

GRE Task Force on Substitutes / Retrofits (TF S/R)**20th meeting****7 December 2023, 12:00 – 13:45 CET****ONLINE MEETING / TEAMS**

Meeting-ID: 362 495 116 79

DRAFT REPORT

		Documents
1	Welcome and opening remarks	
	Mr. Bailey, the chair of the meeting, welcomed the participants and opened the online meeting.	
2	Organisational issues	
	A screen-sharing facility was used via TEAMS.	
2.1	Introduction of participants	
	The participants were noted by the secretary: Ph. Plathner, IEC, secretary Ph. Bailey, UK, chair K. Manz, DE, co-chair D. Rovers, NL M. Fischer, DE T. Targosinski, Poland B. Böttcher, FIA J-M Prigent, OICA S. Sudrie, OICA W. Schlager, IEC B. Terburg, GTB, SAE Th. Bauckhage, CLEPA R. Bertram, IEC expert W. Halbritter, IEC expert W. van Laarhoven, GTB (partly) Apologies had been received from: R. Krautscheid, DE	
3	Adoption of the agenda	TFSR-20-01
	It was noted by the secretary that the document for a formal H11 proposal had been distributed before the meeting with document number TFSR-20-02; and that it belonged to agenda item 7.1. The agenda was approved with this addition.	
4	Report of 19 th meeting	TFSR-19-04
	The report was reviewed on the screen briefly and confirmed.	
5.1	Review of the discussion at GRE89, report paragraph 13.	Report GRE-89

	In addition, report paragraph 44 and 45 (ITC, CO2 benefits)	GRE-89-22
	<p>The GRE89 report was reviewed briefly, and it was noted that no details of the discussion / questions were recorded in paragraph 13.</p> <p>In particular, it was noted that France had raised some questions during GRE89, and that French experts had been invited to attend the TFSR meeting for a detailed discussion on these points. However, it was noted with regret that no French experts were present.</p> <p>Also, the paragraphs 44 and 45 of the report were briefly reviewed, related to the “climate change mitigation”; the IEC input in document GRE-89-22 was reviewed on the screen briefly.</p> <p>Mr. Rovers gave some explanation on the background at ITC and GRPE level.</p> <p>Mr. Prigent informed about general discussion at UNECE level on LCA (life cycle assessment), which might receive more attention in the future.</p> <p>Mr. Bailey commented that the power consumption of LEDr can be increased due to additional electronics necessary to overcome false failure messages, and this should be taken into account when making future, more detailed CO2-saving calculations.</p>	
5.2	Presentation at GRE89	TFSR-19-02 GRE-89-06
	The status report given to GRE89, document GRE-89-06, was briefly reviewed on the screen.	
6	New equivalence approach for high-flux LEDr categories	
6.0	Basic technical considerations for bi-direction designs Including lab demo	TFSR-16-02 TFSR-17-05
	No discussion	
7	R.E.5	
7.1	H11 category sheet changes	TFSR-17-03 TFSR-18-02 TFSR-19-03 GRE-89-05 TFSR-20-02
	<p>Formal category sheet proposal incl. justification</p> <p>Mr. Schlager reminded first about the informal document GRE-89-05, and then introduced document TFSR-20-02, a draft formal proposal for GRE90.</p> <p>There followed some discussion on the “style” of presenting a formal document to GRE, without the possibility of highlighting changes in colours.</p> <p>Mr. Schlager explained the proposed concept of “replacing complete sheets”, instead of trying to mark the changes to a sheet by “bold” and “strike-thru”.</p> <p>Mr. Terburg confirmed that an approach with “replacing the complete sheet” in cases of complex changes had been done successfully in the past e.g. in GTB WGLS proposals. Especially when the changes were more complex, and also involved adding columns or rows to tables.</p>	

	<p>Mr. Prigent confirmed that deleting the old sheet and replacing by the new sheet is a good way forward in case there are multiple, complex changes to the sheet.</p> <p>Also Mr. Rovers supported this approach.</p> <p>It was further confirmed by the group that the formal proposal would only include the changed sheets and would not include the unchanged sheets.</p> <p>The proposed text for the “Introduction” was reviewed line-by-line, as well as the “justification” text.</p> <p>Mr. Prigent reminded the questions from European Commission expert at GRE89, wondering about the risk of increased glare in case of bad aim after light source replacement.</p> <p>Mr. Rovers replied that the risk of wrong aiming was present after light source change in general, independent of light source technology; therefore the headlamp should be aimed after light source replacement, anyway.</p> <p>Mr. Prigent commented that in his experience the manual levelling device is not properly used by car drivers, and therefore automatic levelling was being requested in future by the regulations.</p> <p>Mr. Rovers replied that there is a difference between initial aiming, and the “levelling compensating for load”, and that the two topics should not be mixed.</p> <p>Mr. Prigent repeated that he had concerns that the driver would not properly aim his headlamps after light source replacement.</p> <p>Mr. Böttcher supported the view presented by Mr. Rovers and confirmed that a discussion of re-aim after light source change should be not linked to the light source technology and the discussion on LEDr replacement light sources, also because the beam behaviour is essentially very similar.</p> <p>Mr. Manz supported the statements by Mr. Böttcher and Mr. Rovers.</p> <p>Regarding the introduction text and the justification, there was general support and Mr. Prigent asked for some additional time to study it in detail.</p> <p>Mr. Schlager and Mr. Rovers commented that a statement could be added to inform that this proposal was not linked to an R37-change.</p> <p>Mr. Terburg confirmed that such a sentence was useful and that he also included this information when preparing “R.E.5-only” proposals from GTB WGLS.</p> <p>Mr. Schlager and Mr. Plathner offered to take the conclusions from the discussion into account when preparing an updated document for the formal H11 category sheet proposal.</p> <p>This includes the preparation of an informal document linked to the formal document, but visualising the changes to the existing H11 category sheet in coloured highlights.</p> <p>These updated proposals should then be confirmed by the TF in a short online meeting in January.</p>	
8	Next meeting(s)	
	A next meeting (online only, duration 1 hour) was scheduled for: 26 January 2024 @13:00 CET	

	Mr. Plathner offered to send-out a TEAMS invitation	
9	Closure	
	The chair thanked the participants and closed the meeting.	

P. Plathner