

TYPE APPROVAL AUTHORITIES MEETING

27 and 28 SEPTEMBER 2005 – BORLÄNGE, SWEDEN

MEETING MINUTES

Issue Date: 30 September 2005
Revised item 6.6, 25 April 2006

Authors:

TYPE APPROVAL AUTHORITIES MEETING

27 and 28 SEPTEMBER 2005 – BORLÄNGE, SWEDEN

Attendees:

Austria

Belgium

Estonia

**European
Commission**

Finland

France

Germany

Hungary

Iceland

Ireland

Luxembourg

Netherlands

Norway

Poland

Slovenia

Spain

Sweden

Switzerland

Turkey

United Kingdom

Not Represented:

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy,
Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia.

AGENDA

- 1. Opening of the meeting**
- 2. Adoption of the Agenda**
- 3. Adoption of the minutes from Madrid 9--10 March 2005**
- 4. Follow up on actions from the Madrid meeting**
 - 4.1 Rollover Stability ECE Regulation No. 111, Madrid item 4.2
 - 4.2 Date of origin for existing type, Madrid item 5.3
 - 4.3 Calculation suitable for approving drawbars, Madrid item 5.16
- 5. General items ---**
- 6. Items relating to framework directive 70/156/EEC (motor vehicles)**
 - 6.1 70/156/EEC*2001/116/EC: Number of seating positions
 - 6.2 70/156/EEC: Conformity of production surveillance
 - 6.3 70/156/EEC: End of series
 - 6.4 70/156/EEC: Withdrawal of type approval
 - 6.5 70/156/EEC: Mass of vehicle in running order
 - 6.6 2003/102/EC: Pedestrian protection
 - 6.6.a 96/79/EC, 74/297/EEC: Frontal impact, Steering mechanism in the event of an impact
 - 6.7 2003/97/EC: Devices for indirect vision
 - 6.8 2003/97/EC*2005/27/EC: Devices for indirect vision
 - 6.8.a 70/157/EC, 97/24/EC: Replacement exhausts systems
 - 6.9 72/245/EC*2004/104/EC: EMC
 - 6.10 71/320/EEC*2002/78/EC, ECE R13H: Brakes, low to high friction surface transitions
 - 6.11 76/756/EEC*97/28/EC, ECE R48: Lighting installation
 - 6.12 74/61/EEC*95/56/EEG: Devices to prevent unauthorized use
 - 6.13 92/23/EEC: Type of tyre in the case of Reinforced or Extra load tyres
 - 6.14 92/23/EEC: Tyres on trailers in relation to their speed category

- 6.15 2001/85/EC: Bus & Coach design rules
- 6.16 96/96/EC: Annual vehicle tests (Periodic technical tests)
- 6.17 Individual approval of imported cars

7. Items relating to framework directives 92/61/EEC and 2002/24/EC (motor cycles)

- 7.1 2002/24/EC: Unladen mass for three-wheeled electric moped
- 7.2 2002/24/EC: Type approval authority does not respond to request related to Article 10
- 7.3 93/93/EEC: Installation of lighting

8. Items relating to framework directives 74/150/EEC and 2003/37/EC (agricultural and forestry tractors)

- 8.1 2003/37/EC: Extension of approvals granted according to 74/150/EEC
- 8.2 89/173/EEC: Coupling devices/components/mechanical linkage

9. Miscellaneous

10. Next meeting (2006) – Location to be established

MEETING MINUTES

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The meeting delegates were welcomed by Mr Sören Hedberg, chairman of this session.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES FROM MADRID MEETING March 2005

Minutes from TAA meetings shall be neutral regarding countries questions and statements. The minutes were presented relatively late which gave some difficulties in adopting. The intention of the minutes was although adopted without amendment. Spain was asked to review the minutes before presenting them for the Commission to be published on the web-site.

4. FOLLOW UP ON ACTIONS FROM THE MADRID MEETING

4.1 Rollover Stability ECE Regulation No. 111, Madrid item 4.2

Question is regarding how much facts shall be provided for calculation in the test report regarding tests according to R111. The complete algorithms should be annexed to the test report and the technical service must have full control over all the steps.

4.2 Date of origin for existing type, Madrid item 5.3

Matters concerning how to use separate approvals that are not extended to the last amendment when applying for WVTA. No unity in this question was reached although several members had the view that each separate directive should be followed in its own right. Guidance from the Commission is preferred.

4.3 Calculation suitable for approving drawbars, Madrid item 5.16

Question is withdrawn.

5. GENERAL ITEMS ---

6. ITEMS RELATING TO FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE 70/156/EEC (MOTOR VEHICLES)

6.1 70/156/EEC*2001/116/EC: Number of seating positions

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>2001/116/EC, Annex II, part B “Definition of vehicle type”, Category M1, version “Version of a variant means vehicles, which consist of a combination of items shown in the information package subject to the requirements in Annex VIII. Multiple entries of the following parameters may not be combined within one version:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">. technically permissible maximum laden mass,. engine capacity,. maximum net power,. type of gearbox and number of gears,. maximum number of seating positions as defined in Annex II C.” <p>2001/116/EC, Annex II, part C “ Definition of type of bodywork” category M1 “AF Multi-purpose vehicle Motor vehicle other than those mentioned in AA to AE intended for carrying passengers and their luggage or goods, in a single compartment. However, if such a vehicle meets both of the following conditions:</p> <p>(a) the number of seating positions, excluding the driver, is not more than six. a “seating position” shall be regarded as existing if the vehicle is provided with accessible. seat anchorages. “accessible” shall mean those anchorages, which can be used. In order to prevent anchorages being “accessible”, the manufacturer shall physically obstruct their use, for example by welding over cover plates or by fitting similar permanent fixtures which cannot be removed by use of normally available tools; and</p> <p>(b) $P - (M + N \times 68) > N \times 68$ where: P = technically permissible maximum laden mass in kg M = mass in running order in kg N = number of seating positions excluding the driver</p> <p>This vehicle is not considered to be a vehicle of category M1.</p> <p>Is it allowed to have multiple entries for the maximum number of seating positions (Information document point 9.10.3.2.1) for one version?</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>Decision</i> | All delegates agreed that no multiple entries for maximum number of seating positions are allowed. The vehicles of bodywork type AF (multi purpose vehicle) are considered to have seating positions if the vehicles are provided with accessible seat anchorages. |
|-----------------|--|

6.2 70/156/EEC: Conformity of production surveillance

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>The Commission would like to have information from the member states on following issues:</p> <p>a/ What are the major problems that TA authorities are facing with regard to conformity of production surveillance? How frequent are these problems? What legislative or other measures could be taken to facilitate the work of TA authorities?</p> <p>b/ How frequent are uncertainties with regard to type approval practice? How often do TA authorities detect discrepancies of interpretation? Are there proposals for legislative or other structural measures which would allow a more coherent application of type approval legislation? Are there recurring errors in legislation like unclear formulations, contradictions, too vague definitions, etc.?</p> |
|------------------------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>Decision</i> | Member states agreed that they should send information in writing to the Commission in October 2005 regarding the subjects above. |
|-----------------|---|

6.3 70/156/EEC: End of series

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | The Commission would like to have information from the member states how they use the two different possibilities regarding limits of the end of series vehicles, according to the framework directive Annex XII, item B and also if the member states use this system for other vehicles than M1. |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>Decision</i> | Member states agreed that they should send information in writing to the Commission in October 2005 regarding the subjects above. |
|-----------------|---|

6.4 70/156/EEC: Withdrawal of type approval

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>A Member State which has granted type-approval finds that it is no longer possible to verify, whether the holder of the approval continuously makes adequate arrangements to ensure the conformity of production of the approved type.</p> <p>Possibilities of the solution</p> <p>A withdraw the type-approval in question immediately</p> <p>B withdraw the type-approval in question with a prior notification to the holder of the approval including a limited reaction period (preferably no longer than six months), or</p> <p>C leave the approval as it is and refuse to grant any new approvals</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>Decision</i> | The intention of the directive is that all measures shall be taken to resurrect the conformity. Different approaches are used by the member states when this is not possible. Guidance is advisable and this issue will hopefully be covered by the coming amendment of the framework directive. |
|-----------------|--|

6.5 70/156/EEC: Mass of vehicle in running order

Question/Subject The information document of a WVTA shall present the mass in running order (maximum and minimum for each variant) according to 70/156/EEC Annex 1 or Annex 3 item 2.6. Some manufacturers are presenting only one value for their vehicle type with variants and versions. It seems that all options are considered to be part of the vehicles load capacity when only the minimum value is presented.

Is it possible to exclude optional equipment in this way?

Discussion The separate directive (92/21/EEC) allows that options can be excluded when deciding mass in running order. The information in the framework directive does not have the same interpretation on that item nor the CoC. The discrepancies between these interpretations cause problems for member states that use the system for verification when registering vehicles.

Decision The Commission has a clear view that the information document for WVTA shall present both minimum and maximum value. There is although a problem with the discrepancies regarding separate directives and the framework directive which has to be solved in the future.

6.6 2003/102/EC: Pedestrian protection

Question/Subject Article 2 paragraph 3 of the directive 2003/102/EC says:

3. Paragraph 2 shall not apply to vehicles which do not differ with respect to their essential aspects of bodywork construction and design forward of the A pillars from vehicle types which have been granted EC type-approval or national type-approval before 1 October 2005 and which have not already been approved under this Directive.

The question is, what are the essential aspects of bodywork and design?

Decision The meeting noted that the Article 2 words “essential aspects of bodywork and design” was intended to provide scope for some flexibility to allow facelifts. It was agreed that this would be a case by case decision and the manufacturer should be encouraged to ensure that any changes in design do not make the vehicle less “pedestrian friendly”.

6.6.a 96/79/EC: Enquiry amongst the Member States according to which frontal collision directive vehicles with a maximum mass exceeding 2.5 tonnes are tested

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p><u>Current text</u></p> <p>The scope of directive 96/79/EC says:</p> <p><i>1.1. This Directive applies to power-driven vehicles of category M1 of a total permissible mass not exceeding 2,5 tonnes, with the exception of multistage built vehicles produced in quantities not exceeding those fixed for a small series; heavier vehicles and multi-stage built vehicles may be approved at the request of the manufacturer.</i></p> <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>It's considered that the manufacturer may choose between Directive 96/79/EC (off-set test impact) and 74/297/EEC (full face impact) when the maximum technically permissible mass of the vehicle exceeds 2.5 tonnes.</p> <p>The Commission would like to know the practical situation in the Member States and in particular how many types of vehicle continue to be type-approved in accordance with the test method prescribed in Directive 74/297/EEC.</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>Decision</i> | <p>The member states that granted these approvals pointed out that it was the manufacturer's choice whether to use 96/79/EC (off-set test impact) or 74/297/EEC (full face impact). The number of vehicles approved could not be presented at the meeting.</p> |
|-----------------|--|

6.7 2003/97/EC: Devices for indirect vision-requirements inside rear mirror

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>Directive 2003/97/EC, Annex III defines the minimum number of compulsory mirrors for motor vehicles. For M1 and N1 vehicles an interior Class I mirror is compulsory unless a mirror would not provide rearward vision as defined in item 5.1 of the same Annex. Furthermore it is stated that the interior mirror is optional if it does not provide rearward vision. This provision is aimed at vehicles which, due to their construction principles cannot provide rearward vision or where the rear window has been replaced by metal sheets or is not transparent.</p> <p>Some vehicle manufacturers are of the opinion that it is therefore legally possible to either leave out the interior mirror completely or mount a smaller mirror in all cases where the field of vision requirements of item 5.1 cannot fully be met due to the design of the vehicle. These might be vehicles where the rear window, as a design feature, is smaller than usual. In the manufacturer's view safety is still ensured as this directive requires for the first time outside rear view mirrors on both, driver and passenger side, of the vehicle.</p> <p>Is an inside rear view mirror, fulfilling the requirements of item 5.1 indispensable for all vehicles providing a rearward view?</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

Discussion The member states agreed that the latest amendment of the directive could open for the interpretation that an inside rear view mirror could be excluded if it could not fulfil the requirements. If this was not the intention with the text of the revised directive, the directive should be amended.

Decision The suggestion was to use the same text as in the former version of the directive as the members states were not all in favour that the inside rear mirror could be excluded due to the discussion above.

6.8 2003/97/EC last amended by 2005/27/EC: Devices for indirect vision, approval of cameras

*Question/
Subject* The directive includes provisions for the use of cameras and monitors for indirect vision and the legislation makes provision for the component approval of camera and monitor systems.

However it is not totally clear whether the approval of a camera-monitor system is applicable to all camera-monitor devices used on the vehicle for external vision or whether it is only required for those camera-monitor devices providing an image to enhance one of the mandated fields of view identified in Annex III Section 5.

Discussion Item 3 in the Preamble to 2003/97/EC suggests that cameras etc can be used to supplement (i.e. not replace) the use of conventional mirrors (i.e. material with a reflective surface).

The Annex III paragraph 2.2 states that the provisions of the Directive do not apply to surveillance mirrors - these are defined as mirrors giving a view that is not mandated by the Directive (Ref Annex III section 5)

However, there is no equivalent statement regarding cameras/monitors and VCA therefore seek the views of the other TAAM members regarding the following alternative solutions:

Possibilities of the solution

A Any Camera used on a vehicle to provide external vision must be approved

B Cameras only need approval to if they are being used to supplement one of the prescribed fields of view for a particular vehicle.

The discussion was quite clear that cameras used for filling the requirement for field in vision must be type approved. Cameras used only for parking aid do not need an approval. There were although some reservations regarding what requirements should be fulfilled for the parking cameras.

Decision The member states and the Commission agreed on solution B.

6.8.a 70/157/EEC (+97/24/EEC): Replacement exhausts system

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>A silencer is fitted with an easily (re)movable restriction in the exhaust gas stream (perforated valve) and the valve can be adjusted after breaking a spot-weld. Can and should this system be type-approved?</p> <p><u>Problem:</u> The tested sample complies with the directive “as is”, but it contains a device which facilitates modification. As soon as the spot weld is broken, the silencer is modified and the type approval is no longer valid. On the retailers web-sides there are advice on this modified solution (approval not valid).</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Questions were raised if the manufacturers or retailers information to customers should be in the verification of conformity of production. A general view was that systems that fulfilled the requirements could not be refused. The indelibility of marking was also discussed due to the recommendation from the retailer to remove the marking on modified systems.</p> |
|-------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>Decision</i> | <p>Type-approval is possible to grant if modification can not be easily done without destruction of some parts, otherwise type approval is not possible. The directive should give more guidance regarding anti tampering measures.</p> |
|-----------------|---|

6.9 72/245/EEC amended by 2004/104/EC + ECE R10: EMC

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>The Regulation R 10 is accepted as equivalent to 72/245/EEC according to Annex IV of directive 70/156/EEC.</p> <p>In the last TAAM in Madrid the question (Agenda item 5.20), if an approval authority has to accept a 95/54/EC approval for a component is possible to be incorporated in a 2004/104/EC-approval for a vehicle, ended in a split decision. The question was raised again due to the fact that using an approval granted according to Regulation 10, which has actually the state of the amendment 95/54/EC, is still possible.</p> <p>With the 1st of January 2009 only 2004/104/EC approvals are valid for registration and the aspects of article 7 Paragraph 2.</p> <p>Are components with valid 95/54/EC approvals still allowed to be incorporated in 2004/104/EC vehicle approvals (starting 1.1.2006) up until 1st of January 2009?</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

Discussion Legally R10 is valid for component approval and a 95/54/EC component approval is not accepted in a WVTAs approved according to 2004/104/EC. This was the conclusion for some of the member states and the Commission.
Some member states could not accept that components approved according to 95/54/EC could not be used when R10 is still valid.

One possibility for component manufacturers is to apply for an ECE R10 approval if they will not adjust to the amendments in 2004/104/EC.

There is although some work going on to adapt requirements in ECE R10, but it's not clear when this is finished.

Decision No agreement was achieved, progress is to be monitored at the next meeting.

6.10 71/320/EEC last amended by 2002/78/EC + ECE R13H: Passenger car brakes

Question/Subject According to the legislation, the deceleration of the vehicle must rise to the appropriate high value within a reasonable time. This question concerns what the appropriate high level of deceleration is and what a reasonable time is.

Please consider vehicle performance when transitioning from a surface with a low coefficient of friction to a surface with a high coefficient of friction.

The member state raising this question wishes to seek the help and advice of the other TAAM members to agree for some workable guidelines for this legislative requirement.

Discussion Four alternatives were presented:

A1/ Deceleration must be 75% of the maximum within 0.6 seconds of the front axle transition. (The 75% value is derived from the ABS minimum efficiency in Annex 6 section 5.2.1 and the 0.6 seconds is derived from the system response time in Annex 3 section 3.)

B/ Deceleration must be 6.43 m/s/s within 1 second of the front axle transition. (Values currently being proposed by the PVGTR group which is working on a Global Regulation for Braking.)

A2/ Deceleration must be 75% of the maximum within 1 second of the front axle transition.
(As Solution 'A' but with longer time period in line with PVGTR group proposal.)

C/ Other Proposals currently being used by TAAM members. (To be discussed during the meeting.)

The member states could not evaluate the effects of the differences described above, technical advice is needed.

Decision The question is to be raised to GRRF who can provide technical knowledge to answer what performance is to be expected.

6.11 76/756/EEC last amended by 97/28/EC+ ECE R48: Lighting installation

Question/Subject Automatically switched hazard warning light in case of high brake deceleration

New systems are using automatically operated switches of the hazard warning light during velocities over 30 km/h. In the case of a deceleration / brake force value higher than for example [6/7] m/s², the hazard warning light of those systems will be switched on.

The proposal of the UN-ECE GRE group working document 2005-02 is dealing with emergency brake visualisation and its activation. Herein the flashing brake light (Already granted during 8.2.c exemptions) and using of the hazard warning light beneath 30 km/h is accepted (Not both at the same time).

In what way shall the emergency brake visualisation be approved?

Discussion **Possibilities of the solution**

A The activation of the hazard warning light automatically due to decelerations higher than [7] m/s² is in line with the directive 76/756/EEC / Regulation 48 and it is possible to approve such systems.

B Only systems which are in line with the UN-ECE Prop GRE 2005-02 are possible to be approved (future), at least by an application concerning article 8.2.c. of the directive 70/156/EEC.

C Both systems should be possible today or in the future.

The member states had various opinions in this question and different national requirements regarding the use of hazard warning light made alternative A impossible for some member states. The Commission informed that the compromise within the regulation allows the use of both systems (flashing brake-lights or hazard warning lights).

According to the member states there are several 8.2.c exemptions granted for these systems.

There are ongoing discussions in both GRRF and GRE about this issue. A common view is not close. The problem is how to solve this in the meantime.

Decision No agreement or solution was achieved. It seems to be good to wait for the conclusions in the working groups in ECE.

6.12 74/61/EEC last amended by 95/56/EEC: Devices to prevent unauthorized use

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>The member state raising this question asks for clarification concerning the number of activation periods of alarm sirens by perimetric sensors. Their experience is that there are the following solutions:</p> <p>A Only one siren alarm; further alarm cycles are allowed only if, for example, the car door is closed, or closed and opened again, up to 9 times during this activation periods are possible. The siren can sound for no more than 30s each time. (This interpretation seems to be adopted by most approval authorities.)</p> <p>B 9 repetitive alarm cycles if the door is left open. If the door is closed and opened again, 9 more times and so on until this activation period is ended. The siren can sound for no more than 30s each time. (This interpretation is a Thatcham requirement. Vehicle alarm systems are accepted by Thatcham without the perimetric re-cycling. Thatcham is an insurance company.)</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>Decision</i> | Both alternatives are possible alternatives within the regulation and have to be accepted. Special requirements requested by insurance companies should not affect approvals granted. |
|-----------------|---|

6.13 92/23/EEC: Type of tyre in case of Reinforced or Extra Load tyres

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p>Paragraph 2.1. of Annex V in Directive 2001/43/EC defines that</p> <p><i>“Type of tyre” means, in relation to type-approval pursuant to this Annex (tyre/road noise emission), a range of tyres consisting of a list of tyre size designations (see section 2.17 in Annex II), brand names, trade marks and trade descriptions which do not differ in such essential characteristics as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>— the manufacturer's name</i><i>— the tyre classification (see section 2.4. of this Annex)</i><i>— the tyre structure (see section 2.1.4. of Annex II)</i><i>— the category of use (see section 2.1.3. of Annex II)</i><i>— for class C1 tyres. Reinforced or Extra Load</i><i>— the tread pattern (see 2.3 of Information Document, Annex I, Appendix 3).</i> <p><i>Note: The effect of changes in minor details of tyre tread and construction on the tyre/road noise emission will be determined during checks on the conformity of production.</i></p> <p>The question: do the reinforced or extra load tyres of class C1 belong automatically to the different type than the corresponding standard tyres?</p> |
|------------------------------|---|

Discussion **Possibilities of solution**

- A** The reinforced or extra load tyres of class C1 belong always to the different type than the corresponding standard tyres.
- B** The reinforced or extra load tyres of class C1 may belong to the same type with the corresponding standard tyres.

Decision All member states agreed on alternative A.

6.14 92/23/EEC: Tyres on trailers in relation to their speed category

*Question/
Subject* What is the maximum speed for a trailer? How is speed category set for trailers not restricted by towing vehicles with speed limitation device?

Possibilities of solution

- A** The speed category on tyres for trailers is set as the maximum design speed stated by the manufacturer. Example: the speed category can be set at F (80km/h) for a caravan. And an installation approval can be submitted on this basis.
- B** Some minimum requirements?

Discussion National requirements are used in all member states since the directive does not give adequate guidance. The solution A is accepted for most countries even though this may cause problem for international use of the vehicle.

Decision This is a non harmonized area which gives the member states the possibility to use national provisions as in alternative A.

6.15 2001/85/EC: Bus & Coach design rules

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Question/ Subject</i> | <p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>The issue is how to assess the minimum dimensions necessary to avoid squeezing between steering wheel and driver's seat in the case of an emergency.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The same problem has been encountered with the application of UN/ECE Regulation 52 for which an appropriate amendment has been adopted. The text of the amendment constitutes a significant improvement with respect to safety of occupants in a minibus; therefore, the Commission is proposing to include the same provisions in Directive 2001/85/EC.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Commission recommends to TAAM experts to apply the provisions laid down in paragraph 5.7.2.4.2. of Regulation 52 when approving vehicle types in accordance with Directive 2001/85/EC. This solution has been already communicated to a company producing minibuses (See documents in annex).</p> <p>[New Paragraph 5.7.2.4.2. in Reg 52</p> <p><i>Such requirement shall be deemed to be fulfilled if the test gauge described in paragraph 5.7.5.1. can move unobstructed from the gangway, until the front end of the gauge reaches the vertical plane tangential to the foremost point of the driver's seat back (this seat situated in its rearmost longitudinal position) and, from this plane, the panel described in paragraph 5.6.2.5.2. could be moved to the emergency door in the direction established by such paragraph (see annex 3, figure 22) with seat and steering wheel adjustment in their mid position.].</i></p> |
|------------------------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>Decision</i> | The member states at the meeting support the Commissions' proposal to use the test gauge described in ECE R52 when verifying minimum dimension for accessibility. |
|-----------------|---|

6.16 96/96/EC: Annual vehicle tests (Periodic technical tests)

Question/Subject The KBA and its Ministry of Transport would like to know the national information guidelines of the other member states.

In Germany the technical inspection institutes (often the TÜV and DEKRA) get information about the vehicles to be inspected by the KBA to be able to do their duty.

Are there any equivalent structures, information exchanges or databases in the other member states?
(e.g. national Type approval data exchange)

The KBA would be very pleased to know how other member states deal with this question.

Decision Germany would like to receive information on this issue from the other member states and they will make a summarized report which they will provide to the other member states.

6.17 Individual approval of imported cars

Question/Subject What is the general procedure on individual approval of an imported second-hand car in your country if this car doesn't correspond with several EEC approvals, but the car was already registered in another EC Member State Country?

Could it be considered that the car represents a risk for traffic safety if some parts don't have component EEC approvals?

Discussion If a vehicle is permanently registered in one member state it must be accepted in all the other member states according to the EC-communication 96 C143/04. The requirement is although that equivalent national requirements shall be fulfilled.

Any member state can ask for test results from the member state or the technical service that has approved the vehicle initially, for possibility to verify requirements and avoid vehicles with traffic safety risks.

Harmonized single type approvals could be desirable as a solution for the future.

Decision All member states agreed to assist each other for providing information needed for applying the decision 96 C143/04.

7. ITEMS RELATING TO FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVES 92/61/EEC AND 2002/24/EC (MOTOR CYCLES)

7.1 2002/24/EC + 93/93/EC: Unladen mass for three-wheeled electric moped

Question/Subject When deciding the unladen mass for electric three-wheeled mopeds there is a question if the batteries shall be included or not. The batteries are excluded by the frame directive for all the four-wheeled vehicles but for the three-wheeled vehicles this is not so clear.

The text regulating this is in the frame directive 2002/24/EC and in the separate directive 93/93/EC.

Discussion The frame work directive and the separate directive 93/93 are not clear regarding the three wheeled mopeds. There are different translations of the text in directive 93/93/EC that provide different interpretations.

Decision The member states all agreed that the only logical solution is that batteries are excluded even for the three wheeled mopeds, even if this is not fully supported by all member states. Sweden will apply for an amendment or a correction of the directives concerned.

7.2 2002/24/EC: Type approval authorities do not respond to requests related to Article 10

Question/Subject What kind of measures should be taken if the type-approval authority of the Member State which has conducted the type-approval does not respond to the requests concerning possible or known irregularities of the type-approved vehicles in accordance with Article 10 of the Frame Directive 2002/24/EC.

Possibilities of solution

- A** The Member State has to renew its request until the Member State which has conducted the type-approval reacts
- B** After the period of six months the Member State should cancel the registration of the vehicles until it is shown by the Member State which has conducted the type-approval whether a failure to conform is established or not
- C** The Member State should proceed in establishing the possible failure to confirm. The checks should be carried out by the Member State's own expense.
- D** Nothing can be done.
- E** Something else. What?

Decision Contact the Commission for help.

7.3 93/93/EEC: Installation of lighting

Question/Subject Question was raised for the possibility of approving a motorcycle with a new headlamp system, which will have the following electrical connections:

- when using dipped-beam only: brightness of dipped-beam is 100%,
- when switching from dipped-beam to main-beam, the main-beam headlamp will have a brightness of 100%. In addition, the dipped-beam will remain switched on, but the brightness of the dipped-beam will change from 100% to 50%.

Directive 93/92/EEC allows in 6.2.9. the possibility of leaving the dipped-beam switched on, in addition to the main-beam. Both lamps, main-beam and dipped-beam, can (separately) be ECE approved when having 100% brightness.

The member state asking this thinks that approving this vehicle for a WVTA, with the described electrical connection is acceptable, because 93/92/EEC allows for the main-beam to be switched on either with or without a switched on dipped-beam and would like to know the opinion of the other TAAM members considering this new headlamp system.

Discussion The member states expressed some different opinions regarding this installation due to the fact that it was not clear what effects these connections had on colour, brightness and luminous flux.

There was although a general acceptance for the solution that a lamp could be connected if it could fill the requirements of colour and luminous flux for dipped beam.

Decision A general acceptance for the solution was reached if the dipped beam could fulfil the requirements.

This matter is to be discussed at the next TAAM with more detailed information from the member state raising the question.

8. ITEMS RELATING TO FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVES 74/150/EEC AND 2003/37/EC (AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY TRACTORS)

8.1 2003/37/EC: Extension of approvals granted according to 70/150/EEC

Question/Subject New tractor Directive 2003/37/EC must be applied from 1 July 2005. At the same time the Directive 74/150/EEC (as last amended with Directive 2001/3/EC) will be repealed.

The problem is how the approvals granted according to directive 74/150/EEC should be extended regarding to the type-approval number.

An example is granting new extension for type-approval e17*2001/3*0099*05.

Possibilities of solution

- A** This extension is granted according to directive 2001/3/EC, if the requirements of all separate directives are fulfilled. The approval number is e17*2001/3*0099*06.
- B** This extension cannot be granted according to directive 2001/3/EC. Model information document and EC type-approval certificate must be compiled according to directive 2003/37/EC. The four-digit base approval number remains unchanged. The approval number is e17*2003/37*0099*06.
- C** As solution B, but approval number must have a new base approval number, because the directive is changed. Therefore the sequential number denoting the extension is 00. The approval number is e17*2003/37*0100*00.

Decision All member states agreed on alternative A which can be used until 1st of July 2009.

8.2 89/173/EEC: Coupling devices/components/mechanical linkage

Question/Subject The directive 89/173/EEC in Annex IV Paragraph 3.3.1 state, that the maximum vertical load on the coupling point is set up by the manufacturer. It shall not exceed 3 tonnes.

The Annex IV is dealing on one hand with the system approval (vehicle), on the other hand with the component approval for coupling devices. Following questions arise if the 3tonnes max load belongs to the vehicle or to the max approvable load for the component.

The provisions of 2003/37/EC accordingly

It is obvious that the Annex IV Para. 3.3.1 of directive 89/173/EEC is dealing with the component. Therefore the max permissible approved vertical static load on the coupling point for the component approval is 3 tonnes. It's the member states view that on a technical basis a higher load can be acceptable for approval of a component. The restriction of 3tonnes shall then be valid when granting a WVTA.

Comments from other member states were requested.

Decision The member states agreed that approval for more than 3 tonnes is acceptable. This issue should be dealt with in DG ENTR for Tractors.

9. MISCELLANEOUS

No formal requests submitted.

10. NEXT MEETING (2006) LOCATION TO BE ESTABLISHED

We thank Ireland for their invitation for the TAAM in 2006 Q4.

To facilitate planning in arranging the TAAM in the future, it was agreed that a list should be erected so it was clear where the earlier meetings were held and where the meeting to come should be held.