

This document is intended to help resolve some open items that are still under consideration by the ACPE. It is based on the text from **“ACPE-13-02 (chair) 01 series amendment”**.

Amendments proposed by the UK are identified by **red bold** for new characters and ~~red strikethrough~~ for deleted characters.

I. Proposal

Insert a new Paragraph 2.14., to read:

2.14. "Reducing the effective demand of the accelerator control to zero" means where the resulting power/torque demand from the accelerator control is reduced to the equivalent of the driver removing any input into the accelerator control, irrespective of the actual input being given (this is exclusive of power/torque demand not in connection with the relative position of the accelerator control, e.g. rollback prevention, anti-stall).

Justification:

Concerns were raised about the potential interpretation of provisions in paragraph 5.1.6.2 therefore it was considered necessary to define so as to clarify what “reducing the effective demand of the accelerator control to zero” means when referred to in paragraph 5.1.6.2.

The definition explains that an effective demand of zero from the accelerator control does not include any torque demanded automatically by the vehicle and **only** considers the demand from the accelerator control.

Amend Paragraph 6.6.2.1., to read:

6.6.2.1 Each test condition according to Table 1 shall be tested once with a starting point and a profile of the accelerator control application selected at the discretion of the Technical Service. The starting point and the accelerator control application profile shall be selected such that the triggering condition (as outlined in paragraph 5.1.2.) is achieved as close to:

- The maximum creeping speed in the forward direction;
- 4km/h in the rearward direction,

as reasonably practical whilst remaining at or below that speed and avoiding any ~~ACPE suppression due to an~~ AEBS warning or intervention **which results in an ACPE intervention not occurring.**

Justification:

The performance requirements of paragraph 5.1.4.1 state that “**ACPE intervention is not required when there is an AEB warning or intervention occurring**” and does not necessarily mean that an ACPE intervention is always suppressed, some manufacturers may choose the option to allow an ACPE intervention even when an AEB warning or intervention occurs. Concern was raised that the current wording in the test method suggested otherwise, so the changes proposed are to make it clear that it is not implied that ACPE shall be suppressed when an AEBS warning or intervention is occurring.

Amend paragraph 6.7. & 6.7.1., to read:

6.7. If this is deemed justified, the Technical Service may additionally test in any test condition within the conditions specified in paragraph 5.1.5 or test alternative accelerator control application profiles.

~~**6.7.1 other accelerator control application profiles. may be tested, as necessary, at the discretion of the technical service.**~~

Justification:

Concern was raised about the current wording of 6.7.1. that could imply that the Technical Service may not have to justify the testing of other accelerator control application profiles, potentially leading to different testing demands depending on the technical service involved. It was suggested to repeat the phrase “if this is deemed justified” for that provision to ensure that testing of alternative accelerator control profiles is carried out **only** when the Technical Service has a justifiable reason to do so. However, it is proposed to include the requirement of 6.7.1. within 6.7. as it makes easier to read and helps brevity without detracting from the requirement.