



Economic and Social Council

Distr.

GENERAL

TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/45

19 April 1999

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles

Working Party on Brakes and Running Gear (GRRF)

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON BRAKES AND RUNNING GEAR (GRRF) ON ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

(1 to 5 February 1999)

1. GRRF held its forty-fifth session from 1 to 5 February 1999 under the chairmanship of Mr. M. Fendick (United Kingdom). Experts from the following countries participated in the work: Canada; Croatia; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Russian Federation; Slovakia; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; Ukraine; United Kingdom; United States of America. A representative of the European Commission (EC) also participated. Representatives of Japan took part in the session under paragraph 11 of the Commission's Terms of Reference. Experts from the following non-governmental organizations participated: International Organization for Standardization (ISO); International Road Transport Union (IRU); International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA); Liaison Committee for the Manufacture of Automobile Equipment and Spare Parts (CLEPA); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); European Tyre and Rim Technical Organization (ETRTO). An expert from the Association of European Wheel Manufacturers (EUWA) participated at the invitation of the secretariat.

2. The documents without a symbol distributed during the session are listed in annex 1 to this report.

REGULATIONS Nos. 13 AND 13-H (Braking)

(a) Electronic braking (EBS II)

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 13 and 26 of annex 1 to this report.

3. The Chairman reported on the results of the second meeting of the informal group on electronic control of braking systems (EBS II), which he had chaired in London from 6 to 8 January 1999.

4. He explained that the consideration of work had been divided into two main subjects: (a) provisions for the safety concept of "complex" electronic systems using braking systems as a model to develop a generic approach to system approval; the work should continue during the next meeting, and (b) further development of requirements for electronic braking systems, where proposals would be presented to GRRF.

5. The Chairman announced that the fifth session of the EBS II group would take place in Scheveningen, the Netherlands, 9 to 11 June 1999. A confirmation of the meeting dates would be sent to all informal group participants.

6. Explanations to informal document No. 13, transmitted by the Chairman of the EBSII group, were presented by the expert from CLEPA. As agreed at the forty-fourth GRRF session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, paras 5. to 8.), informal document No. 13 specified which parameters of ISO 11992-3: 1998 should be allowed to be transmitted by the electric control line and which should be excluded.

7. Informal document No. 13 was approved in principle and the secretariat was requested to distribute it with an official symbol. GRRF also agreed to resume its consideration during the next session.

8. Informal document No. 26 was presented by the expert from OICA, who explained that it had been drafted by a sub-group of the informal EBS group. It contained a proposal regarding the electronic transmission of the parking braking system.

9. The experts from the United Kingdom expressed concern about the proposal which differed substantially from the position which had been discussed during the London meeting of the informal group. The drafters of the proposal were invited to continue the discussion, taking into consideration the opinion about the parking brake signal to be transmitted in the case of a failure of the parking brake and the level of redundancy required. It was also agreed that the provisions should not be design restrictive in order to allow the new technologies to be incorporated in electronic transmissions.

(b) Further development

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/4; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/15;
TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/16/Rev.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/18;
TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/1; informal documents Nos. 4, 5, 12, 19, and 22 of
annex 1 to this report.

10. As regards the extension of the scope of Regulation No. 13-H to include N1 category vehicles, the expert from the United States of America recalled the proposal contained in document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/4 and proposed that, for N1 category vehicles, Regulation No. 13-H would only be applied at the request of the manufacturer.

11. The expert from Japan maintained his position, expressed during the previous GRRF session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 11). He also explained that in Japan Regulation No. 13-H is mandatory for vehicles included in the scope. Therefore, if the scope of the Regulation would be extended to N1 category vehicles, Regulation No. 13-H would become the only standard to be applied for these vehicles. He considered that not desirable and repeated that a considerable part of N1 category vehicles currently produced in his country would have difficulty in fulfilling the prescriptions of Regulation No. 13-H.

12. GRRF noted the comments and requested the expert from Japan to consider the possibility to accept the modification of the scope, as proposed by the expert from the United States of America, and to bring a reply for the next session of GRRF.

13. The expert from OICA presented informal document No. 5, which for Regulation No. 13-H proposed amendments equivalent to those of document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/15, which had been approved for Regulation No. 13 at the last session (TRANS/GRRF/44, para. 16).

14. After an exchange of views, GRRF requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 5 with an official symbol for consideration at the next session.

15. The expert from the United Kingdom introduced document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/16/Rev.1, containing proposals for: aligning the service braking performance with that of Regulation No. 13-H, improving the secondary braking performance, reducing the maximum effort in the brake pedal and introducing a warning signal when the assisted energy for braking had a failure.

16. GRRF agreed in principle with increasing of the braking deceleration to 6.4 m/s^2 as reflected in annex 4, paragraph 2.1.1. of the proposal.

17. As concerns the warning signal (paragraph 5.2.1.2.8. of the proposal), GRRF suggested, after detailed consideration, that the United Kingdom should reconsider the proposal and look for another possibility to warn the driver of a failure of the vacuum booster.

18. No conclusions were reached on the issues of the performance for the secondary brake system increased to 3.4 m/s², and the limitation of the force in the foot control, because they were considered unnecessary by some experts.

19. GRRF agreed to continue the consideration of document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/16/Rev.1 at the next session taking into account that the deceleration of 6.4 m/s² had been approved in principle (see para. 16. above).

20. The expert from CLEPA presented document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/18 and informal document No. 19 as a corrigendum of the document. He announced that this document reflected the situation today, because no contributions had been received after the last GRRF session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 23).

21. GRRF requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 19 with an official symbol (as a corrigendum to document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/18) for consideration during the next session.

22. The majority of experts considered that the modular approach contained in the proposal should be a good solution for type-approval of trailers produced in a considerable number. Nevertheless, for trailers produced as a unit, another solution either at a national or an international level should be considered.

23. After a discussion on the benefits of such modular type approval for trailers' manufacturers producing a considerable number of units of the same type, GRRF agreed to create a small informal group chaired by the expert from CLEPA (Mr. Ross) to update the prescriptions and to redraft them, if necessary. It was proposed that the informal group should, as a first step, complete the work to establish a new methodology for type approval. Following this the informal group should seek a solution for small series or individual trailer approvals. It was suggested that existing national procedures might provide a model for this element of the work.

24. GRRF agreed that the informal group should meet during two days, before the next session of GRRF and asked the experts interested in this work to contact the expert from CLEPA.

25. Document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/1 based on an informal document which had been tabled in the previous session of GRRF (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 19) was considered and adopted as a corrigendum to Regulation No. 13-H. GRRF agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and to AC.1 for consideration at the session of June 1999.

26. Introducing informal document No. 12, the expert from the United Kingdom explained that in EC Directive 97/27/EC (Masses and Dimensions) a requirement for a yellow warning light has been introduced to transmit additional information to the driver (lifted rear axle). The aim of the proposal contained in informal document No. 12 was to address concerns that the warning signals of Regulation No. 13 could be used for functions other than braking and when so employed could, in certain cases, disable important braking signals.

27. GRRF asked the expert from the European Community to transmit the concerns to the European Commission and to inform GRRF of the result.

28. GRRF agreed to continue consideration of this item at the next session, and requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 12 with an official symbol.

29. Informal document No. 22 containing a proposal for establishing the speed of cooling air over a brake during the inertia dynamometer test to be equal to 30 per cent of the initial speed was presented by the expert from ISO.

30. In the discussion, Germany and France asked that the air flow be specified instead of the speed. The expert from France said that a verification should also be made for Regulation No. 90, and asked FEMFM to consider possible implications both for Regulation No. 90 and for annex 11 of Regulation No. 13.

31. GRRF agreed to continue consideration of this issue at the next session and requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 22 with an official symbol.

(c) Brake wear adjustment devices

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/17; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/5.

32. GRRF noted that document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/5 was the French translation of document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/17, presented by the expert from Germany during the previous session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, paras. 24 and 25).

33. During the consideration of the proposal, the problem of the validation of the technical service test reports by the Administrative Authority was raised by the expert from France. The matter was discussed and GRRF recalled that a similar situation existed in annex 12 of Regulation No. 13, without any validation.

34. Concluding the discussion, GRRF adopted the proposal without addressing the question of validation. However, it was agreed to open the general problem of validation of the technical service reports during the next session, in September 1999.

35. GRRF also agreed to transmit the adopted proposal to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at its June session, as a draft Supplement 5 to the 09 series of amendments.

(d) Facilitation of testing vehicles in-service

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 2 and 7 of annex 1 to this report.

36. The expert from Germany chairing the informal group on periodic technical inspections (PTI), informed GRRF about the fourth meeting held in Copenhagen on 3 and 4 November 1998 (informal document No. 2). He acknowledged that an expert from the International Motor Vehicle Inspection Committee (CITA) had also participated.

37. The report was noted and GRRF encouraged the PTI group to continue its endeavour. Concerning the typing error signalled for Regulation No. 13 (para. 5.1.4.5.2.), GRRF verified that this information was without substance and that no correction was necessary.

38. The Chairman of the PTI group announced that the next meeting of this informal group would take place on 14 and 15 April 1999, in Prague.

39. As suggested during the previous session, (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 27), the expert from Sweden presented a technical report, contained in informal document No. 7, concerning the feasibility of using roller brake testers for high speed brake tests of heavy vehicles.

40. The experts from France and OICA pointed out difficulties of a roller brake test from a high speed, particularly during the periodic technical inspections, because in their view:

- (a) the time needed to fix a vehicle on the tester would be excessive (20 minutes?),
- (b) Power consumption and dissipation would be excessive.

41. The matter was discussed, but GRRF agreed to continue to collect for experience on this matter and keep it on the agenda.

(e) Provisions for electric vehicles

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/2; informal documents Nos. 6 and 20 of annex 1 to this report.

42. The expert from the United Kingdom presented document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/2. He explained that it contained prescriptions for regenerative braking systems and for hybrid vehicles, taking into account previous documents and the opinions registered during the previous sessions of GRRF.

43. The expert from Japan introduced informal document No. 20 containing detailed comments to document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/2.

44. The expert from Germany agreed with the principles of document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/2, but considered that it would be necessary to improve the wording, following comments of informal document No. 20.

45. The expert from the United Kingdom agreed to consider the comments received and take them into account for updating the proposal.

46. The expert from the United States of America presented informal document No. 6 which compared differences for electric vehicles between FMVSS No. 135 and Regulation No. 13-H and proposed to maintain harmonization between both sets of requirements.

47. GRRF noted the proposal and agreed to continue its consideration during the next session. Delegates were kindly requested to keep for this purpose informal document No. 6 and bring it for the next session.

48. The expert from the United States of America informed GRRF that the FMVSS-135 rule was available via the INTERNET:

<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov>.

The secretariat also made available the address for consulting, via the INTERNET, the European Community legislation:

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/index.html>

(j) Compatibility on braking

49. The Chairman noted that TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/18 had been considered under item 1.2. "further developments". He recalled that GRRF was awaiting a further paper from the expert from the United Kingdom before continuing the consideration of the subject of "compatibility of braking".

HANDLING AND STABILITY OF VEHICLES

Further development

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/1998/36; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/9; informal documents Nos. 1, 3 and 24 of annex 1 to this report.

50. The expert from the Netherlands presented the report of the second meeting of the informal group on dynamic rollover stability of heavy vehicles of categories N and O, held at Renault VI, Lyon, France on 24 and 25 September 1998 (informal document No. 3). He mentioned that the work had focused on the dynamic simulation calculation method and said that OICA had raised objections to the requirement that electronic systems for improving stability should not be taken into account. He explained that the informal group would consider this issue during its next meeting but he asked GRRF for guidance.

51. The expert from OICA confirmed the demand to consider the influence of electronic systems on stability and reiterated general objections to the proposed draft Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/1998/36), which had been stated during the previous session of GRRF (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 36). He insisted that the accident statistics should be examined to analyse the reasons for accidents (road, driver or vehicle) and, if the rollover accident was shown to have been caused by the vehicle, then to establish a test procedure to solve the problem. He regretted that the informal group was in the third phase of work without having considered the two previous phases.

52. Discussing the objections by OICA, GRRF recalled that the terms of reference of the informal group were based on extension of the proposed draft Regulation to vehicles other than those transporting dangerous goods and included the study of a dynamic test and the dynamic simulation calculation

method and GRRF agreed that the informal group should continue the work on this issue.

53. GRRF considered the question of electronic systems influencing vehicle stability and agreed that they were part of the vehicle and consequently should be taken into account during stability tests.

54. The expert from the Russian Federation presented informal document No. 24 and stated that his country would continue to work on this issue. He wished to participate in activities of the informal group. GRRF agreed to transmit informal document No. 24 to the informal group for consideration.

55. The Chairman of the informal group informed GRRF that for the stability test the following manoeuvres were under consideration by the group: double lane change or an equivalent, passage through a roundabout and a double steering manoeuvre.

56. Concerning the practical implication of the Regulation, the expert from France suggested that it would oblige the bodybuilders to comply with a limit of the centre of gravity height when installing the bodywork.

57. The expert from OICA made a presentation, showing vehicles for which the calculation method in Annex 3 of the proposed draft Regulation had been applied. He pointed out a few configurations which were out of limits and said that informal document No. 1 by EIGA showed similar conclusions.

58. GRRF noted that vehicles with difficulties to comply with the test were mostly of special purpose. It was again recalled that it should be the responsibility of Working Party WP.15 to define what vehicles should be covered by the current proposed draft Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/43, para. 22).

59. The expert from IRU insisted that before taking a decision, the statistics of accidents should be examined and the cost/benefit analysis made for the proposal (TRANS/WP.29/1998/36).

60. GRRF noted that the next meeting of the informal group would be held on 9 and 10 February 1999 in Barcelona, hosted by IDIADA, focusing on annex 5 "Dynamic lateral stability test procedure". He said that provisions for this annex should be finalized by the end of 1999.

REGULATION No. 90 (Replacement brake linings)

61. The expert from France announced that, following the decision taken by GRRF (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 55), FEMFM was preparing a proposal for bedding of replacement brake linings and invited other delegates to contribute their knowledge on this particular issue. The expert from ISO suggested that informal document No. 12 should also be relevant to this matter.

62. Considering the time needed for the work, GRRF agreed to skip this item in the next session and include it in the agenda of the forty-seventh session (February 2000).

TYRES

(a) Global harmonization of tyre regulations

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/7; informal document No. 18 of annex 1 to this report.

63. A proposal for a new draft global technical regulation on tyres to be annexed to the Agreement concerning the establishing of global technical regulations of 25 June 1998 was presented by the expert from ETRTO. He said that the draft was prepared jointly by the manufacturers from Europe, the United States of America and Japan in order to harmonize all existing national prescriptions.

64. In the discussion which followed, the proposal was considered a good base document and the authors were congratulated.

65. The expert from the United States of America recalled that the principles of the Global Agreement of 25 June 1998 require that candidate global technical regulations should aim to achieve highest possible standards. The proposal from ETRTO dealt only with tyres for passenger cars and he suggested that tyres for all vehicles up to 3.5 tonnes of mass might be incorporated. Technical comments to the draft were also made by the experts from the Czech Republic and from the United Kingdom (informal document No. 18) and other comments suggested that the proposal should include recently announced tyre constructions as e.g. run-flat systems.

66. The expert from ETRTO provided some explanations to the questions raised. GRRF decided to consider the scope of the draft in the next session and to include in later discussions noise requirements and tyre adhesion requirements. It was also agreed to consider the regulation of tyre dimensions, in order to avoid references to national standards.

67. Various tests of tyres proposed in the draft were considered in more detail. The expert from ETRTO said that the proposal was a compromise aiming towards harmonization. The expert from the United Kingdom requested the inclusion of administrative provisions and of the marking of the service description. ETRTO commented on the difficulty of dealing with the differing procedures of type approval and self-certification in common Regulations.

68. To advance the development of the proposal, GRRF agreed to establish an ad-hoc group dealing with this draft regulation. The Chairman of GRRF agreed to seek endorsement of this decision by WP.29.

(b) Tyre adhesion test

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/2; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/3; informal documents Nos. 10, 11, 16 and 17 of annex 1 to this report.

69. The Chairman informed GRRF that in the European Community effective progress had been made on the issue of tyre/road noise limitation and might soon result in amending the tyre Directive. He proposed to have a general discussion trying to arrive at an acceptable way forward. He also explained that informal documents Nos. 10 and 11 from ETRTO contained suggestions to the proposals by the United Kingdom (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/2 and TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/3).

70. The expert from the United Kingdom presented informal documents Nos. 16 and 17 containing position statements. The first document reviewed the current situation and the second made suggestions for alternative tyre grip test procedures, to form the basis of initial discussions in a proposed ad-hoc group.

71. The expert from ETRTO acknowledged the work done by the United Kingdom, but raised the question of adhesion of used tyres and possible liabilities. In his view manufacturers could only be responsible for adhesion of new tyres, but could not control the used tyres, particularly in cases of uneven or abnormal wear.

72. The expert from the United States of America announced that his country was considering a modification to the tyre rule (FMVSS-109) in order to improve the repeatability of traction tests.

73. The question of tyre friction measurement methods was discussed in some detail, concerning also the test surfaces and measurement repeatability. The expert from the Czech Republic informed GRRF that in his country some experience existed and expressed his favourable opinion for an outdoor test method. After discussion, it was agreed that at present there were not any suitable indoor tests and that outdoor testing was the only option. The expert from Japan recalled that, as he had said during the last session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 58), his country had experience in measuring the friction coefficient μ and insisted on the importance of the uniformity of the surface on which the tests were performed. The expert from Hungary recalled his presentation of informal document No. 11 during the previous session (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/44, para. 59) and also stressed the importance of the surface and of its adhesion coefficient.

74. GRRF agreed that an ad-hoc informal group should consider the questions of: (a) suitability of the ISO surface for tests, (b) measurement of "peak μ " and "locked-wheel μ ", (c) testing tyres on a vehicle or on a trailer, and (d) possible use of the United States of America type of grading method. The Chairman agreed to request during the next session of WP.29 the authorization for constituting this ad-hoc group.

(c) Regulation No. 54 (Pneumatic tyres for commercial vehicles)

Documentation: Informal document No. 8 of annex 1 to this report.

75. The expert from ETRTO presented informal document No. 8 containing a proposal to amend Regulation No. 54, in order to include a new category of asymmetric tyre to rim fitment configuration identified by the marking of the symbol "A".

The secretariat was requested to distribute informal document No. 8 with an official symbol for further consideration at the next session,

(d) Consolidated Resolution of the Construction of Vehicles (R.E.3.)

Documentation: Informal document No. 9 of annex 1 to this report.

76. The expert from ETRTO presented informal document No. 9 containing a proposal to amend R.E.3. in order to incorporate references to Regulations Nos. 106, 108 and 109 and to avoid misuse of downgraded tyres on road vehicles.

The secretariat was requested to distribute informal document No. 9 with an official symbol for further consideration at the next session.

OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Commercial vehicle wheel loss

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 14, 23 and 27 of annex 1 to this report.

77. The expert from the United Kingdom informed GRRF that informal document No. 23 was a response to an EUWA letter addressed to the secretariat and contained in informal document No. 14.

78. The expert from ISO presented informal document No. 27 which contained a summary of the work of Subcommittee ISO/TC 22/SC 19. He explained that the most important item related to commercial vehicle wheel loss could be the draft 180/WD 14400 Road Vehicles -Wheels and Rims- Use and maintenance requirements and that the Working Group W65 had developed a draft which would be offered to GRRF experts.

79. GRRF agreed to keep this issue in the agenda for consideration during the next session.

(b) Proposal for a draft Regulation on wheels

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/19 and Add.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/4; informal documents Nos. 15, 21 and 25 of annex 1 to this report.

80. The expert from Germany tabled informal document No. 25 containing the German position on the proposal for a new draft Regulation on the approval of wheels for passenger vehicles. Three aspects were involved: the basic philosophy, the basic technical objections and detailed technical and editorial remarks.

81. The expert from ETRTO remarked that in informal document No. 25 the type approval of wheels was considered to be linked to a vehicle installation, but in documents TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/19 and Add.1 was considered not to involve tyres on which Regulations were in force. The opinion of ETRTO favoured that type approval of wheels should not be linked to a vehicle installation.

82. The experts from Sweden and Denmark pointed out that prescriptions for wheels should be associated with the speed in order to make sure that they were appropriate for high speeds. They also expressed their opinion that the question of wheels' approval was more commercial than safety related.

83. GRRF called for a collaboration between experts from Germany and Italy to improve the proposal, taking into consideration experience in this field which had been accumulated in Germany.

84. The expert from Italy reminded GRRF that the proposal contained in documents TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/19 and Add.1 should be considered as modified by informal document No. 15. He noted that document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/4 was the translation into French of documents TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/19 and Add. 1. He explained that the aim of the proposal from Italy was to improve the quality of materials and the construction of wheels, without any link with the vehicle installation, in a similar way to the type approval of tyres.

85. The expert from Japan offered to make available to the Italian delegation the national regulation for wheels made of steel.

86. The expert from the United Kingdom commented that installation was important as the wheel/tyre combination must be able to operate within the underbody envelope. This view was supported by the experts from OICA, Germany and Hungary, who stated that the issue of the installation of wheels was strongly related to safety. The expert from EUWA agreed with this comment, but asked for the flexibility of the draft.

87. Concluding this discussion, GRRF agreed not to apply in a first stage provisions regarding the installation of wheels on vehicles, and to consider this issue for a possible second stage.

88. As concerns the marking of wheels, GRRF agreed that a reference to the standard ISO 3911:1998 should be included into the draft Regulation.

89. The expert from CLEPA presented informal document No. 21 containing both general and technical amendments.

90. GRRF agreed that problems raised by different experts might be best resolved at an informal meeting and requested the expert from Germany to organize it. Experts from Germany, Italy, CLEPA and EUWA announced their intention to assist in such informal meeting.

(c) Regulation No. 79 (Steering equipment)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/3; informal document No. 28 of annex 1 to this report.

91. The expert from the Russian Federation presented document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/3 aiming to reduce the maximum permissible effort on the steering wheel. The expert from Poland completed the presentation introducing informal document No. 29 which gave additional information about the test made on M1 vehicles.

92. The opinion on the proposal varied. In general more time was requested to study it and more information might be required from vehicle manufacturers. GRRF therefore agreed to continue the consideration of the proposal at the next session.

(d) Proposal for a draft Regulation on snow-chains.

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/8.

93. The expert from Italy presented the proposal. He explained that its aim was to ensure a minimum level of quality for chains used on M1 vehicles.

94. From the discussion, it became clear that no national rules existed on snow chains (additional grip devices). The expert from Germany informed GRRF that in his country a limitation of the speed existed for vehicles using snow chains.

95. GRRF agreed to consider this item during the next session. The Chairman announced that in the forthcoming session of WP.29 he would raise the question of this proposal and ask for its inclusion in the programme of work if agreed by the Working Party.

AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SESSION

96. The following agenda was agreed for the forty-sixth session of the GRRF (Geneva, 13 September (9.30 h) to 15 September (17.30 h) 1999) 1/:

1. Regulations No. 13 and 13-H (Braking)
 - 1.1. Electronic braking (EBS II group report)
 - 1.2. Further development
 - 1.3. Facilitation of testing vehicles in-service
 - 1.4. Provisions for electric vehicles
 - 1.5. Compatibility of braking
2. Handling and stability of vehicles 2/

Further development
3. Regulation No. 79 (Steering equipment)

Further development
4. Tyres 3/
 - 4.1. Global harmonization of tyre regulations
 - 4.2. Tyre adhesion test
 - 4.3. Regulation No. 54 (Pneumatic tyres for commercial vehicles)
 - 4.4. Consolidated Resolution on the Construction of Vehicles (R.E.3.)
5. Other business
 - 5.1. Commercial vehicle wheel loss
 - 5.2. Proposal for a draft Regulation on wheels
 - 5.3. Proposal for a draft Regulation on snow-chains

1/ As part of the secretariat's efforts to reduce expenditure, all the official documents distributed prior to the session by mail will not be available in the conference room for distribution to session participants. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies of documents to the meeting.

2/ This item will not be considered earlier than Tuesday 14 September 1999.

3/ This item will not be considered earlier than Wednesday 15 September 1999. The GRRF session is followed by the thirty-first session of the Working Party on Noise (GRB), where the questions of tyre-road noise shall be considered on Thursday, 16 September 1999, to allow the participation of tyre experts.

Annex 1

LIST OF INFORMAL DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT A SYMBOL DURING THE SESSION

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
1.	European Industrial Gases Association	2.	E	Uniform provisions concerning the approval of tank vehicles of categories N and O with regard to rollover stability
2.	Germany	1.4.	E	Report on the 4th informal meeting of the GRRF ad-hoc working group on Periodic Technical Inspection (PTI)
3.	Netherlands	2.	E	Report of the working group Dynamic Rollover Stability of heavy vehicles of categories N and O
4.	OICA	1.2.	E	OICA comments to the UK proposal to amend ECE Regulation No. 13
5.	OICA	1.2.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to ECE Regulation No. 13-H
6.	United States of America	1.5.	E	Comparison of electric vehicle requirements and proposal to maintain harmonization of EV requirements FMVSS 135 and ECE R 13-H
7.	Sweden	1.4.	E	Feasibility of using roller brake testers instead of road tests for heavy vehicles
8.	ETRTO	4.3.	E/F	Amendments to ECE Regulation No. 54
9.	ETRTO	4.4.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Consolidated Resolution on the Construction of Vehicles (R.E.3.)
10.	ETRTO	4.2.	E	UK proposal for draft amendments to UN/ECE Regulation No. 30 related to adhesion test of tyre to wet road
11.	ETRTO	4.2.	E	UK proposal for draft amendments to UN/ECE Regulation No. 54 related to adhesion test of tyre to wet road
12.	United Kingdom	1.2.	E	Regulation No. 13. Use of brake failure signals for supplementary functions
13.	Chairman of EBS II	1.1.	E	Regulation No. 13. Prescriptions for shared 11992 database

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
14.	EUWA	5.1.	E	Commercial vehicle wheel loss
15.	Italy	5.2.	E	Proposal for a new draft Regulation. Uniform provisions concerning the approval of wheels for passenger vehicles
16.	United Kingdom	4.2.	E	UK review of position regarding tyre grip
17.	United Kingdom	4.2.	E	UK suggestions for alternative tyre grip test procedures - to form the basis of initial discussions of ad-hoc group
18.	United Kingdom	4.1.	E	UK suggestions concerning Global Harmonisation of Tyre Regulations
19.	CLEPA	1.6.	E	Corrigendum to document TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/18
20.	JAPAN	1.5.	E	Japanese comments on the UK proposal concerning the provision for Electric Vehicle Braking Systems (TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1999/2)
21.	CLEPA	5.2.	E	CLEPA comments on proposal for Regulation on wheels. TRANS/WP.29/GRRF/1998/19 and Add. 1
22.	ISO	1.2.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 13, annex 15
23.	United Kingdom	5.1.	E	UK response to EUWA letter of 9 December 1999 addressed to Secretariat
24.	Russian Federation	2.	E	Comments to the TNO report "Dynamic Rollover Stability Test"
25.	Germany	5.2.	E	Proposal for a new draft Regulation. Uniform provisions concerning the approval of wheels for passenger vehicles [and their trailers] German position
26.	Informal Group EBS II	1.1.	E	Proposal to amend Regulation 13 with regard to the electric transmission of the parking braking system

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
27.	ISO	5.1.	E	Work from subcommittee ISO/TC 22/SC 19 Wheels
28.	Poland	5.3.	E	Information about the tests made in Pimot concerning the steering systems of vehicles of cat. M1

Annex 2

AD-HOC INFORMAL GROUPS OF GRRF

<u>Name</u>	<u>Chairman</u>	<u>Contact person</u>
Electronic Braking (EBS II)	Mr. M. Fendick Tel:(+44-171) 676 2070 Fax:(+44-171) 676 2079 E-mail:Malcom_Fendick@ detr.gsi.gov.uk	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail:
Modular type approval for trailers	Mr. C.F. Ross Tel:(+44-1527) 499-516 Fax:(+44-1527) 499-538 E-mail:	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail
Periodic Technical Inspections (TPI)	Mr. G. Rist Tel:(+49-711) 7861-2268 Fax:(+49-711) 7861-2425 E-mail:	Mr. M Hörner Tel:(+49-69) 97507-244 Fax:(+49-69) 97507-261 E-mail: hoerner@vda.de
Handling and Stability of vehicles	Mr. R.B. Hooqvelt Tel:(+31-15)269-6411 Fax:(+31-15)269-7314 E-mail:hooqvelt@ wt.tno.nl	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail:
Tyres	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail:	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail:
Wheels	Mr. H. Hesse Tel:(+49-228) 300-7539 Fax:(+49-228) 300-7409 E-mail: Hans.Hesse@ BMVBW.BMVBW.Bund400.de	<u>1</u> / Tel: Fax: E-mail:

1/ To be determined
