

## **EXTENSION OF THE SCOPE OF REGULATION NO. 66.**

Transmitted by the experts from Hungary and Spain

### **1. Arguments supporting the extension**

- 1.1. Statistical evidences (see informal doc. No.GRRF-87-5) showed that all bus categories are represented in rollover accidents. Approximately the same casualty (fatality, injury) rate may be observed for the passengers of every bus category, and this casualty rate is very high if the superstructure does not have a certain (required) strength.
- 1.2. More national regulations (Australian ADR, South African SANS, FMVSS in USA) already extended their scope to bus categories other than covered by Regulation No. 66.
- 1.3. The extended use of safety belts in different bus categories underlines the need for extension of the scope.
- 1.4. The “Results and Conclusions” of the ECBOS project also urged the extension of the scope of Regulation No.66. to the small buses.
- 1.5. European Commission also raised the question of small buses in rollover protection (Memorandum, 16.05.2002. GRSG).
- 1.6. During the AHEG meetings, working on the modification of Regulation No. 66 more experts (from Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Hungary, South-Africa) proposed the extension of the scope of it to small buses and double deck coaches, but AHEG was not authorised to do that.
- 1.7.1. Hungary raised the problem of the high decker coaches in the standard rollover test (Inform. Dec. No.6. GRSG, 2003 October meeting) The proposal was: solve this problem when extending the scope of Reg.66.
- 1.8. Both of UNECE Regulation No. 66/Rev.1 and 2001/85/EC Directive covers all bus categories, therefore certain strength requirements of the superstructure should be formulated for all bus categories (Now Annex 5 and Annex 4 use only Regulation No. 66).

### **1. Opinion of WP.29.**

- 2.1. Hungary raised this question on the 131<sup>st</sup> meeting of WP.29 in the Informal Document No.8. After a brief discussion WP.29 agreed to study it and send it to GRSG. WP.29

expressed its demand that this activity should not delay the consolidation of the bus regulations and the modification of Regulation No. 66.

- 2.2. The Hungarian document became a working document of GRSG (TRANS/WP29/GRSG/ 2004/15) The problem was briefly touched on the 86<sup>th</sup> meeting of GRSG and during this discussion Italy and France supported this action, Spain expressed earlier its support.

### **3. Proposal**

- 3.1. As a first step, an analysis is needed, which shows to GRSG what kind of modifications are needed in Regulation No. 66/Rev.1 to extend its scope, what is the work needed and what kind of time schedule could be estimated.
  - 3.2. In the frame of AHEG (which prepared the draft of Regulation No. 66/Rev.1.)
  - 3.3. Hungary and Spain undertake to prepare this analysis to GRSG as an informal document for the April 2005 session. Anybody, who is interested in this work, may join to this action.
  - 3.4. This way is similar to the earlier one, when Spanish, UK and Hungarian experts prepared a document (TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/R.305) in 1997 what and how to do when improving Regulation No. 66. and GRSG could make decisions about the future work.
-