**Position paper from The Netherlands w.r.t. GTR-OBD-document:**

**ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRPE/2016/13**

**1** On page 21 point 3.2 the sentence “…the position of the anti lock brake system …”   The Netherlands is not in favor of that.

**Rationale:**

Below you will find the comments from my colleague in GRRF in red colour. They are taken from his reports from GRRF-80 and -81.

Text from the reports from the GRRF-secretariat are in black.

It would be quite odd to accept this data storing in a GTR on OBD in GRPE while not accepting it in GRRF.

GRRF 80:

5a ii     Document GRRF-80-13 (IMMA) is a proposal for the amendment of the proposal (.../41) of the European Commission w.r.t. an on/off switch of the ABS on a motorcycle. IMMA has particular problems with the prescription (item "f") for a memory that stores the latest state of the ABS on/off button.

Italy, The Netherlands and Germany are also against such a memory because:

-the reading results are owned by the driver,

-the need has not been demonstrated,

-it has no relationship with the security of the system or motorcycle,

-in regulation R13-H and R13 (brakes category M and N) the stability system may be equipped with an on/off switch without a requirement for a memory ,

Canada states that the on/off switch is no safety issue and a cost/benefit analysis should and can be made because the ABS switch already is being used on motorcycles.

Japan proposes to delete the requirement for a memory as a compromise.

*24.          The expert from EC introduced ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2015/40 and ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2015/41, proposing to clarify the possibility to install means to temporarily reduce or disable the ABS function of motorcycles in certain conditions. The expert from Canada submitted an alternative wording (GRRF-80-19) and recalled that an authorization from the Executive Committee AC.3 for developing an amendment to GTR No. 3 would be required. The proposal received some general comments related to road safety. The expert from IMMA briefly introduced GRRF-80-13 commenting the proposals to which the expert from EC responded (GRRF-80-24 and GRRF-80-25). A majority of experts expressed a specific concern related to condition (f). The expert from EC volunteered to prepare two revised proposals for the September 2015 session of GRRF.*

GRRF 81:

5a ii     Document ECE/TRANS/WP 29/GRRF/2015/41 is a proposal by the European Commission  to include in R78 clear demands w.r.t. the possibility of switching off ABS under certain conditions. There was a lot of resistance against the requirement that the system once per second would need to verify whether the ABS is disabled or not, and that the result should be stored in an electronic memory. The EC now comes with an amended proposal, document GRRF-81-28, from which this requirement has been removed. There is a long discussion whether or not ABS on a motorcycle may be disabled anyway. And now there is also a discussion on the transitional provisions. Eventually proposal GRRF-81-28-Rev. 1 is accepted, that will be sent to the meeting of WP. 29 in november after final examination during GRRF-82 in September.

*21.          GRRF agreed with the proposal of the expert from EC to reintroduce ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2015/41 under agenda item 5(a) and to reconsider the proposal clarifying the possibility to install means to disable the ABS function in certain conditions for L-category vehicles. The expert recalled that a majority of experts expressed specific concerns related to the condition (f) in the proposal at the previous session and therefore agreed to delete it, as shown in GRRF-81-28. The proposal etc. etc.*

By and large it comes down to, there is no added value w.r.t. safety and also nowhere else a similar requirement is prescribed. In addition, the problem of who owns the data and whether or not others such as the manufacturer, police etc. should have the opportunity to read out the memory anyway. In fact it is not at all that black and white whether ABS possibly could have prevented an accident. In short, the stored data of the position of the ABS-switch can easily lead to an incorrect conclusion with negative consequences for the driver.

**2** On page 24 point 4.2.5. : The Netherlands is not in favor of the procedure described

here:

**Rationale:**

The vehicle manufacturer and the interested components-, diagnostic tools- or test equipment manufacturer should contact each other directly without intervention of the type approval authority that issued the type approval like described in 4.2. The vehicle manufacturer is responsible for keeping up to date his type approval(s) and for informing the concerned type approval authority. That type approval authority in its turn has to inform the other Contracting Parties’ approval authorities like is normal procedure.

It is not efficient that an approval authority is in between the interested components-, diagnostic tools- or test equipment manufacturer and the vehicle manufacturer while there is no need.

If the above proposal is not approved, The Netherlands suggests some editorial modifications to the current text if we want this procedure to happen:

4.2.5. If an approval authority receives a request from any interested components-, diagnostic tools- or test equipment manufacturer for information on the OBD system of a vehicle that has been type approved by that approval authority to a previous??? version of this Regulation,

(a) The that approval authority shall, within 30 days, ask the manufacturer of the vehicle in question to make available the information required in paragraphs 3.1. and 3.2.; still between square brackets!!!

(b) The vehicle manufacturer shall submit this information to the that approval authority within two months of the request;

(c) The That approval authority shall attach this information to the vehicle approval information and shall transmit this information to the other Contracting Parties’ approval authorities. and the approval authority which granted the original approval