

**GARCIA LOPEZ BERGES Victor (TRADE)**

---

**Subject:**

FW: HLWG; meeting with Ford

---

**From:** EMBERGER Geraldine (TRADE)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 03, 2012 8:19 PM  
**To:** GARCIA BERCERO Ignacio (TRADE)  
**Cc:** PERREAU DE PINNINCK Fernando (TRADE); DE LUSIGNAN Paul (TRADE); SZYMANSKI Arkadiusz (TRADE); NEIRA Pablo (TRADE); DUPUIS Philipp (TRADE); SORENSEN Carsten (TRADE); SCHMITZ Jan (TRADE); GUEGUEN Catherine (TRADE); KADINOVA Desislava (TRADE)  
**Subject:** HLWG; meeting with Ford

FYI:

Together with colleagues from ENTR (Bonvissuto, Daniel and Roeland) we met today with representatives of Ford today ([ *Art 4.1b* ]). Ford presented a ppt outlining their position on EU-US regulatory issues (which they promised to send electronically). The meeting showed that Ford, who has played a leading role in furthering EU-US cooperation in the TEC, is determined to also assume the role of a "champion" for more convergence in the framework of the HLWG, and possible future negotiations. Ford is working closely with ACEA and its other EU and US peers to put forward a strategy for the automotive sector. In the presentation, Ford makes its business case for efficiencies, which would flow from harmonisation of safety regulations and other public domain requirements

*NOT RELEASABLE*

*NOT RELEASABLE*

Ford remains optimistic that progress can be made in a few selected areas to increase convergence between EU and US if there is political will. Stronger EU-US convergence would also have a positive impact on other partners.

In concrete terms, Ford explained the difficulty inherent to the system of the 1998 UNECE Agreement (GTRs), which does not allow for further harmonisation since it leaves too many options and is not being implemented by many countries ([ *DELETED* ]). To date, only 11 GTRs have been agreed, and even these are not sufficiently well implemented in most signatory countries. Ford conceded that GTRs had a potential to work (especially if there were not too many options and modules leading to variations across countries – head rests being the example where there exist 11 different variations- and added that they worked best for areas where there are not yet a lot of regulations (such as electric cars and their connection to the grid). Ford also mentioned that the 1998 Agreement was currently the only framework including US, China, India and other important partners who did not join the 1958 Agreement.

Ford explained that the 1958 UNECE Agreement (based on whole type approval) is much more efficient but it would not allow for full harmonisation either, as many countries were still insisting on additional national requirements (i.e. Japan).

It was concluded to continue discussions on Thursday in the meeting with ACEA (which will be preceded by an internal ACEA meeting in the morning).

Between now and September, the aim would be for industry to produce a realistic work plan with selected areas where progress could be expected in future negotiations, i.e. future regulations for technologies related to automotive sector (the ones covered by TEC plus other promising areas where we have mutual interests) and existing regulations on safety and environment.

Ford mentioned that for the latter, one should take into consideration the possibility of "functional equivalence" of certain regulatory requirements and the mutual recognition of approvals obtained in the "other" certification system [T

NOT RELEASABLE

Geraldine

**Geraldine Emberger**

Economic & Trade Affairs  
Manager  
Trade Relations with North  
America  
Directorate General for Trade  
European Commission

Tel: +32-2-299.20.68  
Fax: +32-2-296.09.98

