

GTB Secretary

Da: Karl Manz <karl.manz@kit.edu>
Inviato: lunedì 28 maggio 2018 17:46
A: GTB Secretary; BAILEY Phil; BAUCKHAGE Thomas; EWALD Jürgen; FUJIMOTO Kiyomi; GENONE Valter; GLUKHENKIY Konstantin; GOLDBACH Thomas; GORZKOWSKI Marcin; GRIGORESCU Benony; GTB President; HAY Frédéric; KRAUTSCHEID Rainer; LANGHAMMER Gert; LAZAREVIC Aleksander; LEVERATTO Daniela; LOCCUFIER Michel; PAMART Antoine; PATERNOTTE Sébastien; PERNKOPF Michael; PLATHNER Philipp; ROVERS Derwin; SCHLAGER Walter; SCHMIDT Olaf; SCHWENKSCHUSTER Lukas; SILVANI Françoise; SUZUKI Katsuaki; TERBURG Bart; VANDERVREKEN Erik
Oggetto: Re: GRE-IWG SLR - 23rd meeting on 4-6 April 2018 || Agenda + WebEx info
Allegati: karl_manz.vcf
Priorità: Alta

Dear All,

unfortunately it will be not possible for me to participate at the next meeting.

With regard to the next steps, that means Stage 2 of SLR, Germany thinks that:

1. The current LSD, RID and RRD photometric requirements are performance based but are not technology neutral and they should be also specified independent of the vehicle categories, because a signal is a information as such. Therefore e.g. one performance for stop lamps position lamps , direction indicators , DRL , etc. for two as well four wheelers.

Also only one side marker - side direction indicator lamp for all vehicle categories and deletion of all others.

2. There are partly concerns about the adequacy of the photometric requirements in the context of modern traffic conditions.

We think also that, it may be necessary, with regard to RID, to define performance criteria based upon the maximum speed of certain vehicle categories.

That means a light distribution for vehicles with a limited maximum speed as Class A (may be same as town function) and a light distribution for vehicles without a limited maximum speed as Class B which is also identical with the Class C for the basic beam function for AFS.

Incorporation of the fog lamp needs into the adverse weather function.

For the symmetric beams deletion of Class A and B , Class C should be the only one for small two wheelers and only Class E for all others.

A revision of the F3 front fog lamp as static front fog function seems to be necessary.

3. For the question : How to specify improved objective performance requirements for road scene illumination

convergence with the approach proposed by some ideas (not all) of Dr. Targosinski also of the latest harmonised beam pattern some years ago also input from out comings from the CIE and pedestrian safety Task Forces etc

For the question : Is there a need to reconsider requirements relating to glare from RID?

(Are the current requirements still relevant?) We think the values are clear over all the years, but we should think about more performance orientated evaluations procedures and more adaptive features.

With regard to the discussion with regard to harmonization with China and USA for SLR, we see the need of further discussions in GER and WP. 29 and if a clear together agreed specification on which items a harmonised position should (could) be reached.

That short the main things , further comments next time.

Have a nice meeting.

Best Regards

Karl

For the RRD more unified test procedures as for colour and environmental requirements (as for the advance warning triangle) etc.

SLR observations on German comments for Stage 2 Simplification

	German comments	SLR observation
1	The current LSD, RID and RRD photometric requirements are performance based but are not technology neutral and they should be also specified independent of the vehicle categories, because a signal is an information as such. Therefore e.g. one performance for stop lamps position lamps, direction indicators, DRL , etc. for two as well four wheelers.	OK to have for LSD a range of variation instead of different levels. Agreed
2	Only one type of side marker - side direction indicator lamp for all vehicle categories and deletion of all others	Important to keep the Cat. 6 side D.I. for trucks. There may be a justification to have 2 different categories for D.I. SLR would prefer to keep Cat. 5 and 6 D.I. as today. SLR would suggest to have only one side marker lamp and, if possible, harmonise with USA (e.g. SM1 with 0.6 cd in reference axis).
3	There are some concerns about the adequacy of the photometric requirements in the context of modern traffic conditions	What is meant by "modern traffic conditions"? High speed, dense traffic, ...
4	It may be necessary, with regard to RID, to define performance criteria based upon the maximum speed of certain vehicle categories. That means a light distribution for vehicles with a limited maximum speed as Class A (may be same as town function) and a light distribution for vehicles without a limited maximum speed as Class B which is also identical with the Class C for the basic beam function for AFS	Agreed. 2 classes of vehicles = 2 classes of passing beams: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≤ 50 km/h • $50 < \infty$ km/h
5	Incorporation of the front fog lamp needs into the adverse weather function	Need clarifications from Germany
6	For the symmetric beams deletion of Class A and B, Class C should be the only one for small two wheelers and only Class E for all others.	Need clarifications from Germany. To be integrated in slow vehicle passing beam requirements (point 4 above)?
7	A revision of the F3 front fog lamp as static front fog function seems to be necessary	Need clarifications from Germany
8	How to specify improved objective performance requirements for road scene illumination?	By combination and harmonisation of the current beam patterns the performance will improve
	Convergence with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - part of the approach proposed by Dr. Targosinski - the latest harmonised beam pattern some years ago Consider also input from CIE and pedestrian safety Task Forces etc	Agreed. Work in progress in SLR and GTB. Need clarifications from Germany.

9	<p>Is there a need to reconsider requirements relating to glare from RID? (Are the current requirements still relevant?)</p>	<p>Current requirements are OK for the time being, however luminance and minimum size to be considered.</p>
	<p>The values are clear over all the years, but we should think about more performance orientated evaluations procedures and more adaptive features</p>	<p>Agreed in principle. Need clarification on the meaning of "adaptive features". For example: Ambient conditions (night, fog, rain, etc.), road conditions (width, bends, motorway, etc.), speed, environment (other road users), traffic, etc.</p>
10	<p>With regard to harmonization with China and USA for SLR, we see the need of further discussions in GRE and WP.29 and if a clear together agreed specification on which items a harmonised position should (could) be reached</p>	<p>Harmonisation is currently focussed on China (GTB work). The harmonisation with USA will be a second step by means of potential GTRs on new technologies. SLR agreed that a clear statement from GRE/WP.29 would be very useful.</p>
13	<p>For the RRD more unified test procedures as for colour and environmental requirements (as for the advance warning triangle) etc</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>