified: [] are deleted, a sentence is added after the first paragraph, reading: “Features shared with a category 1 or 2 vehicle shall be covered by the respective gtr”, the last part of the second paragraph (...unless...) is deleted.

For **motorcycles**, the EU expert points out that it is difficult for them to accept the 50 km/h as their regional V_{\max} is 45 km/h. He would however be ready to defend the Global Harmonisation position although the European Parliament and Council had just confirmed again the 45km/h. IMMA points out that this reconfirmation was not an answer to a specific question, that the EU market is by much smaller than the rest of the world and that a change to 45 km/h is going to have major repercussions; IMMA would like to stick to 50km/h also because this is in line with the Vienna Convention and ECE Regulations and because there is no technical justification for moving down to 45km/h. NL supports the EU and could only accept 50km/h if there would be no tolerance. I sees this also as the way forward: 50km/h should be the gtr0 value and the 0% tolerance should be fixed in a future gtr on V_{\max} . PI supports and suggests mentioning “real speed” instead of “design speed” and to define better the “thermic engine”. IMMA could consider the 0% tolerance, but suggests keeping design speed because the real speed changes too much with the driver of the moped; the thermic engine definition could be looked at in future if there would be a real need.

Conclusion: 50 km/h will be in [] and a footnote will be added, saying: “The EU has entered a study reservation on the maximum speed of Category 3-1 vehicles”

The EU informs further that they have a category called light quadricycle and that they should be defined also in gtr0. IMMA informs that these are typical European vehicles and that therefore they should not be mentioned in the gtr0. As the problem is however that the present definition of category 1 covers also these quadricycles, IMMA proposes to mention in gtr0 that National/Regional authorities can define exemptions at their level for certain vehicles that exist in and are specific to their territory. UK proposes to wait for such issues to come up in future gtr discussions and then if necessary to amend the gtr0.

It is agreed that the following text will be added in CT5-7 as a new paragraph 2.6.: “Contracting parties may continue to apply their existing national definitions and procedures for subcategories of vehicles, within the categories specified in this Regulation, as exceptions to the application of gtrs”

On suggestion of the EU, an additional definition for a category 3 vehicle is inserted as a new paragraph under paragraph 2: “Motor vehicles with two or three wheels”. This new paragraph will

read: "Category 3 vehicle: Motorvehicle with 2 or 3 wheels designed and constructed for the carriage of persons and/or goods".

As an introduction to the issue of **breakpoints for Category 2**, the Secretary gives an outline of the possibilities that could be applied together with a list of pros and cons (CT5-5). The Chairman then introduces his proposal (CT5-6). This suggests that for each gtr, there will be a detailed discussion and evaluation on the best breakpoints for the respective gtr. In order to avoid the proliferation of breakpoints in gtr discussions, the Chairman introduces the attachment to CT5-6. This contains a "flowchart" for defining the breakpoints and starts from the assumption that one single breakpoint is the ideal to be pursued. If this would not be possible then two breakpoints would be defined, together with the most stringent subcategory requirements that can be used to build vehicles that will be accepted everywhere. Only as a last resort, the gtr would list two breakpoints, each one being used in a certain region. For vehicles in between the two breakpoints, each region will apply its own requirements.

On request of H, the chairman confirms that this approach can be used for any topic (e.g. subcategories of busses), but that we should be careful not to introduce too many breakpoints. D proposes that, if this suggestion is followed, the number of options from which the GRs could choose their breakpoints should be limited to [two]. These could be e.g. 3.5t and 4.5t.

UK wants the GRs still to be able to set their own breakpoints base on their technical expertise. The Chairman refers to the last sentence of document CT5-6 and suggests that there could be two breakpoints for safety issues (3.5t and 4.5t) and two for environmental issues (3.5t and 3.9t). A suggestion to this effect will be included in the preamble of the gtr0. It is agreed that this will read: "In establishing a breakpoint in a gtr, consideration should be given to the breakpoints most widely in use: 3.5t and 4.5t for safety issues and 3.5t and 3.9t for environmental issues".

H requests clarity on inclusion of further categories in gtr0. The Chairman refers to document CT5-7, paragraph 2.4; Mr. Ramos suggests that such issues will be coordinated in and assigned by AC3 to GRSG/Common Tasks.

3. Any Other Business

The EU requests to add standing passengers in the definition of the category 1 vehicle. In addition, also the model range in paragraph 4 on page 3 of document CT5-7 should be defined.

H, supported by UK, prefers to keep "seated passengers" only in order to avoid confusion. I explains that they had requests about vehicles that would have e.g. 6 seats and several standing passengers. In order to avoid that these vehicles would be a category 1 vehicle, it is agreed to accept the Italian suggestion to add at the end of para1.2.1 of annex 1: "A category 1-1 vehicle cannot have standing passengers." In addition it is agreed to replace in paragraph 1.2.2. the words "seating positions" with "...passengers, whether seated or standing, ..."

OICA will propose a definition on "model range".

The EU further requests to have the corresponding EU definitions next to the definitions already in the text of CT5-7. This is not accepted as it would lead to a list of all regional variants of wording in the gtr0.

After discussions in 5 meetings, the Informal Group has agreed on the contents of the draft gtr on masses, dimensions and categories.

The Informal Group has also agreed the following schedule:

The Secretariat will circulate a new draft gtr by end 2002

The final document will be submitted to 84/GRSG (May 2003)

Format of the future text:

The Chairman recalls that the Common Tasks Group was requested to submit a document to WP29 who would then decide on the most suitable format for the document. The Chairman asks Japan to prepare such a request document.

The Chairman thanks the participants for their constructive work in all the CTG meetings and closes the fifth and for the moment final Common Tasks Group meeting.

Ben Van Assche
Secretary to the Common Tasks Group