

UN ECE Regulation No. 107
5th meeting of the GRSG Informal Group on
Service Doors, Windows and Emergency Exits of buses and coaches
2-3 March 2011
OICA offices, 4 rue de Berri
F-75008 Paris

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Welcome by the Chair

2. Approval of the minutes of the 4th meeting

Document: SDWEE -04-11 (Secretariat)

The minutes were not available at the time of the meeting. The secretariat however produced document SDWEE-04-11 which summarized the conclusions of the 4th meeting of the informal group.

The Chair pointed out that some important issues are still waiting for consensus by the informal group, referring in particular to the concerns raised by Germany per their email dated 11 February 2011 (see item 4.a. below).

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Document: SDWEE-05-01 (Secretariat)

The agenda was adopted with no modification.

4. Corner stone questions

Documents: SDWEE-02-07-Rev.2 (Editorial Task-Force)
Email dated 11 February 2011 (Germany)

a. Laminated vs. toughened glass

Background:

- The informal group was urged by Mr. Copelin (IRU) to provide guidance about whether promoting laminated vs. toughened glass in the Regulation.
- The Chair and the Secretariat of the informal group understood from the discussions held at the 4th meeting of the informal group that a decision was made in the direction of promoting doors and hatches as emergency exits in order to overcome an impossible decision toward one particular window technology.
- This understanding was however challenged by Germany in their email dated 11 February 2011.

A debate took place concerning the outcomes of the 4th meeting of the informal group:

- European Commission seemed keen to go in the direction of laminated glass.
- The group decided to continue the discussions and make proposals in the direction of improved provisions and performances for the mandatory emergency exits and reducing their number.
- Such decision would make unnecessary a decision toward laminated vs. toughened glass
- Germany could not support this point of view:
 - o The wish of the European Commission for laminated glass addresses keeping the passengers in the vehicle at the time of accident and this has no common point with the issue of emergency exits.
 - o The decision for improving the quality of the emergency exits and decreasing their number cannot be easily defended on the basis of improvement of the level of safety. Germany could not support this idea, in particular taking into account the lack of evidence that side windows are not used in practice, even if this is the informal group's conclusion.
- Mrs. Reyntjens (Van Hool) informed that US investigations on laminated vs. toughened glass are "inconclusive", and that in consequence the US Authorities decided to support the equipment of 3-P belts, withstanding 20g deceleration.
- The Chair however pointed out that only the coaches in North America are similar to vehicles addressed by the SDWEE informal group.

Conclusion:

- Informal group to make regulatory proposals along the line of the above discussions, i.e. conservative about the number of emergency exits to be regulated.
- The informal group's expertise and some evidence and reports strongly indicate that side windows are seldom used as emergency exits in emergency situations. As a consequence the informal group could not conclude that side windows are NEVER used in emergency, implying that the SDWEE informal group cannot provide GRSG with recommendations about side windows (reference to a "balance of probabilities").
- Chair to report the debates of the informal group to GRSG.

b. Emergency exit requirements to be re-written from scratch or simply amended

Background:

- No discussion was held at the 4th meeting on this subject.
- The Editorial Task Force made the choice to simply amend the existing paragraphs.
- Germany questioned in their email dated 11 February 2011 "why the proposal contains that much text which was left unchanged".

This item was not discussed by the informal group at its 5th meeting.

5. Revision of working documents

Documents: SDWEE-02-07-Rev.2 (Editorial Task-Force)
 SDWEE-05-02 (Mr. McKenzie)
 SDWEE-05-03 (HUN)
 SDWEE-05-04 (NL)
 SDWEE-05-05 (D)
 Email dated 11 February 2011 (Germany)

Background:

- Proposed working document divided in 2 parts:

- The 1st part is already in the format of an official document as the items contained in it were discussed in depth by the informal group;
- The 2nd part is in the format of a table with 2 columns, for permitting further exchange of view.
- Indicates the issues still to be addressed.
- Includes further proposals from the editorial task force.
- Document SDWEE-05-02 is a proposal for detailed provisions on safety signs.

SDWEE-05-04:

Mr. Jongenelen (NL) presented the document and stressed that the current wording of paragraphs 7.6.7.2. and 7.6.5.1 is such that the emergency exit could be used only by operating the device dedicated to the service door.

IRU confirmed that this item touches a big problem for the operators because some passengers use the emergency exit devices for getting out of the vehicle at traffic lights. Paragraph 7.6.5.1.1. is the main source of problems for IRU, with no proposal for improvement yet. The informal group had an exchange of view on the most efficient way to address this problem and re-visited the paragraph 7.6.7.2. in order to accurately include all the possibilities.

Conclusion: Revision of document SDWEE-05-04 adopted, to be included in 02-07-Rev.3.

SDWEE-05-02

Mr. Rickaby (Plaxton) pointed out that the sequence of movements for operating the emergency exit control could be long, and that some extensive space could be needed for indicating the actions to perform for opening the exits.

Mr. McKenzie (OICA, CLCCR), as author of the proposal, recalled that it is up to the manufacturer to achieve the goal as the requirement is not prescriptive. The informal group agreed to respect the decision of the last meeting to favour pictograms in all case, with supplementary explanatory wording when necessary. It was agreed to introduce the relevant provisions in a new paragraph 7.19 rather than in paragraph 7.6. which addresses exits only. Mr. McKenzie kindly produced document SDWEE-05-02-Rev.1 which was reviewed in depth by the experts. In particular the experts acknowledged that the requirement for “photo-luminescent” signs could preclude other systems. Concerning the pictograms, it was considered reasonable that the regulation defines a pictogram for each type of emergency exit, i.e. door, window, roof hatch, floor hatch. Mr. McKenzie volunteered to prepare a proposal in that sense for the next meeting.

Conclusion:

- Relevant provisions to be added in a new paragraph 7.19.
- Current 7.6.11. to be amended accordingly.
- Mr. McKenzie to produce a proposal defining a pictogram for each of the four types of emergency, in addition to some provisions for minimal dimensions of the emergency exit windows and some indication of the exits which are addressed by the provisions.

SDWEE-05-05

Some experts had the concern that the proposed value of 2 Nm seemed quite a low value in particular in the case of mechanical operation. Plaxton Ltd. committed to internally investigate the feasibility of the value. It was however pointed out that only the unlocking action was regulated, rather than the operation of the exit itself. This implies that, probably, a second movement would have to be indicated for opening the exit.

Some debate in addition took place on whether the regulation should mandate a direction of movement (clockwise vs. counter clockwise). While there was no consensus about the proper

direction to mandate, it was agreed that the direction would have to be indicated by appropriate signage.

The experts in addition agreed that the required angular displacement of 90° would cover the total possible control opening movement, i.e. a movement of 45° each direction for opening would be compliant.

The group in addition agreed to regulate the dimensions of the control, based on some information to be provided by the manufacturers.

Conclusion:

- Principle of a mandatory rotary control adopted.
- Maximum dimensions requirements to be added.

SDWEE-05-03

The informal group decided not to review this document because, while it was related to the topic, it did not take into account the latest version of the working document.

SDWEE-02-07-Rev2

The informal group started a revision of the document paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 7.6.1.5.: proposed amendments deleted, the text will remain as currently in the Regulation.

Paragraph 7.6.1.7.:

The Chair informed that the Editorial Task Force was expecting some help from English native speakers for the text between []. The informal group, after some lengthy debate, supported to amend the paragraph as in the updated working document.

The other changes agreed by the experts can be found as well in the document SDWEE-02-07-Rev.3.

6. Other business

After lengthy discussions on the main items above, the experts acknowledged that the informal group is lacking time for completing its full revision of the document SDWEE-07-02, in particular its Part 2 where some inputs are still expected before approval by the informal group. It was as a consequence found reasonable that the informal group presents to GRSG at its 100th session a proposal for amendment to UNECE R107 consolidating all the text agreed to date, and that the Chair of the informal group requests to GRSG some extension of the mandate, aiming completion of the work at the 101st session of GRSG, in October 2011.

Conclusion:

- Informal group to table a partial result at GRSG in addition to a meeting report
- This partial result being Part 1 of the revised document SDWEE-02-07 + the parts of document SDWEE-04-10 which were agreed.

7. List of action items

- Secretariat to produce an informal document for next GRSG session (100th - April 2011) with all agreed items (SDWEE-02-07 up to paragraph 7.6.1.11 + SDWEE-04-10 – adopted paragraphs + SDWEE-05-02-Rev.1 + SDWEE-05-04).
- Chair to prepare adequate report to GRSG.
- Chair to prepare request for mandate extension to GRSG.
- Vehicle manufacturers to investigate the current rotary controls (actuation forces + dimensions/housing + direction of movement).

- Additional meeting tentatively in June 2011 in London in week 23 - To be confirmed at GRSG-100.
- Over next meeting probably on 17th of October pm + 18th am in Geneva, to be arranged with UNECE secretariat (B&C items to be covered at beginning of meeting).

8. Date and place of next meetings

Need for an additional meeting before October GRSG. Venue and date tentatively in London (IRU offices), in week 23.
