Informal Document No. **GRRF-63-44** (63rd GRRF, 4-8 February 2008 agenda item 10(a))

PROGRESS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GLOBAL TECHNICAL REGULATION ON ELECTRONIC STABILITY CONTROL (ESC) FOR LIGHT VEHICLES

A. Objective of the report

The purpose of this report is to provide details on the progress made on the development of a Global Technical Regulation (GTR) for Electronic Stability Control Systems for Light Vehicles (ESC) and seek guidance on the last few remaining issues that could not be resolved at the GRRF. It also makes recommendations concerning adoption of the regulation should the issues be resolved by the Executive Committee for the 1998 Agreement.

B. Development of the regulation

The Executive Committee for the 1998 Agreement (AC.3) tasked the GRRF to develop the regulation following its acceptance of the formal proposal from the United States of America (United States) seeking to establish a GTR in this area. The document, which contains the safety rationale, consulted regulations and standards, etc., can be found under the following reference: ECE/TRANS/WP.29/AC.3/16 of 2 May 2007. AC.3 further instructed the GRRF to plan its work expeditiously so that the regulation can be adopted by mid 2008.

Under the guidelines governing the development of a GTR, the GRRF immediately began work through an informal working group that met June 2007. The informal working group deliberated further at a second meeting in September 2007 before providing a progress report to the September session of GRRF. The GRRF accepted much of the work, provided guidance on the remaining parts, and further tasked the informal working group to meet for a third time to address the open issues (this meeting took place in January 2008). The informal working group presented its second progress report to the February 2008 GRRF, where the updated latest draft was accepted with just a few issues still remaining. The GRRF is now seeking guidance from AC.3 to help resolve the last outstanding issues. The GRRF (in special session) and/or its informal working group will then meet so that the draft regulation can be finalized in time for vote by AC.3 at its June 2008 session. Alternatively, provided that these issues are resolved by WP.29/AC.3 itself at the March session (and noting that the document can then meet the deadline for translation by the UN Secretariat), the GRRF recommends that AC.3 adopt the regulation at its June 2008 session.

C. Description of outstanding issues

The attached informal document is the latest complete draft of the GTR. The draft contains bracketed alternatives on two areas of disagreement. These are:

1. **Section 5.5.1**: The last paragraph in the section requires the default mode of an ESC system for a particular drive configuration (for the rare cases when there are multiple ESC modes available) to be the one with the highest margin of compliance relative to the stability requirement described in section 5.1. The manufacturers and several Contracting Parties (CPs) argue that the best default modes for each drive configuration are not

necessarily the ones with the highest margin of compliance relative to the stability performance requirement in section 5.1., but the ones that manufacturers specify based on their particular designs. As such, they have proposed alternative text that allows each manufacturer to specify the default mode for each of a vehicle's drive configurations without regard to performance relative to the requirement described in section 5.1 (subject to the base requirements of the GTR), but have conceded that the ESC system must automatically return to the manufacturer's default mode, within a particular drive configuration, at the next ignition cycle regardless of the last none-default mode selected by the driver.

2. **Section 5.5.3**: This section requires multipurpose controls that have the function of deactivating the ESC system to be labelled with either the text or "ESC OFF" or the ISO ESC symbol in conjunction with the word "OFF". Industry and most CPs have opposed this as unnecessary (with regard to safety) since there is also a telltale that indicates when ESC has been deactivated. The alternative text offered simply requires that the control be labelled with either "ESC" or the ISO symbol for ESC.
