

## EPPR-01

Geneva, 18 Jan 2013, 13:30 – 16:30

### Draft minutes

**Chair: Petter Åsman**  
**Secretary: Thomas Vercammen**

#### Summary and draft operational conclusions :

- The first task of the group will be to prepare and submit final ToR including scope and priorities of the tasks as well as a roadmap for the work for the next GRPE meeting in June 2013.  
There is a principle agreement on the proposed Terms of Reference (see doc. EPPR-01-02)
- The group has a common understanding that '98 agreement should be the basis for the work. EC reminded though not to forget the '58 agreement.
- The GTR no 2 is a good basis to build on and should be the basis for further development.
- Japan, India, Italy and IMMA would like to see priority on L3-category. EC insists on covering all 'low powered' vehicles, and prefers to open GTR2 for mopeds. Further bilateral discussions will be needed, preferably before next IWG meeting.
- Japan requested to put priority on Evaporative emissions and OBD.
- It was agreed on request by Japan to avoid overlap/confusion with the EVE group, when it comes to (H)EV's. Further discussion with EVE IWG should take place.
- TRL's study (stocktaking, ...) will be an important input to the group.
- Next IWG meetings:
  - o 2-3 days in the week of 22 April 2013 (exact dates to be confirmed asap). Venue: Brussels (EC DG ENTR)
  - o 7 June 2013 (PM), half day in conjunction with 66th GRPE. Venue: Geneva
  - o 2-3 days in Oct/Nov 2013. India kindly volunteered to host and will soon make a proposal for exact date(s).

#### Detailed Notes

- **Introduction and adoption of the agenda**

Document: *EPPR-01-02 (slide no.1-3) + EPPR-01-01 Rev1*

(agenda item #1 and #2)

- The chairman welcomed everyone, and introduced himself and the secretary, providing their contact details, *EPPR-01-02 (slide no.1-3)*
- *The agenda was adopted with the suggested change of order as proposed by the chairman.*

- **Terms of Reference**

Document: *EPPR-01-02*

(agenda item #5)

- Chairman said it was not his intention to have final agreement on this today but to exchange views in order to have a document to be submitted in June (GRPE).
- IMMA suggested the potential need for sub-groups to be mentioned in the ToR, and added that the timing foreseen (2016) seems challenging.
- The chairman replied that the timeline needs to be discussed within the group. Regarding the need for sub-groups the chairman argued for a simple structure where ad-hoc groups could be formed based on the need during the work (see agenda item #7).
- India commented that the timeline is connected to the scope. If the entire L-category would be in the scope, finishing the work in 2016 will be difficult.
- As outlined in their position document (EPPR-01-06e) Japan supports the amendments (Inf.doc.GRPE-64-26) that UK submitted at last GRPE and would like to amend 2(c) as follows;
  - o “c) work both on Regulation under the 1958 and **in particular** 1998 Agreements, bearing in mind...”
- UK said they put trust on the chairman to put that through.
- It was generally agreed that the ToR text is acceptable however the document will be discussed and decided at the next meeting of the IWG in April before submitted to GRPE.

- **Proposal for meeting structure and next meetings**

Document: *EPPR-01-02 (slide no. 12 and 13)*

(agenda item #7)

- In response to IMMA’s suggestion regarding the organization of the group, the chairman proposed to have:
  - o Halfday meetings in conjunction with GRPE in January and June
  - o Between GRPE meetings, 2-3 day working meetings (March and October timeframe) in altering locations
  - o Ad hoc phone/web meetings based on subject and need
- The chairman proposed not yet to set up sub-groups, and keep a simple structure, at least for the 1<sup>st</sup> half year. It was recognized though by the chairman that the group will need ad hoc meetings with dedicated experts.
- Proposal for next meetings:
  - o 2nd meeting during week of 22-26 April in Brussels (hosted by European Commission)
  - o 3rd meeting in conjunction with GRPE in Geneva on 7 June 2013 (To be confirmed)
  - o 4th meeting October/November 2013 (location and date to be confirmed)
  - o 5th meeting in conjunction with GRPE in Geneva in January 2014
- Regarding next meeting (2-3 days) in the week of 22-16 April, no member of the group indicated a specific preference for meeting dates within that week. The chairman informed that phone/web participation can be offered in case anyone has difficulties to travel.
- The chairman suggested to have meetings in also in other (than the European) region.
- India kindly offered to host the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, and will make a proposal for exact date(s).

- **Scope of the group and priorities**

Document: *EPPR-01-02 (slide no.4-8), WP29-158-15, EPPR-01-06e*

(agenda item #4 and #3.3)

- The chairman introduced this item, based on EC's proposed mandate document as submitted to WP29.
- The European Commission (EC) explained the regulatory situation for EU:
  - o The co-decision regulation containing the base requirements is expected to be published in February.
  - o For the non-essential elements EC has delegated power. Since 1,5 year EC has been sharing draft text with EU Member States and stakeholders. One of those 'delegated acts' is dedicated to environmental requirements.
  - o The whole package will become mandatory from Jan 2016.
  - o EC would like to simplify the REPPR by referring to UN regulations.
  - o In the exercise of taking stock of international and national legislation globally EC have noted some issues that could serve as basis for international harmonization.
  - o EC hope to elaborate and lift global requirements to a level to enable CP's to implement and refer to from their national regulations including EU regulations. This would be to the benefit for industry and citizens of all Contracting Parties (CP).
- The chairman informed that the purpose of today's meeting was to collect views of CP's and stakeholders.
- To a question by India, the EC confirmed that Type VI means the low ambient temperature emission test (as described in R83).  
India noted that at previous 'IEPPR workshop' (June 2012), some stakeholders mentioned that types VI should apply to quadricycles. India wanted to know if participants reflected on that.  
The chairman took note of that , but suggested not to start detailed discussion on this issue now.
- Spain, asked if the EC's intention was to repeal R40 and R47?  
EC stated that there would be no repeal as some CPs were still using the regulations.
- India asked what the EC meant by the restricted L category vehicles' (cfr. point 10 in *WP29-158-15*)  
EC offered the example of mopeds with limitation in power and maximum speed, and suggested that the introduction of sub-classes was to restrict the speed or power).
- EC feels it is important to have a common procedure to measure max. power and vehicle speed.  
The test procedure needs to be adapted as in EU now HEV's and EV's have come to the market.
- Japan presented its position (*EPPR-01-06e*): (Agenda item no#3.3)
  - o Japan supported international harmonization but stressed the importance to put priorities on the tasks.
  - o Suggestion for first priority on L3 category with combustion engines, as this has the largest market share and greater environmental influences.
  - o In Japan, L6 and L7 category vehicles are considered as four-wheeled vehicles, and the emission requirements for these vehicles are the same with those for M1 and N1 vehicles.  
As such Japan raised concerns to regulate these "four-wheeled vehicles" along with motorcycles and tricycles. Japan takes it necessary to research the situations in each Contracting Party and to consider in detail how the regulations for these categories (L6 and L7) should be.

- Japan proposed to put lower priority for EV and HEV, and to discuss these based on the outcome from the EVE and WLTP informal groups (under GRPE),
  - in which overall discussions take place on electric range and energy consumption. and it is desirable to take advantage of their results. Currently the overall discussion of electric energy consumption, electric range determination and such are considered in EVE and WLTP and it is desirable to take advantage of their results.
  - Japan proposed to delete “Test type VI” from the proposed mandate document (*WP29-158-15*) since they see no need for worldwide harmonization for low temperature test.
  - Proposal to unify the reference fuel when developing the regulations because the limit values vary depending on the reference fuels.
  - And it was also proposed to update GTR2 first, and copy the content (of GTR2) afterwards into R40.
- UK acknowledged that quadricycles are not the largest part of the market, and may be lower priority, but UK did not want them to be out.
  - The EC explained their biggest concern is at low-end/low displacement vehicles (mopeds and smaller motorcycles). And the EC suggested to consider to open GTR2 to include mopeds. EC stated there is only a virtual boundary between mopeds and motorcycles.
  - IMMA preferred also to continue building on what we already exists (GTR2) for L3-vehicles. IMMA called this the next phase of WMTC.
  - EC said that looking into L3 only is preventing us to have a holistic view. EC proposed not to focus on one particular subcategory.
  - Italy agreed to look at all vehicles and take into account particular specifications of e.g. quadricycles. But Italy stated there is a need to set priorities, and added that motorcycles should be priority.
  - The chairman agreed there is a need for a priority list.
  - India support Japan’s proposal for no global harmonization regarding the Type VI (low ambient temp.)
  - India was unsure if R85 was useable for current L-vehicles for propulsion performance.
  - EC said R85 is usable for EV’s and maybe also for HEV, but for HEV, it is not complete. For ICE-vehicles EC saw no appropriate regulation available.
  - India suggested that instead of updating R40 and R47, a new regulation should be developed so that this would allow developing countries to apply these current regulations
  - The chairman assumed this was in line with the view within EU.
  - EC confirmed their preference to first look at the ‘98-agreement, and then at ‘58, as there is a solid base by GTR2.
  - EC stated though they found some weaknesses and flaws in GTR2 that need to be addressed. And EC saw a need to upgrade GTR2.  
EC mentioned that the ‘58 agreement is for them also important, and they would like to keep things in parallel.
  - India commented that GTR2 is still a recent document and if there are some flaws that should be addressed we should look at GTR2, and try to resolve them rather than starting a new book. India preferred to find expansion rather than start new GTR.
  - The chairman concluded that he sees an understanding between EC, Japan and India that GTR2 should be the basis for further work. The group was invited to send addition, written comments to the chairman and the secretary.

- **EPPR study by TRL/Ecorys**

Document: *EPPR-01-04*

(agenda item #3.1 and #3.2)

- Presentation made by Andrew Nathanson, ECORYS/TRL and informed of the questionnaire that had been set-up. To get the link for the questionnaire, contact: [int-l-cat-leg@trl.co.uk](mailto:int-l-cat-leg@trl.co.uk)
- The chairman welcomed this work and assumed this would become important for the group.
- India asked what the EC meant by 'global harmonization of testing equipment' and what was the purpose of this, and added regional test equipment should not be restricted by this.
- EC explained that they want to harmonize equipment for Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles. As example EC mentioned the reference temperature, even if this may not be a big issue because you can re-calculate it, it may lead to confusion and errors.
- Korea and India noted that the information shown by TRL at slide no. 15 contained a mistake and would give the correct information on legislative bodies involved in regulations in their countries.
- The chairman invited all CPs and stakeholders of the group to respond to the questionnaire as this will bring important input to the work of the EPPR group.

- **Presentation by Japan-MoE: Summary of the Future Emission Reduction Measures for Motorcycles**

Document: *EPPR-01-05*

(Agenda item no#3.3)

- Japan stated that their expectations had been to amend limit values, prepare for regulations (evap emissions and OBD) to be developed by the IG.
- EC saw several elements that were open for harmonization;
- EC informed that in EU they are putting OBD out of the environmental scope by including safety. As such, EC saw a central role for OBD more fast and efficient vehicle repair, by setting a flag for both environmental and safety problems.

- **Roadmap, as proposed by EC**

(agenda item #6)

Document: *EPPR-01-03 Rev1*

- EC explained their view for the different topics:
  - First look at categories and consider whether to work under the 98 or 58 agreements
  - Type I: Suggestion to look into GTR2, upgrade where needed, e.g. require PM measurement as this is not yet in the GTR. And regarding dilution air, the current GTR is not much developed.

- Durability: There is the AMA, and EC developed its own cycle, 'the SRC'
- EVAP: EC sees common grounds which are going in the direction of the Californian 'Shed test', or alternatively more cost effective method 'permeation' testing for lower end vehicles – still reflecting on it.
- Regarding propulsion requirements there is a lack of harmonized requirements at UNECE for power testing.
- Japan requested that the priority for this group had to be OBD and EVAP, as Japan has pressure to develop these regulatory issues on national level. Japan also informed that they do not have requirements for crankcase emissions, and suggested priorities were set.

- **AOB**

- At 65<sup>th</sup> GRPE plenary meeting, two informal documents were introduced (GRPE-65-12, GRPE-65-13) regarding 'Vehicle Propulsion System Definitions'.
- The chairman asked whether there was agreement that this should be not priority for our IWG. And added it could be on the agenda of next IWG meeting in April if stakeholders wanted.
- EC agreed this should not priority, however suggested it would be important to make sure that the document would not only focus on M- and N-category only.
- The chairman informed that, at the plenary GRPE, a face to face meeting was already scheduled in February to discuss the proposed document, and if necessary the outcome could be reviewed by us in April.

- **Concluding remarks and closing**

- The chairman concluded he was happy with the outcome of the meeting as there are a number of topics for which there was common ground,
- Task is to make first a priority list and working plan.
- An agreement was noted that '98 agreement should be the starting point. EC reminded not to forget '58.
- India and Japan said they want priority for L3 category, while EC insisted to cover all lower powered vehicles. The chairman noted that further discussions will be needed for this topic.
- TRL's study is expected to result in valuable and important input for the group
- A principle agreement on the Terms of Reference was noted.
- The chairman thanked India again to host the autumn meeting and suggested again to have meetings also in other parts of the world.
- Other issues were, e.g. the presentation by Japan on OBD and EVAP
- The chairman concluded by suggesting there should be some bilateral contact before next IWG

## **Participants**

EC: Mr. Guido Gielen, Mr. Bernardo Martinez  
TRL: Mr. Andrew Nathanson  
India: Mr. Marathe, Mr. Nakhawa, Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Anoop Bhat, Mr. Petkar  
Japan: Mr. Takai (MoE), Mr. Horie (MLIT), Ms. Toba (Jasic), Mr. Narusawa (NTSEL), Mr. Ishii (NTSEL),  
Mr. Sakai (Jasic)  
Korea: Dr Junhong Park (MoE)  
US: Mr. Michael Olechiw (EPA)  
Canada: Mr. Jean-Francois Ferry  
China: Mr. Liu Xin (Tianjin Motorcycle Technology Center)  
Sweden: Mr. Petter Åsman, Mr. Per Ohlund, Mr. Lars Rapp  
Italy: Mr. Errario  
Spain: Mr. Laguna, Mr. Costa Escarrà  
UK: Mr. Simon Davies (DfT)  
NL: Mr. Theun Stoffels (RDW), Mr. Henk Baarbé (MoE), Mr. Henk Dekker (TNO)  
Austria: Mr. Werner Tober (MoT)  
Belgium: Ms. Ann Vereecken (MoT)  
Czech republic: Mr. Woitsch (Dekra), Mr. Trnka (TÜV Süd)  
Switzerland: Mr. Felix Reutimann  
EC-JRC: Mrs. Covadonga Astorga Llorens  
Hungary: Mr. Pollak, Mr. Krisztian UHLIK (KTI Institute for Transport Sciences)  
IMMA: Mr. Edwin Bastiaensen (SG), Mr. Rav Choda (TO), Mr. Thomas Vercammen  
ACEA: Ms. Caroline Hosier  
AECC: Mr. John May  
Euromot: Mr. Christophe Gossard  
Logos: Mr. Frederic Soudain