

<p><b>MINUTES</b>  10<sup>th</sup> GRB Informal Group Meeting  London (UK), 01.-03. December 2004</p>
---

<b>1</b>	<b><u>Welcome</u></b>	Action
	<p><b>Mr. Theis</b>, Chairman of the GRB Informal Group, opened the meeting by thanking Mr. Turner (UK) and Mr. Walsh (SMMT) for organising and hosting the meeting.</p> <p><b>Mr. Walsh</b> welcomed the group at the Forbes House in London.</p>	

<b>2</b>	<b><u>Adoption of the Agenda</u></b>	Action
	<p>The agenda was adopted with the following changes proposed by the <b>Secretary</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRP-057 (JAMA) and CRP-058 (TRL) were added to item 3 ("Presentation of results from comparison studies")</li> <li>• CRP-059 (OICA) was added to item 6 ("Presentation of working papers")</li> <li>• "Revision of Annex 10" was added as agenda item 7.</li> </ul>	DECISION

<b>3</b>	<b><u>Adoption of minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> meeting</u></b>	Action
	The minutes were adopted.	DECISION

<b>4</b>	<b><u>Presentation of results from comparison studies</u></b>	Action
	<p>The results from the comparison studies of ACEA, SAE, Japan, TRL and India were presented.  Note: the data bases for trucks and busses are still missing. <b>OICA</b> agreed to distribute the results in sufficient time before the next meeting.</p> <p><b>ACEA (WP-061 / CRP-061)</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b> introduced the ACEA databases of M1, N1 and M2 vehicles (WP-061).  In addition <b>Mr. Steven</b>, gave an overview of the results of the ACEA comparison measurements conducted by the RWTÜV Fahrzeug GmbH (see CRP-061).</p> <p>Some of the results outlined by <b>Mr. Steven</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The advantage of AT's in the current ECE R51 disappears with the new method.</li> <li>• The rolling noise influence (measured by coast-by (→ without torque)) is higher in the new ECE R51.</li> <li>• The sound level <math>L_{urban}</math> of N1 vehicles is higher in loaded condition (50% payload) than in unloaded.</li> <li>• It was shown in several examples that the influence of the driving condition options "locked or unlocked gears" is not dramatic. The examples also showed that the use of pre-acceleration does make sense.</li> </ul>	<b>OICA</b>

	<p><b>SAE (WP-062 / CRP-062)</b></p> <p><b>SAE</b> shortly outlined the US test program and introduced the test results.</p> <p><b>Japan (CRP-057 / CRP-060)</b></p> <p><b>Japan</b> made a presentation outlining the results of the vehicle measurement program for M1 and N1 vehicles in Japan.</p> <p>The presentation included figures for engine speed distribution over PMR, frequency distribution of sound pressure level, comparison of sound pressure levels for current and new test method and propulsion / tyre/road noise contributions in the new test method.</p> <p>Some of the results outlined by <b>Mr. Shirahasi</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the engine speeds during tests according to draft ECE R51 were close to 95 % (&lt;-&gt; representative for urban driving)</li> <li>• propulsion noise has still a significant influence on the test results according to the new method</li> <li>• the average of difference between current and new method sound pressure levels is app. 2 dB(A)</li> <li>• the influence of load condition for N1 was less than 1 dB(A) in the final sound level (the sound level in unladen condition was always lower)</li> </ul> <p><b>TRL (CRP-058)</b></p> <p>The expert of <b>UK</b> presented the results of the TRL comparison study.</p> <p><b>India (CRP-063)</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b> introduced the data base from India. OICA hopes India will deliver additional information soon.</p>	
--	---	--

5	<p><b><u>Interpretation and discussion of results from comparison studies</u></b></p>	Action
	<p><b><u>Discussions concerning interpretation and new limit values</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NL</b> stated it should be kept in mind during limit discussion that a new regulation should enforce new technologies in order to achieve a benefit. <b>UK</b> supported the statement, but suggested with support of <b>COMM, Germany</b> and <b>ISO</b> to find first "technical equivalents" and define new classes.</li> <li>• <b>NL</b> was not in favour of equivalent limit values as a first step and proposed to start with more stringent limits. <b>Chairman</b> reminded the group that vehicles which are already in development will have no chance to fulfil more stringent limit values and was strongly supported by <b>OICA</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Germany</b> introduced as a starting point for future limit discussions a figure showing cumulated distribution curves for current and new test method (see <a href="#">CRP-065</a>). <b>France</b> offered a similar approach (see <a href="#">CRP-066</a>).</li> <li>• <b>OICA</b> suggested to classify the results according to today's legal limit values. <b>NL</b> expressed the concern that this proceeding would exclude low noise cars from the considerations. <b>SAE</b> stated to keep in mind the environmentally relevance.</li> <li>• <b>Germany</b> suggested to prove also the necessity of today's limit value exemptions (e.g. + 1 dB(A) for diesel direct-injection).</li> </ul>	

	<p><b>DECISIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>All data sets shall be combined</u> for further interpretations and determination of new limit values. <u>All tested vehicles shall be taken into account</u> (but in a proper contest, in particular the electric vehicle measured by TRL).</li> <li>• <u>The data set analysis shall base on the rounded values (<math>L_{typ}</math>)</u>, not on the physical values (<math>L_{urb}</math> and <math>L_{old}</math> respectively)</li> <li>• <u>Test mass for N1 vehicles:</u> After review of data (see test results from ACEA and Japan) were was a general agreement to <u>test N1 vehicles always in unladen condition</u>. The table of vehicle test masses in <u>§ 2.2.1, Annex 3</u>, must be amended as follows: "<u>Vehicle category N1: <math>m_t = m_{kerb} + 75</math> kg for the driver</u>"</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional data requests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OICA</b> agreed to expend the data sets by columns for <u>today's limit values</u>, <u>engine speeds</u> and <u>ambient noise</u> as requested by <b>GRB Informal Group</b>.</li> <li>• <b>OICA</b> also ensured to provide the data sets (on request) in <u>excel sheets</u> as requested by <b>NL</b>. A <u>clarification for the tyre rolling noise calculation</u> will be provided as requested by <b>Italy</b>.</li> <li>• <b>OICA</b> agreed to distribute <u>the results from the heavy duty vehicles and busses comparison studies</u> in sufficient time before the next meeting.</li> <li>• <b>ETRTO</b> asked for the <u>results from the additional tyre measurements</u> carried out by the RWTÜV. <b>NL</b> agreed to provide the results as soon as available.</li> </ul>	<p>DECISIONS</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p><b>OICA</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b></p> <p><b>NL</b></p>
--	---	--

6	<p><b><u>Presentation of working and conference room papers</u></b></p> <p>The papers were discussed in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WP-064 – Presentation of background for WP-063 (ISO)</li> <li>• WP-063 – Proposal for changes to ECE 51 Draft (ISO)</li> <li>• CRP-059 – Definition of masses (OICA)</li> </ul> <p><b>WP-064 - Presentation of background for WP-063</b></p> <p><b>ISO</b> outlined the proposal for amendments to ECE R51 based on experiences from the practical test programs of Japan, US and Europe.</p> <p>The proposed amendments include ISO 362 restructuring, clarifications in order to provide outdated ambiguous or unintended interpretations and technical corrections in order to conform to the intent of procedure.</p> <p><b>ISO</b> also drew the intention on two outstanding issues (description of loading N2 and N3 vehicles / potential conflicts of ISO/ECE definitions with EU directives (see also CRP-059)).</p> <p><b>WP-063 - Proposal for changes to ECE 51 Draft</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments from <b>ISO</b> were discussed in detail and the following decisions were taken.</p> <p><u>New definitions:</u> (Note: renumbering of paragraphs is necessary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>§ 2.10</u> ("Automatic downshift") The ISO proposal was withdrawn, because the proposed definition is only applicable for category L vehicles. → <u>no definition for "automatic downshift"</u></li> </ul>	<p>Action</p> <p><b>Secretary</b></p> <p>DECISION</p>
---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>§ 2.10.1.1</u> ("Power to mass ratio index") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.11(.1/2)</u> ("Reference point") → <u>proposals accepted</u> (see also § 3.1.1, Annex 3)</li> <li>• <u>§ 2.13</u> ("Engine") Note: the definition was checked during the meeting for possible conflicts with EU directives. → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.14</u> ("Target acceleration") The ISO wording was changed. → <u>The definition now reads:</u> "Target acceleration" means an acceleration at a partial throttle condition in urban traffic and is derived from statistical investigations."</li> <li>• <u>§ 2.15</u> ("Reference acceleration") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.16</u> ("Gear ratio weighting factor k") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.17</u> ("Partial power factor k<sub>p</sub>") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.18</u> ("Pre-acceleration") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.19</u> ("Locked gear ratios") → <u>proposal accepted</u></li> <li>• <u>§ 2.20</u> ("Minimum tread depth") There was a longer discussion about the proposed requirement for tread depth measurements ("60 % of the surface"). <b>OICA</b> stated that the manufacturers need a specification how to measure the tread depth in order to ensure the tyre requirements in § 2.2.2 of Annex 3 are satisfied. Therefore <b>ETRTO</b> offered a proposal which specified the number and locations of measurement points (random positions proposed by <b>NL</b>). Neither the ISO wording nor the ETRTO proposal were agreed by GRB Informal Group. → <u>no definition for "minimum tread depth"</u> (+ <u>no amendment to § 2.2.2, Annex 3</u>, until ISO / ETRTO will provide a acceptable wording which addresses the problems of OICA)</li> </ul> <p><u>Annex 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>§ 1.1</u> ("Acoustic measurements"): Clarification of IEC instrument type. → "Type 1 instruments" was replaced by "<u>Class 1 instruments</u>".</li> <li>• <u>§ 1.4</u> ("Instrumentation for speed measurements"): The ISO proposal was accepted with minor changes. The paragraph now reads: "The rotational speed of the engine shall be measured with instrumentation having an accuracy of ± 2 per cent <u>or better at the engine speeds required for the measurements being performed.</u> The road speed of the vehicle shall be measured with instrumentation having an accuracy of <u>at least ± 0.5 km/h when using continuous measurement devices.</u> <u>If testing uses independent measurements of speed, this instrumentation must meet specification limits of at least ± 0.2 km/h.</u></li> </ul>	<p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISIONS</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>§ 2.1</b> ("Test site and ambient conditions"): The <b>ISO</b> proposal was accepted with minor changes. The description of background noise measurement procedure was specified by proposal of <b>Germany</b>. The 10 dB value was agreed. The recommendation for 15 dB was deleted. Finally the following sections and a <u>correction table</u> were added to this paragraph:  <u>"The background noise shall be measured for duration of 10 sec immediately before and after a series of vehicle tests. The measurements shall be made with the same microphones and microphone locations used during the test. The A-weighted maximum sound pressure level shall be reported.</u>  <u>The background noise (including any wind noise) shall be at least 10 dB below the A-weighted sound pressure level produced by the vehicle under test. The following correction shall be applied to the individual measured test value.</u> </li> <li>• <b>§ 3.1.1</b> ("General conditions of test"): The definitions for the reference points were deleted and shifted to the main text, see § 2.11.</li> <li>• <b>§ 3.1.2.1</b> ("Vehicles of category M1, M2 &lt;= 3500 kg, N1")  The reference to the definition of the reference points in § 3.1.1 was deleted and the vehicle path throughout the test was clarified as follows:  <u>"The path of the centreline of the vehicle shall follow the line CC' as closely as possible throughout the entire test, from the approach to line AA' until the rear of the vehicle passes line BB'."</u> </li> <li>• <b>§ 3.1.2.1.2</b> ("Calculation of acceleration"): The <b>ISO</b> proposal to change the heading into "Determination of the Acceleration" was not accepted.  The proposal to add the sentence "<u>Acceleration calculation are applicable to M1, N1 and M2 &lt; 3500 kg categories only</u>" was accepted and it was shifted to the top of the section by proposal of <b>OICA</b>.</li> <li>• <b>§ 3.1.2.1.2.1</b>  The <b>ISO</b> proposal was accepted with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The explanation of a <sub>wot test</sub> was specified.  It now reads "each <u>valid</u> measurement run" by proposal of <b>Germany</b>.</li> <li>- It was discussed whether pre-acceleration may be used or not.  <b>NL</b> and <b>UK</b> expressed there concerns that the proposed wording allows too much freedom and might have an unwanted influence on the test results. <b>Germany</b> and <b>ISO</b> didn't share the concerns. They both didn't expect a significant influence and pointed out that the tests still will be reproducible because pre-acceleration is part of the communication form. Nevertheless it was decided to discuss the matter again <u>after review of data</u>.  The paragraph now reads:  "calculation procedure for [...] and CVTs <u>tested</u> with <u>locked</u> gear <u>ratios</u>  <math>a_{wot\ test} = [...]</math>  <u><math>a_{wot\ test}</math> used in the determination of gear selection shall be the average of four <math>a_{wot\ test, i}</math> during each valid measurement run</u>  <u>Pre-acceleration may be used [review of data]. The location [...]"</u> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>§ 3.1.2.1.2.2</b>  The <b>ISO</b> proposal was accepted with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "<u>valid</u>" was added by proposal of <b>Germany</b> (see § 3.1.2.1.2.1)</li> <li>- <b>Germany</b> proposed that pre-acceleration also <u>may</u> be used for vehicles with automatic transmissions, adaptive transmissions and CVTs tested with non-lockable gear ratios. The wording was changed, but the matter</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISIONS</p>
--	--	--

	<p>will be discussed again <u>after review of data</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was discussed to bring in line AT's and MT's in § 3.1.2.1.2.1./2 Therefore <b>Chairman</b> proposed to change the "a<sub>wot test</sub>-formula" generally from PP'-BB' to AA'-BB' and check afterwards which vehicles do need an exception to this formula (for example CVTs). The proposal was fully supported by <b>Germany</b>. <b>OICA</b> strongly recommended to leave the formula like it is until review of data (especially the Japanese data base, because the original case differentiation was a result of Japanese problems). Both formulas are included until a <u>final decision will be taken based on review of data</u>.</li> </ul> <p>The paragraph now reads:  "calculation procedure for [...] and CVTs <u>tested with non-locked gear ratios</u>  <math>a_{wot\ test} = ((v_{BB}/3.6)^2 - (v_{AA}/3.6)^2) / (2 * (20+1))</math> <u>review based on Japan data</u>  <math>a_{wot\ test\ PP-BB} = ((v_{BB}/3.6)^2 - (v_{PP}/3.6)^2) / (2 * (20+1))</math>  <u>a<sub>wot test</sub> used in the determination of gear selection shall be the average of four a<sub>wot test, i</sub> during each valid measurement run</u>  The location [...]. <u>Pre-acceleration may be used [review of data].</u>"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• § 3.1.2.1.3 ("Partial power factor kp"): The <b>ISO</b> proposal to add the following sentence at the end of paragraph was accepted:  <u>"In cases other than a single gear test a<sub>wot ref</sub> has to be used instead of a a<sub>wot test</sub> (see 3.1.3.1)."</u></li> <li>• § 3.1.2.1.4 ("Gear ratio selection"): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The following wording was shifted from sub-paragraph 3.1.2.1.4.1 ("Manual transmission") to this paragraph and applies now for all kind of vehicles:  <u>"The selection of gear ratios for the test depends on their specific acceleration potential a<sub>wot</sub> under full throttle condition, according to the reference acceleration a<sub>wot ref</sub> required for the full throttle acceleration test."</u></li> <li>- During discussion of § 3.1.2.1.4.2 the question "which automatic operation mode should be chosen for testing?" was raised by <b>Chairman</b>. <b>OICA</b> outlined that the "standard reset mode" should be chosen, because it's the only stable one (all other modes are normally adaptive), and was supported by <b>France</b>. Other delegations, like <b>COMM, Germany, UK, NL</b> and <b>ETRTO</b>, were in favour of choosing the worst case mode (→ highest engine speeds). The expert of <b>Germany</b> and <b>ISO</b> offered the following wording as a compromise. It was introduced in this paragraph:  <u>"It is in the responsibility of the manufacturer to determine the correct manner of testing to achieve the required accelerations."</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>• § 3.1.2.1.4.1 ("Manual transmission"): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The subparagraph now applies to all vehicles with locked gears as proposed by <b>ISO</b>. Therefore the heading was changed as follows:  <u>"Manual transmission, automatic transmissions, adaptive transmissions or transmissions with variable gear ratios (CVTs) tested with locked gear ratios."</u></li> <li>- The first sentence was shifted to § 3.1.2.1.4.</li> <li>- The first condition for selection of gear ratios was corrected as follows:  <u>"If one specific gear ratio gives an acceleration in a tolerance band of +- 5 per cent of the reference acceleration a<sub>wot ref</sub>, <u>not exceeding 2.0 m/s<sup>2</sup></u>, test with that gear ratio."</u></li> <li>- The third condition for selection of gear ratios was adapted as follows:  <u>"if the acceleration value of gear ratio i exceeds 2.0 m/s<sup>2</sup>, the first gear ratio shall be used that gives an acceleration below 2.0 m/s<sup>2</sup> <u>unless gear ratio i+1 provides acceleration less than a<sub>urban</sub></u>. In this case, two gears,</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p>
--	--	---

	<p><u>i and i+1 shall be used, including the gear i with acceleration exceeding 2.0 m/s<sup>2</sup>. In other cases no other gear shall be used. [...]."</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>§ 3.1.2.1.4.2</u> ("Automatic transmission, [...]"): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The subparagraph now applies to all vehicles with non-locked gears as proposed by <b>ISO</b>. Therefore the heading was changed as follows: "Automatic transmission, adaptive transmissions and transmissions with variable gear ratios (CVTs) <u>tested with non-locked gear ratios.</u>"</li> <li>- All other technical corrections proposed by ISO were accepted after a discussion concerning the gear selector position for full automatic operation (see § 3.1.2.1.4). The paragraph now reads: "The gear selector position for <u>full automatic operation</u> shall be used. <u>The acceleration value a<sub>wot test</sub> shall be calculated as defined in 3.1.2.1.2.2.</u> [...] <u>Therefore, it is permitted to establish and use electronic or mechanical devices to prevent a downshift to a gear ratio which is typically not used at the specified test condition in urban traffic.</u> <u>The achieved acceleration a<sub>wot test</sub> shall be greater or equal to a<sub>urban</sub></u> <u>If possible, the manufacturer shall take measures to avoid an acceleration value a<sub>wot test</sub> greater than 2.0 m/s<sup>2</sup>.</u> The achieved acceleration a<sub>wot test</sub> is then used [...]."</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>§ 3.1.2.1.5</u> ("Acceleration test"): Acceleration and down-shift requirements were deleted due to revisions in § 3.1.2.1.4.</li> <li>• <u>§ 3.1.2.1.6</u> ("Constant speed test"): The following sentence was added for clarification reasons: "<u>If the gear is locked for the acceleration test, the same gear shall be locked for the constant speed test.</u>"</li> <li>• <u>§ 3.1.2.2</u> ("Vehicles of categories M2&gt;3500 kg, M3, N2, N3"): The pathway of the vehicle was clarified (see § 3.1.2.1.).</li> <li>• <u>§ 3.1.3</u> ("Interpretation of results"): The decimal precision for speed and acceleration measurement was clarified as follows: "<u>The speed measurement at AA', BB' and PP' shall be noted and used in calculations to the first significant digit after the decimal place.</u> <u>The calculated acceleration a<sub>wot test</sub> shall be noted to the second digit after the decimal place.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>CRP-059 - Definitions of masses</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b> drew the attention to the inconsistent use of definitions for unladen vehicle mass, mass in running order, driver mass, gross vehicle weight and maximum axle (group of axles) capacity according to draft GTR 0: 2004/25, ISO 1176 and 97/27/EC.</p> <p><b>OICA</b> recommended to agree at least to one definition and was in favour of using ISO definitions.</p> <p><b>Chairman</b> pointed out that this regulation should be a basis for a GTR and therefore he proposed to agree on GTR definitions. <b>NL</b> supported the proposal. <b>COMM</b> agreed in principal, but recommended with support of <b>Germany</b> and <b>UK</b> to leave the decision to WP.29.</p> <p><b>COMM</b> stated that there might be additional conflicts with definitions in other regulations / directives and agreed to clarify the matter inside the Commission.</p> <p><b>OICA</b> will prepare a draft with consistent GTR definitions and a flow chart "how to load a vehicle" for the next meeting. Decisions will be taken in GRB.</p>	<p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p><b>COMM</b></p> <p><b>OICA</b></p> <p>DECISION</p>
--	--	---

<b>7</b>	<b><u>Revision of Annex 10</u></b>	Action
	<p><b>Mr. Theis</b> outlined the results from last GRB and the further proceeding regarding ASEP (see also report from last GRB meeting):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deletion of the alternatives regarding the additional test track provisions and the chassis dynamometer test prescriptions in Annex 10</li> <li>adoption of the amendments to Regulation No. 51 (after the inclusion of new limit values) and submission of the proposal for consideration to WP.29 (→ "first step")</li> <li>establish a new informal working group in order to further develop the additional sound emission provisions for M1 and N1 vehicles (Annex 10), taking into account the experiences gained with the new test method (→ "second step")</li> </ul> <p><b>OICA</b> introduced a proposal for ASEP which was already submitted at the 40<sup>th</sup> GRB session (informal document No. GRB-40-4). <b>UK</b> and <b>Germany</b> criticised the proposed wording "The manufacturer shall provide [...] test results [...]. The technical service shall have the possibility to repeat the test(s).", because it was not intended to put the responsibility for the tests on the manufacturers. There was no support of GRB Informal Group for the proposed changes.</p> <p><b>Italy</b> and <b>France</b> pointed out that the wording in § 6.2.3.2 of this draft regulation might exclude devices which are used in order to lower the noise.</p> <p>Therefore the last bullet point of § 6.2.3.2 now reads: "- it is required to fulfil <u>this and/or</u> other regulations."</p> <p>At the request of <b>Chairman</b> it was decided that there is <u>no further need to discuss ASEP in this Informal Group</u>.</p>	<p>INFO</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p> <p>DECISION</p>
<b>8</b>	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	Action
	<p><b>Co-Secretary</b>, Mr. Redmann, has to quit his assignment due to new responsibilities at the German Ministry for Transport, Building and Housing. It is still undecided who will be his successor.</p>	INFO
<b>9</b>	<b><u>Dates and locations of next meetings</u></b>	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>11<sup>th</sup> meeting Berlin, Germany</u>: 24.-26. January 2005</li> <li><u>12<sup>th</sup> meeting Spain</u> (if necessary): 14.-16. March 2005</li> </ul>	INFO
<b>10</b>	<b><u>Meeting closure</u></b>	Action
	<p>On behalf of the Informal Group <b>Mr. Theis</b> thanked all organisations which carried out the test programs and provide the data sets. In addition he thanked UK and SMMT for the well organized and hosted meeting and the Co-Secretary, Mr. Redmann, for his work.</p>	