

Regulatory priorities and possible technology roadmap

I. Background

The representatives of OICA, CLEPA and IMMA were requested to report to the next session of AC.3 in November 2010 on the new technologies being developed by manufacturers as well as a list of priorities for global regulatory harmonization. The following constitutes the joint input from OICA and IMMA, representing the global manufacturers of cars, light and heavy trucks, buses and coaches, and motorcycles.

II. Current status of the '98 Agreement

Two associations, OICA and IMMA, have reviewed the work processes and the GTRs established – including their implementation in national / regional regulations. While the goal of achieving global harmonization is very much a core interest of both associations, the outcome of this joint assessment indicates that the objective has not been fully met. Before devoting much resource trying to harmonize additional technical requirements, priority should be placed on resolving the procedural issues identified below. These issues indeed represent a major obstacle for industry to proactively support the further development of GTR's. These issues are largely not new but no significant improvement can be observed compared to the explanations provided by OICA already in 2005 (TRANS/WP.29/2005/53).

Procedural issues:

- a. Technical regulations in general should contain lead-time provisions (see § 4.1.3.3. of 1998 Agreement), but currently do not. The existence of lead-times and their duration determine most significantly the cost to implement a new requirement and the impact on the cycle plans of OEMs. Ideally they should extend over the life cycle of a product. Extended lead-times are justifiable as in most cases regional regulation already exists and the main motivation of the '98 agreement should be the harmonisation of requirements and not the desire to cover existing regulatory holes quickly.
- b. The implementation dates of GTR's should be harmonised by CP's like the technical requirements. Thus, national deviations (see example below for GTR #1) should not occur.
 - ECE-R 11.03: to be applied by new and running series by Aug. 12, 2012
 - FMVSS 206 (USA): to be applied by new and running series by Feb. 19, 2010
 - CMVSS 206 (CDN): can be applied by new and running series since Feb. 18, 2009
 - GB 15086-20xx (China): draft exists, trans. provisions still unknown
- c. Commitment from CP's that technical requirements are not being altered in the national / regional implementation process in such a way as to leading to serious incompatibilities.
- d. Clear process needed when amending an existing GTR e.g. to incorporate new test tools / new requirements etc regarding Transitional Provisions and an orderly transition between the CP's (see also a & b).
- e. Commitment from CP's that products meeting the GTR requirements as adopted by WP.29 are accepted in their national territories, i.e. they are automatically deemed to comply with any other national requirements on the same subject. This requires that as much as possible modules but especially options are to be avoided.
- f. Unfortunately the current harmonization efforts do not always look at the most appropriate requirements on a global scale but tend to pick the most severe ones, sometimes from different existing regulations. In order to justify the work under the '98 agreement a number of additional requirements are often being added. A general review on how GTR's are to be developed from a technical content perspective is recommended.
- g. Understanding for sure whether conformity of production testing, durability testing and in-service conformity are in or out of the GTRs (open question on WLTP, WMTC, Motorcycle braking gtr).
- h. To assess the real level of harmonization, WP.29 should fill a table, which answers the following questions for each GTR:
 - Date of adoption by AC.3
 - Date of national/regional transition/adoption by Contracting Parties (with the names of the CP's)

- Technical differences of the national regulations of these CP's with respect to the original GTR
- List of all CP's which have not yet adopted the GTR

In addition to the procedural issues outlined above, several parameters have been identified by industry to be critical for the successful completion of a new work item. These can mostly be assessed ahead of the formal establishment of an informal group or should be the first task of such a group.

Go / no-go criteria for GTR development include parameters like stated clear political support from key CP's, non-harmonised current requirements or requirements only in one region or country, the availability of needed research data, an adequate cost-benefit analysis for key regions, administrative savings for regulators and manufacturers etc.

In summary: several procedural aspects need to be addressed with high priority and a proper up-front assessment of the chances of success needs to be completed before starting a new work stream including the commitment of taking a rationale approach towards the technical requirements to be harmonized.

➔ The resolution of these items is key for the continued interest and proactive support of the industry for activities under the '98 agreement.

III. Existing regulations and technologies

There are a number of existing regulations and technologies that either create additional work and complexity or are very costly to meet that should be considered as priority items for future GTRs if they meet the above mentioned criteria. These fall in two main groups:

1. Difficult to comply for manufacturers, as diverging requirements exist world-wide.
2. Need to design to comply from start, as subsequent modifications of the components/systems are complex/expensive.

Quite a number of items fall into either of these above categories. However, it is clear for industry that before engaging in trying to harmonize these, the procedural issues mentioned above need to be resolved in order to avoid repeating the rather negative experiences from the past.

IV. New technologies

During the discussion at the June 2010 WP.29 a number of technologies have been highlighted by different CP's that are viewed as appropriate topics to be regulated under the '98 agreement. From an industry perspective all of these technologies need to undergo the following steps before starting any new work stream:

1. Clarify if WP29 is the only body to work on the technology in question or whether possible overlaps exist with other bodies (e.g. on ITS where also other stakeholders such as infrastructure operators have a key role)
2. Analyze if the technology in question is ready and appropriate for regulatory work or if standardization is the more reasonable way forward. The necessity of regulations should be justified by meaningful statistics, accident data and real world effectiveness.
3. Completion of the "chances of success" assessment as outlined before.
4. Sufficient evidence to be available that a positive cost / benefit can be achieved for key regions.

To consider new or revised legislation for new technologies, especially in the beginning phases of their launch on the market, could actually hamper and restrict technological developments in those particular fields. It is best to wait for the technology to mature, and to base legislation on actual statistics and in-depth accident and other data, as stipulated in the bullet 2. above

Technologies and their application in new vehicles is a highly competitive area and a detailed roadmap can not be made available by any of the associations.