SLR special meeting on “Headlamp levelling”

WebEx on Friday, 20 July 2021
9:30 - 11:00 hrs (Central European Summer Time)
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DRAFT MINUTES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Welcome and opening remarks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The chairman opened the meeting welcoming all the participants and provided a brief overview on the purpose of this special SLR session. A list of all participants is available in Annex 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Adoption of the agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;The agenda was adopted without modifications.</td>
<td>SLR-HL-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Approval of the minutes of the last meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;The minutes were shown on the screen and approved without modifications.</td>
<td>SLR-HL-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome of GRE-84</strong></td>
<td>ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/84 (Paragraphs 14. and 15.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>SLR revised proposal to amend UN Regulation No. 48</strong></td>
<td>GRE/2020/8/Rev.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Polish proposal to amend the initial downward inclination</strong>&lt;br&gt;The agenda items Nos. 4, 5 and 6 have not been discussed since they were put on the agenda only for information and reference purposes.</td>
<td>GRE-84-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>SAE Reference documents</strong>&lt;br&gt;- “Recommendations of the SAE TF on Headlamp Mounting Height”&lt;br&gt;- “Headlamp Mounting Height for Passenger and Pickup Truck Vehicles”&lt;br&gt;The participants took note of the availability of these two Technical Reports on headlamp mounting height, kindly provided by SAE for review/reference purposes only.&lt;br&gt;The chairman thanked Mr. Gorzkowski and SAE for having granted to the SLR reading access to these documents and reminded that such documents remain SAE copyrighted intellectual property.</td>
<td>J2338&lt;br&gt;J2584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>How to move forward</strong>&lt;br&gt;- <em>what is the basis of further work (diagram)?</em>&lt;br&gt;- <em>revised or new proposal?</em>&lt;br&gt;- <em>further investigations needed?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chairman opened the debate by providing a comprehensive justification on the need to achieve unanimous agreement. He explained that working on the basis of the support from the majority only works at decision level meetings (such as WP.29), but not in a WG where technical discussions take place. If SLR wants to succeed in GRE, “unanimous agreement” (at least consensus, a full “buy in” without objections or “concerns” expressed) shall be achieved.

The expert from Poland recalled the significant compromise achieved by agreeing on having automatic levelling for all vehicles, with the only exception of the off-road vehicles.

The expert from UK reminded to have consistently raised, during the last meetings, the UK concerns for the lack of a solid justification for moving to the left in the diagram. Glare is a significant concern in the UK by the public and by the administration, therefore shifting the diagram to the left - which usually causes issues of glare - shall be clearly justified. If the proposal is adopted in its current form, it is likely that there will be no more interest to further improve it in the future. He suggested to move the left line more to the right, as this would help finding an agreement.

The expert from Germany agreed that the 0.2 % value for the upper vertical inclination limit should be better clarified in the justification. However, after the additional explanation at the last meeting (i.e. having initially at least 0.5 % on the vehicle), he has now less concerns about the 0.2 % value.

The expert from France pointed out that concrete proposals are necessary in order to make progress and avoid the repetition of this situation again in the future. He observed that consensus has been achieved many times in the IWGs (VGL first and then in SLR) but then at GRE level the position from CPs was different and we never succeeded.

The expert from France reiterated his support for the last version of the diagram (see GRE/2020/8/Rev.2) as this compromise solution reflects several aspects to be taken into account such as PTIs, glare, levelling, visibility range. Moreover, he pointed out that the solution shall be technology neutral since the target is to stay within the box and not to define how to achieve this. To this end, the proposed HMI improvements could help. Reopening the discussion on the box would be acceptable only in case of concrete and justified proposals.

The expert from Japan recommended to stick to the current proposal. She pointed out that there is no relaxation from the existing requirements while the safety on the road would increase by mandating auto-levelling. Furthermore, she reported that the Japanese experts had further looked into all issues pertaining to the box and, in principle, cannot support the suggestion from UK to move the left line.

The expert from Poland commented that something which improves the current situation should be proposed and, in this regard, he observed that the proposed diagram is not perfect, but it is better than the existing one. Nevertheless, he pointed out that with mandatory auto-levelling for all vehicles (except off-road), the main focus should be on the initial aim since this is now the main issue for safety and not the box itself, like in the past. To better explain this comment, the expert from Poland showed a diagram indicating in green colour where the attention should be focussed (see doc. SLR-HL-18).
The chairman, having heard all the comments from the various CPs, suggested to make one more attempt to find a solution supported by unanimous agreement. He therefore suggested to schedule one more special SLR meeting in September, but under the proviso that concrete proposals will be received from CPs (latest a week prior to said special meeting). Without any concrete input, the meeting will be cancelled and the SLR will have to report to GRE that, despite several attempts, no unanimous agreement could be reached.

The group agreed to proceed as suggested by the chairman.

9. **Any Other Business**
   No other business was discussed.

10. **Next meetings**
    The next SLR special sessions on "Headlamp levelling" is scheduled on 16 September 2021, from 9:30 to 12:30 hrs (CEST). Nevertheless, this special meeting will take place only if the SLR Secretariat will receive concrete proposals from the CPs by 10 September 2021 at 12:00 hrs CEST. Without concrete proposals, this special meeting will not take place.

11. **Closure**
    The chairman thanked all the participants for their fruitful contribution and closed the meeting.
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