

PROPOSAL FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE SCOPE OF REGULATIONS UNDER THE
1958 AGREEMENT COVERED BY GRSP

Transmitted by the expert from the European Commission

Background: The Commission services intend to make many UNECE Regulations mandatory within the EC. Therefore a check has been made of the scope of all the Regulations that the EC has adhered to. This review found a series of recurring uncertainties or errors. These have been listed in a document (WP29-134-22) called “Annex 1” which was sent to WP29 in November 2004, in order to explain our concerns, and was sent to all the GR’s on behalf of WP29 (GRE-54-2). The Commission services were then invited to present more detailed preparatory work to the GR’s. The process was started with a document which considers those Regulations covered by GRPE, followed by one for Regulations covered by GRRF, one for Regulations covered by GRB, one for Regulations covered by GRE, whereas the present document makes a series of suggestions for Regulations covered by GRSP.

Another step towards greater clarity as to the scope of Regulations is a so-called “Horizontal Regulation”. The Commission services propose that a Horizontal Regulation would take over most of the content of the last version of Annex 7 to R.E.3 on vehicle categories, but would introduce some modifications, mainly by taking in elements of S.R.1. However, the major difference of this Horizontal Regulation would be that it is directly and uniformly applicable, even when a Regulation still refers to any old version of R.E.3. A draft Horizontal Regulation has been forwarded to WP.29 (WP29-135-18).

On request of the UNECE secretariat, this paper covers also the regulations the EC did not adhere to.

I. Regulation No. 11 – Doors:

The scope refers to the vehicle categories of Reg. 13 instead of R.E.3 directly. The European Commission services have launched a separate proposal aiming at the integration of the first GTR into Reg. 11. This proposal already includes a modified scope.

II. Regulation No. 12 – Steering mechanism:

The scope is clear. However, we suggest raising the limit value to 2,500 kg in order to take account of the fact that vehicles get ever heavier.

III. Regulation No. 14 – Safety-belts anchorages:

The reference to vehicle categories relates to an older version of R.E.3. This problem can only be solved by a Horizontal Regulation.

IV. Regulation No. 16 – Safety belts:

The current scope covers M, N, L2, L4-7 and T. But it is formulated in a very complicated way. We therefore suggest: “This Regulation applies to vehicles of category M, N, L2, L4-7 and T with regard to safety-belts and restraint systems and to safety-belts and restraint systems as such.”

V. Regulation No. 17 – Seats, their anchorages and head restraints:

1. The scope of Reg. 17 covers those M2 and M3 that are not covered by Reg. 80. Reg. 80 covers all M2 and M3 which are not class I, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 36 and class A, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 52. The double reference makes the system too complicated. The regulation should directly refer to Reg. 36 and Reg. 52, if really needed.
2. At the same time, we wonder whether there is any logic in the system. Vehicles which need the lowest degree of safety (class I, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 36 and class A, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 52) are de facto included in the scope of the severest regulation (Reg. 17), because Reg. 17 covers all M2 and M3 not covered by Reg. 80 – Reg. 80 covering vehicles of categories M2 and M3 other than those of class I, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 36 and class A, as defined in paragraph 2.1.1. of Regulation No. 52.
3. In addition to that, it is not clear whether the Regulation is meant to provide for a vehicle approval (see 2.1.) or only a system and component approval (see current scope).
4. To avoid confusion, the Commission suggests taking into account the discussion on our proposal for Reg. 80 first. Secondly, the question of whether there is still a need to cover M2 and M3 under Reg. 17 should be assessed. Maybe, it would suffice to state in Reg. 80 that seats ... approved according to Reg. 17 are exempted from Reg. 80.
5. The entire scope could be formulated as follows: “This Regulation applies to the approval of vehicles of category M1 and N with regard to their seats, seat anchorages and head restraints except folding, side-facing or rearward-facing seats and head restraint fitted to these seats.”
6. The current footnote 1 should disappear. The footnote 2 shall become regular text after section 5.1.4.

VI. Regulation No. 21 – Interior fittings:

This Regulation does not refer to any definition of M1 category of vehicles. This problem will be solved by the Horizontal Regulation.

VII. Regulations No. 22 – Helmets:

Helmets are not a vehicle component, so we do not see any problems with regard to the scope.

VIII. Regulation No. 29 – Passenger protection in commercial vehicles:

“Commercial vehicles which are intended for the carriage of goods” should be called “vehicles of category N”. The scope should be modernised: “This regulation applies to vehicles of category N.”

IX. Regulation No. 32 – Rear-end collision:

Similarly to Reg. 29, “private (passenger) cars” should be replaced by “vehicles of category M1”.

X. Regulation No. 33 – Head-on collision:

Similarly to Reg. 29, “private (passenger) cars” should be replaced by “vehicles of category M1”.

XI. Regulation No. 34 – Liquid fuel tanks:

The scope is acceptable except that the reference to vehicle categories relates to R.E.3. This problem can only be solved by a Horizontal Regulation.

However, the scope could be simplified. If, in 1.2, “M1” is replaced by “M, N and O”, 1.3 could be deleted.

XII. Regulation No. 42 – Bumpers:

The scope covers all “Passenger cars”, should be clarified to state “vehicles of category M1”.

XIII. Regulation No. 44 – Child restraint systems:

The regulation should be clarified as to whether L2, L3-7 and T are covered.

XIV. Regulation No. 94 – Frontal impact:

Paragraph 1.2 should be removed as it is meaningless.

XV. Regulation No. 95 – Side impact:

The scope is acceptable