India's comments on ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20 and ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22

Note: The proposals by France (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20) and Germany (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22) are acceptable for India in principle. However, the expert from India proposes the following amendments to paragraphs 6.13.2. and 6.13.4.2.:  

A. PROPOSAL

Paragraph 6.13.2., amend to read:

"6.13.2. Number  
Front: Two visible from the front  
Rear: Two visible from the front and optionally two additional lamps visible from the rear when fitted in accordance with paragraph 6.13.4.2."

Paragraph 6.13.4.2., amend to read:

"6.13.4.2. In height:  
Front: ….  
Rear: At the maximum height compatible with the requirements relating to the width, design and operational requirements of the vehicle and to the symmetry of the lamps.  

The additional lamps as referred to paragraph 6.13.2. may be grouped with other rear lamps at a minimum possible height compatible with the requirements relating to the design and operational requirements of the vehicle and to the symmetry of the lamps."

B. JUSTIFICATION

According to our understanding, proposed additional two end-outline marker lamps may be optionally fitted on the rear side of the vehicle and may be independent or grouped with other lamps. However, ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/22 provides:  
"Two visible from the front and two visible from the rear.  
Optional: two additional lamps visible from the front."

This shows that, two visible from the rear (optional) is repeating in front. India believes that this is not the case.

Similarly, ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/20 provides:

"Front: Two visible from the front  
Rear: Two visible from the front or four visible from the rear when fitted in accordance with paragraph 6.13.4.2."

Here for the rear, requirements showing in front.