

PROPOSAL FOR ISOFIX DYNAMIC TEST

Insert a new paragraph 7.1.4.1.10., to read:

7.1.4.1.10. In the case of a child restraint making use of an ISOFIX anchorage system and anti-rotation device, if any, the dynamic test shall be carried out:

7.1.4.1.10.1. For ISOFIX CRS of size classes A and B :

7.1.4.1.10.1.1. with the anti-rotation device in function, and

7.1.4.1.10.1.2. without the anti-rotation device in function, if possible .

7.1.4.1.10.2. For ISOFIX CRS of other size classes with the anti rotation device in function

. Paragraph 7.1.4.4.1.1., figure 1, insert a reference to a footnote 5/ to the 550 dimension, and insert the corresponding footnote 5/, to read:

5/ For the purpose of the test specified in paragraph 7.1.4.1.10.1.1, this dimension shall be 500 mm.

The extra test specified in paragraph 7.1.4.1.10.1.2, is subject to revision five years after the entry into force on [xx] of this [yy] supplement.

NOTE FOR THE MINUTES

The group fully debated several aspects concerning proposed head excursion limits. On the one hand, there was a desire not to have a special extra test to cater for an unintended use mode. On the other hand, there was a recognition that the situation with the introduction of group 1 forward facing ISOFIX child restraints for children was unique, given the large number of cars that would be equipped with two lower anchorages only.

The decision was as follows. The test with top tether should require a limit on forward head movement of 500 mm. Exceptionally this test should be supplemented with an extra test (to cater for unintended use) using only the two lower anchorages (with the anti rotation device not in use) where the limit on forward movement would be 550 mm. The group was clear that such a test in no way implied the CRS could be used with only two lower anchorages in practice as vehicle seats varied and the performance and consequences could not be safely predicted; the warnings in CRS and vehicle handbooks should emphasise the importance of using the anti-rotation device. The group also made clear that the acceptance of an extra test, given the unique circumstances associated with the introduction of ISOFIX, should not set a precedent for the wider introduction of special tests in Regulations to cater for misuse modes generally. They agreed that this requirement proposed in 7.1.4.1.10.1.2 should be reviewed by GRSP by [May 2005] in good time to allow this special requirement to be revised if appropriate five years after the above requirements take effect.