

Proposal for an amendment to document ECE/TRANS/WP29/GRSG/2010/13  
Regulation No. 58 (Rear under run protection)

The modifications to the text of document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/2010/13 are marked in bold or strikethrough characters.

A. PROPOSAL

Paragraph 2.3., amend to read:

- 2.3. Any vehicle in one of the categories M1, M2, M3, N1, O1 or O2 will be deemed to satisfy the condition set out above:
- (a) if it satisfies the same conditions as set out in Part II or Part III, or
  - (b) if the ground clearance of the rear part of the unladen vehicle does not exceed 55 cm over a width which is not shorter than that of the rear axle by more than 10 cm on either side (excluding any tyre bulging close to the ground).

**However, in case of vehicles of category O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> where the tyres project outside the bodywork, it is sufficient when the ground clearance of the rear part of the unladen vehicle does not exceed 55 cm over a width corresponding to the width of the local bodywork.**

Where there is more than one rear axle, the width to be considered is that of the widest.

This requirement must be satisfied at least on a line at a distance of not more than 45 cm from the rear extremity of the vehicle.

Insert a new proposal to amend paragraph 16.2 of Regulation 58

**Paragraph 16.2, amend to read:**

- 16.2. The width of the rear protective device must at no point exceed the width of the rear axle measured at the outermost points of the wheels, excluding the bulging of the tyres close to the ground, nor must it be more than 100 mm shorter on either side. **However, in the case of vehicles of category O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> where the tyres project outside the bodywork, the device must at no point exceed the width of the bodywork locally.** Where there is more than one rear axle, the width to be considered is that of the widest rear axle. In addition the requirements of paragraphs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 of Annex 5 relating the distance of the points of application of the test forces from the outer edges of the rear wheels (Annex 1, item 7) must be verified and recorded in the type approval communication form.

Insert a new proposal to amend paragraph 25.3 of Regulation 58

**Paragraph 25.3., amend to read:**

25.3 The width of the RUP must at no point exceed the width of the rear axle measured at the outermost points of the wheels, excluding the bulging of the tyres close to the ground, nor must it be more than 100 mm shorter on either side. **However, in the case of vehicles of category O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> where the tyres project outside the bodywork, the RUP must at no point exceed the width of the bodywork locally.**

Where there is more than one rear axle, the width to be considered is that of the widest rear axle. Where the device is contained in or comprised by the vehicle bodywork which itself extends beyond the width of the rear axle the requirement that the width of the RUP must not exceed that of the rear axle shall not apply.

**B. JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal of the European Commission extends the scope of Regulation 58 with vehicles of category O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub>. Paragraphs 16.2. and 25.3. require a rear underrun device to be not more than 10 cm shorter on each side than the width of the axle(s). The application of these provisions to vehicles of category O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> of which the tyres project outside the width of the bodywork would mean that the rear underrun device will also extend the width of the bodywork substantially. Such a rear underrun device can catch vulnerable road users, like cyclists, and does not increase road safety with regard to underrun protection; on the contrary it creates a dangerous situation. In such cases the width of the rear underrun device as required by paragraphs 16.2. and 25.3. should be limited to the width of the bodywork. In the present proposal we suggest to take no account of the projections of the axles outside the bodywork in cases where the wheels project outside the width of the bodywork.

As a consequence of this we believe that paragraph 2.3, as proposed by the European Commission should be brought in line with the suggested wording for paragraph 16.2 and 25.3.

-----