

## Svensson Bolennarth

---

**Från:** Svensson Bolennarth  
**Skickat:** den 26 augusti 2013 14:15  
**Till:** 'Teyssier Pierre'; Westphäling, Jürgen  
**Kopia:** Olivier FONTAINE (ofontaine@oica.net)  
**Ämne:** SV: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Experts,

As I look into this again I realize that this is something that I have noted several times to be a general problem. What I aim at is the confusion that we get as we do not distinguish between actual equipment performance and required performance generated by a specific application.

- When you are testing equipment according to Annex 6 then you verify a specific performance level to be put in the certificate of the product. This of course represents a maximum level of performance.
- When you apply the D-value formula you evaluate the minimum performance level that is required in a specific application.

As I remember the discussion around the tables (among them table 3) was that it should be possible to classify to e.g. A50-1 also a product that have a D-value higher than 17 kN. By saying that the table is indicating minimum values is to say that a coupling of e.g. class A50-1 has at least a D-value performance of 17kN.

I think that the original text with the word "maximum" in the legend was originally put there to indicate that the application where the coupling is used may not require a higher performance level than what is stated for the different coupling classes in e.g. table 3.

I think that we shall withdraw the item from the proposal to the September GRRF. Instead I propose that we take in the informal working group a new debate on how to distinguish between actual equipment performance levels and required performance level in the specific application.

I meet this confusion among users often. It would be a very good thing to have this sorted out once and for all.

We may end up in this debate anyhow as we eventually address combinations, like e.g. a rigid truck + a dolly + a semitrailer that is fairly common. Furthermore we have other combinations that are defined within the European Modular System. We then need to address where to handle the requirements for combinations that has today really no direct link to the certification of a specific vehicle.

Hälsningar

**Bolennarth Svensson, PhD**  
**Business Engineer Coupling Equipment**  
VBG GROUP TRUCK EQUIPMENT AB  
Box 1216  
SE-462 28 Vänersborg  
Street address: Herman Kreftings gata 4

Tel +46 521 278126  
Fax +46 521 277794  
Mobile +46 706 177217  
E-mail [bolennarth.svensson@vbgroup.com](mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbgroup.com)

Disclaimer: The content of this e-mail is intended solely for the use of the Individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this communication in error, be aware that forwarding it, copying it, or in any way disclosing its content to any other person, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail immediately.

---

**Från:** Teyssier Pierre [mailto:Pierre.Teyssier@volvo.com]  
**Skickat:** den 26 augusti 2013 11:37  
**Till:** Svensson Bolennarth; Westphäling, Jürgen  
**Kopia:** Olivier FONTAINE (ofontaine@oica.net)  
**Ämne:** RE: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Jürgen, Bolennarth,

Thanks for your clarifications about "ball couplings" proposal. I forwarded them to the concerned OICA colleagues for comments.

What do you think about the proposal I did in my original mail:

- The add-on of "*Legend of Table 3*, delete the word "maximum"." clarifies an ambiguity created by the original amendment (I was about to comment on that). However, deleting the word "maximum" would result in the following: "D = D value (kN)", which looks rather strange. A simpler way would be to delete the legend and add a reference to definitions in paragraph 2.12, whose headline could be amended as follows: 2.12. Symbols and definitions used in ~~annex 6 of~~ this Regulation. This would avoid duplication of definitions with different wordings.

Best regards  
Pierre

---

**From:** Svensson Bolennarth [mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com]  
**Sent:** lundi 26 août 2013 11:01  
**To:** Westphäling, Jürgen  
**Cc:** Olivier FONTAINE (ofontaine@oica.net); Teyssier Pierre  
**Subject:** SV: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Jürgen,

Yes, Vacation has been outstanding. I hope you had the same experience.

Regarding your comments I find your reasoning well founded and agree.  
Let us await the comments from Pierre.

Best Regards

**Bolennarth Svensson, PhD**  
**Business Engineer Coupling Equipment**  
VBG GROUP TRUCK EQUIPMENT AB  
Box 1216  
SE-462 28 Vänersborg  
Street address: Herman Kreftings gata 4

Tel +46 521 278126  
Fax +46 521 277794  
Mobile +46 706 177217  
E-mail [bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com](mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com)

Disclaimer: The content of this e-mail is intended solely for the use of the Individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this communication in error, be aware that forwarding it, copying it, or in any way disclosing its content to any other person, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail immediately.

---

**Från:** Westphäling, Jürgen [<mailto:Juergen.Westphaeling@tuev-sued.de>]

**Skickat:** den 26 augusti 2013 10:53

**Till:** Svensson Bolennarth

**Kopia:** Olivier FONTAINE ([ofontaine@oica.net](mailto:ofontaine@oica.net)); Teyssier Pierre

**Ämne:** AW: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Bolennarth,

I hope, You all had good holidays.

I just remember, that the addition of

**(ball couplings that can be moved without separation to a position under the vehicle chassis when not used)**

and

**In the legend of table 3 delete the word "maximum".**

have been overtaken from the French proposal from Mr. Lescaïl, dated 14.05.2013 and I do not agree at all with this proposals.

In the first work, we spoke about ball couplings: the blockage and the lever are clearly actuated by hand, if not only by fingers.

Only in the case of coupling ball the function of movement may be reasoned by hiding the ball underneath the vehicle. More than this couplings may need to be height adjusted or combined with further parts and coupling devices.

Also here we must assume, the actuating force is coming from the hand and not from the arm.

In the regulations minimum 2 cases for actuating forces are given, both with arm actuation.

1. the ECE R58 height adjustable underrun protections, with 40 daN, a lever unlimited actuated by the whole body, because of enough place.
2. the ECE R13 for the parking brake lever. also here the arm is actuating with a lever of about 350 to 450 mm length.

the lever (-knop) of ball coupling lockings is about 50 to 80 mm, a hand lever for height adjustable sliders is 80 to 100 mm.

May be with 20 daN the limit is just too high.

I spoke with Mr. Zander, who is the expert for ergonomic and safety questions in the responsible organisation, we just agreed, that 40 daN are too high for sure.

The intention of the second argument was to open higher performance without losing the class of couplings. so in the headline –as naming the intention of the table- should be added the wording minimum.

in the legend / footline, nothing should be changed.

I will try to add a correction for this, if You agree.

---

**Von:** Svensson Bolennarth [<mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com>]

**Gesendet:** Montag, 26. August 2013 08:18

**An:** Westphäling, Jürgen

**Cc:** Olivier FONTAINE ([ofontaine@oica.net](mailto:ofontaine@oica.net)); Teyssier Pierre

**Betreff:** SV: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

**Wichtigkeit:** Hoch

Dear Jürgen,

I would appreciate some comments on the change that Pierre has observed.

The time to the GRRF is short and I understand that OICA need to consolidate their position.

Best Regards

**Bolennarth Svensson, PhD**  
**Business Engineer Coupling Equipment**  
VBG GROUP TRUCK EQUIPMENT AB  
Box 1216  
SE-462 28 Vänersborg  
Street address: Herman Kreftings gata 4

Tel +46 521 278126  
Fax +46 521 277794  
Mobile +46 706 177217  
E-mail [bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com](mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com)

Disclaimer: The content of this e-mail is intended solely for the use of the Individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this communication in error, be aware that forwarding it, copying it, or in any way disclosing its content to any other person, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail immediately.

---

**Från:** Teyssier Pierre [<mailto:Pierre.Teyssier@volvo.com>]

**Skickat:** den 22 augusti 2013 15:26

**Till:** Svensson Bolennarth

**Kopia:** Olivier FONTAINE ([ofontaine@oica.net](mailto:ofontaine@oica.net)); Jürgen Westphäling

**Ämne:** RE: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Bolennarth,

I hope you had a good summer time.

Do you have any news regarding the questions and proposals below?

Thanks for feedback

Pierre

---

**From:** Svensson Bolennarth [<mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbggroup.com>]

**Sent:** mercredi 10 juillet 2013 6:29

**To:** Teyssier Pierre

**Cc:** Olivier FONTAINE ([ofontaine@oica.net](mailto:ofontaine@oica.net)); Jürgen Westphäling

**Subject:** Re: OICA comments to R55 informal group proposal on "simple items"

Dear Theyssier,

Thank you for your observations. I do not actually know from where the value 20 daN comes. Often the value of force for manual operation is set to 40 daN. Perhaps mr Westphaeling has a good explanation. I think it is certainly appropriate to recirculate to the OICA members.

I am currently on vacation and might not be responding very rapidly.

Best Regards

Bolennarth

10 jul 2013 kl. 11:39 skrev "Teyssier Pierre" <[Pierre.Teyssier@volvo.com](mailto:Pierre.Teyssier@volvo.com)>:

Dear Bolennarth,

I have noticed several differences between the original document you presented at OICA/CLEPA GERF-75 meeting in June and the GRRF working document 2013/16. Thus, I need to circulate this paper again within OICA in order to get eventual comments.

The main change is probably the paragraph 1.4, where a new technical requirement is added:

Original:

**"1.4. Movable ball coupling devices**

**A movable coupling device shall be designed for positive mechanical engagements in service position."**

New:

**"1.4. Movable coupling devices (couplings that can be moved without separation to a position under the vehicle chassis when not used)**

**A movable coupling device shall be designed for positive mechanical engagements in service position. In case of manual movement the actuating force shall not supersede 20 daN. The movement shall be limited by mechanical end stops"**

Where does the proposal come from? hat is the background for the proposal? For the value of 20 daN?

The other changes looks to be more editorials:

- The new definition of "class C" we need to check
- The add-on of "*Legend of Table 3*, delete the word "maximum"." clarifies an ambiguity created by the original amendment (I was about to comment on that). However, deleting the word "maximum" would result in the following: "D = D value (kN)", which looks rather strange. A simpler way would be to delete the legend and add a reference to definitions in paragraph 2.12, whose headline could be amended as follows:  
2.12. Symbols and definitions used in ~~annex 6 of~~ this Regulation.  
This would avoid duplication of definitions with different wordings.

Thanks for your feedback,

Best regards

Pierre Teyssier  
GERF chairman

<GERFA75-Annex 5\_ECE-TRANS-WP29- R55simple items 120413.docx>

<ECE-TRANS-WP29-GRRF-2013-16e -- Inf group R55-01 suppl 4.doc>