

Minutes of the 9th Session of the Informal Group of IWVTA

Date & time: March 9 (Friday) 10:00-16:00

Venue: OICA (Paris)

Participants: Messrs. Gauvin (Chairman), Renders (Co-chairman/EC)

Onoda (Co-chairman/Japan) Hubert (UNECE TD)

Government: Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Russian Federation,
South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom

Industry Organization: CLEPA, OICA, ETRTO

Technical Secretary: Oshita (Japan)

Total: 30 participants

Agenda 1.Adoption of the agenda (IWVTA-09-02-Rev.1)

- Germany requested to add the agenda item “the proposal to establish a permanent group for the IWVTA process”. The Chairman agreed to discuss it as part of agenda 8 “Others”.

Agenda 2.Adoption of the report of the 8th IWVTA Informal meeting (IWVTA-09-01)

- Germany stated that his statement mentioned at line 6-7 on page 3 of the document IWVTA-09-01 was not accurate so he would send corrected version of his statement to Technical Secretary afterward. (note by Technical Secretary: The document was revised and uploaded as the document IWVTA-09-01-Rev.1)

Agenda 3.Outcome of WP29 at its 155th session: working schedule for the revision of 1958 Agreement and drafting UN R0 and proposal to set up two drafting teams (IWVTA-09-03-Rev.1)

- The Chairman summarized the outcome of WP.29 at its 155th session referring to paragraph 50 of the report (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1093).
- The Technical Secretary illustrated the outline of the document “The proposed work schedule to revise the 1958 Agreement and to make UN R0” (IWVTA-09-03-Rev.1).
- OICA welcomed the revised schedule to hold more meetings for the drafting teams and expressed its intention to participate in both teams. OICA asked the way to hold the meetings; concurrent or consecutive?
- The Chairman proposed to have two consecutive meetings; one on the morning and the other on the afternoon of the previous day of the IWVTA Informal meeting. The Chairman asked OICA to reserve the meeting room for these meetings. The Chairman further stated that EC would be the Chairman of the Sub-group to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement and Japan would be the Chairman of the Sub-group to draft UN Regulation No.0.

- OICA asked the way to revise the 1958 Agreement; reconstruct the whole Agreement or amend it article by article?
- EC replied that amending the Agreement article by article would be easier and added that the document “Proposed actions by article” (IWVTA-09-05-Rev.1) was prepared for this purpose.
- Japan stated that the ministry of foreign affairs in each CP should be consulted about the format of the revision of the 1958 Agreement.
- UK stated that amending article by article would make it easier to explain the revisions in the ratification process of the revised 1958 Agreement in each CP. UK also stated that it would be necessary to draw up a work schedule considering the time necessary to process the documents by WP.29 Secretariat.
- The Chairman replied, “The revised Agreement shall enter into force nine months after the notification provided that no CP expresses an objection.” The revision of the 1958 Agreement would be carried forward in such a way as the previous ones. All the CPs would be asked about the necessary period for domestic consideration and related procedures which would be provided accordingly. Strong support from each CP would be required.

Agenda 4.Candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA &

Agenda 5.Guideline for GRs to review technical regulations applicable to IWVTA

- Technical Secretary illustrated the outline of the document “Proposal for candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA and the guideline for GRs to review technical regulations applicable to IWVTA” (IWVTA-09-04) and introduced comments submitted by GR Chairpersons on the document.
- Germany recommended that IWVTA Informal Group should coordinate and consolidate GR activities and report to WP.29 because it would not be effective for each GR to approach WP.29 with different positions on various issues. Germany also stated the necessity of a special meeting attended by GR Chairpersons and IWVTA Informal Group to discuss the guideline issues and to clarify open questions, which could be held on Thursday afternoon of WP.29 session.
- The Chairman stated that it would be difficult to hold such a meeting in June because Enforcement Informal Group meeting is scheduled on the afternoon of June 28 (Thursday).
- Germany replied that Thursday afternoon of November WP.29 session would be appropriate for the meeting because GRRF and GRB do not have meetings until September.
- Japan explained about “IWVTA ambassador” which was new to the IWVTA Informal Group. Japan suggested that CPs attending IWVTA Informal meetings should proactively consider becoming IWVTA ambassadors because it would play an important role of liaison between GRs and IWVTA Informal Group.
- OICA supported the proposal of Germany and added that a special meeting

attended by GR Chairpersons and IWVTA Informal Group should be held periodically.

- OICA proposed to remove items for individual unit such as headlamp from the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA. OICA also proposed to add consideration of the possibility of virtual testing to the reviewing points by GRs.
- UK stated that it would be natural for the industry to pursue virtual testing but it would be difficult for GR to forward it because virtual testing has uncertainties.
- EC stated that basic concept for virtual testing should be placed in “Placeholder” and individual cases should be considered at each GR.
- OICA agreed with EC on the approach to forward virtual testing.

- Germany pointed out the importance to communicate with GRs via IWVTA Ambassador because it would be difficult for GRs to understand the guideline only through papers.
- The Chairman supported the proposal by Germany because direct report to AC1 from GR might cause some confusion.
- EC stated that it was legitimate for IWVTA Informal Group to update and summarize the progress of each GR in reviewing IWVTA technical regulations at IWVTA Informal meeting and report it to WP.29 to be held in the following week, which enabling us to take a consistent approach to WP.29.
- Japan asked OICA its intention to raise the issue of virtual testing. More specifically, Japan asked, if OICA intends to offer another new proposal regarding virtual testing since the inventory (WP.29-155-27) already includes virtual testing as main issues.
- OICA replied that it would like the concept of virtual testing to be introduced in the placeholder of the revised 1958 Agreement and the possibility for virtual testing on a case-by-case basis to be considered by respective GR.
- UK stated that there has been no agreement regarding virtual testing so far.

- Next, IWVTA Informal Group discussed OICA comments on the flow chart for “Guideline for each GR to review technical regulations applicable to IWVTA” (IWVTA-09-10) and agreed to amend it as follows.
 - Step 0: ”Approve the candidate of technical regulation items applicable to IWVTA” was amended to read as “Approve in principle the candidate of technical regulation items applicable to IWVTA”.
 - Step 1/2: “each GR reports to WP.29” was amended and read as “each GR reports to IWVTA Informal Group / IWVTA Informal Group coordinates and consolidates GR all activities and reports to WP.29”
 - Step 3: “Final consultation process between each GR and IWVTA Informal Group to reconsider the list of UN Regulations applicable to IWVTA, if

necessary” was added.

- Next, IWVTA Informal Group discussed OICA comments on the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA (IWVTA-09-09).
- OICA put remarks of “No” for the items whose contents were unclear, such as item “Running system”. OICA also stated that items for individual parts would be unnecessary for IWVTA.
- EC asked whether OICA regarded NTA as necessary on top of IWVTA approval if OICA said “No” for the nationally applicable unique items.
- OICA responded that eliminating NTA is ideal but in practice it is difficult. OICA suggested taking a three-step approach illustrated by the document IWVTA-04-10; start with Step1 allowing national requirements and NTA, evolve over time to Step 2 reducing national requirements, and finally reach Step 3 realizing complete mutual recognition of WFTA.
- OICA added that OICA did not say parts requirements should not be considered, rather the relation between the parts requirements and their installation requirements should be reviewed and might be rearranged.

- Japan stated that it was important to firstly put all national requirements on the agenda of this meeting even if some of them might be given lower priority. Then, if there were national requirements which were judged to be inappropriate as the international regulations in this meeting, those regulation could tentatively be removed from the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA.
- OICA had concern that the existence of ten or more items which has no UN Regulations might hinder the whole process to review technical regulations applicable to IWVTA. OICA suggested that items having no UN Regulations should be considered at a later stage.
- EC proposed to prioritize the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA.
- Germany stated that adding national requirements to technical regulations applicable to IWVTA has lower priority.
- The Chairman asked the meaning of “No” expressed in OICA comments; second priority or elimination?
- OICA responded that “No” meant the necessity of the item was unclear. OICA did not request to eliminate the items with the remarks “No” right away. Rather, OICA would like GR members to take OICA comments into consideration in reviewing technical regulations applicable to IWVTA.
- Japan stated the issue of reproduction and reference to private standards in UN Regulations should also be considered.
- CLEPA pointed out eliminating parts requirements might lead to a loophole in IWVTA.

- OICA replied that the loophole would be prevented by stipulating the necessity of type approval on parts in the provision of installation requirements such as R48.
- EC suggested that a remark “covered by R48” should be added to the note for the lamp unit items.
- In conclusion IWVTA Informal Group agreed, in principle, to report the document IWVTA-09-04 to WP29 for its consideration with a note saying the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA would be prioritized later and reported to WP.29 at its June session.

- The Russian Federation representative, WP29 Chairman, Mr. B. Kisulenko informed informal group about the new Custom Union Regulation on Motor Vehicle Safety, which was adopted in December 2011 and will enter into force from 1.01.2015 for the Russian Federation, Belorussia and Kazakhstan. This Regulation is based on Russian Regulation on Motor Vehicle Safety, and also uses ECE UN Regulation and GTRs as normative references. After 1.01.2015 no national legislation in the Russian Federation, Belorussia and Kazakhstan for motor vehicles will exist.

[The meeting schedule was discussed before moving to agenda item 6]

- Japan proposed to hold kickoff meetings of the two Sub-groups on May 23-24 in Tokyo. However, it was made clear that the week of May 21 falls on GRSG meetings.
- IWVTA Informal Group agreed on the meeting schedule as follows.
 - June 20 (Wednesday) at OICA in Paris: the 1st Sub-group meeting to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement
 - June 21 (Thursday) at OICA in Paris: the 1st Sub-group meeting to draft UN R0
 - June 22 (Friday) at OICA in Paris: the 10th IWVTA Informal meeting
 - September 26* (Wednesday) at European Commission in Brussels: the 2nd Sub-group meeting to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement
 - September 27* (Thursday) at European Commission in Brussels: the 2nd Sub-group meeting to draft UN R0
 - November 7 (Wednesday) at OICA in Paris: the 3rd Sub-group meeting to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement
 - November 8 (Thursday) at OICA in Paris: the 3rd Sub-group meeting to draft UN R0
 - November 9 (Friday) at OICA in Paris: the 11th IWVTA Informal meeting

*Note: At the 9th IWVTA Informal meeting, it was decided to hold September meeting on 25 and 26. However, the meeting dates have been shifted to 26 and 27 due to the availability of a conference room in EC. .

Agenda 6.The review of the 1958 Agreement

6-1 proposed actions by Article

- EC explained the document IWVTA-09-05. EC stated that the action “Consider to add the amendment procedure for placeholder” for Article 13 was added, which was not mentioned in the inventory.
- OICA stated that it was necessary to include “completeness of data” in placeholder.
- UNECE informed that the latest revision of WP.29/2011/48/Rev.1 will be issued in due course.

6-2 Confirmation of proposed revision of Article 3 (MRA)

- EC asked whether OICA proposal for the revision of Article 3 would cause any problems or not.
- Japan agreed on OICA proposal. However, Japan had the concern that COP audit might be difficult if one of the conditions to accept type approval, i.e., “and manufactured either in the territory of a Contracting Party applying the Regulation concerned, or in such other country as is designated by the Contracting Party which has duly approved the types of wheeled vehicles, equipment or parts concerned” should be deleted from Article 3. Japan requested to put this concern on record.
- OICA responded that WTO would make an objection to restricting vehicle manufacturing sites.
- EC totally agreed to delete the above-mentioned clause from Article 3. EC suggested that the COP issue should be addressed by the revision of Article 2.
- UK stated that further review of the wording in Article 3 must be necessary. UK pointed out that the clause “---- shall be held to be in conformity with the legislation of all the Contracting Parties applying the said Regulation ---” should be amended such as “---- shall be held to be in conformity with the concerned legislation of all the Contracting Parties applying the said Regulation ---”
- Germany pointed out that proposed revision of Article 3 still covers only UN ECE type approvals granted to components and vehicle systems and does not cover whole vehicle type approvals.

6-3 Consideration of possibility of issuing and accepting type approvals according to earlier versions of UN Regulations

- EC explained the document IWVTA-09-07. EC asked whether it should be necessary to enable new CPs to move to a version between entry level and current version or not.
- OICA responded that it would be necessary to give new CPs flexible approach in raising the level of UN Regulations they apply because it would be sometimes difficult for them to move to the latest version with one leap in some cases such as exhaust emission regulation.
- South Africa talked about the problem they faced. Technical Services cannot

perform COP audit on Euro 2, the older version of emission regulation applied in South Africa. South Africa now discusses moving to a later version of emission regulation with the vehicle manufacturers.

- Russian Federation stated that the older version of UN Regulations cannot be applied under the current 1958 Agreement.
- The Chairman replied that's why the Informal Group was considering the way to make it possible.
- OICA stated that it was significant to allow type approvals issued based on the older versions of UN Regulations under the 1958 Agreement because one UN type approval could replace several national type approvals based on the older version of the UN Regulation required by respective countries.
- OICA stated that it was better not to limit to new CPs which are allowed to apply older versions of UN Regulations.
- EC replied that the proposal targeted at new CPs was made because one of the purposes of the revision of the 1958 Agreement was to make it so attractive that emerging countries would be willing to join it. EC added that it might be possible to extend this right to the existing CPs which had not applied the concerned UN Regulation yet, if necessary.
- UK asked whether the CPs applying the latest UN Regulation could issue type approvals based on the older version of the said UN Regulation or not.
- EC replied that a matter of acceptance should be considered first and then matter of issuance should be addressed separately. EC also stated that rights and restrictions for CPs applying older versions of UN Regulations should also be considered.

Agenda 7.The first draft of UN R0

- OICA explained the outline of the first draft of UN R0 using the document IWVTA-09-11. OICA stated the necessity to make a matrix chart showing the CP and the regulations applied by that CP because of the complexity of the IWVTA requirements referring to Annex 4: List of requirements for the purpose of IWVTA.
- Japan stated the drafting Sub-group should start consideration of UN R0 based on this first draft made by OICA. Japan also stated feedbacks from Asian or other countries could be expected.
- UK showed the concern over too many approval marks.
- OICA replied that UN R0 excludes multi-stage approvals and that approval marks are not necessary for vehicle systems.
- Germany suggested that the information on the complied UN regulations should be added to Certificate of Conformity. Germany also suggested to consider the potential linkage of technical description between CoC and DETA.
- EC pointed out that the word "Limited Validity" should be changed to either

“Restricted Recognition” or “Limited Recognition” because “Limited Validity” can be interpreted as “Validity limited in time”.

- UK asked how the evolving list of requirements for IWVTA would be updated ? Updating the list including not only UN Regulations but also national or regional requirements would be a burden.
- EC stated the necessity to eliminate NTA but supposed it to be partial IWVTA plus NTA for the time being.
- OICA gave a reason for including national requirements in Table 4 of Annex 4. OICA expected it to have an effect to restrain national requirements.
- UK stated that any idea of restraining national requirements from updating would be opposed.
- CLEPA stated from their experience that it would be difficult to collect information on national requirements.
- Japan supported UK and stated that the contents of UN R0 should be discussed after its purpose should be made clear.
- Japan raised the issue of VIN having no UN regulations as one of discussion points to be considered.

Agenda 8.Others, if any

8-1 Proposal to establish a permanent group for the IWVTA process

- Germany explained the proposal.
- The Chairman stated that establishing a new GR would not be approved because of the budget restriction but permanent informal group might be possible. The Chairman asked Germany to submit this proposal to WP.29.
- Germany responded that the proposal should be submitted to WP29 at its November session or later after it being agreed by IWVTA Informal Group because it was not an urgent matter.
- The Chairman told the Technical Secretary to put it on the agenda of IWVTA Informal meeting in June.
- UK suggested submitting the proposal to WP29 after UN R0 should have been fixed more firmly. It was not necessary to take the November target too seriously.

8-2 Other

- The Chairman told the Technical Secretary to put decision of IWVTA Ambassadors on the agenda of IWVTA Informal meeting in June.
- Japan stated that it would be desirable that a single person who attends all of the WP.29 sessions, GR meetings and IWVTA Informal meetings could play the role of IWVTA Ambassador, however, a Contracting Party may play such a role.
- The Chairman suggested that WP29 Secretariat and JASIC representative in Geneva Office would be perfect for IWVTA Ambassador because they attend both

meetings.

- UNECE TD responded that it might be impossible to get permission from higher-ups.
- Japan responded that IWVTA Ambassador would not be allocated to individual persons but to be allocated to CPs.

Action Items

Action Items	Responsibility	Due
Agenda item 4. -Prioritize the candidate items for technical regulations applicable to IWVTA and send it to the Technical Secretary	All members	June 1 (Friday)
-Consider the basic concept of virtual testing to be placed in placeholder	OICA	
Agenda item 5. -Inform the IWVTA Informal Group of its intention to volunteer for IWVTA Ambassador	All CPs	June 22 (Friday)
Agenda item 6. -Send the documents to be used at Sub-group meeting to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement to the Technical Secretary	Sub-group to draft the revision of the 1958 Agreement	June 12 (Tuesday)
Agenda item 7. -Send the documents to be used at Sub-group meeting to draft UN R0 to the Technical Secretary	Sub-group to draft UN R0	June 12 (Tuesday)
Agenda item 8. -Consider the proposal to establish a permanent group for the IWVTA process	All members	June 22 (Friday)

Attendant List

	NAME	Country or organization
1	Mr. Bernard Gauvin	Chairman
2	Mr. J. Renders	European Commission / Co-chairman
3	Mr. Takao Onoda	JAPAN / Co-chairman
4	Mr. Harry Jongenelen	Netherlands
5	Mr. Ian Yarnold	UK
6	Mr. Tony Stenning	UK/VCA
7	Mr. Steve Morgan	South Africa
8	Mr. Richard Damm	Germany
9	Mr. Frank Wrobel	Germany/ KBA
10	Mr. Ignacio Blanco	Spain/ INTA
11	Mr. Boris Kisulenko	Russian Federation
12	Mr. Vitaly Komarov	Russian Federation
13	Mr. Hiroyuki Inomata	Japan
14	Mr. Ryo Yamada	Japan
15	Mr. Romain Hubert	UNECE TD
16	Mr. Yves van der Straaten	OICA
17	Mr. Olivier Fontaine	OICA
18	Mr. Peter Schramm	OICA
19	Mr. Turan Haldun	OICA
20	Mr. Torsten Janzyk	OICA
21	Mr. Dominique Mennesson	OICA
22	Mr. Tadaomi Akiba	OICA
23	Mr. Michio Miyamoto	OICA
24	Mr. Ben Van Assche	OICA
25	Mr. Uwe Toppel	VDA
26	Mr. Louis Sylvain Ayrat	CLEPA
27	Mr. Jean-Claude Noirhomme	ETRTO
28	Mr. Ushio Ueno	Japan/ JASIC
29	Mr. Masahiko Sakai	Japan/ JASIC
30	Mr. Ryuzo Oshita	Japan/ JASIC, Technical Secretary