



Auto Service

Mehr Sicherheit.
Mehr Wert.

List of remarks to TFAC05-09

J. Westphäling



This is not a prejudication between integrated or separated agricultural couplings. The separated version TFAC 05-10e has nearly the same items to discuss. Actual situation (see beginning of this presentation) is the integrated one.

1. The supplements 4 and 5 of inbetween ECE R55.01 are not taken into account.
2. Contents: in annex 8 and 9 have to be mentioned categorie C vehicles.
3. Calculation of „height above ground shall form annex 7 appendix 2.
4. § 1.2.3. categorie C vehicles missing.
5. Cancel 1.4., with lower link arms and 3 point linkage it is not possible to form a combination of vehicles (§1.2.3.), no need to exclude this devices.
6. § 2.3 . Cancel this sentence: before 94/20/EC the interchangeability was assured by categories of couplings regarding dimensions and characteristic values, in agricultural application this is not standardized. So there are no „standard couplings“ in the sense of ECE R55 in agricultural application.



7. § 2.7. categorie C vehicle missing.
8. § 2.7. cancel all sub-classes (with 4 digits), as there are no interchangeable standard couplings, sub classes with or without standard make no sense.
With different mounting provisions there is no risk to failure with interchangeability. Discuss: class e as same as class E until 40 km/h
9. Class p:cancel, according to 2015/68 it is not allowed to mount 5th-wheel couplings on tractors. Otherwise obviously king pins and 5th-wheel couplings are intended to mount in accordance to ECE R55.01, so also mounting plates shall be approved accordingly.
10. Class s: cancel, if necessary the definition of class S is good enough.
11. The inclusion of rigid drawbar trailers to ECE R55 / or R55A has a great effect on transport trailers and approval procedures. Provisions have to be taken, calculation method ISO 7641-1 has to be discussed / amended.



12. § 4.3. non automatic couplings to be limited to T?a) and C?a) vehicles until 40km/h; not to be excluded all small letter couplings.
13. §4.9. Class f: „Quick height-adjustable“ is a German-English word by word translation is, please agree on more common international expression such as slider hitch.
14. § 6.2.2. Annex 7 item 3 (see also discussing item 3 on page 11) actually is the calculation of ground height. This shall not be required on categorie R, S vehicles.
15. Mounting equirment
16. Mounting requirments on class f, such as fixing points, coupling point, distance to the PTO, free space around hand levers are missing,
17. § 6.2.4. (mounting instructions) is not necessary, 6.1.3. shall be generally valid.

18. § 8.5.3. all couplings of existing ECE R55 are adapted for agricultural vehicles, a supplement letter is not needed
19. §8.5.4. categorie C is missing
20. Annex 1, § 9.2.1. cancel „if applicable“ and „ v_{max} “ speed is not a characteristic value. Indicate in approval number, on type plate and in application range.
21. Annex 3, give one more example
22. Annex 4, table 2: see supplement 5 footnote to table 1, T is defined in definitions,
23. Annex 7 agricultural couplings: class f missing requirments for fixing points (see A50-X), coupling point, distance to PTO, free space arround handles.
24. Tables and pictures shall have current counting numbers not starting again for every annex. So the tractor in annex 7 item3 sall be figure 27, and so on.
25. Some drawings still are in German language



26. Change to form a,b,c... instead of standard flanges, standard drawbar eyes, couplings and so on or refer to ISO standard
27. Annex 6 § 3.1.8. (secondary coupling) must be repeated with higher values.
28. Annex 8 table 6: connection between major and minor letter couplings?
29. Clevis couplings behind trailers?

TESTING REQUIREMENTS annex 9 to be discussed in order to keep closed logic over all coupling devices.



If a tractor is approved with a coupling dynamic tested.
Is it possible to mount a static test coupling?

This is one problem

