

**India's comments on ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20 and ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22**

Note: The proposals by France (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20) and Germany (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22) are acceptable for India in principle. However, the expert from India proposes the following amendments to paragraphs 6.13.2. and 6.13.4.2.:

A. PROPOSAL

Paragraph 6.13.2., amend to read:

"6.13.2. Number

**Front:** Two visible from the front

**Rear:** Two visible from the front **and optionally two additional lamps visible from the rear when fitted in accordance with paragraph 6.13.4.2."**

Paragraph 6.13.4.2., amend to read:

"6.13.4.2. In height:

Front: ....

Rear: At the maximum height compatible with the requirements relating to the width, design and operational requirements of the vehicle and to the symmetry of the lamps.

**The additional lamps as referred to paragraph 6.13.2. may be grouped with other rear lamps at a minimum possible height compatible with the requirements relating to the design and operational requirements of the vehicle and to the symmetry of the lamps."**

B. JUSTIFICATION

According to our understanding, proposed additional two end-outline marker lamps may be optionally fitted on the rear side of the vehicle and may be independent or grouped with other lamps. However, ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22 provides:

"Two visible from the front and two visible from the rear.

**Optional: two additional lamps visible from the front."**

This shows that, two visible from the rear (optional) is repeating in front. India believes that this is not the case.

Similarly, ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20 provides:

**Front:** Two visible from the front

**Rear:** Two visible from the front **or four visible from the rear when fitted in accordance with paragraph 6.13.4.2."**

Here for the rear, requirements showing in front.

-----