

DRAFT AGENDA

16th meeting of the GRRF informal group on

Advanced Emergency Braking and Lane Departure Warning Systems

Venue: Palais des Nations, UNECE, Geneva
Chairman: Mr. Johan Renders (EC) (johan.renders@ec.europa.eu)
Secretariat: Mr. Olivier Fontaine (OICA) (ofontaine@oica.net)
Duration of the session: Monday, 12 September 2011: starting at 10.30 am

Note: Any comments or documents relating to this meeting should be sent to the OICA Secretariat (ofontaine@oica.net) in e-format, so that meeting documents can be made available to the UNECE secretariat for publication on the website of WP29.

1. Welcome and Introduction

2. Approval of the agenda

Document: AEBS/LDWS-16-01 (Chair)

3. Outcome of GRRF-70 and the 15th meeting of the AEBS/LDWS IG

Oral report by the Chair and approval of the draft minutes

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/70
AEBS/LDWS-15-08 (draft minutes)

4. Outstanding issues in the draft UNECE Regulation on AEBS

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2011/92 + ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2011/93

4.1. Introduction

Outcome GRRF70: GRRF agreed to provide guidance to the Contracting Parties on such vehicles in a specific paragraph of the preamble of the Regulation. GRRF agreed to have a final review of the wording of this paragraph, reproduced in Annex II, at its September 2011 session.

4.2. D proposal for “deceleration phase” (paragraph 5.2.2.)

Outcome IG15: The informal group held a debate about the performance requirements of the emergency braking phase. The Chair suggested that D comes up with a proposal for GRRF-71 of September 2011, as the informal group did not receive mandate to deal with this item, and as the D proposal did not receive support from the Contracting Parties present at the 15th meeting of the informal group.

4.3. Annex 3 - Warning and activation test requirements – pass/fail values

Outcome GRRF70: GRRF discussed the pass/fail values proposed by the informal group for the warning and activation test in Annex 3 of the draft Regulation (...).GRRF agreed in principle to have requirements for N2 vehicles above 8 tonnes equipped with mitigation systems (row 2 of the table in GRRF-70-05) and deleted the "blank row" option for this group of vehicles. (...) GRRF could not agree on the other text in square brackets in the table (footnotes, row 3).

4.3.1. Document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2011/92:

- a. **Vehicles with pneumatic-hydraulic braking system (AoH) (footnote [1])**
- b. **Vehicles of category M₃ with hydraulic braking system (footnote [2])**
- c. **Vehicles with pneumatic braking system (footnote [3])**
- d. **Vehicles with pneumatic rear axle suspension (footnote [4])**

Outcome GRRF70: GRRF also discussed the issue as to whether the draft Regulation should include requirements for vehicles not equipped with pneumatic rear axle suspension (i.e. vehicles with rigid rear axle suspension). The expert from CLEPA presented GRRF-70-08 showing the vertical angle capability of AEBS sensors and that, for these vehicles, sensor system development was required. A number of experts were of the opinion that such vehicles should not be subject to the pass/fail values proposed in Annex 3 of the draft Regulation because the present AEBS were not able to cope with the variation of the pitch angle of these vehicles. Other experts were in favour of including such vehicles in Annex 3 of the draft Regulation to support the development of specific sensor systems for these vehicles. Other options considered by GRRF were to cover such vehicles in a further step of the Regulation or only require warning systems with no action on the brakes for these vehicles in a first step. GRRF could not reach a final decision and agreed to let WP.29 decide on this issue. GRRF requested the AEBS/LDWS informal group to study the possible options mentioned above, as well as the alternative proposal (GRRF-70-02-Rev.1) proposed by Germany. The AEBS/LDWS Chair agreed to hold a meeting of the informal group before the summer break (26-27 May 2011) on this topic.

Outcome IG15: OICA to present a consistent proposal for non-pneumatic suspension vehicles

- e. **Reservation from Japan for light M₂/N₂ vehicles (footnote [5])**

*Outcome IG15: J stated that they withdrew their reservation per footnotes 4 (document AEBS/LDWS-15-01) & 5 (AEBS/LDWS-15-02).
Conclusion:*

- footnotes 4 & 5 (reservation from Japan toward light M₂/N₂ vehicles) withdrawn.
- If still interested, Japan is urged to table a relevant document to GRRF-71 in order to generate a debate about the consistency of the requirements for light vehicles.

f. timing of warning modes for moving target scenario

Outcome GRRF70: With regard to the timing of the first warning mode for a moving target for collision avoidance requirements (i.e. cells E1 and E2 of the table in GRRF-70-06), GRRF noted the preference by the expert from Germany, for 2 seconds in particular for legal reasons. However, a majority of experts favoured 1.4 second. Therefore, GRRF agreed to delete the 2 second option and to keep the value of 1.4 second in square brackets in cells E1 and E2 of the table in GRRF 70 06 (avoidance systems) as well as in cell E1 of the table in GRRF 70-05 (mitigation systems).

g. M₂ vehicles and N₂ vehicles below 8 tonnes (row 3)

Outcome GRRF70: (...) For N₂ vehicles below 8 tonnes and M₂ vehicles (row 3), GRRF requested the AEBS/LDWS informal group to further discuss the possibility of further developing the specific requirements for these vehicles, including requiring warning systems only or covering such vehicles in a further step.

Outcome IG15:

- New 3rd option from OICA, for the 1st step (deletion of row 3)
- No clear support from the other parties for this 3rd option
- No progress made by the informal group towards reaching consensus on this item.

4.3.2. Document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2011/93:

a. Vehicles of category M₃ with hydraulic braking system (footnote 1)

See agenda item 4.3.1.b above

b. Vehicles with pneumatic braking system (footnote 2)

See agenda item 4.3.1.c above

c. Vehicles with pneumatic rear axle suspension (footnote [3])

See agenda item 4.3.1.d above

d. Reservation from Japan for light M₂/N₂ vehicles (footnote 4)

See agenda item 4.3.1.e above

e. timing of warning modes for moving target scenario

See agenda item 4.3.1.f above

f. M₂ vehicles and N₂ vehicles below 8 tonnes (row 3)

See agenda item 4.3.1.g above

4.4. Transitional provisions:

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2011/93

Outcome GRRF70: The AEBS/LDWS Chair presented the draft transitional provisions between step 1 and step 2 of the draft Regulation prepared by the informal group in GRRF-70-06 superseding ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2011/26, indicating that for none of these provisions consensus had been reached.. A number of experts were in favour of further simplifying these transitional provisions. However, GRRF could not reach a final decision and agreed to send the draft transitional provisions contained in GRRF-70-06, as reproduced in Annex II, for final decision by WP.29 at its November 2011 session.

5. Actions for GRRF-71 and general conclusions.