

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE INFORMAL GROUP DEALING WITH THE ROOF
STRENGTH OF BUSES (R.66)
(Presented by Hungary and Spain)

1. Antecedents

- GRSG on its last meeting (April, 2005) discussed the question of the scope of R.66, based on the report and proposal of a voluntary ad-hoc group (GRSG-88-09)
- 11 delegates (Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden, UK and European Commission) supported the establishment of an official informal group and asked the chairman (Mr. Erario) to get the agreement of WP.29.
- Because of lack of time GRSG could not finalized the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the informal group. The GRSG chairman asked the involved delegates to hold a new voluntary ad-hoc meeting for determining the ToR. Spain offered to organize this meeting.

2. Reconciliation by e-mail

- The majority of the involved delegates recognized that it would be more effective (cost and time effective) to work by e-mail instead of organizing a meeting
- Spain and Hungary prepared a draft for ToR, based on the original proposal of the voluntary ad-hoc group (see para.5 in doc. GRSG-88-09) and considering EC's "Declaration" to this subject (presented both in WP.29 and GRSG) as well as the discussion about this subject in GRSG.
- This draft was circulated among the involved delegates for comments, proposals, modifications. The delegates were asked whether they need a meeting to determine the ToR, but there was no demand for that.
- The delegates were asked about the chairman of the informal group, too. There were three options, based on the antecedents.
- 9 delegates contributed and made proposal for the ToR (Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden, UK and EC) and 7 delegates for the chairmanship.

3. Proposal for ToR and chairmanship

- Considering the delegates proposals making more precise the earlier draft, the following ToR is proposed to WP.29 as the opinion of the majority:

"The task of the informal group (IG) is to collect and evaluate available, existing accident statistics and in depth accident analysis about rollover accidents of all bus categories in different countries and conclude to a required protection level for all bus categories in rollover, including small buses and double deck buses as well. Considering the results of this study the IG shall formulate conclusions on extending the scope of R.66 to other bus categories and the technical research needed to enhance safety in bus rollover accidents. Based on the conclusions of the accident analysis and technical research, the IG shall propose work programs for amendments to R.66 and other actions to enhance safety in bus rollover accidents. The IG shall determine its preliminary time table on its first meeting and shall report briefly about its major progress to every GRSG meeting."

- The majority of the delegates (7) suggested a co-chairmanship: Dr. Matolcsy (Hungary) and Prof. Aparicio (Spain) should be co-chairmen and they shall share the job and work between each other.

4. Notes, comments, explanations:

- The final version of the ToR is the result of the contribution of 7 delegates making more precise and clearer the draft, but do not change its essential content.
- UK proposed the widening of the whole work, including the accident analysis and to extend it to all kind of bus accidents (not only rollover) and injury causation factors. “Depending on the results of this study GRSG shall consider the findings and the necessity for amendment to UNECE Regulations, providing information to WP.29 if outwith the scope of GRSG. If necessary, recommendations about the technical research needed to produce amendments to UNECE Regulations shall also be made.”
- UK expressed this opinion on the GRSG meeting in the discussion, too, but the majority of the delegates did not support this approach saying that this could be an unlimited, endless work which is not the task of GRSG “We do not think that a group of vehicle experts that volunteers to work-out the technical prescriptions for such a subject is competent to gather and interpret the accident data in a professional manner” (Polish opinion) The delegates could not finance this very wide accident research and it could decelerate the work. When working on the first version of R.66 (1976-1982) we had a rollover accident statistics about 30-35 events, and now we have already 10-12 times more. (350-400 rollover accidents)
- EC urged the acceleration of the action. “The issue of safety of people transported in coaches is very sensitive in “Brussels” and there is a pressure urging us to improve safety on those vehicles (...) We do not deny that collection of accident data being important in order to have a sound basis for the decision making process. However, a lot of studies of high value on the subject are already available.”

Even there were no formulated proposals in the EC comments to the draft, the modifications, corrections are in line with this EC recommendations.

- There was no reaction from Germany to the circulated ToR draft, but the German GRSG delegate supported the earlier version, proposed by the Madrid ad-hoc group to GRSG. The newer modifications are improvement and did not change the essential philosophy of ToR. So it may be supposed that it is not against the German opinion.

- - - - -