



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.

GENERAL

TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/22
26 January 1998

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles

Meeting of Experts on Passive Safety

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF EXPERTS ON PASSIVE SAFETY
ON ITS TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

(1 - 4 December 1997)

1. The Meeting of Experts on Passive Safety held its twenty-second session from 1 December (afternoon) to 4 December (morning) 1997 under the chairmanship of Mr. C. Lomonaco (Italy). Experts from the following countries participated in the work: Belgium; Canada; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Italy; Netherlands; Poland; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; United Kingdom; United States of America. A representative of the European Commission (EC) participated. Representatives of Japan and of the People's Republic of China took part in the session under paragraph 11 of the Commission's Terms of Reference. Experts from the following non-governmental organizations participated: International Organization for Standardization (ISO); International Touring Alliance/International Automobile Federation (AIT/FIA); Consumers International (CI); International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); Liaison Committee for the Manufacture of Automobile Equipment and Spare Parts (CLEPA); European Experimental Vehicles Committee (EEVC).

2. The documents without a symbol distributed during the session are listed in annex 1 to this report.

REGULATION No. 17 (Strength of seats)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/1997/7; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/1;
TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/8; informal documents Nos. 11 and 12 of annex 1 to this report.

3. The adoption of the draft 07 series of amendments to the Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/1997/7) by the Administrative Committee AC.1 at its seventh session was recalled. At the same time the Meeting of Experts noted the invitation by the Working Party that the work should continue in order to improve the protection of passengers, particularly children, against the load of luggage causing the deformation of seat backs in accidents (TRANS/WP.29/599, paras. 64 and 97).

4. The expert from the United Kingdom confirmed that his proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/1) should be a step forward and that the position of the transverse plane limiting the movement of the seat backs which is specified in this document should ensure an adequate protection to children under the conditions of the test contained in the draft 07 series of amendments. The proposal was supported by the expert from the Consumers International who reiterated that the protection was inadequate under the adopted specifications of the draft 07 series of amendments (TRANS/WP.29/599, para. 65). He recalled that the proposal by the United Kingdom had been based on actual test results and should establish the coherence between Regulation No. 17 and Regulation No. 44.

5. The expert from CLEPA drew attention to his informal document No. 12, proposing further modifications to the draft 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17. He said that the proposed amendments were based on practical experience and should improve the reproducibility of the test.

6. After an exchange of views and noting that the proposals of informal document No. 12 needed to be examined, the Meeting of Experts agreed to resume the consideration of this matter at the next session. The secretariat was requested to distribute informal document No. 12 with an official symbol. The expert from the United Kingdom suggested that consideration of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/8 should also be postponed, in order to discuss it in conjunction with the other related proposals.

7. The expert from Spain introduced his proposal for ensuring adequate space and function of the front seat displacement system for passengers alighting from the rear seats of two- or three-door vehicles (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6). He gave a presentation showing the research made on current vehicles and justifying the technical solution proposed (informal document No. 11).

14. The expert from OICA introduced informal document No. 14, combining documents TRANS/WP.29/1997/5 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/3 and suggested that the reconsideration should not be limited to M1 category vehicles.

15. Taking account of the above-mentioned informal documents, the Meeting of Experts agreed to transform the original proposal (TRANS/WP.29/1997/5) into the 05 series of amendments and to attempt the approach proposed by OICA (para. 14 above). To assist the discussion, the secretariat prepared informal document No. 18, combining the proposals of informal documents Nos. 4 and 14.

16. During the consideration, the text of informal document No. 18 was amended. In particular it was agreed to modify the title of paragraph 7. in order to show that the seat deformations needed to be measured during and after the test. Also incorporated was a relevant proposal prepared during the session by the expert from Germany and specifying the maximum allowed deformation for the seats of other than M1 categories of vehicles (a section of paragraph 7.1.1., marked by square brackets, to indicate a need for further consideration). The periods for the transitional provisions were also modified. However, the secretariat was authorised to check that these periods were aligned with those proposed for the 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17 (see para. 3 above). The text of informal document No. 18 in the modified version adopted by the Meeting of Experts is reproduced in annex 2 to this report.

Note by the secretariat: also included in annex 2 is the comment estimating the entry into force of the 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17 and justifying a corresponding modification of the periods for transitional provisions (paragraphs 14.2. and 14.3.).

17. Considering the matter to be urgent, the Meeting of Experts requested the secretariat to prepare an official working document, based on annex 2 to this report, in time for transmission to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its eighth session (March 1998).

18. The proposal by CLEPA, to make for the seats of M2 and M3 categories of vehicles a cross reference to existing provisions of Regulation No. 80, was not discussed (informal document No. 13).

19. The proposal to introduce into Regulation No. 14 provisions for the ISOFIX system of attachment of child restraints (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/11) was introduced by the expert from the United Kingdom and additional justifications were given by the expert from the EEVC. In the exchange of views which followed, the Meeting of Experts focused on the intention to require the top tether anchorage, on which the opinions were diverging. It was confirmed that the latest version of the ISOFIX system as developed by ISO/TC22/SC12 had two rigid lower anchorages only and in such arrangement easily complied with Regulation No. 44. The top tether was defended by some experts as providing additional protection against the rotation of the child restraint and reducing effectively its movement, whilst opposed by the others as unnecessary and prone to be misused.

20. Detailed consideration of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/11 was deferred to the twenty-third session.

(b) Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/1997/6; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165; informal documents Nos. 5, 10, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 24 of annex 1 to this report.

21. The Meeting of Experts was informed of the request made by the Working Party at its one-hundred-and-thirteenth session to consider the additional amendments which had been proposed by OICA to document TRANS/WP.29/1997/6. For the purpose of this consideration the proposals by OICA were distributed as informal document No. 5. It was noted that the proposal itself had been considered acceptable and the reconsideration was expected to be limited to the content of informal document No. 5 (TRANS/WP.29/599, para. 62).

22. Considering informal document No. 5, the Meeting of Experts did not accept the suggestion to limit the provisions related to the installation of universal child restraints to M1 category vehicles only. Besides the other reasons this was justified by the rules in the European Union, where M1 and N1 category vehicles belonged to the same category of use.

23. In view of the above decision (see para. 22) the expert from OICA prepared and distributed informal document No. 22, which was adopted by the Meeting of Experts with an amendment proposed by the Netherlands (informal document No. 24). The adopted text is reproduced in annex 3 to this report. The Meeting of Experts agreed to transmit the adopted text to the Working Party and to the Administrative Committee (AC.1) for consideration. With respect to the urgency of the matter, the secretariat was asked to prepare the relevant document in time for the eighth session of AC.1 (March 1998).

24. Considering the proposal by Germany concerning the safety-belts with load limiters and designed to be used in conjunction with an airbag (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165), the Meeting of Experts resumed consideration of that part of the document which had not been adopted into Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments (TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/21, para. 28). It was noted that the matter needed to be resolved with an urgency, because such safety-belts cannot be approved to Regulation No. 16, whilst performing well in the front impact test of Regulation No. 94, 01 series of amendments.

25. Referring to the above question (para. 24), the expert from CLEPA withdrew informal document No. 10 from consideration, noting that the majority of its matters of concern were addressed by informal document No. 16.

26. Informal document No. 16 tabled by Germany was discussed in detail, although its philosophy of testing the safety-belt on a trolley in conjunction with an airbag and using the Regulation No. 16 dummy was found not acceptable. The suggestion of informal document No. 19, submitted also by Germany, to introduce for safety-belts with load limiters a new test on a trolley, without an airbag, but from a speed reduced to [35 km/h], was also not accepted.

27. Instead, the Meeting of Experts favoured the proposal by the expert from the Netherlands (informal document No. 20), allowing the assessment of the performance of the safety-belts with load limiters on the basis of a dynamic test on a trolley, with the dummy conforming to Regulation No. 16, and requiring that the displacement speed measured on the thorax of the dummy (when the displacement exceeds 300 mm) must be less than [24 km/h]. It was also agreed that such safety-belts have an appropriate marking, showing that they should be used only in conjunction with an airbag.

28. The expert from the United Kingdom supported the proposal by the Netherlands (informal document No. 20), but had difficulties with the overall balance of advantage between reducing the safety-belt load and other risks, linked to the increased forward movement of the restrained occupant. He also said that it was the very first occasion where the very different approaches of testing safety-belts with load limiters were discussed. He therefore supported the idea that the proposal should be considered further and decisions postponed to the next session.

29. To allow for further study and development of the proposal, the Meeting of Experts entrusted the experts from France, Netherlands and Germany to consider and develop the proposals of informal document No. 20 into a working document to be considered at the next session. The experts were invited to respect the secretariat's 10-week document publication deadline (20 February 1998), allowing distribution of the documents prior the session.

(c) Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/4.

30. Considering the proposal by the Russian Federation (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/4), the discussion reviewed the views for and against this proposal, as considered during several previous sessions (TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/51, paras. 30-33). Research was made during the session by the secretariat in order to find the reasons which had been used to extend Regulation No. 29 in its 01 series of amendments (entered into force on 1 August 1977) also to vehicles of category N1. The abandoned attempts to modify Regulation No. 29 in line with the Swedish national rule were also recalled.

31. The discussions were concluded by the adoption of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/4 by majority. The expert from Italy made a reservation to this decision.

32. The Meeting of Experts decided to transmit the adopted document to the Working Party and to the Administrative Committee (AC.1) for consideration at its eighth session (March 1998). The expert from OICA said that the proposal would need to be introduced with an appropriate set of transitional provisions and indicated that they would be proposed by his organization at the March session of WP.29 and AC.1.

(d) Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/2.

33. The expert from the United States of America introduced document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/2 and explained that it aligned the original proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163) with the final rule which will become effective in his country on 1 September 1998.

34. The expert from the EEVC reported on the work by the Committee on the subject, very much aligned with the above proposal by the United States of America: he confirmed that after initial evaluations the same modified Hybrid III headform was being used and that the initial idea of testing vehicle subsystems had been abandoned and the tests were to be done on whole vehicles. He said that in this respect the merits of guided and free-flying headform were judged, but considered that the guided system would be awkward to be used inside vehicles. He estimated that the study should be concluded early next year and the results of the whole exercise presented to the next ESV Conference (Enhanced Safety Vehicles). He also said that the considered head impact points should correspond to the European situation (i.e. lateral impact), whilst the FMVSS rule considered the front, lateral and rear impacts.

35. In the following discussion the development of Regulation No. 21 towards harmonization with the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard FMVSS No. 201 was appreciated. However, it was noted that in the amending procedure an account remained to be taken of such new developments as e.g. the head protecting airbags. The expert from the Consumers International suggested that WP.29/GRSP might wish to invite the EEVC to consider also the situations of a frontal impact and of a vehicle roll-over; however, no formal action was taken.

36. The expert from Spain said that Regulation No. 21 had been developed in times of unpadding dashboards and its modernization was necessary. He indicated his intention to prepare for the next session a proposal addressing the same areas like FMVSS 201 and the EEVC work, but less complicated and easier to implement.

DRAFT REGULATION ON AIRBAGS

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148; informal documents Nos. 1, 3 and 6 of annex 1 to this report.

37. The Meeting of Experts noted the decision taken by the Working Party at its one-hundred-and-thirteenth session to withdraw the first proposal for the draft Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/R.790/Rev.1) from consideration (TRANS/WP.29/599, para. 73).

38. The ECE press release ECE/TRANS/97/3 was also noted (see annex 1 to this report), prepared as a contribution to informing the public of possible dangers of airbags, following the invitation by the Working Party at its one-hundred-and-twelfth session (TRANS/WP.29/534, para. 78). In this connection the statistics of injuries and fatalities by airbag deployments in the United States of America were distributed (Informal document No. 3).

39. The expert from Germany introduced informal document No. 6, modifying the proposal for the draft Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148) in line with the decision of the Meeting of Experts to limit its scope to aftermarket airbags (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/51, para. 38). He also provided justification for the modifications of the document proposed (informal document No. 1). Due to lack of time, only a brief discussion was held, however, the Meeting of Experts invited the secretariat to present the proposals of informal document No. 6 in a suitable form for consideration at the next session. The expert from Germany agreed to assist the secretariat in deciding if this should be a revision of the proposal, or an amendment to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148.

REGULATION No. 22 (Protective helmets)

Documentation: Informal document No. 21 of annex 1 to this report.

40. Consideration of this agenda item was deferred to the twenty-third session. The secretariat was invited to distribute informal document No. 21 with an official symbol.

OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/10; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/12; informal documents Nos. 8 and 23 of annex 1 to this report.

41. Document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/10 was introduced by the expert from the Consumers International. Using the examples of labels used in the United States of America in comparison with the European situation, he demanded that labelling of airbags should be improved and include the text information in the language of the country where the vehicle is sold. He recalled that forty-nine children had already been killed in the United States of America by airbag deployments (see para. 3 above, informal document No. 3) and that the U.S. NHTSA considered a switch allowing the vehicle user to disconnect the airbag in specified circumstances. He appreciated that in Europe the child restraints sold were appropriately marked with warnings in the language of the country of sale.

42. Justifications and explanations to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/12 were presented by the expert from the EEVC. In the discussion, the experts focused again on the question of the top tether (see also para. 19 above). The situation was repeated, with a group of experts claiming the top tether unnecessary, while its safety benefits were supported by others, mainly with respect to entirely uncontrolled quality and shape of the vehicle seat cushion on which the child restraint rested. In principle it was agreed that the top tether, correctly attached, improves the performance of a child restraint, including those attached by ISOFIX.

43. Positive experience with the use of the top tethers (but not in conjunction with ISOFIX) was reported by Australia (informal document No. 8). The expert from Canada distributed informal document No. 23, giving comparison data for the child restraints with and without the top tether. In this

connection, it was noted that also in Europe, even after the introduction of ISOFIX, the other types of child restraints would continue to exist.

44. The Meeting of Experts agreed to resume the consideration of the proposal for introducing ISOFIX restraints into Regulation No. 44 at its next session, leaving open the question of the top tether requirement. Further discussion at the next session was also foreseen of the question of airbag labelling (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/10).

(b) Regulation No. 94 (Frontal collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/10; informal document No. 2 of annex 1 to this report.

45. The intention was confirmed to continue the consideration of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/10 at the next session (see para. 44 above).

46. Informal document No. 2 was withdrawn by Italy, considering that further study was needed to introduce provisions concerning electric vehicles into Regulation No. 94.

(c) Amendments to passive safety Regulations intended to achieve coherence with Regulations Nos. 94 and 95 in their 01 series of amendments

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 7 and 15 of annex 1 to this report.

47. The Chairman of the Meeting of Experts summarized the results of the informal meeting held on the subject of alignment of Regulations Nos. 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21 and 33 in Rome, on 22 and 23 September. The informal meeting had concluded that of the Regulations concerned, Regulations Nos. 11 and 17 need not be amended. For Regulation No. 33 it had been recommended that its provisions itself should not be modified for the time being, but that the compliance with Regulation No. 94 should be offered as an alternative.

48. Informal document No. 7 was introduced by the expert from France, who explained the proposed modifications to Regulations Nos. 12, 16, 21 and 33, prepared as a follow-up of the informal meeting in Rome. The Meeting of Experts agreed to consider the proposals at its next session and the secretariat was requested to distribute them under separate official symbols.

(d) Regulation No. 12 (Steering systems)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/7.

49. The proposal by Spain was examined, but the Meeting of Experts agreed that it should be considered together with the amendments proposed to the Regulation in connection with its alignment to Regulation No. 94 (see para. 48 above).

(e) Regulation No. 80 (Strength of seats and their anchorages)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/9.

50. The proposal was considered and adopted and the Meeting of Experts agreed to transmit it to Working Party and to the Administrative Committee (AC.1) for consideration at its eighth session (March 1998) as a proposal for draft Supplement 1 to the Regulation.

(f) Tribute to Mr. K. Brettschneider

51. Learning that Mr. K. Brettschneider intends to retire before the next session, the Meeting of Experts thanked him for his work and wished him all the best for a long and happy retirement. In his address, Mr. Brettschneider acknowledged the support he had received from the members of WP.29/GRSP when recovering from his illness. He recalled his work in the area of passive safety and returned the wishes of success in future work to the Meeting of Experts.

AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SESSION

52. For the twenty-third session, to be held in Geneva from 4 May (14.30 h) to 8 May (12.30 h) 1998 1/, the Meeting of Experts agreed on the following agenda:

1. Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats)
2. Amendments to ECE Regulations
 - 2.1. Regulation No. 12 (Steering systems)
 - 2.2. Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorages)
 - 2.3. Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)
 - 2.4. Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)
 - 2.5. Regulation No. 33 (Head-on collision)
 - 2.6. Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)
 - 2.7. Regulation No. 94 (Frontal collision protection)
3. Draft Regulation on airbags - development
4. Regulation No. 22 (Protective helmets) 2/
5. Other business
 - 5.1. Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection)

1/ As part of the secretariat's efforts to reduce expenditure, all the official documents distributed prior to the session by mail will not be available in the conference room for distribution to session participants. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies of documents to the meeting.

2/ This item will be considered not earlier than Thursday afternoon, 7 May 1998.

Annex 1

LIST OF INFORMAL DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT A SYMBOL DURING THE SESSION

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
-	Secretariat	4.	E/F	Are Airbags Dangerous? Press Release ECE/TRANS/97/3
1.	Germany	4.	E	Justification of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148/Rev.1 - Proposal for a draft Regulation of replacement airbag system
2.	Italy	2.	E	Proposal for draft Supplement 01 to the 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 94
3.	Secretariat	4.	E	U.S. Airbag Deployment Injury/Fatality Statistics
4.	OICA	3.1.	E	Proposal for draft Supplement 1 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 14 (Redistribution of informal documents Nos. 13 and 13a to the 113th session of WP.29)
5.	OICA	3.2.	E	Proposal for draft Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 16 (Redistribution of informal doc. No. 16 to the 113th session of WP.29)
6.	Germany	4.	E	Proposal for a draft Regulation: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of: an airbag module for a replacement airbag system; a replacement steering wheel equipped with an airbag module of an approved type or without an airbag; replacement airbag device(s) other than those installed in a steering wheel
7.	France	6.3.	E/F	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulations Nos. 12, 16, 21 and 33 in order to harmonize them with Regulation No. 94-01
8.	Australia	6.1.	E	Australian experience with upper tether straps
9.	CLEPA	2.	E	Side impact deformable barrier CLEPA's position

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
10.	CLEPA	3.2.	E	Proposal for a draft amendment to Regulation No. 16
11.	Spain	1.	E	Annex to the Spanish proposal of amendment of Reg. R17
12.	CLEPA	1.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 17
13.	CLEPA	3.1.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 14
14.	OICA	3.1.	E	OICA proposal for a draft 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 14
15.	Italy	6.3.	E	Report of the informal GRSP meeting (Rome, 22-23 September 1997)
16.	Germany	3.2.	E	Draft proposed amendments to ECE Regulation 16 (Proposal of a working group from France, Netherlands and Germany to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165)
17.	EEVC	2.	E	EEVC MDB Face Evaluation Programme
18.	Secretariat	3.1.	E	Proposal for draft 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 14 (draft Revision 1 of document TRANS/WP.29/1997/5)
19.	Germany	3.2.	E	Proposal for discussion for a draft amendment of Regulation No. 16
20.	Netherlands	3.2.	E	Draft proposed amendments to Reg. 16
21.	Germany	5.	E	Draft proposal for 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 22
22.	OICA	3.2.	E	Proposed amendments to TRANS/WP.29/1997/6
23.	Canada	6.1.	E	Draft SAE paper: The effect of top tether strap configurations on child restraint performance (France Legault, Bill Gardner and Alex Vincent, Transport Canada)
24.	Netherlands	3.2.	E	Text of a new proposed para. 15.1.3.1.

Annex 2

PROPOSAL FOR DRAFT 05 SERIES OF AMENDMENTS TO REGULATION No. 14
ADOPTED BY THE MEETING OF EXPERTS AT ITS TWENTY-SECOND SESSION
(Revision of document TRANS/WP.29/1997/5,
based on the amended text of informal document No. 18)

Paragraph 4.2., amend to read:

".... Its first two digits (at present 05, corresponding to the 05 series of amendments) shall indicate the series"

Paragraph 7., amend to read:

"7. INSPECTION DURING AND AFTER TESTING"

Insert a new paragraph 7.1.1., to read:

"7.1.1. For vehicles of category M1 of a total permissible mass not exceeding 2.5 tonnes, if the upper safety-belt anchorage is attached to the seat structure, the effective upper safety-belt anchorage shall not be displaced during the test forward of a transverse plane passing through the R-point and point C of the seat in question (see figure 1 of annex 3 to this Regulation).

[For vehicles of other categories than mentioned above the effective upper safety-belt anchorage shall not be displaced during the test forward of a transverse plane inclined 10° in forward direction and passing through the R-point of the seat.]

The maximum displacement of the effective upper anchorage point shall be measured during the test.

If the displacement of the effective upper anchorage point exceeds the above-mentioned limitation, the manufacturer shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the technical service that there is no danger to the occupant. As an example, the test procedure according to Regulation No. 94 or a sled test with corresponding pulse may be carried out to demonstrate a sufficient survival space."

Paragraphs 14. to 14.3., replace by the following text:

"14. TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

14.1. As from the official date of entry into force of the 05 series of amendments, no Contracting Party applying this Regulation shall refuse to grant ECE approvals under this Regulation as amended by the 05 series of amendments.

14.2. As from 12 1/ months after the date of entry into force of the 05 series of amendments to this Regulation, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation shall grant ECE approvals only if the

requirements of this Regulation, as amended by the 05 series of amendments, are satisfied.

- 14.3. As from 36 1/ months after the date of entry into force of the 05 series of amendments to this Regulation, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may refuse to recognize approvals which were not granted in accordance with the 05 series of amendments to this Regulation.
- 14.4. For vehicles not affected by paragraph 7.1.1. above, approvals granted according to according to the 04 series of amendments to this Regulation shall remain valid."

Annex 2, in the examples of the approval marks and in the captions below amend the approval number "042439" to read "052439" (3 times, related to Regulation No. 14). In addition, in the caption below Model A of the approval mark amend the words "04 series of amendments" to read "05 series of amendments". The caption below Model B of the approval mark amend to read as follows (footnote */ not modified):

".... on the dates on which these approvals were granted Regulation No. 14 included the 05 series of amendments and Regulation No. 24 was in its 03 series of amendments."

1/ Note by the secretariat, (see paras. 3 and 16 of the report):

1. The draft 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17 had been adopted by AC.1 at its sixth session (June 97). (For the transmission by the UN Secretary-General to the Contracting Parties to the Regulation, working document TRANS/WP.29/1997/7 was converted into final document TRANS/WP.29/601, dated 11 Dec. 1997). Expecting the usual 10 months needed from the adoption by AC.1, the date of entry into force may be estimated to [September 1998].

2. In document TRANS/WP.29/601:

- (a) Paragraph 13.2. reads "As from 24 months after the date of entry into force...", i.e. its provision should be applicable as from [September 2000].
- (b) Paragraph 13.3. reads "As from 48 months after the date of entry into force...", i.e. its provision should be applicable as from [September 2002].

3. If adopted by AC.1 in March 1998, the 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 14 should enter into force about 10 months later (see item 1.), i.e. in [January 1999]. To align its transitional provisions with those of the 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17:

- (a) Paragraph 14.2. should be applicable as from [September 2000] (see item 2.(a) above), i.e. **20 months after [January 1999]**.
- (b) Paragraph 14.3. should be applicable as from [September 2002] (see item 2.(b) above), i.e. **44 months after [January 1999]**.

4. Conclusion: Taking account of the authorization by the Meeting of Experts, paragraphs 14.2. and 14.3. were modified by the secretariat to read **20 months** and **44 months** respectively (see doc. TRANS/WP.29/1998/25).

Annex 3

ADDITIONAL DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSAL FOR DRAFT SUPPLEMENT 8 TO THE 04 SERIES OF AMENDMENTS TO REGULATION No. 16 ADOPTED BY THE MEETING OF EXPERTS (Document TRANS/WP.29/1997/6)

Paragraphs 2.18.1. to 2.1.18.3. (former), the proposal for renumbering of these paragraphs is erroneous and should be deleted.

Paragraph 6.4.1.2.4.1., renumber as paragraph 6.4.1.2.4., and amend to read:

"6.4.1.2.4. In the case of safety-belt with a preloading device the minimum displacement specified in paragraph 6.4.1.3.2. below may be reduced by half. For the purpose of this test, the preloading device shall be in operation."

Paragraph 8.3.5. (new), amend to read:

"8.3.5. In order to inform vehicle user(s) of the provisions made for the transport of children, vehicles of categories M₁ and N₁ shall meet the information requirements of annex 17."

Paragraphs 15.1.2. and 15.1.3. (new), amend to read:

"15.1.2. As from 1 October 1999, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation shall grant ECE approvals only if the requirements of this Regulation, as amended by Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments, are satisfied.

15.1.3. As from 1 October 2001, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may refuse to recognize approvals which were not granted in accordance with Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments to this Regulation."

Insert a new paragraph 15.1.3.1., to read:

"15.1.3.1.1. However, as from [1 October 2000], for vehicles of categories M₁ and N₁, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may refuse to recognize ECE approvals which were not granted in accordance with Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments to this Regulation, if the information requirements of paragraph 8.3.5. and annex 17 are not met."

Annex 17 (new), the title, amend to read:

"REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF SAFETY-BELTS AND RESTRAINT SYSTEMS FOR ADULT OCCUPANTS OF POWER-DRIVEN VEHICLES ON FORWARD FACING SEATS"
