Dear Mr Gauvin,

Dear Mr Ramos-Garcia,

Topic: request for correction of amendments to Regulations No 4, 6, 7, 23, 38, 50, 77, 87, 91 and 119, which have been submitted to the November 2013 session of WP29 for adoption.

In the Technical Committee Motor Vehicle meeting on 03 October 2013, the Member States and the Commission services discussed certain concerns regarding amendments to the above mentioned UN Regulations, which have been submitted to the November session of WP29 for adoption. These concerns are related to the following two paragraphs of UN Regulation No 4 [document reference ECE/TRANS/WP29/2013/69, proposal for Supplement 17 to Regulation No 4 (Illumination of rear registration plates)]:

- "1.2.4.2.: In the case where doubt exists in respect to compliance of the non-replaceable filament lamp(s) with lifetime requirements and/or, in the case of colour coated filament lamps, with colour endurance requirements, as specified in paragraph 2.11. of IEC 60809, Edition 3, conformity shall be checked (by the light source manufacturer indicated in the type approval documentation) as specified in paragraph 2.11. of IEC 60809, Edition 3."
"5.7.: In the case of non-replaceable filament lamp(s) or light source module(s) equipped with non-replaceable filament lamp(s), the applicant shall annex to the type approval documentation a report (by the light source manufacturer indicated in the type approval documentation), acceptable to the Authority responsible for type approval, that demonstrates compliance of these non-replaceable filament lamp(s) with the requirements as specified in paragraph 2.11. of IEC 60809, Edition 3."

Concern No 1: it is unclear to the Member State’s experts whether or not “edition 3” of the IEC standard in the paragraphs above concerns a dynamic or a static reference. It has to be clarified by GRE and made sure that this only concerns a static reference;

Concern No 2: there is a question mark regarding the legality of paragraph 1.2.4.2 as it seems to include conflicting conformity of production requirements. The light source manufacturer is held responsible for monitoring the light bulb production in case of doubt, whereas the approval for the product is actually granted to the light bulb manufacturer and not to the light source manufacturer;

Concern No 3: the wording of paragraph 5.7. is not sufficiently clear as to what the acceptance / rejection criteria should be for the Authority responsible for type-approval, whether or not the report can be accepted and what the format requirements for such a report should be.

Paragraphs 1.2.4.2. and 5.7. above have been replicated by GRE in the amendments to Regulations:

No 6 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/71);
No 7 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/72);
No 23 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/76);
No 38 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/79);
No 50 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/83);
No 77 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/87);
No 87 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/88);
No 91 (ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2013/89); and
No 119 (doc ref 2013/94).

The three concerns related to the abovementioned ten WP29 working document jeopardize the EU internal adoption procedure and as such also create a significant risk for the adoption of all the amendments submitted for adoption by WP29 in its November 2013 session. On behalf of the Member States, the Commission services would like to express their worries as regards the quality control mechanisms in GRE and urges GRE to correct these concerns at the earliest possible occasion so as to be able to vote on possible corrigenda during the WP29 session in March 2014. If this requirement cannot be met the Union will not be in the position to vote on the WP29 working documents listed above.

Yours sincerely,

Philippe Jean

Cc/ Mr Marcin A. Gorzkowski, M. Eng. P. Eng.
Transport Canada - Road Safety & Motor Vehicle Regulation
e-mail: marcin.gorzkowski@tc.gc.ca