Proposal for Supplement 1 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 25 (Head restraints)

Submitted by the expert from the International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers*

The text reproduced below was prepared by the expert from the International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA) to prevent the mandatory compliance of provisions on head restraint in more than one UN Regulation. It is based on a document without symbol (GRSP–54–17) distributed during the fifty-fourth session of the Working Party on Passive Safety (GRSP) (see ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/54, para. 40). The modifications to the current text of UN Regulation No. 25 are marked in bold for new or strikethrough for deleted characters.

* In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2012–2016 (ECE/TRANS/224, para. 94 and ECE/TRANS/2012/12, programme activity 02.4), the World Forum will develop, harmonize and update Regulations in order to enhance the performance of vehicles. The present document is submitted in conformity with that mandate.
I. Proposal

*Paragraph 1.1., footnote 1, amend to read:*

"1.1. This Regulation applies to head-restraint devices conforming to one of the types defined in paragraph 2.2. below.¹

---

¹ The head restraints of category M₁ vehicles which conform to the provisions of Regulation No 17 are not required to conform to the provisions of this Regulation. Seats type approved according to Regulation No. 80 are not required to conform to the provisions of this Regulation."

II. Justification

1. Provisions for head restraints are already implemented in Regulation No. 17. It is contradictory that one component should be type approved according to more than one UN Regulation. Therefore the restriction to category M₁ vehicles should be deleted.

2. A head restraint as defined in Regulation No. 25 is "a device whose function is to limit the rearward displacement of an adult occupant's head in relation to his torso in order to reduce the danger of injury to the cervical vertebrae of that occupant in the event of an accident."

3. The task of the head restraint is mainly dedicated to mitigate the consequences of rear collision.

4. Currently passenger seats in buses and coaches are not subjected to requirements on head restraints because of the fact that the impact from a passenger car against the rear of a bus or coach does, by far, not cause damage comparable to a passenger car hitting another passenger car from the rear. There is no accident data-based evidence resulting in the need to review the current provisions.

5. It is therefore the aim of this proposal to eliminate the inadvertent application of UN Regulation No. 25 to seats in buses and coaches where this requirement is not justified.