

Meeting date: 22pm-0am May, 27 2021 (Japan time)

1. Change of TF1 leader

(1) **Co-leader: Mr. He Yuntang**

**Co-leader: Ms. Annett Schuessling**

(2) **Leaders to set a TF1 meeting before the next #10IWG on Jun 28-29.**

2. Getting consensus on the issues

(1) Material compatibility: [GTR13-7-8](#)/Description of the method, [GTR13-9-13](#)/Draft test procedure

➤ **EU**: Part 2 or CP option. Annex referred in Part 1 can be acceptable. Other solutions can also be considered. The key point is that CP should not be able to reject perfectly safe products simply because it does not conform to a regional material specification standard.

**EC will try to propose wordings for GTR to reflect the above policy in next IWG.**

➤ **CHI**: No need or Part 1. China has national standard. The material issues should not be included in the regulation.

➤ **US**, : Part 1. Appreciates the test procedure development, it is useful information. However, this should be in Part I only. In addition, the test procedures for material compatibility are long, so they should be placed in an Annex which can be referred to by Part I.

➤ **CA**: Agrees with US and China that material compatibility table should not be in Part 2.

➤ **JPN**: Part 2 or CP option. Annex referred to in Part 1 can be acceptable. Agrees to consider other solutions.

➤ **Korea** : Part 2 or CP option. It is necessary to prevent the possibility of problems caused by the use of indiscriminate materials.

**China is requested to show how the material standard can be applied to the products in next IWG.**

**Chairman will consult with the Secretary of GRSP/WP.29 about the use of “annex”.**

(2) Sled Test

➤ **EU**: Part 2.

**EC will explain its proposal and discuss in TF1.**

➤ **US**: TBD. US questions what the sled test seeks to evaluate, and notes that problems with mounting/anchors have not been reported. US suggests considering the container impact test that is being developed for UNR134. In this impact test, the container, along with its associated vehicle shielding, is impacted by a deformable barrier. This impact test may be preferable to a sled

test because it addresses a broader range of risks such as front impact, side impact, and rollover.

**EC is requested to show the necessity of the sled test in next TF1 or IWG.**

(3) Receptacle

- US admitted that it could be in Part 1 and that the receptacle design should not be frozen at current version of ISO.
- CA: agreed with US but also expressed flexibility with the ISO standard citation. . TF2 leader agreed with US position in recent discussions by mail.
- **Chairman will request TF2 leader to clarify and make a specific proposal.**

(4) Change of design: [GTR13-9-12](#)

- Chair: Objected that the change of design table be included in the GTR, which is meant to be certification system neutral. Because it is not compatible with the GTR, it should not be discussed in TF 3, other than to clarify that the table would be in an annex of UNR 134.
- US: stated that this item is not suitable for the GTR based on the 1998 Agreement. The change of design concept is incompatible with self-certification, and therefore incompatible with the GTR.
- CA: No need or Part1. Support US position but can compromise on Part1.
- EU: stated that it did not matter that much, and that EC would be flexible because it would transpose the table from UN Regulation No. 134
- JPN: Part2 or Part1.
- Korea : Part2. If it is minor change & same performance, double testing is not necessary.
- Chair asked at the end of the discussion, since there was no consensus on this issue, if a reference to an annex would be a possible solution.

3. Schedule

**The schedule was confirmed.**

- Jun?/TF1 → Jun/28-29 #10 IWG
- Sep?/#11 IWG
- Dec/ GRSP Informal proposal → May/'22 GRSP Formal Proposal