

Meeting Report (10th meeting)**Report on the tenth meeting of the GRRF Informal Working Group on Alternative Method Electronic Vehicle Stability Control (AMEVSC) held 12th December 2012.**

Venue: CLEPA Offices, 87 Boulevard Brand Whitlock; BE- 1200 Brussels, Belgium

Chairman: Dr. Michel LOCCUFIER (Belgium Ministry of Transport)

Secretariat: Mr. Paul JENNISON (CLEPA/Knorr-Bremse)

Participants: See document AMEVSC-10-08e

1. The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially the Spanish delegates (Mr. Lujan and Mr. Elpuente), Mr. Harder of TÜV Nord and OICA delegates (Mr. Teyssier and Mr. Schremmer) who were participating for the first time. He also expressed his thanks to Japanese delegation for participating in person, and noted the apologies for non-attendance from Mr. Broertjes.
2. The draft agenda (document AMEVSC-10-01e) was adopted without change, with no new documents being identified for consideration.
3. The report of the ninth meeting (document AMEVSC-09-07e) was adopted without change.
4. The chairman considered that it was not necessary to spend time specifically reporting on the 73rd Session of GRRF as the points raised would be part of the meeting discussions under agenda items 5 and 6.
5. Although GRRF at its 73rd Session had expressed general support for the “simulation tool” amendment proposal some detailed issues were raised and chairman had invited delegates to provide the AMEVSC group with written comments (paragraph 13 of the report).

The only written comments received were those from OICA – document AMEVSC-10-05e. The result of the discussions were:

- 10 year availability of simulation tool software (Appendix 1, para. 1.4.):

Governments were of the opinion that it was necessary to be able to rerun a simulation and that the 10 year time requirement was appropriate. Therefore, as it was agreed that there could be problems to maintain the original hardware over a period of 10 years, it was considered that the justification should be amended in document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2013/10 (GRRF-73-06) to clarify that new hardware could also be used in the rerunning of an earlier simulation.

- Load representation in the simulation tool (Appendix 2, para. 1.4.2.):

Meeting Report (10th meeting)

While it was confirmed/agreed that the requirements of this paragraph did not require the movement of the load to be taken in to consideration during the simulation, it was considered that for clarification a specific reference to a fluid load should be included in the justification.

- Parameters validated without a practical vehicle test (Appendix 2, para. 2.2.):

It was clarified that this paragraph is to allow the tool to be used for certain parameters, e.g. a wheelbase, that were not specifically validated via a practical vehicle test. It was also clarified that there were parameters that could only be validated via a practical vehicle test, e.g. an axle configuration. Therefore, it was agreed that the justification should be expanded to include “wheelbase” and “axle configuration” as examples of what is allowed and not allowed.

- Use of a simulation tool validated prior to the amendment (Appendix 2, para. 2.5.1.):

It was confirmed that the objective of this paragraph is to allow the continued use of a validated simulation tool, without re-validation, after this amendment comes into force if the relevant technical requirements and the scope of application resulting from the amendment are complied with. To ensure that this was fully apparent in the justification, it was agreed to add a number of words to the justification.

At the 73rd GRRF the UK Government had expressed concern of the use of the words “take into account/taken into account” and although no specific input had been received it was agreed to examine the use of this wording.

The wording “take into account/taken into account” occurred five times and it was considered that while it was appropriate to keep this wording in four cases, its use in footnote 1 of Appendix 2 could be improved by replacing “taken into account” with “included”.

In conclusion, it was agreed that the secretary would create an informal document containing the above changes and send it to GRRF for consideration at the 74th Session of GRRF.

6. As result of the discussion at the 73rd Session of GRRF (paragraph 6 of the report), the group revisited the use of sub-system/component/function test reports in a vehicle braking system type-approval using as the basis for its discussion the documents AMEVSC-10-04e and AMEVSC-10-06e.

All were in agreement that sheet 3 of document AMEVSC-10-06e illustrated the use of sub-system/component/function test reports in the braking system type-approval according to ECE Regulation 13, and that it was very clear that only the vehicle manufacturer could obtain a braking system type-approval.

In considering the level of responsibility applicable when signing a test report, reference was made to document AMEVSC-10-04e and the two items where there was

Meeting Report (10th meeting)

both a “yes” and “no” indicating a difference of opinion at the informal lunchtime meeting at the 73rd GRRF. It was considered that the various possibilities identified under item 3 were not complete and the terminology used was not as clear as it could be. Therefore, the table was revised/expanded as document AMEVSC-10-10e.

Each possibility in item 3 was considered, with the countries Germany, Japan, Netherlands and Spain, CLEPA, OICA and TÜV Nord expressing the view that the Approval Authority “may accept” a sub-system/component/function test report (the yes – must accept – not being correct). Belgium and France expressed the view that the report could not be rejected (must accept) if it was technically correct, although they would reserve the right to question the report with regard to its technical content. Therefore, with regard to the table, Belgium and France agreed that “may accept” was appropriate. Norway expressed no opinion.

In considering item 1 and the “correctness of content” it was agreed by all, with the exception of Norway who had no opinion, that the Approval Authority is responsible for the content when signing a sub-system/component/function test report. Germany advised that it had revised its opinion since the 73rd GRRF as a result of internal discussions which had led to a change in its internal procedures. The earlier procedure had only confirmed that the technical service was designated to carry-out the work. Now a content check was also carried-out.

In conclusion, the group agreed that there was no need to propose any changes to ECE Regulation 13 and to recommend at the 74th Session of GRRF that this subject is closed. If any actual problems were to appear in the future they could be specifically addressed on either a direct basis or via the formation of a new informal working group.

7. **Next meeting:**

No further meetings are scheduled.
