

## Svensson Bolennarth

---

**Ämne:** VB: Documents for GRRF / comments on remote indication

R55\_04\_13

**Från:** Svensson Bolennarth  
**Skickat:** den 8 april 2013 13:23  
**Till:** 'Teyssier Pierre'  
**Kopia:** Carlo Tagliaferri ([c.tagliaferri@orlandi.it](mailto:c.tagliaferri@orlandi.it))  
**Ämne:** SV: Documents for GRRF / comments on remote indication

Dear Pierre,

I find the wording in Annex 5 § 12.3.1. to be ambiguous. The last part of the paragraph shall be taken out. I.e. "... in paragraph 12.2. ~~which shall at least indicate the open condition of the coupling.~~" According to § 12.2 the indication is not a convenience appliance. It is a safety feature.

You asked how our indication in VBG products work. It works according to the §12.2.x. It indicates closed and double locked position with a green light and not double locked coupling position with a red light. The green but not the red light can be switched off in accordance with §12.2.1. The optical signal will come back immediately when anything happens that would cause the coupling not to be double locked.

Hence to our company the indication is a safety feature that executes a surveillance task.

Best Regards

**Bolennarth Svensson, PhD**  
**Business Engineer Coupling Equipment**  
VBG GROUP TRUCK EQUIPMENT AB  
Box 1216  
SE-462 28 Vänersborg  
Street address: Herman Kreftings gata 4

Tel +46 521 278126  
Fax +46 521 277794  
Mobile +46 706 177217  
E-mail [bolennarth.svensson@vbgroup.com](mailto:bolennarth.svensson@vbgroup.com)

Disclaimer: The content of this e-mail is intended solely for the use of the Individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this communication in error, be aware that forwarding it, copying it, or in any way disclosing its content to any other person, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail immediately.

---

**Från:** Teyssier Pierre [<mailto:Pierre.Teyssier@volvo.com>]  
**Skickat:** den 14 februari 2013 09:58  
**Till:** Svensson Bolennarth  
**Ämne:** Documents for GRRF / comments on remote indication

Hej Bolennarth,

Jag hoppas som du mår bra.

I am preparing GRRF of next week but did not see so far any informal document from R55 informal group. Will there be any document tabled? I understood from the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting that there should be a proposal for the terms of reference for the group, based on the table with the 27 items? We should get the documents very soon now if we (OICA) wants to have a chance to review them and give some feedback next week. Who should make the informal group reporting in GRRF, Jürgen Wästphäling? Will you be in GRRF next week?

Regarding the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, I received some notes from M. Carlo Tagliaferri but did not see on the web site the report from the meeting. It would be helpful for me to get it before GRRF, at least a draft. Do you think it would be feasible?

M. Tagliaferri told me in his mail that it was now proposed to change the requirement paragraph 12.3.1 on “remote indication” so that it shall at least show the “closed” status of the coupling. If it looks interesting regarding safety, I am not sure it is relevant for remote indication as it is thought in this paragraph.

According to me, the remote control is used to open the device, not to close or lock it. So the remote indication should inform the driver about the “open status”, which means to the driver: *“yes the device is open, you can now go backward with the truck without risk of damaging the coupling”*. It is then the task of the automatic coupling (and not of the remote control !) to doubly lock the device, and there are other provision in the R55 to request for a remote indication that indicates the closed status after automatic locking operation. This other provision is in paragraph 12.2.1: “For an automatic coupling procedure, remote indication devices shall indicate the closed and doubly locked position of the coupling in an optical manner according to paragraph 12.2.2. ...”.

So in the end I think R55 is relevant, only the wording is confusing and could be improved.

To me, the confusion is coming from that there are two type of remote indication:

- Remote indication of paragraph 12.3.1 deals with indication of effect of the remote control operation
- Remote indication of paragraph 12.2.1 deals with indication of effect of the automatic coupling operation

As a conclusion, no need to change from “open” to “close” in 12.3.1, but to improve the wording (if it does not bring us “too far...”).

What do you think Bolennarth? How are the remote control VBG systems work? (I know we are equipping some of our trucks with such systems but did not have time so far to talk to my colleagues).

I will send this mail to M. Tagliaferri so that we go on digging into it until next meeting.

mvh,

Pierre