Transmitted by the GRB informal group on

Additional Sound Emissions Provisions (ASEP)

Informal document No. **GRB-48-3**
(48th GRB, 1-3 September 2008,
agenda item 3(c))

Report
GRB ad hoc Working Group ASEP

issued by the Chairman of the ASEP WG
GRB 48; September 2008

2008-09-02 ASEP report to GRB 48

Abstract

- Acceptance for ASEP
- The main approach is finished
- Essential elements: in discussion
- Formal Wording: waiting for decisions

Reminder: why ASEP

- Annex 3 covers the part of the engine map with lower revs

- Decision made to have Additional Sound Emission Provisions to cover a wider part of the engine map (higher revs).

Products to deliver:

Product to deliver: A proposal to GRB for the text (test method, data processing to test result, limits and control range) of annex 10, and - if needed - proposals for necessary changes in the main body.

Meetings:

1. Amsterdam	2005 November
2. The Hague	2006 January
3. Geneva	2006 February
4. Geneva	2006 September
5. The Hague	2006 November
6. Geneva	2007 February
7. The Hague	2007 May
8. The Hague	2007 autumn
9. Ann Arbor USA	2008 January
10. Geneva	2008 February
11. Tokyo	2008 June

What did we accomplished:

- Acceptance of ASEP
- The measurement method (mr Moore)
- Focus only on the ‘normal’ vehicles.
- A choice for a design based system
- We have a system (anchor point, slope, margin)
- Decision to exclude tyre noise (no calculation)
- Intention for text main body
- The beginning of a legal wording
- Decision: COP applies

What do we have to do:

Text Main body

Fine tuning method

Wording annex 10

Decision yes/no ‘Always Testing’

Wording Certificate

Fit with regulation for ‘Replacement Silencers’

Fine tuning method (1)

GER/FRA and OICA methods become close

Differences:

Fixed (FRA/GER) vs relative limit line

Measurement procedure: free vs protocol

Fine tuning method (2)

Work to do: decisions essential elements

- limit line: fixed or relative
- slope limit line (4-5-6-7 dB(A)/1000revs)
- anchor point
- boundary conditions

Fine tuning method (3)

Main issue: **anchor point** of the limit slope

lower in revs → more liberal ASEP limit
higher in revs → tougher limit

Difference: up to 6 dB

Relation with COP

By The Way:

Fine tuning method (4)

Boundary condition ‘maximum acceleration’

In discussion:

2 m/s^2 sufficient for high powered vehicles?

Process

Important decisions take time

Next meeting:

- some members have no position yet
- So open discussion about the essentials of both methods

Thank You