

This document describes Japan’s stance on the points shown in IWVTA-02-08. As regards amendment of the 1958 Agreement, it’s possible that we will propose amendments based on the results of discussions on the IWVTA concept, etc. in addition to the matters described herein. Furthermore, the points shown in IWVTA-02-08 that are related to the IWVTA should also be discussed based on the results of discussions on the IWVTA concept.

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>14</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether the provisions of the 1958 Agreement in relation to the criteria for establishing of new Regulations are sufficiently clear and detailed or whether there would be a need for addressing these in the review of the 1958 Agreement to provide further detail and precision. - whether, as a matter of principle and for the sake of ensuring and promoting mutual recognition, it would be appropriate to maintain in these criteria the possibility of including alternatives in the technical requirements. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provisions of the 1958 Agreement are clear enough and do not need to be detailed more for explaining and considering the objectives of proposed new regulations. 2. However it is considered appropriate to add into the justification part of a draft new regulation the explanation of technical and economic feasibility. 3. Instead of having the possibility of including alternatives in the technical requirements, it is considered appropriate to allow application of previous versions of the UNECE Regulations with issuance by the Administrative Department of the Contracting Party of a document equivalent to the communication on type approval. Such a document can be accepted by the Contracting Party mandating the previous versions of the UNECE Regulations in its territory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no particular problem with the current Agreement in establishing regulations. Thus, there is no need to amend the 1958 Agreement for this. ● For discussing, the definition of “alternative in the technical requirements” should be clarified first. (Does it mean the different test procedures for the same level technical requirements or the different level of technical requirements?) ● In order to make it easy for various countries to join the new Agreement, the possibility of including alternatives in the technical requirements as well as the framework where each Contracting Party can choose whether or not they apply such alternative requirements should be maintained. However, to prevent regulations from being overcrowded with alternative requirements, there should be a framework where they are limited to minimum extent.

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>15</p> <p>Similar to the considerations with regard to the criteria for establishing new Regulations, the informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether the provisions of the 1958 Agreement in relation to the criteria for amending existing Regulations are sufficiently clear and detailed or whether there would be a need for addressing these in the review of the 1958 Agreement to provide further detail and precision. - whether, as a matter of principle and for the sake of ensuring and promoting mutual recognition, it is appropriate to maintain in these criteria the possibility of including the existing requirements as an alternative. - associated questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ the need for stocktaking / consolidation / codification of existing Regulations, amendments and corrections ? ◦ the possible need for splitting existing Regulations covering a multitude of different topics into separate Regulations? ◦ clarification on how to deal with amendments / corrections to existing Regulations for type approvals issued based on the existing Regulation? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Similar to the considerations with regard to the criteria for establishing new Regulations the provisions of the 1958 Agreement are clear enough and do not need to be detailed more for explaining and considering the objectives of proposed amendments to the regulations. 2. Perhaps it would be reasonable to clarify the possibility of application of the previous version of the Regulation in question and issuance of a document concerning compliance to that previous version within the framework of the 1958 Agreement. 3. The stocktaking / consolidation / codification of existing Regulations, amendments and corrections is well performed by the UNECE secretariat. 4. The Russian Federation has already raised the issue of the need for splitting existing Regulations covering a multitude of different topics into separate Regulations. This activity shall be included into the WP.29 workplan. 5. The clarification on how to deal with amendments / corrections to existing Regulations for type approvals issued based on the existing Regulation shall be described in the Regulation in question, whether the existing type approvals will remain valid or have to be renewed. That depends on the content of the technical provisions. It should be taken into consideration that the Contracting Parties may keep applying the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no particular problem with the current Agreement in amending regulations. Thus, there is no need to amend the 1958 Agreement for this. ● In order to make it easy for various countries to join the new Agreement, the possibility of including the existing requirements as an alternative in the technical requirements as well as the framework where each Contracting Party can choose whether or not they apply such alternative requirements should be maintained. However, to prevent regulations from being overcrowded with alternative requirements, there should be a framework where they are limited to minimum extent. ● At this point, we don't see any specific needs for stocktaking / consolidation / codification of existing Regulations, amendments and corrections. ● Agree to split existing Regulations covering a multitude of different topics into separate Regulations. ● There is no particular problem with the

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
	previous version of the Regulation in question.	current Agreement on how to deal with amendments / corrections to existing Regulations for type approvals issued based on the existing Regulation. Thus, there is no need to amend the 1958 Agreement for this.
<p>16</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether the provisions of the 1958 Agreement in relation to the procedure for the adoption of new Regulations and amendments to existing Regulations are sufficient or whether there would be any issue with regard to the procedure for voting, notification, objection and entry into force that needs to be improved and addressed in the review of the 1958 Agreement. - in particular, whether, as a matter of principle and for the sake of ensuring mutual recognition based on the IWVTA concept, it would be appropriate to maintain in these provisions the possibility for a Contracting Party to object or to disagree with an adopted new Regulation or adopted amendment to an existing Regulation and as a consequence this adopted Regulation or amendment would not enter into force for such Contracting Party. - whether there would be a need to cover in the 1958 Agreement a special, accelerated adoption procedure in case an urgent 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proposed to shorten the period between adoption and entry into force of new Regulations and amendments to existing Regulations, which, however, shall include introductory / transitional provisions stipulating the delay of application of the newly adopted Regulations or their amendments. 2. There is no actual need for the Contracting Party to have a possibility to object or to disagree with an adopted new Regulation or adopted amendment to an existing Regulation within the framework of the 1958 Agreement. Instead of that the Contracting Party may or may not require in its territory the mandatory application of the new Regulation / amendment to the existing Regulation. 3. The Russian Federation does not see any reason for the need for a special, accelerated adoption procedure. The same adoption procedure shall be followed for all cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no particular problem with the procedures for voting, notification, objection and entry into force. However, regarding the number of votes required for establishing/amending a regulation, etc., we need to hear opinions of various countries from the standpoints of ensuring that the opinions of Contracting Parties are properly reflected and of making sure that regulations are amended appropriately and swiftly, while keeping in mind the possibility of various countries joining the Agreement. ● In order to make it easy for various countries to join the new Agreement, the right to object or disagree should be granted as before. ● As regards an urgent regulatory need, it has been, to date, addressed by advancing deliberations as far as possible, and there is no particular problem with this current method. ● Further, even if an “accelerated adoption

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
regulatory need would arise.		procedure” is to be provided, we need to restrict it, for preventing overuse of such procedure, by, for example, limiting its entry into force to when an urgent safety/environmental problem is deemed to exist.
<p>17</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to include within the inventory and the roadmap the issue of quality of rulemaking, with a view to develop measures and commonly agreed criteria to guarantee an acceptable level of safety, environmental protection or energy performance and to ensure that only high quality and unambiguous texts are adopted and problems of interpretation of existing Regulations are addressed. - which of the provisions of ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059, and/or any other elements – either existing or new, could serve as a basis for developing the above measures as part of the review of the UNECE 1958 Agreement. 	The Russian Federation agrees that such an activity is reasonable, but does not have particular proposals for the time being.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● While unambiguous texts are desirable, how detailed or clear the texts can vary depending on each system, part, etc., and it is therefore difficult to specify requirements that are effective across all the regulations in the text of the Agreement. Instead, this issue should be addressed in discussions on establishment/amendment of each regulation. ● No problem to use ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059 as a basis for discussions.
<p>18</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement and the aim of establishing mutual recognition of vehicle type approvals 	The Russian Federation does not have particular proposals on this subject.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no particular problem with the current Agreement in establishing/amending regulations. Thus, there is no need to amend the 1958 Agreement for this.

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>based on the IWVTA concept, a re-assessment of the different above mentioned rights and obligations for Contracting Parties arising from an adopted Regulation or amendment to an existing Regulation would be appropriate, and in which way these rights and obligations could be improved to support a better and wider application of the Regulations annexed to the 1958 Agreement.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In order to make it easy for various countries to join the new Agreement, the right to object, etc. should be maintained.
<p>19</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement and the aim of establishing mutual recognition of type approvals based on the IWVTA concept, it would be appropriate to maintain within the provisions of the Agreement a reference to other administrative procedures alternative to type-approval (such a self-certification), and - in the light of the above assessment, the need to reformulate the references to “<i>a Contracting Party applying a Regulation through type approval</i>” in Articles 2 to 5. 	<p>The Russian Federation does not see any reason to keep in the 1958 Agreement a reference to other administrative procedures alternative to type-approval.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unless otherwise requested by other Contracting Parties, there is no need to maintain any reference to “other administrative procedures alternative to type-approval (such a self-certification)” in the provisions. ● In the light of the above, we need to reformulate appropriately the references to “a Contracting Party applying a Regulation through type approval” in Articles 2 to 5.
<p>20</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement and with the aim of establishing mutual recognition of type approvals based on the IWVTA concept, it would be appropriate to include in the main 	<p>The Russian Federation agrees with the proposal to include in the main body of the 1958 Agreement provisions governing the main principles to be applied for the application for type approval taking into account the existing EU legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is desirable to uniform the type approval application procedures, including application documents, sample vehicles, etc. to be submitted, to the extent necessary. ● Since they can be changed based on the actual operations of test or approval, they should be

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>body of the 1958 Agreement provisions governing the main principles to be applied for the application for type approval, with a view to ensure their consistent application to all Regulations annexed to the 1958 Agreement and to enable a simplification of the Regulations themselves by avoiding the repetition of each of these main principles in every Regulation, and by limiting the application provisions to be specified in each Regulation to the specificities of the equipment or parts covered by that Regulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether the approach followed in the EU legislation for the procedure to be followed for the type-approval of vehicles could serve as a basis for developing the application procedure for the IWVTA concept. 		<p>based on regulations or guidelines that allow for swift amendment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EU legislation is for harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore, while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.
<p>21</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement and with the aim of establishing mutual recognition of type approvals based on the IWVTA concept, it would be appropriate to include in or append to the 1958 Agreement provisions governing the procedures to be followed with respect to type approval, with a view to complement the more specific and technical provisions on testing methods specified in each of the Regulations annexed to the 1958 Agreement. - whether the approach followed in the EU 	<p>The Russian Federation agrees with the proposal to include in or append to the 1958 Agreement provisions governing the procedures to be followed with respect to type approval taking into account the existing EU legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is desirable to uniform the approval procedures to the extent necessary. ● Since they can be changed based on the actual operations of test or approval, they should be based on regulations or guidelines that allow for swift amendment. ● How about providing a place where approval authorities and technical services, discuss establishment, amendment, interpretation, etc. of the regulations or guidelines on approval procedures (including test procedures)?

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>legislation for the procedure to be followed with respect to type-approval could serve as a basis for including or appending such provisions to the 1958 Agreement.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EU legislation is for harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore, while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.
<p>22</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider whether, with a view to improve the functioning of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - expand the provisions of (article 2 of) the 1958 Agreement to clarify that type-approval shall be based on demonstration of compliance by means of appropriate tests; - specify that, for the selection of the type to be tested, the principle of worst casing shall be applied, in line with the provisions of ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059; - specify the minimum information to be provided in the test report the technical services have to submit to the approval authority - include within the 1958 Agreement the provisions on type-approval documentation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demonstration of compliance may be done by other means, like virtual testing, for example. However, it should be stated that the certain evidence of correctness of applied means shall be provided. 2. The Russian Federation agrees that the principle of the worst case shall be applied. 3. The Russian Federation agrees to include within the 1958 Agreement the provisions on type-approval documentation as specified in Chapter E of guidance document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to clarify in the text of the Agreement that type-approval shall be based on demonstration of compliance by means of appropriate tests. ● It is desirable to uniform the principle of worst casing, test report, documents necessary for type approval, etc. to the extent necessary. ● Since they can be changed based on the actual operations of test or approval, they should be based on regulations or guidelines that allow for swift amendment. ● How about providing a place where approval authorities and technical services, etc. discuss establishment, amendment, interpretation, etc. of the regulations or guidelines on approval procedures (including test procedures)? ● No problem to use ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059 as a basis for discussions.

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
as specified in Chapter E of guidance document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059		
<p>23</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, in the context of the review of the 1958 Agreement and with the aim of establishing mutual recognition of type approvals based on the IWVTA concept, it would be appropriate to include in the 1958 Agreement specific provisions enabling self-testing and virtual testing. - whether the approach followed in the EU legislation for self-testing and virtual testing could serve as a basis for including or appending such provisions to the 1958 Agreement. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Russian Federation agrees with the proposal to include in the 1958 Agreement specific provisions enabling self-testing and virtual testing especially for the purpose of checking the conformity of production. The Russian national legislation allows for certain cases submission of self-test reports for the type approval purpose. 2. The virtual testing may substitute the physical testing (see the position above). The existing EU legislation can be taken into account in this regard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For a reasonable and efficient type approval, alternative specific testing methods should be allowed. For discussing the definitions of self testing and virtual testing should be clarified first, and, for example, the allowable range of self-testing and virtual testing, its method, etc. should be stipulated in regulations so as to prevent too much variance among Contracting Parties in performing such testing. ● In doing so, adequate consideration should also be given to the experiences in self-testing and virtual testing currently conducted in each country's type approval. ● In addition, how about providing a place where approval authorities and technical services, discuss establishment, amendment, interpretation, etc. of the regulations or guidelines on these test procedures? ● The EU legislation premises harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore,

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
		<p>while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.</p>
<p>24</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether, with a view to improve the functioning of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to include in the 1958 Agreement specific provisions to deal with new technologies, based on the special amendment provisions of Chapter B of document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059; - whether the approach followed in the EU legislation for type-approval of new technologies could serve as a basis for including similar provisions in the 1958 Agreement. 	<p>The Russian Federation considers appropriate to include in the 1958 Agreement specific provisions to deal with new technologies taking into account the approach followed in the EU legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A framework where new rules can be swiftly developed is necessary for when new technologies have emerged and no corresponding regulation exists. ● However, the way to deal with a new technology varies depending on each case, and thus it is not suitable to provide for the uniform handling method for dealing with new technologies in the Agreement. Rather, it is desirable to address each case in a flexible manner in the form of guidelines such as ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059.
<p>25</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether it would be appropriate to expand the provisions of Article 2 of the 1958 Agreement to specify all conditions necessary for granting type approval. - whether the provisions of Article 5 may benefit from being amended to also include procedures to be followed in the case of amendments to type-approvals or refusal or withdrawal of type-approvals and conditions 	<p>The Russian Federation considers appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to expand the provisions of Article 2 of the 1958 Agreement to specify all conditions necessary for granting type approval; - to include into the Article 5 the procedures to be followed in the case of amendments to type-approvals or refusal or withdrawal of type-approvals and conditions for the termination of their validity. <p>The approach applied by the EU can be taken into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● General provisions on the conditions for granting, amending, or withdrawing type approvals, etc. are effective from the standpoint of preventing discrepancies in the quality of type approval among Contracting Parties. ● Since they can be changed based on the actual operations of test or approval, they should be based on rules or guidelines that allow for swift amendment.

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>for the termination of their validity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether the approach followed in the EU legislation with regard to the amendments to and validity of type approvals can serve as a basis for reviewing and enhancing the provisions of the 1958 Agreement. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EU legislation is for harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore, while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.
<p>26</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider whether, with a view to improve the functioning of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review the provisions of Appendix 2 to the 1958 Agreement to enhance the requirements governing the procedures for ensuring conformity of production and to specify any corrective and restrictive measures to be taken by the type approval authority in case these procedures would not (longer) be respected, - consider whether the approach followed in the EU legislation with regard to the Conformity of Production can serve as a basis for reviewing and enhancing the CoP provisions of the 1958 Agreement. 	<p>The Russian Federation agrees that the CoP procedures in the 1958 Agreement should be improved, and the EU legislative approach, as well as the Russian approach to the same issue, can be taken into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is appropriate to clarify the requirements governing the procedures for ensuring COP procedures in the Agreement. ● It is also necessary to clarify the responsibilities of the approving country for ensuring the COP (appropriate assessment of the type, appropriate assessment of the manufacturer, instruction/supervision/audit for the manufacturer, etc.). ● The EU legislation is for harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore, while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>27</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider whether, with a view to improve the functioning of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better clarify and specify the rights and obligations of manufacturers in relation to the type-approval procedure and the conformity of production, - consider the introduction of a certificate of conformity to be issued by the manufacturer for his production vehicles, to confirm their conformity with the vehicle type for which the manufacturer holds a type-approval. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Russian Federation agrees that the rights and obligations of manufacturers shall be better clarified and specified. 2. The Russian Federation legislation provides for a document identifying a vehicle owner and containing the information on the type approval document for that vehicle. Without this information the vehicle owner cannot acquire the registration plates. The type approval certificate number is also appeared on the manufacturer's plate on a vehicle. From this standpoint it seems not reasonable to introduce a certificate of conformity. 	<p>with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No problem to specify general provisions on rights and obligations of the manufacturer to the extent necessary, such as submitting documents and test vehicles necessary for approval testing and manufacturing vehicles of the same type as the approved type. ● Since the detail of them can be changed based on the actual operations of test or approval, the main principle should be based on the Agreement, and the details should be based on regulations or guidelines that allow for swift amendment. ● The COC would change depending on the IWVTA concept that is being discussed. Thus, discussions on COC should be based on the results of discussions on the IWVTA concept.
<p>28</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether it would be appropriate to expand the provisions of the 1958 Agreement to specify the procedure for exchange of information and for consultation between Contracting Parties in case interpretation would arise either prior or subsequent to type approval 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Russian Federation agrees that the provisions of the 1958 Agreement can be expanded to specify the procedure for exchange of information and for consultation between Contracting Parties. 2. The Russian Federation considers desirable to set up a data storage and retrieval system. 3. The Russian Federation considers that the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no particular problem with the provisions in the current Agreement on how to resolve conflicts between Contracting Parties, including those under ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059. Thus, there is no need to amend the Agreement for this. If the procedures under ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059 were problematic because they are based on guidelines and this needed to be mentioned

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>being granted, by introducing the principles and procedures specified in Chapter A of Guidance document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether for the purpose of facilitating information exchange between Contracting Parties it would be desirable and feasible to set up a data storage and retrieval system (to be addressed by the DETA informal group?) - whether the provisions of Article 3 may benefit from being amended to clarify the criteria and procedures to be followed for a Contracting Party to designate another country (not being a Contracting Party applying the Regulations concerned) in which territory vehicles are manufactured for which that Contracting Party has issued the type-approval, as well as the criteria according to which such vehicles can be held to in conformity with the applicable Regulations - whether the provisions of Article 5 may need to be improved by clarifying the details of the type-approval information that shall be made available upon request, based on the guidance provided in Chapter E of guidance document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059. 	<p>manufacturer, whose product has been granted a type approval, is fully responsible for assuring conformity of production. From this standpoint it seems there is no need to amend Article 3 of the 1958 Agreement as proposed by the EU.</p> <p>4. The Russian Federation agrees that the provisions of the Article 5 of the 1958 Agreement may need to be improved by clarifying the details of the type-approval information that shall be made available upon request.</p>	<p>in the Agreement, specific problems should be identified first and then discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A data storage and retrieval system is effective and should be specified as regulations or guidelines. ● As regards clarification of “criteria and procedures to be followed for a Contracting Party to designate another country (not being a Contracting Party applying the Regulations concerned) in which territory vehicles are manufactured for which that Contracting Party has issued the type-approval”, there is no particular problem with the current Agreement. If amendment were necessary, specific problems should be identified first and then discussed. ● Exchange of information on type approval between Contracting Parties is sufficiently guaranteed under Article 5, and there is no need to amend the Agreement for this. If amendment were necessary, specific problems should be identified first and then discussed.
<p>29</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the need to define, within the 1958 	<p>The Russian Federation agrees with the proposed improvements of the provisions of the 1958 Agreement related to technical services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Since technical services have large responsibilities in type approval, it is necessary to define their roles and responsibilities as well as to specify the

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>Agreement, the role and responsibilities of technical services, as well as the criteria for the assessment of their competence and their designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the provisions in Chapter D and Annexes 1 and 2 of guidance document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059 as a basis for developing appropriate requirements on technical services within the 1958 Agreement. - whether the updated requirements on conformity assessment bodies adopted by the European Union in the context of its framework legislation on the marketing of products could serve as a basis for improving and complementing the criteria for technical services as specified in ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059. 		<p>criteria for evaluation/designation of technical services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Note that since positioning (public or private, dedicated or not, etc.), quality control procedures, etc. vary depending on each technical service, instead of formal requirements (acquisition of ISO, etc.), general capability requirements (to be approved by the approval authorities to be capable of performing reliable assessment of compliance with the standards according to the regulations under the Agreement) should be provided. ● The EU legislation is for harmonization of regulations and mutual recognition of approvals in the EU as mandatory requirements and is also based on the EU's legal systems, institutions, facilities, organizations, environment, etc. Therefore, while it is no problem to use it for reference, it is not appropriate to use it as is (or only with partial changes) as a basis for the 1958 Agreement.
<p>30</p> <p>The informal group is invited to consider whether, with a view to improve the functioning of the 1958 Agreement, it would be appropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introduce more rigorous and defined safeguard 	<p>1. The Russian Federation considers appropriate to introduce in the 1958 Agreement the uniform detailed measures on protection of the national markets from products (both vehicles and components) that do not comply with the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Under the current 1958 Agreement, even if a vehicle, etc. had once been accepted through mutual recognition, when its non-compliance with the regulation or non-conformity with the type has been found, the right to prohibit

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
<p>requirements, and to use for that purpose the examples provided in the EU legislation on the type-approval of motor vehicles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introduce provisions on market surveillance, using the EU framework legislation on market surveillance as an example. - develop and introduce specific provisions relating to the recall of vehicles, by specifying the respective obligations and responsibilities of the parties involved (manufacturers, Contracting Party demanding the recall, Contracting Party that issued the type approval for the type of vehicle concerned, other Contracting Parties applying the Regulations concerned; - to review the dispute settlement procedure in Article 10, and in particular to re-assess the appropriateness of allowing new Contracting Parties to opt out from this dispute settlement procedure. - to consider whether any useful role could be provided to WP.29 and/or its working groups in the dispute settlement procedure, as outlined in paragraphs A.3 and A.4 of document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/1059. 	<p>safety requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Russian Federation agrees that the dispute settlement procedure in Article 10 of the 1958 Agreement should be reviewed for allowing new Contracting Parties to opt out from a dispute settlement procedure. 3. The Russian Federation considers that within the dispute settlement procedure between Contracting Parties, any of them may raise the issue at the level of the WP.29 or its appropriate working group providing the Contracting Party's position and justification and seek for necessary clarification. 	<p>its sale and use within one's territory is granted to Contracting Parties (safeguard). Under the new Agreement also, it is presumed to be sufficiently possible to ensure the safety and environmental performance of distributed vehicles, etc. using the same right of the Contracting Parties. If amendment were necessary, specific problems should be identified first and then discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is the basic understanding that the safety and environmental performance of vehicles, etc. other than type-approved ones are to be ensured under the responsibility and authority of the each Contracting Party where those vehicles, etc. are used. Furthermore, with the above safeguard provision, it is possible to ensure the safety and environmental performance of vehicles, etc. within the territory of each Contracting Party. Thus, it is not appropriate to specify provisions in the Agreement on the surveillance or recall. ● It is possible that we will propose amendments based on the results of discussions on the IWVTA concept, etc ● There is no particular problem with the current dispute settlement procedure. Thus, there is no need to amend the Agreement for this. If amendment were necessary, specific

Item of the Document IWVTA-02-08	Position of the Russian Federation	Position of Japan (draft)
		problems should be identified first and then discussed.