



EGEA Working Group 6 Meeting

Wednesday 26th June 2013, 10h30 ~ 16h30

EGEA Offices

-Points for action and summary of decisions-

PARTICIPANTS

AFIBA/Vteq
AICA/Vamag
ASA/Bosch
ASA/Maha
GIEG/Actia Muller
RAI/NBT
EGEA
EGEA

BERENGUER, Jaume
BRUNAMONTI, Massimo
GERDES-ROEBEN, Michael
BEAUJEAN, Jean
SAUZAY, Olivier
NIJBOER, Michiel
PATTEMORE, Neil
VOGT, Philip

* * *

1. Welcome

Frank Beaujean opened the meeting welcoming the participants. No change of the agenda was requested

2. Approval of the minutes of the last WG6 meeting held on 5th June in 2012 in Brussels

The minutes were approved unanimously.

Michiel Nijboer asked for a brief summary of the WGs activities.

Frank Beaujean summarized the two fields of action

- Suspension testing, PTI and ECSS Tender
- The Safety of Roller-Brake Testers (Due to fatal accidents in France)

3. PTI – State of affairs of decision-making process: how is suspension/shock absorber testing affected?

Presentation from Neil Pattemore

- All of the key EGEA position paper points were adopted by Parliament, with the exception of shock absorber testing
- He explained the concept of the two pillars of the electronic vehicle information platform EGEA has suggested.
 - Action: Neil Pattemore called the participants to discuss the concept with their governments
- The electronic certificate implies interlinked test equipment
- Further explanation on headlamp testing, OBD, emissions and NOx

Jaume Berenguer suggested to work more closely with CITA

Michael Gerdes Roeben noted that testing measures on NOx are incomplete which was confirmed by Neil as, according to him, it is dependent on combustion temperature and therefore a test method needs to be agreed.

On Michiel Nijboer's request Neil confirmed that most likely the legal form of the dossier will be a Directive which gives more leeway for the implementation. If the wording on tailpipe testing remains it will be implemented as the default test method everywhere.

Michael Gerdes Roeben reminded the participants that since the introduction of EURO 5 hardly any MILs trigger anymore.

Philip Vogt explained the details of the possible L-category re-integration.

The participants discussed the differences and the positive and negative effects of national PTI systems.

Neil Pattemore continued his presentation on suspension. Shock absorber test equipment had been taken out by Council but not by the Parliament. The Commission is still in favour of suspension testing, including shock absorber testing but insists on a single European test method.

Jaume Berenguer added that 23% of all accidents were due to suspension failures. Massimo Brunamonti mentioned that the Italian government is going to support the introduction of shock absorber tests.

4. Suspension Testing: Confirmation of the terms of reference, budget & next steps

Neil Pattemore explained that EGEA was in a good position to propose a solution which is acceptable for member states. Still, 50.000€ are needed for the validation of the test method.

Frank Beaujean added that next to the UK, Germany might be one of the member states problematic to convince, as FSD claims that the MAHA Theta tester is not accurate according to Lehr. Germany even considers suspension testing by driving over speed bumps. Frank replied to Massimo Brunamonti that the current German test parameters remain unknown.

Massimo Brunamonti explained that in Italy is trying to implement a technologically neutral standard, the damping ratio test simply needs to be based on the principle according to Lehr.

Michael Gerdes-Röben and Frank discussed the ownership of the data FSD is collecting in Germany.

Michiel Nijboer noted that government representatives would not be able to follow the technical discussion.

The participants agreed that 40.000€ might be enough for the validating tests. Neil announced that EGEA would ask if the European Commission could fund the tests, but this may be unlikely.

Frank gave a detailed report on the main pitfalls of agreeing on measurement principles as different test systems have never shown the same ratio. The discussion therefore has to stop and an agreement on the damping ratio is to be found. A remaining problem is the incomparability of the values different suspension testing systems produce.

The participants explained to Massimo that GOCA, following Walter Nissler's advice, is going to test the shock absorber ratio. All three producers (from France, Germany and Spain) are about to provide GOCA with their shock absorber testers.

Massimo Brunamonti confirmed that AICA was happy to contribute 18.000€ and Frank announced that ASA would give 8.000 to 10.000€. Michiel announced to collect funds in the Netherlands.

Frank Beaujean raised the question about whom should be commissioned with the validating tests, SERAM (France), IDIADA (Spain) or Aachen (Germany) and asked on how to proceed.

Neil Pattemore concluded that a decision has to be taken defining the terms of reference while money was less of an issue for the time being.

Frank Beaujean suggested to collecting the money first. He continued explaining that the German and the Spanish test institutes would only allow a very limited number of persons (3-5) to be present during the

testing. Therefore he considered it as necessary to take a decision on the number of test runs before the tests start. Michiel Nijboer opted for one single test per suspension tester only.

Jaume Berenguer and Frank argued for looking at the testing technology as first eligibility criteria while the cost for the testing should be secondary. Frank added that the technical part could be discussed openly while the EGEA Secretariat should keep the prices in check until the technical conditions have been assessed.

Decision:

- The participants decided on technical requirements as first eligibility criterion.

Massimo Brunamonti insisted that it is crucial to first know about the money available. Frank explained that the more money available, the more different vehicle models (micro cars, light trailers) could be integrated into the testing.

Michiel Nijboer proposed to ask NMI, Michael mentioned TRW and Neil added that also MIRA could be asked for a quote.

5. National safety regulation in France for brake testers: status quo from GIEG

Olivier Sauzay reported that two fatal accidents with roller test benches had happened in France during HDV brake testing. Therefore, the French government had asked GIEG to come up with a new safety standard. The master solution consists in preventing staff to come too close to the bench. It is the government's goal to make it a European standard.

Frank Beaujean gave a presentation on the French standard. He showcased problems and solutions.

6. EU ECSS tender: pre-preparation to identify technical approaches for the plausibility checks of safety relevant ECU functions prior to signature of the tender

Neil Pattemore outlined that 2 tenders are coming as part of the Roadworthiness Package, one on checks of the vehicle's electronic safety system functions (ECSS) and a second to provide a single European electronic vehicle information platform. Neil justified the need to participate in the ECSS tender and presented the organizational diagram of the project.

Since Bosch is a direct partner of the CITA ECSS project a discussion followed whether Bosch could still participate in the project under the roof of EGEA.

Michael Gerdes-Röben explained that due to the direct involvement of some CITA Members, Bosch had decided to play a strong role as a direct participant as well. If possible Bosch would be interested to participate in Work Package 1 in addition.

Frank Beaujean proposed to leave the decision to the EGEA Board. Jaume Berenguer noted that it should first of all be checked with the Commission. Massimo Brunamonti highlighted the possible advantage of having EGEA member's additional direct involvement.

According to Michael Gerdes-Röben, Klaus Burger had insinuated that if Bosch opted to participate directly they could no longer participate via EGEA.

Massimo Brunamonti agreed with Frank Beaujean that the decision should be left to the Board. Frank added that, apart from Bosch, other companies might have an interest to participate via EGEA.

[Note from the EGEA Secretariat, clarification from Sylvia Gotzen: "As for your question on the participation of Bosch within WP1, EGEA is the leader of WP1, and the WP1 partners which have been officially nominated in the tender document to the Commission are EGEA, FSD, Robert Bosch GmbH, GOCA, ADIS-Tech. A close collaboration of all EGEA members (whether included as EGEA or as individual partners) is desired; EGEA as leader of WP1 endeavors to achieve a good collaboration of all WP1 members."]

Concerning the actual tender activities, Neil Pattemore explained that the main project decision making body is the project steering group, but that this in turn reported to the CITA Bureau Permanent who would make any final decisions.

Frank Beaujean advised the participants that he expects CITA to push for its own objectives and therefore it would be important to define EGEA's own objectives. He asked:

- How do we organize ourselves? Do we call for point 12 on the electronic testing of suspension?
- Do we need a "light working group"?

7. Discussion on how WG6 could support WG10 and the creation of a European Vehicle Test Equipment Network

Decision:

- The participants decided that no support of WG 6 was required.

8. Next meetings, frequency and location

Frank Beaujean and Neil Pattemore listed to following meetings and deadlines:

- Meeting with Walter Nissler to be requested
- CITA kick-off to be requested
- Clarification of Bosch's participation (EGEA Board decision)
- 15th July as deadline for the collection of funds for the shock absorber validation tests
- The participants agreed to hold the next WG6 meeting in September

Frank Beaujean closed the WG6 meeting.

* * *



Philip Vogt
Policy Manager

Attachments:

- 1) Presentation: EGEA WG6 Meeting 2013 06 26