Safety-Belt Reminders

Proposal by France, Japan and UK
Purpose and justification

- **Purpose**
  - Mandate a system to remind an occupant to wear its safety belt if it is not buckled
  - The system shall provide assistance to an occupant that accepts the benefits of the safety belt. It must be a gentle reminder so as not to lead to rejection.

- **Justification**
  - High rate of safety-belt use provides positive impact on road safety
Principles

- The alert will consist of two mandatory levels
  - A visual signal
  - Then, both visual and audible signals

- The proposed text is compatible with international regulations and consumers requirements
  - A vehicle may be designed so as to both fit the proposed requirements and other requirements already into force (USA, Japan, Australia, Republic of Korea, Gulf Countries, and also NCAP)
Scope

- **Proposed text**
  - Vehicles of category M1
  - Driver’s seat

- **Further steps**
  - Other categories of vehicles
  - Other seating positions

- **Progressive enforcement due to:**
  - Technical & economic feasibility assessment
  - Consumers’ acceptance
Requirements

- French proposal: documents GRSP/2004/26/Rev.1 and GRSP-40-03 Rev1
- Requirements to be introduced by a new series of amendments
- Transitional provisions:
  - New types: 18 months after entry into force
  - All types: 72 months after entry into force
  - Derogation on transitional provisions for Contracting Parties yet applying such requirements
Discussions since 2004: deactivation

- Taking into account Japan and UK comments, France proposed a text which:
  - Stipulates that contracting parties may allow deactivation of the safety-belt reminder
  - Gives a definition of what is a short term versus a long term deactivation
This document includes GRSP and Japan and UK comments:
- Colour of the visual signal not defined; but where red, ISO symbol needed
- If vocal message, market language needed
- Audible warning to be easily recognized by the driver
- If long term deactivation specific tools needed
- Inclusion of definition of “normal operation”
- Inclusion of transitional provisions
- Inclusion of TRANS/WP29/GRSP 2006/4 (Japan)
- Some editorial improvements