



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SME's
Sustainable Growth and EU 2020
Sustainable Mobility and Automotive Industry

Brussels, 08-06-2016
ENTR/C4 RG D (2016)

**Draft Meeting minutes of the
Motorcycle Working Group MCWG / MVEG on Motorcycles
(L-category vehicles)**

Brussels, 11th of May 2016

Meeting Motorcycle working group (MCWG)

Date and Venue

11 May 2016, 14.30h – 17.00h.
Centre Albert Borschette
Room: AB 2A
36, Rue Froissart - Brussels

Documentation

Documents can be downloaded from the CIRCABC website:

<https://circabc.europa.eu/w/browse/dbcc50f8-b39a-446d-8153-3ca1f1e48996>

Summary

Madam Chair, Mrs Bonvissuto (European Commission - DG GROW – Automotive Unit C4), welcomed the participants (list attached in Annex). Madam Chair introduced Mr. Ramon Gouweleeuw as a new colleague. Mr Gouweleeuw will take over the task from Mr Gielen and will also be responsible for the MCWG. Mr. Sanchez Galindao and Mr. Vosinis will still follow some of the L-cat files.

(1) Approval of the draft agenda

Document: [MCWG_2016_05_11_draft_agenda_v1.pdf](#)

The Spain representative:

The representative of Spain proposed adding the item End of Series as is mentioned in Article 44 of Regulation (EU) No. 168/2013. The subject is placed on the agenda under item nr.7.

The agenda was adopted.

(2) Approval of the draft minutes of the MCWG meetings of 15 December

Documents: [Minutes_2015_12_15_MCWG_L_Cat_v3.pdf](#)

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair asked the members if there are any remarks or amendments to the minutes. The minutes were adopted without further amendments.

(3) Policy studies:

(3a) Euro 5 effect study;

Documents: [03.a.TNO presentation: EURO 5 EFFECT STUDY FOR L-CATEGORY VEHICLES](#)

The TNO representative:

The representative of TNO presented the state of play on the Euro 5 effect study.

The purpose of the study is to validate the Euro 5 limits published in Regulations (EU) No.168/2013. Based on the results, the Commission will make if necessary appropriate proposals.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

The second part of the study is to assess the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of possible post Euro 5 elements such as: in-service conformity; testing requirements for Off-cycle emission requirements; expand PM limit scope and introduce a PN emission limit for certain (sub-) categories of L-category vehicles.

Based on the results, the Commission will consider introducing these new elements into future type-approval legislation (beyond Euro 5). The outcome of the test done should give good input on the applicability of the WMTC; the coverage of the WMTC and the ECE coverage of the engine map; the impact of ethanol; evaporative emissions; durability of pollution control devices; OBD requirements and PM - PN test results.

The representative of TNO presented an example of a low speed L1e-B moped that easily follows the cycles of the WMTC and explained the status on the SHED tests; Fuel permeation and carbon canister rapid ageing tests; the assessment of the OBD threshold and cost effectiveness.

The next update will be presented in the MCWG of September 2016.

ACEM:

The ACEM representative thanked TNO as representative of the Contractors for the update. The representative stated that the update provides us all with a clear picture of how far we are. ACEM always emphasized the importance of conducting this study with all available expertise and knowledge. This is also the reason why ACEM and ACEM members will continue to provide the consultant all necessary supporting data, especially for those areas that already previously were identified as their main priority concern e.g. the Euro 5 emission for the diesel engines of the quadricycles; to some extent also mopeds and smaller displacements motorcycles; and OBD II.

ACEM have provided vehicles and components to JRC and the consultant. In parallel to the study ACEM is discussing the final details to what is an ACEM funded emission programme to be executed by an external laboratory which if necessary can be witnessed from the consultant. The aim is to complement the test already being done, especially to help the OBD model which was touched upon by the representative of TNO in his presentation. The representative of ACEM expressed their concern with regard to the lead time needed by industry to implement Euro 5. The representative from ACEM requested the Commission to forward the proposals as soon as possible after finalizing the study. Only in this way it might be possible to have the minimum lead time the ACEM member's need. The representative of ACEM stated that if the first proposals would be finalised in 2018 the lead time would be too short.

Italy:

The representative would like to recall his request to come up with the conclusions for this study as soon as possible. The niche productions like the quadricycles production need to be carefully assessed with regard to the feasibility of the requirements. The representative stated that in general the OBDII is troublesome; when the decisions are taken in regard to the Euro 5 step, it should be assessed whether or not the lead time is sufficient.

France:

The representative of France stated that France is sympathetic to the quadricycle market, this is indeed a niche market, and the vehicle requirements are not a problem at the moment but could become a problem in the future. The Euro 5 requirements could be quite demanding in regard to the quantity of vehicles in the market.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

ACEM.

On behalf of EQUAL the representative of ACEM asked the Commission to upload to CIRCABC a position paper to amend annex I of the Regulation (EU) No. 168/2013 to allow light quadricycle manufacturers in the future to abandon the diesel technology and shift to petrol technology. At the moment there is limit of 50 cc PI engines. This type of engine clearly lacks the power to propel this vehicle type. Therefore there will be an ACEM – EQUAL proposal to amend Annex I and allow a higher engine displacement for the PI engines used in this category.

Madam Chair

Madam Chair recalled that we are looking for confirmation of limits already set out in a legal text. However it is not excluded that there might be amendments. In the next MCWG we might be able to have some preliminary indications on any necessary proposals and a more precise calendar for these proposals.

(3b) Study to enhance UN Regulation Nos 9, 63 and 92 with respect to sound test requirements;
Documents: [03.b.Presentation: update on revision of approval legislation of L-category vehicles.](#)

The TNO representative:

The representative of TNO presented the state of play on the study regarding sound test requirements. Task 1 of the study is completed, this was the stakeholder consultation. The presentation given shows the state of play for tasks 2 and 3. In the last GRB (63rd session) in Geneva the proposals for the UNECE regulations were presented. The amendments proposed were editorial amendments; amendments of the definitions; and amendments of specification; as well as additional sound emission provisions (ASEP). The proposal for ASEP were the most critical amendments. The chair of GRB asked the Commission to contact IMMA and discuss the most controversial point and draft new proposals for the next GRB in September 2016. The informal documents were changed into working documents. During a teleconference between IMMA, ACEM and the Commission it was agreed that ASEP requirements needed more discussion and actual test data. The consequence of this outcome was that amendments including ASEP would not be possible at short notice. Therefore the Commission has decided to go forward with the amendments without ASEP requirements. The Commission shall require ASEP to become part of the future working list of GRB, the proposals will be modified and submitted to GRB in September.

Task 3, the cost benefit analysis. It is the objective to perform a cost-benefit calculation over a period of 20 years, the cost benefit analysis will contain environmental (and health) benefits due to noise reduction. Furthermore additional costs to industry, suppliers, and type-approval and enforcement authorities will be part of the analysis.

The methodology and input data is tailored for L-category vehicles, using the approaches for CBA that is also applied for road traffic. The methodology will take into account the geographical differences.

The study is on schedule to reach final conclusions and submit the final documents to the GRB on the 10th of June.

The representative of TNO thanks the industry and Member States for their contribution to the study.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM thanked the Commission and Mr. Steven for the draft amendment of the UNECE regulations. ACEM supports the compromise to take more time to work on the more controversial points. ACEM supported the aim to have the amendments adopted in September. ACEM expressed the need for a level playing field between the OEM and aftermarket manufacturers. ACEM provided initial comments on the cost benefit ratios and is available for further questions and is looking

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

forward on more details on the cost benefit analysis for enforcement. ACEM expressed the importance of an overall strategy for Europe. ACEM raised a question on the topic of sales loss and asked the contractor to give a more detailed explanation.

The TNO representative:

The representative of TNO explained this loss is a sales loss for the aftermarket with regard to the drop in sales of illegal exhaust systems.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM pointed out that ACEM does not share the opinion on the actual benefit or loss, and how this will help to ensure a level playing field. Hence these products are not supposed to be on the market.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair explained that when the impact assessment for the change in the type approval legislation was carried out, we calculated the benefit of having less non complying products on the market. We should not calculate the loss for illegal operators but the benefits to society from the fact there are less illegal products on the market.

Italy:

The representative of Italy expressed that Italy had some reservation towards the proposed ASEP requirements, and expresses that it is good to take more time to reflect on this topic.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair informs the members of the MCWG that the Commission will launch a study regarding the sound level limit as is mandated by the co-decision act. It is however too early to discuss it here, the study will be on the agenda of the next MCWG.

UK:

The representative of the UK asked the Commission whether this study is done to amend UNECE regulation 41, and to have a more stringent requirement or to have a new EU regulation on noise.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair explained that the mandate of the Commission is within the EU regulation, so the Commission will look at the limit values set in the co-decision act 168/2013. The Commission is aiming at an alignment with the UNECE regulations, this is why the Commission is thinking about acceding to other UNECE regulations. It is in all of our interest that the two systems eventually are aligned. The Commission is launching a call for tender and looking at the technical feasibility and the cost benefit analysis. After the study the Commission will decide whether amendments are to be made on the EU level or in parallel with the UNECE process.

UK:

The representative of the UK asked if it is correct that the dates when these requirements will come into force are already set in the co-decision act.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair confirms that the date for the euro 5 step are already set. However a cost benefit analysis and feasibility analyses will be carried out, the outcome of the study will give the information whether there is any need for readjustment. If this means adjusting the limit set, this will have to be done through a co-decision proposal.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM pointed out that the sound level limits for the category L3e currently applicable are set out in UNECE Regulation 41 and that the limits set for Euro 4 in Annex VI (D) have become obsolete from the date of accession. What we are left with is an empty column for the Euro 5 step in Annex VI (D) which is linked to the provisional dates of the Euro 5 stage of January 2020. As the European Commission is launching a separate study to evaluate whether or not there is a need to implement other limits than currently are existing in Regulation 41, ACEM pointed out that a part of that process should include how to do this and to what level, since Europe is one of the contracting parties of Regulation 41. It is the request from ACEM to have a minimal lead time for not only the Sound level limits but also the pollutant emissions, especially since the column in Annex VI (D) is empty and manufacturers have no foresight on the outcome.

UK:

The representative of the UK pointed out that when empty column in Annex VI (D) is not filled in, the limit values set in UNECE Regulation 41 will stay valid.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair concurs with the representative of the UK that the limit values of Regulation R41 will stay valid until the limits for Euro 5 are set. The limit values are in the co-decision act and it was decided by Council and Parliament that by 2020 we should have new limit values. The outcome of the study will be used to make a co-decision proposal for the new limits. The MCWG will be updated on both subjects in the next meeting in September.

(4) Guidance classification of powered cycles in the scope of type-approval legislation

Documents: [Guidance classification of powered cycles in the scope of type-approval legislation](#)

Since the last MCWG there has been a meeting involving ACEM, AVERE, CONEBI, and the Commission services where the issue was further discussed. The EC representative is asked to update the MCWG on the outcome of the meeting.

EC-representative:

The EC representative stated that the meeting was held on the 15th of January 2016 at the ACEM headquarters in Brussels. The topic discussed was the interpretation of the Co-decision Act with respect to cycles designed to pedal. There are two references to cycles designed to pedal in Regulation (EU) No 168/2013: the first reference is made in the scope [Article 2(h)]: according to this Article it is clear that pedal cycles with pedal assistance which are equipped with an auxiliary electric motor and having a continuous rated power of less than or equal to 250 W, where the output of the motor is being cut off when the cyclist stops pedalling and is otherwise progressively reduced and is finally cut off before the vehicle speed reaches 25 km/h are out of scope of the regulation; the second reference is made in Annex I, where the sub-category L1e-A is defined as Powered cycle: "Cycles designed to pedal equipped with auxiliary propulsion with the primary aim to aid pedalling and the output of the propulsion is cut of at the speed ≤ 25 km/h."

He indicated that there is a clear difference with Article 2(h), as the powered cycles have propulsion with the primary aim to assist pedalling. However it may have others aims. On the basis of this interpretation, vehicles of sub-category L1e-A should not be limited to cycles designed exclusively to assist pedalling and therefore may include also cycles equipped with a throttle or power modulator. This was the outcome of the meeting on the 15th of January 2016.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM stated that ACEM took note of the interpretation of the Commission, although in their opinion there is a flaw in the reasoning and this was not the interpretation of the text during the co-decision procedure. It is of the opinion of ACEM that vehicles with a power modulator shall be type-approved under sub-category L1e-B. It is the opinion of ACEM that by approving the vehicles in the category L1e-A there is a break in the logic of the categorization of vehicles set out in Annex I with potential negative effects on safety. The representative of ACEM asked Member States for their opinion.

AVERE:

The representative of AVERE stated that safety would not be better guaranteed in the case that bicycles equipped with a throttle (or power modulator), would be excluded of sub-category L1e-A, as they would not be subject to the test for frames and forks. This would clearly not be beneficial to the safety of these vehicles. It is therefore absolutely logical to include these vehicles in sub-category L1e-A.

Italy:

The representative of Italy explained that this subject is important for Italy, in Italy there are many cases where vehicles have some kind of throttle and that these vehicles are illegal unless they are type approved as a moped (sub-category L1e-B). The Category L1e-A should be limited for powered cycles which need continuous peddling to move.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair stated that this subject has been discussed for a long time, and reminded that these vehicles will, although out of sub-category L1e-B, still be subject to type approval. According to the reading of the Commission these vehicle belong to category L1e-A, since the text does not specify that the power assistance should be cut off when the cyclist stops pedalling. The Commission also does not see any safety concerns, at least not at this stage. Madam chair acknowledged that it is difficult for the legislation to cope with new products and developments on the market. In the future we might need to adjust the definitions based on the evolution of the products and the technology. For the time being this is, according to the Commission, the correct interpretation of the legislation.

Italy:

The representative of Italy asked the Commission if this interpretation will be communicated in writing to Member States or that this will be in the draft minutes, as it is quite important to have a clear interpretation for the enforcement authorities.

Netherlands:

The representative of the Netherlands agreed with the request from Italy and asked the Commission to have its interpretation in writing.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM also asked for a written explanation.

Madam Chair:

The Commission confirmed the interpretation and that this will be reflected in the minutes of the MCWG meeting.

(5) Update on the revision of type-approval legislation of L-category vehicles

- Document:**
- [Commission presentation: update on the revision of type approval legislation of the L-category vehicles](#) .
 - [Corrigendum to Regulation \(EU\) no. 168/2013](#).
 - [Update on the revision of type approval legislation of L-category vehicles](#).
 - [05.1.a Discussion paper-Amendments Delegated Acts L-category vehicles V6-clear version](#).
 - [05.1.b Discussion paper-Amendments Delegated Acts L-category vehicles V6- tracked changes](#).
 - [05.1.c Q &A track list regulation 44/2014 RVCR](#)
 - [05.1.d Q &A track list regulation 134/2014 REPPR](#)
 - [05.1.e UK suggestion on the proposal for amending the requirements on sound levels for the replacement of silencers set out in point 3.5.5 of annex IX to regulation 134/2014 \(REPPR\)](#)
 - [05.1.f NL Comments on the UK suggestion](#).
 - [05.2.a Discussion paper-Amendments RAR L-category vehicles V5-clean version](#) .
 - [05.2.b Discussion paper-Amendments RAR L-category vehicles V5-traked changes](#).
 - [05.2.c Question and Answer tracking list RAR](#).

EC- representative:

With the help of the member of the MCWG a lot of work was done on the amendments of the Delegated and Implementing Acts. The Commission hopes to finalize the amendments just after the summer break 2016. The representative of the Commission explained the timing of the amendments, as follows:

The Corrigenda to Regulation (EU) No 168/2013 was published in the official Journal (OJ) on the 2nd of March 2016.

With regard to the amendments for the RVFSR, RVCR and REPPR the inter-service consultation is finalized. The Commission received substantial comments from the Legal Service, but most of the changes were of editorial content.

The new texts were uploaded to CIRCABC on 27th of April 2016. The Commission received comments from ACEM and France. The representative explained that it is still possible to add minor editorial changes and the Commission would be grateful if the members review the texts once more. The translation of the amendments is already started and it is the objective of the Commission to have the translations finalized by end of June. He indicated that in order to avoid the recess period of the EU Parliament the proposed amendments must be sent to the Council and Parliament before the 15th of July. The amendments will hopefully be published in September 2016.

The Implementing Act was presented in the last TCMV meeting in March 2016 and will be presented in the TCMV meeting of the 12th of April 2016. The inter-service consultation for the Implementing Act is finalized and the translation should be finished on 22nd of July. The vote on the Implementing act is planned for the 5th of July 2016. The adoption and publication in OJ is planned for end of August 2016 and the amendments will enter into force in September 2016.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM thanks the Commission for the update and for keeping the timeline as anticipated. ACEM will try to finalize the review this week. The representative of ACEM asked the Commission in regard to the upcoming amendments of Regulation (EU) 168/2013 if the proposed changes include the 10 items discussed in the previous MCWG and if it is possible to give an indication what will be included, e.g. the amendment of the sunset clause for the empowerment of the Commission.

Madam Chair:

Madam chair stated that the list of 10 items, the Euro 5 step and in particularly the empowerment of the Commission will need to be addressed. When the Commission makes a proposal it will include all

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

outstanding amendments. This subject will be placed on the agenda of the September session of the MWCG.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM would like to reinforce the comment or concern made by ACEM earlier on the time line for the Euro 5 and also for the sunset clause. The delegated power of the Commission runs until the 22nd of March 2018, this would mean a time limit for launching any amendments 1 or 1½ year before the end of the mandate.

EC representative:

The representative explained that several amendments were made in the RVFSR, RVCR and REPPR, the amendments can be found in the presentation "[update on the revision of type approval legislation of the L-category vehicles](#)". The presentation contains the amendments endorsed by the Member States in January 2016.

UK:

The representative of the UK stated that the UK would be supportive to the proposal of AVERE, to not measure the maximum assistance factor for the category L1e-A, since they are not subject to the factor 4.

AVERE:

The representative of AVERE stated that AVERE is disappointed with the decision of the Commission of maintaining the test set out in section 3.5 for the category L1e-A. AVERE is of the opinion that consumers cannot conclude from the information on the assistance factor whether it is a vehicle with pedal assistance or throttle or a combination. This information should be in the manual or instructions.. As for the argument that it would be interesting to know the assistance factor for the owner of the vehicle, the representative of AVERE would like to underline that those vehicles, subject to the test, have a maximum design speed of 25 km/h. From this point of view it makes not much sense applying the assistance factor.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair stated that the Commission acknowledges that factor 4 does not apply to L1e-A vehicles. However the information on the assistance factor could be relevant to the end user, even more in the context of the recent discussions on the classification of vehicles under that sub-category. In this regard, the Commission would like to receive the view of Member States on this subject before the 13th of June.

UK:

The UK representative stated that the UK had a comment on the REPPR, the comment was sent to the Commission. The comment was about after-market silencers; point 3.5.5. of Appendix 2 of Annex IX seems to state that an emissions test is compulsory for replacement silencers. The UK is of the opinion this is unnecessary and that an emissions test should only be performed when the emissions control system is affected. It is the understanding of the UK that many other Member States will waive the test in those cases, since it is only a silencer and not a catalyst or another part of the emission control device. The UK would like the wording to be changed.

EC- representative:

The Commission thanked the UK for the input and for the reminder regarding this comment. The Commission has carefully assessed it, and is of the opinion that an amendment might be feasible.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM thanked the UK for the proposal. The representative would like to know whether this will go in the first package or as a correction amendment which will be done later. If that is the case, the EU might by that time have acceded already to UNECE regulation no. 92.

Madam Chair:

If there is a need for an amendment at this moment it is the preference of the Commission to address it immediately. If it is possible to adopt a wording from UNECE R92 the Commission prefers that option. In principle Member States should agree to this option and if they have not spotted any problems so far with regulation 92 this might be the solution. However for transparency reasons the Commission will need to draft the amendment and this will be sent to the MCWG.

UK:

The UK would certainly welcome the opportunity to make comments and they very much welcome the initiative to take this on board as soon as possible.

Madam Chair:

Without any more comments, Madam Chair concluded the discussions as follows: in the delegated acts there are two open issues to be addressed: the first one is the proposal from AVERE on the test for Le1-A, point 3.5 of Appendix 4 of Annex X to the REPPR, on which the Commission would like to receive the comments from the participants in the MCWG by 13-05-2016; and the second one is the proposal from the UK. The Commission will draft a proposal which will be submitted to the members of the MCWG.

France:

The representative of France informs that France has submitted proposals to improve the implementing act; these changes were only editorial. Therefore no further discussion is needed.

Spain:

The representative of Spain encouraged the Commission to adopt the amendments to the delegated and implementing acts as soon as possible, as the manufactures are already planning their production based on these amendments.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair stated that the Commission cannot go faster than is the timeline presented. The proposals will be adopted in July. The Commission will publish a new set of documents as soon as they have been sent to the translators. Any additional amendment to the RAR will also be presented in the TCMV of 12 of May.

(6) Status work of UNECE informal working group on environmental and propulsion performance requirements for L-category vehicles (L-EPPR)

- (a) State of play**
- (b) Next steps.**

Documents: - [06.a. Presentation: UNECE IWG on EPPR for L-category vehicles –state of play](#)
- <https://www2.unece.org/wiki/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=5800520>

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair invited the representative of ACEM to give an update on the L-EPPR. The Chair of the informal working group was due to private reasons not able to attend the meeting.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM provided the members of the MCWG with an update on the progress made. The chair and the secretariat of the working group have recently changed.

The new contact information is:

Chair :Adolfo Perujo (adolfo.perujo@ec.europa.eu)

Vice Chair: Hardik Makhija (hardik@siam.in)

Secretariat: Daniela Leveratto (d.leveratto@immamotorcycles.org).

The mandate of the L-EPPR working group was extended by WP29 until 2020. The main topic worked on since the last MCWG has been OBD I. The working group hopes to complete the OBD I proposal during the meeting on the 6th of June 2016 and submit the document to GRPE. Some open issues are still to be resolved within the group e.g. the Definition of warm-up cycle; the clarification of “freeze-frame” parameters to be stored; the Template for the RMI based upon some of the already existing templates. The technical report is under preparation.

The completed new draft GTR (informal document June 2015 & working document January 2016) on Evaporative and Crankcase emissions was sent to WP29 for adoption. The next step is the revision of the existing GTR nr. 2.

For the roadmap of the working group the representative refers to the presentation and states that this roadmap is to be discussed in the future and it might need adjustments.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair thanks the representative of ACEM for the update and the detailed information.

(7) Any other business.

Madam Chair.

Madam chair concludes that there is one point. This is the point on End of Series provisions by Spain. The representative of Spain is asked what could be added to the previous discussions in the MCWG.

Spain:

The representative of Spain explained that there is still some flexibility in the application of article 44 of Regulation (EU) No. 168/2013. Spain would like to clarify if the article would apply to the whole production, or by type approval, or in some cases in a mixture of two. The representative stated that until now that there was no problem due to the fact it was a percentage of the vehicles sold in the previous two years. With the introduction of the fixed numbers in the new regulation there could be some flexibility in the interpretation of the article. Spain would like to clarify this and to have one uniform application of this article.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair stated that this is a somewhat different issue as discussed in the past and stated that it is the interpretation of the Commission that in conjunction with article 1 the numbers referred to in article 44 are per type. Madam Chair asked the Member States how they apply article 44.

France:

The representative of France stated that France will apply article 44 per type approval since this a more logic approach.

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

UK:

The representative of the UK stated that the UK applied in the past for cars the by market approach, this was also adopted for the 168/2013. When the UK learned that other Member States applied it by type, the UK now leaves it up to the manufactures to choose between the two options.

Italy:

The representative of Italy explained that Italy recently sent out a questionnaire on this topic. Although there were not that many replies the majority applies a percentage of the production per single type. Italy and a majority of the other Member States were more flexible. The representative of Italy concludes that the majority of the Member States applies end of series in the way as described by France so per type.

The Netherlands:

In the past the Netherlands always used the criteria per type for cars, and for the powered two wheelers the Netherlands will do the same.

ACEM:

The representative of ACEM proposed to bring this subject to TAAG and not only to TAAM. ACEM would, after having listened to the discussion, have clarity as soon as possible.

Madam Chair:

The topic can be brought to TAAG. However it is important to ensure coherence, as the wording in the legal frameworks for cars and tractors are drafted more or less in the same way. It is not the intention to have different interpretation for L-cat and the 2007/46 or the 167/2013. Madam Chair indicated that the topic will be discussed internally and the Commission will inform the members of the internal analysis during the next MCWG.

UK:

The representative of the UK stated that the issue of the End of Series and placing on the market is also discussed in the new motor vehicles framework. When a suitable solution can be found for the new car framework this solution could be adopted in the next co-decision procedure for the motorcycle framework regulation.

Madam Chair:

Madam Chair thanks the UK for this last suggestion and closes the meeting.

Next meeting: 22nd of September 2016.

ANNEX ATTENDANCE LIST

Motorcycle Working Group MCWG / MVEG regarding L-category vehicle approval legislation held in Brussels on 15 December 2015

MEMBER STATES

Austria	Franz Höller
Belgium	Kristof Soenen Aurélie Wahyenberg
Croatia	-
Finland	Keijo Kuikka
France	Marine Molina Christian Pichon
Hungary	Krisztián Uhlik
Ireland	John Kilroy
Italy	Antonio Erario
Latvia	Ainars Abolins
Luxembourg	Gilles Ast
Malta	Mauro Xuereb
Netherlands	Theun Stoffels
Poland	Wojciech Przybylski
Spain	Victor Costa José Pablo Laguna Gomez Carlos Anton
Slovakia	Ján Javorčík
United Kingdom	Mike Lowe
Portugal	Luis Paulo

CANDIDATE COUNTRIES

EFTA COUNTRIES, Observers

Norway	Tormod Schau
--------	--------------

ORGANISATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

ACEA	Erwin Kirschner Haldun Turan
ACEM	Ludovic Basset Erwin Segers Thomas Vercammen Fabio Daddi Bob Mius Ludovic Basset
AECC	Cécile Favre
ANESDOR	Jose M. Riano
ATVEA	Thomas Linget
AVERE / KU LEUVEN	Anick Roetynck Bram Rothier
CONEBI	Joost Bakker

MCWG meeting, 11th of May 2016

Consortium consultants

EQUAL
FEMA
FIGIEFA

JAMA

Manuel Marsilio
Eugène Moerkerk
Erik van der Hout
Willar Vonk

Alain Jung
Dolf Willigers
Neil Pattemore
Henry Wasung
Ian Ashdown
Alex Desplenter
Huub Forschelen
Fumikazu Kimura
Takashi Micome
Tomohiro Matsuda
Serge Verdee
Hans Sipkema

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DG GROW, Unit C4 Barbara Bonvissuto (deputy Head of Unit,
Chair)
Efrén Sanchez Galindo (Policy officer)
Ramon Gouweleeuw (Policy officer)

Contact: GROW-C4@ec.europa.eu
Tel: +32 (2) 29 91976 or (2) 29 53298