Proposal for amendments to ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/2009/24
(Document of OICA for Revisions and extensions of approvals according Regulation 46)

(New text is underlined and deleted text is striked out)

PROPOSAL

1. Paragraph 7.1 of the proposal of IOCA should read:

7.1. Every **type** modification of the **type of** device for indirect vision including its connection to the bodywork shall be notified to the administrative department which approved the type of device for indirect vision. The department shall then **either decide, in consultation with the manufacturer, that a new type-approval is to be granted or apply the procedure contained in either paragraph 7.1.1. (Revision) or and 7.1.2. (Extension), if applicable.**

JUSTIFICATION

When the modified device doesn’t fit within the existing type definition then a new type approval has to be granted and it cannot be treated as a revision or extension. This should be reflected in paragraph 7.1.

Furthermore the standard procedure is that all other modifications are revisions, but in some cases they become an extension. Also in case of an extension the administrative department (also named approval authority or competent authority) has to issue the revised pages of the information document as prescribed in paragraph 7.1.1.

2. Paragraph 7.3. amend to read:

7.3. (reserved)

JUSTIFICATION

It seems that this paragraph is already covered by the first sentence of paragraph 7.2

3. Paragraph 16.1 amend to read:

16.1. Every modification of the vehicle type shall be notified to the administrative department which approved the vehicle type. The department shall then **either decide, in consultation with the manufacturer, that a new type-approval is to be granted or apply the procedure contained in either paragraph 16.1.1. (Revision) or and 16.1.2. (Extension), if applicable.**

JUSTIFICATION

Same justification as for paragraph 7.1.