



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
ENTERPRISE AND INDUSTRY DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Sustainable growth and EU 2020  
Sustainable mobility and automotive industry TECHNICAL COMMITTEE - MOTOR  
VEHICLES (TCMV)

Brussels, 25 November 2014  
ENTR/B4 - CM -

8dA,  
SC 28/1

**MINUTES OF THE  
43RD MEETING OF THE 'TECHNICAL COMMITTEE - MOTOR  
VEHICLES' (TCMV) MEETING**

\*\*\*\*\*

**HELD IN BRUSSELS  
ON  
24 NOVEMBER 2014**

European Commission - B-1049 Brussels - Belgium - Office: [REDACTED]  
Telephone: direct line ([REDACTED])  
E-mail: [REDACTED]@ec.europa.eu

**1. Approval of the draft agenda;**

The agenda was approved.

**2. Updating of the TCMV members' list;**

The participants were asked to send any changes to the secretariat.

**3. Approval of the draft minutes from the 42nd meeting held on the 15 October 2014;**

The minutes were approved with German comments included.

**4. Draft proposal submitted for final examination and delivery of opinion for a Commission Regulation amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 347/2012 with regard to AEBS;**

The Commission services recalled the background for this proposal already presented at the last TCMV meeting: It introduces into Regulation (EC) No 347/2012 pass/fail values for the warning and activation test of AEBS designed for vehicles of categories M2 and N2<8tonnes. It mirrors the relevant amendment to UNECE Regulation 131 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/60). Replying to the request of AT asking for a specific approval numbering for the new requirements introduced by this draft proposal, the Commission services recalled no M2 and N2<8tonnes could be approved under Regulation (EC) No 347/2012 (see Art 3(5)(c)) before this proposal, and therefore a different marking type-approval number was not necessary.

The TCMV gave a positive opinion to the proposal as amended during the meeting.

**5. Proposal for introducing Real Driving Emission (RDE) test procedures into Euro 5/6 Regulation 692/2008/EC": State of Play, exchange of views and final discussion with a view to a vote at the next TCMV.**

**Introduction**

- Member States welcomed the presentation and the discussion on the draft proposal on the real driving emission procedure presented by the services of the European Commission.
- The services of the European Commission outlined the background of the proposal, timeline and the structure of the proposal.
- The representative of the Commission explained in detailed main points of the proposal including scope of considered pollutants, concept of presumed conformity of vehicles, family building approach and collection and sharing of data.
- Following the introduction, the Member States provided their general comments on the proposal.

### General comments on the proposal

- Representative of DE stressed the importance of the Regulation and considered that the proposal is at the stage where it could be put under vote still this year.
- Representative of FR supported the proposal and inquired about the intentions of the Commission about the mode of application of the 1<sup>st</sup> package: as a stand-alone act or in conjunction with the 2<sup>nd</sup> package only. In addition he requested explanation on the references made to WLTP in the text of the proposal.
- Representative of DK underlined the importance of the proposal and requested its swift implementation. Vote in December was considered as a preferred option.
- Representative of NL supported the proposal and urged other Member States to proceed as soon as possible in order to be ready with a vote in December. Moreover he suggested including in the monitoring phase not only new types of vehicles but also other vehicles in order to collect more information about the emission performance of Euro 6 cars.
- UK Representative expressed his full support for the proposal as a mean to achieve air quality objectives. He opted for a vote in December and expressed willingness to compromise on some aspects. In addition, he indicated that small vehicle manufacturers should be considered in the proposal.
- Representative of ES underlined the importance of resolving air quality problems but indicated that still a lot of work is to be done. He outlined the existing type-approval set up and requested a better clarification on the concept of the 'Third parties' mentioned in the proposal.
- IT Representative stated that he was extremely interested to adopt this proposal but he underlined the importance of having a complete package. He indicated the issue of a maximum speed and the concept of a subsequent test which would be introduced in the type-approval logic. In addition, he inquired about the legal base for an implementation of the procedure by Comitology.
- RO Representative ensured that the proposal is welcome. He requested a justification why all the vehicles are covered and why other pollutants should be included if only NOx is problematic. In addition, he raised concerns about the maximum speed and the timing of the implementation (in particular the possibility of introducing changes after the monitoring phase)
- SK Representative requested more time for the implementation (5 years) and expressed concerns about the possibility to revoke a type-approval, Third party definition, maximum speed and other boundary conditions.
- DG ENV reiterated a fully support for the proposal as an important step to address air quality in Member States and urged for an adoption still this year.

- The Representative of the Commission addressed the question raised by the Member States explaining the importance of including all pollutants in the proposal following the prescription of the Regulation (EC) 715/2007, explained the notion of the 'presumption of conformity and legal basis as well as clarified the intention of the Commission in reference to the use of WLTP provisions.
- Subsequently, the Member States were provided with an introduction to the points related to the boundary conditions and were requested to provide their comments to the open points.

### Temperature

- Representative of DE expressed his readiness for a compromise and to except 3 degrees as a minimum temperature for moderate conditions in the context of a final compromise.
- ES Representative supported a two-stage approach, with lower threshold between 5 and 10 degrees in in the 1<sup>st</sup> phase for moderate conditions (extreme conditions up to a temperature chosen from a range between 0 and 5 degrees) and with minus temperatures for extreme conditions in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase.
- Representative of NL supported Commission proposal and requested to take a decision at this point instead of postponing it to the next stage. He recalled a temperature analysis prepared by JRC as a background for setting the boundary conditions in the proposal.
- UK Representative expressed his support for the proposal for moderate conditions and left a possibility to fine-tune lower levels of extreme conditions.
- SE Representative expressed his support for the Commission proposal
- DK Representative supported the Commission approach and expressed her willingness to compromise if this would facilitate adoption of the proposal.
- Representative of IT reiterated the 2 phase implementations and expressed his concerns about the representativeness of the temperatures in the proposal especially for the -7 degrees for the extreme conditions which he found not acceptable.

### Max speed

- The Commission Representative made a short introduction to the maximum speed required during a PEMS trip, explained the rationale behind it and outlined the path of reaching the compromise proposal of 145 km/h.
- Representative of FR welcomed the Commission compromise proposal but requested to make a more explicit clarification that the test cannot violate national laws. In addition, he provided some suggestions how the text could be modified to address the concerns.

- UK Representative supported the proposal of 145 km/h and requested to make the test valid even if the vehicles are not tested with maximum speeds.
- DE Representative considered point 2.4 as sufficiently elaborated to also address the concerns of other Member States with regard to local speed restrictions. He underlined that in the interest of DE a higher limit than 145 km/h would even more be appropriate as DE has high shares of trips still above 145 km/h, but he also expressed his readiness to support the compromise proposal.
- Representative of NL expressed his support for the proposal and clarified that high maximum speed required should ensure that the emission control systems are not deactivated above certain speed.
- IT Representative expressed his reservations for the proposal.
- Representative of SE inquired if higher speeds (above 90 km/h) are tested with accelerations or as steady states.
- SK Representative supported the FR proposal and expressed his flexibility in this respect
- Representative of ES supported the proposal.
- Representative of the Commission provided additional clarification and promised to further analyse FR proposal.

#### **Payload**

- The Commission Representative made a short introduction to the subject of a payload outlining the Commission proposal and ACEA proposal.
- FR Representative regarded ACEA proposal as not fit for purpose and requested the Commission proposal to address differently N1 and N2 vehicles (50% payload).
- RO Representative requested to use 'technically permissible mass' in the definition and requested a clarification about the application of the 90% payload requirement.
- Representative of NL expressed his support for the Commission proposal.
- Representative of DE supported the Commission proposal.
- IT Representative expressed his doubts about the proposal and stated that the FR proposal should be investigated.
- Representative of the Commission provided additional clarification and promised to further analyse FR proposal.

### **Average speeds**

- The Commission Representative presented the concept of the average speeds and explained the Commission and ACEA proposals.
- FR Representative indicated that it might be problematic to fulfil all the requirements in a test but in general supported the Commission proposal.
- Representative of BE expressed her preference for higher percentage of stops and inquired about non-inclusion of a cold start.
- DK Representative supported BE statement about cold start.
- DE Representative supported the proposal indicating that it might be fine-tuned in case such a need arises.
- Representative of the Commission provided additional information about the cold start explaining why it has not been included and how it could be handled in the next steps.

### **Implementation dates**

- Representative of ES requested to discuss the implementation schedule and expressed his support for a 2 stage approach with less stringent requirements in the beginning and more stringent ones in the second step.
- SE Representative supported the beginning of the monitoring phase in 2015 and the implementation with limits as from 2017/2018.
- Representative of CZ generally supported the measures however requested a two-step approach following the ES proposal.
- IT Representative expressed his preference for a two-stage approach with 1<sup>st</sup> stage less stringent and 2<sup>nd</sup> more stringent
- DE Representative supported the Commission proposal with dates 2017/2018. ES proposal was considered not acceptable as it would delay the implementation to the time frame.
- SK Representative expressed his support for the ES proposal
- DK Representative requested implementation without delay.
- NL Representative supported the position of DE
- BE Representative supported the position of DE
- RO Representative supported a two-stage approach and reiterated the issue of implementing possible changes after the monitoring phase.

- FR Representative was in favour of a two-stage approach however did not support a major delay between the implementation of the requirements for new types and all new vehicles. 6-12 months was indicated as a possible approach. He expressed his preference for discussing the implementation dates in the second step.
- UK Representative considered that the decision about implementation dates should be taken in the next step.
- HU Representative supported two-stage approach with an introduction date discussed in the second stage.
- DE Representative expressed its understanding for the proposal to discuss the implementation dates in the second stage.

#### Next steps

- The Commission Representative thanked for all the contributions and indicated that they will be carefully analysed and introduced to the extent possible in the text.
- Member States were informed that the text will be sent for inter service consultations with an intention to organise a vote in December. The text should be circulated one week in advance of the meeting.
- The Commission Representative confirmed that even if the text is not ready for vote in December the meeting will take place in order to discuss and agree upon all open points.