

Request for guidance from WP.29

I. Introduction

When asking for extensions for existing type approvals, vehicle manufacturers currently face problems with the application of Supplements. This creates uncertainty for manufacturers and potentially adds considerable cost when making relatively straightforward changes to the administrative aspects of type approval documentation.

The issue that OICA would like WP.29 to consider relates to a situation where a manufacturer wishes to amend or update an existing type approval where the specific regulation has been modified or updated since the original approval was issued. The issue has arisen in the context of an approval to Regulation 13 and was discussed at GRRF in February 2011. On the recommendation of the Chairman, it was suggested this issue should be considered by WP.29 to ensure a consistent approach was adopted across all regulations rather than discrete solutions being developed on a case-by-case basis.

II. Example

One recent example for vehicle braking:

- A motor vehicle has an existing type approval for its braking system according to regulation UNECE R13, Series 11, Supplement 2. **This type approval is accepted until October 2016** by all countries signatory to UNECE Regulation No. 13 for the first entry into service of new vehicles covered by the existing type in accordance with the transitional provisions of the regulation.
- The vehicle manufacturer subsequently opened a new production site and in consequence needed to extend the existing braking system type approval to recognise the new facility. There are no modifications in the technical definition of the vehicle.

For information, UNECE R13, Series 11, Supplement 2

- addresses provisions for ABS and introduces administrative clarifications for trailer braking approval;
- **mandates** compliance for new types as from October 2013 and for existing **types as from October 2016**

However, since the original approval was issued Regulation 13 had been updated by Supplements Nos 3 & 4. Supplement 4

- introduces new requirements for the Human Machine Interface (HMI) and is relevant to the vehicle in question;
- **mandates** compliance for all vehicles **as from December 2010** (no transitional provisions)

This led to the situation where Supplement 4 applies before Supplement 2.

It is also important to note that the change of production site does not change the vehicle type according to the criteria listed under item 2. of UNECE R13 (see the current list below):

- 2.2.1. *in the case of power-driven vehicle,*
 - 2.2.1.1. *the vehicle category, (see paragraph 1.1. above);*
 - 2.2.1.2. *the maximum mass, as defined in paragraph 2.16. below;*
 - 2.2.1.3. *the distribution of mass among the axles;*
 - 2.2.1.4. *the maximum design speed;*
 - 2.2.1.5. *a different type of braking equipment, with more particular reference to the presence or otherwise of equipment for braking a trailer, or any presence of an electric regenerative braking system;*
 - 2.2.1.6. *the number and arrangement of the axles;*
 - 2.2.1.7. *the engine type;*
 - 2.2.1.8. *the number and ratios of gears;*
 - 2.2.1.9. *the final drive ratios;*
 - 2.2.1.10. *the tyre dimensions.*

The manufacturer explained to the type approval authority that Supplement 2 is still accepted for whole Vehicle Type Approvals and requested the original approval was extended. The Authority instead insisted that the vehicle comply with the latter HMI requirements by requiring conformity with Supplement 4.

III. Discussion

OICA tabled this issue at GRRF at its 69th session (informal document N°11). GRRF found the request relevant and concluded that the question extends to a wider range than the sole Regulation N°13. As a consequence, GRRF considered it appropriate to request guidance to WP.29.

IV. Request for guidance

OICA believes that as a general principle, and unless otherwise specified in the transitional provisions, extensions of approval should be fully linked to the original approval. In other words, an extension of approval should not be considered as a procedure for new approval, but simply as a slight administrative modification to an existing approval. This becomes even more crucial when one considers the above example, where only the production site is changed, without any change to the vehicle design.

OICA would appreciate WP.29's views on this issue and for any decision to be shared among the GRs – possibly to ensure all regulatory texts are consistent.
