

Seventeenth Plenary meeting of the Working Group on Off-Cycle Emissions 5 June 2007, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland

The Chairperson introduced himself to the Plenary group. He indicated that he was looking forward to working with the participants to complete work on the GTR.

Agenda Item 1

The draft Agenda was reviewed and amended to include an item for the Chair to provide an update to the Plenary group of the 16th Plenary meeting held in Tokyo.

There were no other amendments to the draft Agenda, so it was accepted and finalized by the Plenary group.

Agenda Item 2

The Minutes from the 16th Plenary meeting were reviewed and accepted without amendment.

Agenda Item 3

The Chair provided an update of the recent meetings, including the 15th Plenary meeting, the 16th Plenary meeting and the AC3 of November 2006.

The 15th Plenary meeting was held in October 2006 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Three presentations were made to the group. The first presentation was by TNO, on the joint project between TNO and DG Enterprise, to study and evaluate the WNTE zone concept and what it means for European driving conditions. A presentation was made by U.S. EPA on the PM measurement work that has been undertaken in the United States thus far. Finally, OICA made a presentation on the WNTE correction factors to be included in the draft GTR. All of these presentations are available on the OICA website.

AC 3 last met in November 2006, and the representative from the U.S. provided a progress report on the GTR. The development of the GTR was discussed, including the outstanding issues that the group has to resolve. AC 3 was told that the GTR is on a path to be completed within the next 18 months if things continue to progress on the current path. AC 3 was also advised about the TNO study and informed that if the group decides to pursue an alternative path, it would be 2 to 3 years before the GTR could be completed.

The 16th Plenary meeting was held in May 2007, in Tokyo, Japan. At that meeting OICA provided an updated presentation on the correction factors. Japan reported on the PEMS work it is undertaking in Japan to date. The EC presented updated material on the TNO study. At the 16th Plenary meeting the group developed 5 options for continuing the work on the GTR. Consensus was not reached as to which path to pursue, so it is on the agenda for this meeting to continue those discussions.

Agenda Item 4

EMA made a presentation on a proposal to replace altitude with barometric pressure to define conditions where the WNTE applies. Currently, in the GTR, ambient conditions where the WNTE applies are defined based on ambient temperature and altitude. EMA proposed that the applicable conditions be defined based on ambient temperature and barometric pressure because it is more technically correct to use barometric pressure rather than altitude to define conditions where the WNTE applies. Furthermore, use of barometric pressure facilitates in-use testing. EMA proposed to keep the same temperature limits as currently exist in the GTR, OICA stated that it can support the EMA proposal in principle. It may be wise to change the numbers in the GTR from 37.7 to 38 °C and from 1680 to 1700 meters. OICA always thought that the standard atmospheric pressure was 101.13 kPa and not 100 kPa.

EMA suggested that the group should look at the implications of rounding up/down and the group needs to look at the comment on having atmospheric pressure at 101.13 kPa rather than 100 kPa.

The Chair presented the document with the 5 options to the group.

OICA stated that after lengthy discussions among the OICA members, Option 1 is the option OICA supports. The Plenary group has worked hard for 6 years, and has developed a well drafted GTR, so it is not appropriate to stop the work at this time. There is a clear advantage to Option 1 because it provides an opportunity to have a harmonized in-use procedure in the future. If the Plenary group goes with Option 1, the GTR can be finalized in 1 to 1 ½ years. Completion of this GTR is important for the completion of the EURO 6 Directive, which will reference the WHDC, and the OCE GTR is necessary because off-cycle control is going to be part of the EURO 6 Directive.

Japan also expressed support for Option 1. This is the best approach for proceeding with the GTR. Japan does not have a legal framework for in-use testing at the moment and needs that framework to be in place first in order to introduce in-use testing in Japan.

EMA stated that they have had some discussions among the EMA members and were not able to come forward with a consensus position on the options. The options were developed in committee just three weeks ago, so there has not been enough time for members to fully discuss them within their own companies let alone at the EMA level. EMA can agree with OICA in principle, but is not in a position to endorse any option at this time. EMA recognizes that a U.S. based approach may not work in the EU and Japan. At the core of EMA's apprehension with Option 1, is that a WNTE based procedure will be used for certification and in-use compliance will be based on a different procedure, resulting in two unique methods which may not be reconcilable and which will force engine manufacturers to design engines to meet to two different procedures. EMA will forego giving an opinion at this time, but will give an opinion on which option to pursue at the next plenary meeting.

The EC stated that, from its perspective, it does not have strong opinions for or against any of the options developed at the 16th Plenary meeting. The outcome, regardless of which option is selected, will be very similar from a policy perspective. Therefore the EC does not have a preference for any one option at this time. The EC's preference is to develop regulations through the GTR process if other contracting parties are interested in developing these procedures together. Any of the 5 options will suit the EC's need, but if there is a willingness to work thru the GTR process, the EC is willing to participate in that process.

The U.S. indicated a preference for Option 2, which allows the group to move forward with the GTR as written. The US already has an in-use program, so it is not an issue in the United States. The U.S. is not opposed to Option 1 either, but can definitively state that options 3, 4 and 5 are not preferred options.

Canada stated that like OICA, it hates to see the work that has been completed to date to go to waste. Either Options 1 or 2 are satisfactory because there is really no difference between Option 1 and Option 2. In the short term, the group ends up with Option 2 until a proposal is written to create a new GTR, as contemplated by Option 1. Canada, can therefore support either Option 1 or 2.

Germany prefers Option 1, but agrees with Canada that Options 1 and 2 are similar. Ultimately, it is up to WP. 29 and AC3 to decide if a 2nd GTR on in-use testing will be pursued. Germany is very much in favor of Option 1, but the proposal for a new GTR needs to come from AC3.

The Netherlands agrees that Option 1 & 2 are very similar. Option 2 is where the group would start but, the group needs to ensure that a GTR as contemplated in Option 1 be developed. In the spirit of developing a complete off-cycle procedure, the group may need a mandate from WP.29 to develop a new GTR. The Netherlands does support Option 1, recognizing that the way to Option 1 is through Option 2.

The Chair wanted the group to clarify how it is interpreting Option 1.

The Netherlands provided the following clarification. Today, the group has an off-cycle GTR, but there will be differences in how the GTR is used/applied. In EU, the GTR will use the procedures for laboratory testing, but in the U.S. the procedure will be used for in-use testing, which results in disharmony. Option 1, in theory, will work towards a fully harmonized program. There will be a GTR that harmonizes laboratory testing and a GTR that harmonizes in-use testing. Option 2 will allow the group to have a final laboratory test procedure in the interim and each country will be responsible for conducting its own in-use testing until a new GTR is developed.

The EC stated that when we look at the scope of the group, the OCE GTR is linked to the WNTTE concept. If the group decides to change the scope, clarification from WP.29 will be necessary. The EC suggested that the group should try to eliminate some of the options to help those participants who are undecided make a decision. Option 3 may still be an option open for consideration, but perhaps Options 4 and 5 can be taken off the table.

The Chair asked if anyone objected to dropping Options 4 & 5. There was no opposition, so only Options 1, 2 and 3 are still open for further consideration by the group.

Agenda Item 5

At the AC 3 meeting in November, 2006, they were told that the target for completing the GTR was approximately 18 months. This may still be possible depending on how the group plans to proceed.

Agenda Item 6

The next OCE meeting will be held in conjunction with the WHDC plenary meeting in San Francisco U.S.A... OCE will meet for two days on the 16th and 17th of October and WHDC will meet on the 18th and 19th of October. Further details will be distributed to the group prior to the meeting.

Joanna Vardas, Secretariat
Dated September 26, 2007