PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENT TO ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2007/106

A. PROPOSAL (Provisions for vehicle stability control systems)

Add a new footnote in paragraph 5.2.1.32, to read:

"5.2.1.32. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 12.4. to this Regulation, all vehicles in categories M2, M3, N2 and N3 shall be equipped with a stability control function. This shall include roll-over control and directional control and meet the technical requirements of Annex 21." */

Add a new footnote in paragraph 5.2.2.23, to read:

"5.2.2.23. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 12.4. to this Regulation, all vehicles in categories O3 and O4 shall be equipped with a stability control function. This shall include at least roll-over control and meet the technical requirements of Annex 21." */

*/ It may be reserved not to mandate this function on the basis of national regulations.

B. JUSTIFICATION

Japan is not favorable to mandate EVSC installation for vehicles except M1/N1 categories. It is too early to mandate such a wide category at one time, because testing method is not still mature and the patterns of accidents are different between Europe and Japan. (Analysis result of accidents in Germany and Japan is attached for reference.). ADR vehicles and long distance touring busses and coaches categories are considered for mandatory at first. And we think it appropriate for the first step. But we also understand the European situation that EVSC installation is very important and urgent matter. Therefore we propose the compromise proposal considering upper situations. Our proposal makes it possible not to mandate EVSC installation on the basis of national regulations. But considering the formal proposal has been already submitted from EC to WP.29, we added the footnote in our proposal to minimize modification.
The comparison of accident cause between Germany and Japan for vehicles of the classes N2, N3, and M3

Germany

The accidents caused by curve departure and collision with obstacle in same lane are 12.2% of all the accidents. (Those accidents are considered to be EVSC relevant according to informal document of EVSC06-11.)

- Collision with obstacle in same lane, 65, 0.6%
- Curve departure right side, 834, 7.2%
- Curve departure left side, 512, 4.4%
- Running into oncoming vehicle, 809, 7.0%
- Running into back of moving or slowing/stationary vehicle, 1009, 8.7%
- Running into joining traffic flow at side-junction/X roads, 2519, 21.8%
- Turning into overtaking vehicle, 1250, 10.8%
- Running into pulling-out or parked vehicle, 3068, 26.5%
- Accidents for other reasons, 1490, 12.9%

Japan

The accidents caused by curve departure, collision with obstacle and rollover are only 1.2% of all the accidents in Japan.

- Collision with obstacle and curve departure (except straight line road), 128, 0.4%
- Rollover, 26, 0.1%
- Running into head-on, 724, 2.5%
- Running into oncoming vehicle, 561, 1.9%
- Running into back of moving or slowing/stationary vehicle, 10584, 36.4%
- Running into joining traffic flow at side-junction/X roads, 5412, 18.6%
- Accidents for other reasons, 11467, 39.4%

(包括ing running into parked vehicle, running into overtaking vehicle)

Reference
1. Sources: Germany; EVSC06-11 Accidents in 2004, Japan; ITARDA (Institute for Traffic Accident Research and Data Analysis) The average of the number of accidents from 2004 to 2006 during 3 years
2. Total analysis number of accidents; Germany 11556, Japan 29096
3. Collisions with pedestrian(s) are excluded.