

Transmitted by the AMEVSC Chairman

Informal document No. GRRF-74-xx
(74th GRRF, 19-22 February 2013
agenda item 3(a))

Report of GRRF Alternative Method Electronic Vehicle Stability Control (AMEVSC) Informal Working Group

As a result of the comments made at 73rd Session of GRRF with regard to the proposed supplement 10 to the 11 series of amendments to ECE Regulation 13 (document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2012/2 as amended by GRRF-73-06, now ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2013/10) and an informal lunchtime discussion on the use of test reports, there was a further meeting of the AMEVSC informal working group. This meeting, held on 12th December 2012, was the 10th meeting of the informal working group and specifically discussed the issues highlight by GRRF.

Proposed supplement 10 to the 11 series of amendments:

- Points of concern raised by OICA (document AMEVSC-10-05e) and concerns expressed by the UK Government on the use of the wording “take into account/taken into account” were reviewed. As a result, a number of amendments were agreed to the justification to provide clarification and one of the uses of “take into account” was changed to “included”.
 - The proposed changes to ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/2013/10 are detailed in the informal document GRRF-74-06.

The use of test reports in type-approval of a vehicle braking system:

- It was confirmed by all the parties present that Regulation 13 requires/allows 2 types of test report.
 - A type-approval test report is required, on which the Approval Authority will grant/refuse approval.
 - Sub-system/component/function test reports are allowed in the type-approval process, but they are not in themselves a type-approval report.
- All parties were in agreement that only the vehicle manufacturer could obtain a vehicle braking system type-approval and that this was a clear requirement in Regulation 13.
- Regarding the level of responsibility applicable when signing a test report, the discussion was based on the table resulting from the informal lunchtime discussion at the 73rd GRRF (document AMEVSC-10-04e). It was considered that misinterpretation could occur regarding the obligation of the Approval Authority to accept a sub-system/component/function test report and that not all possibilities had been covered. Therefore, this section of the table was revised (document AMEVSC-10-10e). While the informal lunchtime discussion at the 73rd GRRF had resulted in different opinions by some of the contracting parties present, these differences no longer existed as a result of a re-consideration and/or a re-structuring of internal procedures.
 - The final result is shown in the table at the end of this report (document AMEVSC-10-10e).
- As a result, it was agreed that there was no need to propose any changes to Regulation 13 and to recommend to the 74th GRRF that this subject is closed.
 - If any actual problems were to be experienced in the future, they could be specifically addressed either on a direct basis or via the formation of a new informal working group.

AMEVSC-10-10e

Use of test reports - results of the review by the GRRF AMEVSC of the document resulting from the informal lunchtime meeting held during the 73rd GRRF (19th Sept.)

		Yes	No
1	The Approval Authority is responsible when signing a:		
	Vehicle type-approval test report (e.g. braking system):		
	Correctness of content:	Yes	
	Open method (flexibility)	Yes	
	Standardized method (same for all)		No
	Technical Service is accredited	Yes	
	Sub-system test report (e.g. Trailer brake, vehicle stability function)		
	Correctness of content:	Yes	
	Open method (flexibility)	Yes	
	Standardized method (same for all)		No
Technical Service is accredited	Yes		
2	Responsibility of Technical Service when using a sub-system test report:		
	Fully responsible for the content (has the ability to check content)	Yes	
	Limited responsible		No
	No responsibility		No
3	Obligation of the Approval Authority to accept a sub-system test report:		
	Signed by the same Approval Authority:		
	Must accept		No
	May accept	Yes	
	Signed by another Approval Authority:		
	Must accept		No
	May accept	Yes	
	Signed by Technical Service, but not signed by an Approval Authority:		
	Must accept		No
	May accept	Yes	
	Signed by a Technical Service designated by another Approval Authority		
	Must accept		No
	May accept		No
	Technical Service not designated		
	Must accept		No
May accept		No	

Note: yellow highlighting indicates the AMEVSC conclusion. Red text indicates additions