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10:30 hrs until 17:00 hrs on day 1

9.00 hrs until 16.00 hrs on day 2

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and hoped for another fruitful meeting.

**2. Approval of the agenda**

Two documents were added under agenda item 4 : ACV-08-02 and ACV-08-03.

**3. Outcome of the 7th meeting of the IG/ACV**

Two items need correcting in the report :

* on the length of the EBS cable, the most common on trailers is 12 to 13m
* under point 7 the gentleman’s name is Wartenberg

**4. ACV in R13:**

ISO 13044 parts 1 and 2 need to be studied. 13044 guarantees a location and best wiring for the connector to ensure compatibility between every tractor and trailer. But 13044 is still a draft at this moment; we don’t know yet when it will be released. 13044 contains rules that have to be followed and later several standards could be harmonised with the regulation. There is no standardisation at the moment.

OICA and Clepa prefer a standard. A document will be made available to this group with the outcome of OICA/Clepa discussions. If we were to put another standard in R13 then in 5 years time we may need to do this work again.

Automatic couplings may become a next generation of couplings without making it mandatory. That will open the market. It is most acceptable for it to become a market standard.

At the current time, no application is ‘standard’ but it is geometrically compatible with everything else.

There is a real need for this ACV application but ISO7638 postponed the application.

The question is asked as to whether we can write in the regulation that one point to consider is that the connector used can have one wiring plan as per 13044 or a wiring diagram.

Over time, the market will establish a standard but for the next few years only specialist operators will use the system. We need to ask OICA and Clepa for more support on the development of the ISO standard.

~~This group will advise GRRF to : 1. Wait for the ISO~~

~~2. begin and work with the ISO in parallel~~

Note : deleted as a result of review at 9th meeting

The ISO is now voted on, DIS voting is still to come. There is no real link between the ISO work and the UN-ECE.

The question was considered as to what would happen if this group set the technical part. We cannot enforce interchangeability in R13. Clepa and OICA should drive that within the standards organisations.

Standardisation is needed for economic reasons. It is not needed for safety issues or anything else. Standardisation will open the market, now we are looking for an intermediate solution.

Conclusion of the discussion : OICA/Clepa to send a paper, this group answers and sends the document to Geneva.

On the question of cable length, maybe if a repeater is needed less cable length will be used.

Exemptions are asked for only on a few vehicles. Only ACV vehicles? In the future there may be more but not in the next couple of years. 40m is the natural CAN-bus limit. 40m is one second response time. We need to modify the text for all cases now. Or we might use a footnote.

In paragraph 2.2, in square brackets, we have a 20m-20m split. In mixed mode there is no change, in ACV mode we have a 19m-21m split.

If the vehicle is ACV equipped, the vehicle split is 20m-20m for retro fit we fit a repeater.

With regard to the proposal, the Chairman concludes that rather than add something here it is maybe easier to change the body building instruction.

Consideration was given as to whether this group should also look at road trains.

The group had a lengthy discussion on paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4

**5. ACV in R55:**

This group is of the opinion that communication to the R55 group would be helpful.

Within R55 there are requirements for indication. This group requires that ACV’s should have remote indication.

We need a document and someone from this group needs to be in the R55 working group. Jost volunteered to write a document on what needs to be done in the R55 group.

The Chairman will report to GRRF that this group is now only discussing step 1 of our Terms of Reference. There is an interest from this group to look at road trains brake related issues.

The document resulting from phase 1 will go onto GRRF and does not wait for the work in phase 2 to be done.

It would be good to communicate before the next meeting and also to have a justification for paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4

**6. Other Business**

No additional items were discussed under this agenda point.

**7. List of action items**

As time ran out, action items were not specified separately.

**8. Date and place of next meetings.**

The next meeting of this working group was scheduled for 22nd and 23rd August in Brussels.