

DRAFT REPORT

Kick-off meeting of the Informal Working Group (IWG) on Advanced Emergency Braking Systems (AEBS) for light vehicles

10.00 – 12.00, on 31 March 2017,
in Berlin, Germany,
Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure

1. Welcome and Introduction

The chair clarified that the aim of the meeting is to finalize the terms of reference.

2. Approval of the agenda

Document: AEBS-01-01 (Japan)

The Secretary informed that new documents (AEBS-01-04 and -05) are added to the internet web page.

3. Background

Document: Proposal to extend the scope of Regulation No. 131 (AEBS) to vehicles of Category M1 and N1 (GRRF-83-17)

The group skipped this item as the document was already tabled and discussed at GRRF-83. Industry committed to provide accident data at the next meeting.

4. Regulatory approach

Document: WP29-171-14 (OICA)

➤EU-GSR

The European Commission committed to provide accident data as well at the next meeting. The European Commission expert informed being preparing a proposal to mandate AEBS, to be endorsed by the Council and the Parliament.

The group was informed that OICA tabled WP29-171-14 at the last session of WP29, presenting the OICA priority list for the elaboration of new GTRs annexed to the 98 Agreement.

The GRRF chair pointed out that the discussions about the GTR approach should ideally take place at WP29 (AC3), yet found it good that this group be aware of the process.

He in addition informed having reported to WP29, among others about the request of J and the European Commission to extend the scope of UN R131 to include M1/N1. WP29 endorsed the approach of an amendment to UN R131.

➤Possibility of a GTR

The GRRF chair informed about the state of play at WP29 and AC3. He stressed that entering a GTR approach could delay the process. Yet the informal group should make sure at GRRF to take into account the positions of the contracting parties of the 98 Agreement.

D supported the approach of starting under the 58 Agreement. F, OICA, ROK and J supported this approach as well.

The group was informed that the issue of the priorities under the 98 Agreement will be discussed at the June session of WP29

Conclusion:

- AEBS informal group to develop a regulatory proposal under the 58 Agreement.
- GTR approach to be kept in mind for the sake of best harmonization

5. Discussion for TOR of the IWG on AEBS

Document: Proposal for ToR for the IWG on AEBS (GRRF-83-18)
 AEBS-01-05 (Industry)
 AEBS-01-04 (S)

OICA presented the document AEBS-01-05 proposing amendments to the terms of reference.

Item 3.a

D had concern that “in lane” mandates road marking recognition.

UK was keen to keep the terms of reference open to any technology.

NL supported D and UK, and added that the speeds as in the informal document GRRF-83-17 be kept into account.

OICA pointed out that the presentation focused on the vehicles, not the obstacles.

F supported OICA that the group should focus on vehicles.

Item 3.b

The chair introduced document AEBS-01-04.

OICA informed that some additional research is needed to identify big animals vs. pedestrians.

F supported the introduction of animals, yet requested clarity about “pedestrians”, whether they include Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs).

NL supported the inclusion of animals in the terms of reference.

D pointed out that such change should not delay the results.

OICA was concerned that including all types of objects can affect the focus of the informal group. In addition, there exist no pre-existing target simulating big animals.

UK found important to understand the limits of a technology, yet to remain pragmatic. Concerning the GTR approach, the approach with regard to the justifications is different. The decision on whether including or not certain types of obstacles depend on the impact assessment.

The group wondered whether “Vehicles” include motorbikes and cyclists. D pointed out that no motorcycle harmonized target exists for the time being. Yet, a bicycle target does exist at EuroNCAP.

F was of the opinion that the group is a long term working group.

UK and the chair were keen that V2V and V2P be considered simultaneously, even if they may be delivered at different times. UK pointed out that pedestrians are the first fatality population.

D committed to table accident data about cyclists for the next meeting.

The Secretary informed about the new informal group on VRU-Proxi.

The group then debated on the accident scenario (in lane, oncoming, crossing, etc.)

Conclusion:

- The informal group to address:
 - o Rear end collision with M/N vehicles.
 - o Pedestrians.
 - o Cyclists
 - o Extension of technical requirements to include motorcyclists and large animal
- List above does not preclude any chronological delivery.

Item 5

Adopted

Item 6

There was a debate on the dates of delivery.

The UK pointed out that the group does not start from a blank sheet of paper, the expert then suggested to include the dates in [].

Conclusion:

- Industry to provide input on what is deliverable with regard to the existing protocols and test methods, as well as what does not exist, at the next meeting of the Informal Working Group for AEBS.
- GRRF-84 to confirm the group's amended terms of reference (document
- Next AEBS meeting to take place in November, invited by France (TBC) or SMMT (TBC)

6. Discussion on roadmap

Document: AEBS-01-02 (roadmap)

OICA tabled an amendment to document AEBS-01-02 (becomes AEBS-01-02-Rev.1)

7. Other business

8. Schedule for further meetings.

Information about the second meeting: October/November 2017, in Paris or London (TBC)