

Terms of Reference of TF TA

Oct 11th 2023

TFTA



JAPAN AUTOMOBILE STANDARDS INTERNATIONALIZATION CENTER

ToR amendment proposal (TA-16-02v1) has been reviewed.

- Mileage
- Timeline

The purpose and activities of TF TA are well defined in the current Terms of Reference. TF TA established accordingly.

Feedback on amendment proposal for mileage

- ✓ The development of evaluation method aimed at customer convenience is not understandable. It is necessary to carry out educational activities regarding tyre abrasion performance.
- ✓ It is questionable to develop evaluation method that is not intended for Type Approval on 1958 agreement.
- ✓ It was pointed out that there is no direct relationship between tyre abrasion and mileage or tread depth in discussions at past TF TA meeting. Therefore, it is technically not feasible at this moment. If provide indirect indicator of tyre abrasion, confusion for customers and society are caused by other factors come into play. (e.g., tyres with good indicator even if tyre abrasion is not good will become widespread, and then tyre abrasion will not be reduced as expectation)

Need to continue the discussion with current ToR

Consideration for test methods and limit

C1

- ✓ Test methods : ok
- ✓ If contents of market assessment are appropriate, timeline for abrasion limits can be agreed. We need to discuss contents of market assessment.

C2* *tyre installed on vehicle with a GVW 3.5 tons or less

- ✓ Test methods: C1 test method developed based on WLTC mode can be applied to C2* tyre installed on vehicle with a GVW 3.5 ton or less. Inflation pressure and load will be changed, verification of test method will be necessary. If just verification for test method, timeline likely to be achievable. (WD in Feb 2025)
- ✓ Market assessment for limit is necessary. (WD in Feb 2026; around 1 year if same as C1)

C3 & C2** **tyre installed on vehicle with a GVW more than 3.5 tons

- ✓ Test method and test conditions need to be developed from scratch, since the vehicle driving mode and vehicle type are completely different from C1. Proposed timeline is not realistic. Development duration for C3 & C2** might be required more than C1 test methods, and the timeline is too early to decide. To continue discussion.

Depends on contents of market assessment for C1

Need to discuss how to proceed for C2 & C3