



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/21
14 August 1997

~~ORIGINAL - ENGLISH~~

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles

Meeting of Experts on Passive Safety

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF EXPERTS ON PASSIVE SAFETY
ON ITS TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

(12 - 16 May 1997)

1. The Meeting of Experts on Passive Safety held its twenty-first session from 12 May (afternoon) to 15 May only 1997 under the chairmanship of Mr. C. Lomonaco (Italy). Experts from the following countries participated in the work: Belgium; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Italy; Netherlands; Poland; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; United Kingdom; United States of America. A representative of the European Commission (EC) participated. Representatives of Japan took part in the session under paragraph 11 of the Commission's Terms of Reference. Experts from the following non-governmental organizations participated: International Alliance of Tourism / International Automobile Federation (AIT/FIA); Consumers International (CI); International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); Liaison Committee for the Manufacture of Automobile Equipment and Spare Parts (CLEPA).



2. The documents without a symbol distributed during the session are listed in annex 1 to this report.

REGULATION No. 17 (Strength of seats)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.129/Rev.2; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.159; informal documents Nos. 8, 16 and 17 of annex 1 to this report.

3. Document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.129/Rev.2 was considered by the Meeting of Experts in conjunction with the corrigenda and draft amendments noted in the report of the previous session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, paras. 3-5).

4. The expert from the United Kingdom noted that his proposal which he had prepared during the twentieth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.159) was intended to provide sufficient survival space for a child in a restraint system attached to a seat back, although it should be considered as an interim proposal only. He emphasised that the child protection was a matter of concern and that the forward movement allowance of 150 mm of the seat back contour in the proposed test (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.129/Rev.2) was excessive. He demonstrated this by measurement results (informal document No. 8). He suggested that his informal document No. 16 should be considered as a solution superior to his former interim proposal.

5. The matter of the proposed test stringency was discussed in detail. The expert from AIT/FIA again confirmed that the test which had been selected by WP.29/GRSP may detect weak seat back designs (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 8).

6. During the discussion, attempts were made to modify informal document No. 16, an alternative solution also being proposed by the expert from Germany. Not being able to find any common position on the presented proposals, particularly in making a difference between deformation of the seat frame and its upholstery, the Meeting of Experts decided by vote to continue the discussion in the future and to transmit document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.129/Rev.2 with the modifications noted in TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, paras. 3-5 to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a proposal for draft 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17.

7. A reservation to this decision was made by the expert from the United Kingdom. The expert from Denmark did not wish to make a reservation, although he indicated that, in his view, the solution proposed in informal document No. 16, or its alternative suggested by Germany would in his view be preferable.

8. The Chairman of the Meeting of Experts reviewed the factors which justified the decision made by WP.29/GRSP and his proposal was supported to record in the report a commitment to continue with development of Regulation No. 17 and to consider the adopted test of the seat back luggage load resistance (see para. 6 above) as a first step only.

9. The concerns of the United Kingdom were shared by the expert from the Consumers International who wished to stress the dissatisfaction of his organization with the decision taken by WP.29/GRSP regarding a test of seat resistance to additional loading from luggage in a frontal impact (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/19, paras. 3 and 4). In his statement he said that this decision was deficit in two important ways:

- (a) It did not acknowledge a basic reality within the car fleet, namely that larger cars were capable of carrying a greater mass of luggage than smaller cars. WP.29/GRSP rejected a solution in which the luggage simulation reflected luggage volume in favour of a test using a single luggage mass for all sized cars.
- (b) The permitted dynamic movement of the seat back chosen by WP.29/GRSP was too great to ensure that children would not be subjected to additional loading from the deflected seat.

He further said that those decisions made it impossible to justify the proposed amendment to Regulation No. 17 as providing a high level of protection and that the aim of a logical link between Regulations Nos. 44 and 17 would not be achieved despite WP.29/GRSP spending four years over these discussions.

10. Informal document No. 17 tabled by Spain drew attention to the need of adequate seat displacement systems for the two- or three- door vehicles, where the rear seat passengers had to use the front door. In the discussion, the problem was acknowledged. The expert from the Russian Federation noted that similar problems exist on some N category vehicles. The expert from Spain agreed to prepare for the next session a proposal providing a solution for the matter of his concern.

REGULATION No. 94 - Development (Frontal collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.133 and Add.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.160; informal documents Nos. 3, 9 and 15 of annex 1 to this report.

11. The Meeting of Experts noted the main features of the proposal for draft 01 series of amendments (informal documents Nos. 3 and 9), aligning Regulation No. 94 with EU Directive 96/79/EC (deformable barrier, impacted by a test vehicle with 40 per cent \pm 20 mm overlap of the barrier face, from the speed of 56 -0/+1 km/h). The proposal was considered on the basis of informal document No. 9, which superseded the original proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.133 and Add.1). Where applicable, the amendments agreed to informal document No. 9 took into account the proposals of informal document No. 3 and the original text of the Directive (96/79/EC). The Meeting of Experts agreed to transmit the amended document to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for

consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a proposal for draft 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 94; for this purpose the secretariat was requested to prepare a relevant working document.

12. In consideration of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.160, it was noted that it referred to the replacement market, more than to new vehicles, where the use of poor quality adhesives could cause a detachment of windscreens in frontal accidents. In addition, it was indicated that the proposed provision would create a divergence from Directive 96/79/EC. The expert from the United States of America explained that in his country it was required that, after the test from the speed of 30 mph, at least 75 per cent of the windscreen should stay in place. Although originally this had been intended to prevent passenger ejection, the requirement was still deemed important for the function of airbags.

13. The expert from Italy agreed to take the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.160 into account when preparing amendments to the Regulation, intended to extend its scope to electric vehicles.

14. Also on the basis of creating a divergence from Directive 96/79/EC, the Meeting of Experts rejected a proposal of the expert from the United Kingdom to incorporate into the 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 94 a dummy lower leg calibration procedure which had recently been proposed by the EEVC (European Experimental Vehicle Committee).

15. The expert from Consumers International re-opened the question of labelling of airbags (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 41). In this respect he gave the initiative of the NHTSA as a positive example and compared the situation in the United States of America with the practices in Europe. During the discussion, the importance of conveying the information about the potential dangers of airbags to the public was acknowledged, and the Meeting of Experts decided to request through WP.29 the help of the Working Party on Road Traffic Safety (SC.1/WP.1); the secretariat was requested to prepare a suitable working document.

(Note: The information and the request for an assistance by SC.1/WP.1 in informing the public was prepared under document symbol TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/1977/11, which should be considered by SC.1/WP.1 at its twenty-ninth session, scheduled to be held from 1 to 5 September 1997).

16. The expert from France presented informal document No. 15 listing the amendments and their priorities, necessary to Regulations Nos. 11, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 21, in order to ensure the coherence of those Regulations with Regulations Nos. 94 (and 95) in their 01 series of amendments. This proposal was supported by a number of delegations and the Chairman of the Meeting of Experts suggested that a first step in addressing this matter should be made at an informal meeting, to be organized for this purpose. He agreed to inform the Working Party accordingly and to request its consent.

(Note: This was conferred to the Working Party at its one-hundred-and-twelfth session (TRANS/WP.29/566, para. 47) and the first session of the informal group should be held in Rome, on 22 and 23 September 1997).

REGULATION No. 95 - Development (Lateral collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.137; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.138; informal documents Nos. 4 and 10 of annex 1 to this report.

17. The expert from OICA opened the question of the mobile barrier construction, indicating that different barrier faces (impactors) on the market give somewhat different test results, whilst conforming to the performance corridors specified in Regulation No. 95. He also mentioned that the informal group entrusted with considering an improved definition of the impactor was not yet ready to submit its proposal for consideration to the Meeting of Experts. He stated that, whilst alignment of Regulation No. 95 with EU Directive 96/27/EC was considered urgent, the matter of influence of the impactor on the test results also needed attention by the Meeting of Experts.

18. The expert from France confirmed that the informal group working on the evaluation of impactor designs defined a certain number of tests to be used for comparing different makes of impactors, although without an intention to give preference to any particular construction. The report was noted and the Meeting of Experts agreed that the matter would need further attention and should be kept on the agenda, awaiting the advice of the informal group on documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.137 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.138.

19. In view of the situation described above (paras. 17 and 18), the Meeting of Experts approved OICA's suggestion that, in the meantime, the impactor to be used for type approval should be selected by the vehicle manufacturer, provided the impactor type meets the performance requirements of Regulation No. 95. It was also agreed that, for conformity of production testing, the same impactor type should be used as the one which had been used for type approval.

20. Following the above agreement, the Meeting of Experts focused on the proposals for the 01 series of amendments to the Regulation (informal documents Nos. 4 and 10), aligning Regulation No. 95 with EU Directive 96/27/EC. It was noted that the main feature was enlarging the barrier ground clearance from 260 ± 5 mm to 300 ± 5 mm. Informal document No. 10 was taken as a base for the work and it was adopted with amendments based also on informal document No. 4 and on the text of EU Directive 96/27/EC, where applicable. The Meeting of Experts agreed to transmit the amended document to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a proposal for draft 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 95; for this purpose the secretariat was requested to prepare a relevant working document.

AMENDMENTS TO ECE REGULATIONS

(a) Regulation No. 12 (Steering systems)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/R.798.

21. The secretariat informed the Meeting of Experts that the above-mentioned proposal by WP.29/GRSP had been adopted by the Administrative Committee (AC.1) at its fifth session and transmitted to the UN Secretary-General as a proposal for draft Supplement 2 to the 03 series of amendments to Regulation No. 12 (final document symbol TRANS/WP.29/563). It was recalled that this amendment to Regulation No. 12 should eliminate the possibility to approve replacement steering wheels with airbags (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 20).

Note by the secretariat: Transitional provisions have later been agreed by the Working Party and adopted by AC.1 at its sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/566, para. 138, final document symbol TRANS/WP.29/589).

(b) Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorages)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145; informal document No. 5 of annex 1 to this report.

22. The expert from OICA introduced informal document No. 5, proposing modifications to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145, deemed necessary with respect to seats of M2, M3, N2 and N3 category vehicles, which in principle had less inclined seat backs. The proposal was considered, but the Meeting of Experts decided not to accept it and instead it was agreed to limit the proposal of TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145 to M1 category vehicles only; at the same time a commitment was made to reconsider the matter in the future for other categories of vehicles. Document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145 was then approved with the following modifications:

Paragraph 5.5.1., the proposal should be deleted, i.e. the text retained as currently exists in Regulation No. 14, (coming into its 04 series of amendments). However, for the French text only of Regulation No. 14, the following corrigenda should be made:

Paragraph 5.5.1. (French only), correct the reference to "paragraphe 5.4.3.5." to read "paragraphe 5.4.2.5.".

Paragraph 5.5.1.1. (new), amend to read:

"5.5.1.1. For vehicles of category M1 of a total permissible mass not exceeding 2.5 tonnes, the effective upper belt anchorage, if fixed no danger to the occupant.

As an example, the test procedure according to Regulation No. 94 or a sled test with corresponding deceleration pulse could be applied to demonstrate a sufficient survival space."

23. The Meeting of Experts agreed to transmit amended document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145 to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a proposal for draft Supplement 1 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No 14.

(c) Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165; informal documents Nos. 14 and 18 of annex 1 to this report.

24. The expert from Italy explained that document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164 had been prepared following the recommendation by the Meeting of Experts to introduce provisions related to installation of safety belts from the Consolidated Resolution R.E.3 into Regulation No. 16 (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 47).

25. During the discussion which followed, the Meeting of Experts accepted the requirement of the expert from the Consumers International to incorporate into Regulation No. 16 also provisions ensuring that safety belts could accommodate the universal category child restraints. At the invitation by the Chairman, a corresponding proposal was prepared by the expert from Italy and distributed as informal document No. 18. However, the expert from Italy entered his reservation to introducing the text of those provisions (informal document No. 18) into the Regulation and stated that in his view a reference to a corresponding section of the Consolidated Resolution R.E.3 would be preferable.

26. Some additional amendments to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164 were also agreed and are incorporated in annex 2 to this report, together with the text of informal document No. 18. The Meeting of Experts agreed that the introduction of provisions for the installation of safety-belts in vehicles would not modify the existing provisions of Regulation No. 16 with respect to the approval of safety-belts. Accordingly, it was agreed to transmit the amended document (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164 and annex 2 to this report) to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a proposal for draft Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 16. The transitional provisions proposed were related to the installation of safety-belts in vehicles.

27. Considering document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165, it was acknowledged that it refers to two separate questions:

- (a) elimination from Regulation No. 16 of the test of preloading devices, for which experience had shown that they have no functional flaws;
- (b) introduction into the Regulation of safety-belts with load limiters reducing belt loads and therefore risk of injury to restraint occupants.

28. The Meeting of Experts adopted the part of the document related to (a) above, i.e. proposals referring to paragraphs 6.4.1.2.4. and its two subparagraphs and to paragraphs 7.9.1. and 7.9.2., and agreed to incorporate these modifications of the Regulation into Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments (see para. 26 above). The relevant text is noted in annex 2 to this report.

29. There was a first exchange of views on part (b) of the proposal (see para. 27 above). The expert from France gave a presentation of accidentological data and test results (informal document No. 14) showing the benefits of this development intended to optimize the interaction of the safety-belt and the airbag. The Meeting of Experts agreed, in principle, that the action which had been taken for adapting EU Directive 77/541/EEC should also be considered for Regulation No. 16. However, it was made clear that a thorough consideration was needed particularly with respect to the conditions for use of such safety-belts and their influence on e.g. attachment of child restraints; referring to the latter case, the expert from CLEPA confirmed that the child restraint systems were manufactured to be compatible with the current safety-belts (i.e. without load limiters). No conclusions were made, but the Meeting of Experts agreed to resume its consideration of the relevant section of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.165 at the next session.

- (d) Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles)

Documentation: Informal document No. 12 of annex 1 to this report.

30. The expert from the Russian Federation proposed that the centre of gravity of the swing-bob used to test the resistance of the cab of a commercial vehicle was placed 50 +5 mm below the R-point of the driver's seat (informal document No. 12). He said that this proposal was based on the data assembled in his country (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 29). The experts from the Czech Republic and Poland supported the proposal, including an additional suggestion of the Russian Federation to eliminate the 1,400 mm maximum height of the swing-bob.

31. The expert from France gave a presentation of truck accidentological data, based on the French 1996 accident statistics, in which accidents of 760 commercial vehicles were registered, with 113 fatalities. His conclusion was that the commercial vehicle bumpers had been struck in 50 per cent of fatal accidents and that

it was not therefore justified to modify Regulation No. 29 in order to prevent the swing-bob from striking the bumper. His findings were supported by the expert from Italy (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 28).

32. In the discussion which followed the influence of vehicle design was evaluated. Using his 1996 statistical data, the expert from France estimated that the accident situation modelled in Regulation No. 29 corresponded to real accidents of 100 vehicle cabins with 114 passengers inside, of which 50 were injured and 18 killed. The expert from Sweden reported that a national law had reduced injuries of commercial vehicle occupants and that there had been attempts in the past (1988/89) to update Regulation No. 29. He indicated that the proposal of informal document No. 12 was in a positive direction, although he was not in the position to estimate if the actual value proposed was adequate.

33. In principle, there was a moderate support to the initiative to update Regulation No. 29. Giving a summary of the discussion, the Chairman invited the delegations to furnish more statistical data for consideration at the next session. He also requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 12 with an official symbol.

(e) Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163; informal document No. 2 of annex 1 to this report.

34. Document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163 was introduced by the expert from the United States of America, together with its most recent modifications (informal document No. 2). He explained that the proposed amendments to the Regulation had been based on Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard FMVSS No. 201 in order to provide padding protection in those areas of the cars which could be contacted by passengers' heads. He also mentioned that the cost-benefit analysis had shown that introduction of the corresponding provisions into FMVSS No. 201 should save 1,000 lives per annum in the United States of America.

35. In the discussion which followed, the main attention was given to the test procedure specified in the document and to the high safety-belt wear rate in Europe. It was noted that the EEVC (European Experimental Vehicle Committee) had suggested to test vehicle interior fittings as components, as an alternative to the inside-the-car test proposed in TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163.

36. For the discussion at the next session the Meeting of Experts requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 2 with an official symbol, in order to make the proposal complete. The expert from Germany agreed to make the EEVC aware of the proposal and to request a participation of its expert in the discussion.

DRAFT REGULATION ON AIRBAGS

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148.

37. It was noted by the Meeting of Experts that consideration of the proposal for a draft Regulation on aftermarket airbags (TRANS/WP.29/R.709/Rev.1) had been deferred by the Working Party at its one-hundred-and-eleventh session (TRANS/WP.29/534, para. 10(ii)). This was commented by a number of experts, including the expert from the Consumers International, who recalled the reservations to the proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, paras 37-40). The expert from Germany said that a Regulation on airbags was felt indispensable and if the so-called first stage proposal (TRANS/WP.29/R.709/Rev.1) would remain not acceptable, the matter might be resolved by limiting his (second stage) proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148) to aftermarket airbags.

38. There was a majority opinion that aftermarket airbags needed to be regulated in order to eliminate products which are more dangerous than protective. With the situation left open (see para. 37 above), in the first reading of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148 those sections were identified which would need to be eliminated if the scope of the proposal was reduced to aftermarket products (i.e. section II, including paras. 1.2., 3.2., 4.2., 5.3. 6.2. 8.3. annexes 2 and 6). It was noted that an eventual adoption of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.148) would also replace a section of Regulation No. 12 (replacement steering wheels). The Meeting of Experts agreed to proceed to a second reading of the document at its next session, anticipating that a decision of the Working Party regarding TRANS/WP.29/R.709/Rev.1 would be known at that time.

REGULATION No. 22 (Protective helmets)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.161.

39. The proposal was considered and adopted by the Meeting of Experts with an amendment (see below), noting the explanation of the expert from Germany that it had been intended to re-introduce into the Regulation a visor test which accidentally was deleted when the Regulation had been brought into its 04 series of amendments and to modify some conformity of production and routine tests. It was also agreed to transmit the amended document to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a draft Corrigendum 2 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 22.

40. The matter of additional improvements to Regulation No. 22 was also discussed, which had been under the consideration of an informal group and remained due for a period of time, i.e. protection against the rotational acceleration and

testing of the chin guard (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/16, paras. 8 and 9) as well as improved provisions for visors, intended to harmonize the requirements with those developed in CEN (TRANS/WP.29/487, para. 41). The Chairman of the informal group revealed that difficulties had been encountered with repeatability and reproducibility of tests proposed. He estimated that the work might be concluded by the informal group before the next session of WP.29/GRSP with respect to chin guards and visors, but doubted that the question of the rotational acceleration protection would be resolved by that time. The Meeting of Experts agreed to put the matter on its agenda for the twenty-second session and asked the Chairman of the informal group to accelerate the work as far as possible.

OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Regulation No. 80 (Strength of seats and their anchorages)

41. At the request of the expert from the United Kingdom the question of strength requirements for rearward-facing seats (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 34) was deleted from the agenda.

(b) Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 1, 6, 7, 11, 19 and 20 of annex 1 to this report.

42. Informal document No. 1 was introduced by the expert from the United States of America, who pointed out the main features (informal document No. 11) of the proposed rule. He gave reasons for the preference of a system called UCRA (Uniform child restraint anchorages), using two flexible lower anchorages and a top tether and requested the opinion of WP.29/GRSP on this proposal. He also suggested that a harmonized approach could be taken in the European legislation.

43. Considering the proposed rule (informal document No. 1), a favourable opinion by Australia was noted (informal document No. 6), as well the information by the United Kingdom on a modified ISOFIX system with two rigid anchorages (informal document No. 7).

44. The Meeting of Experts compared all available alternatives and formulated its draft response to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (informal document No. 20) with respect to the proposed rule (informal document No. 1). The response recognized that there might be a need for the UCRA system in the United States of America, but the ISO approach was considered preferable and WP.29/GRSP suggested that NHTSA should not encourage a unique national solution in its final rule. The Chairman of the Meeting of Experts agreed to forward the response of

WP.29/GRSP to NHTSA. The Meeting of Experts justified its preference for ISOFIX for the European cars by the following safety benefits:

- (a) improved protection in side impacts (especially important as there is restricted space in many European cars);
- (b) an upper tether is not mandated;
- (c) a greater reduction in the potential for misuse;
- (d) improved protection for rearward facing child restraints (relatively popular in Europe).

45. The Chairman of the Meeting of Experts recalled that, during the consideration of Corrigendum 2 to the 03 series of amendments to Regulation No. 44 (document TRANS/WP.29/560), a commitment had been made to review the provision of paragraph 7.1.4.4.1.2.3. at an earliest opportunity (TRANS/WP.29/534, para. 73) in order to improve the related requirement on which there had been reservation by the United Kingdom (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/20, para. 12). To facilitate the discussion, the text of the paragraph concerned was distributed (informal document No. 19). The expert from CLEPA gave a presentation of test results to justify the need for an improvement of the provision in the Regulation (see the last entry in annex 1 to this report).

46. The following agreement was reached by the Meeting of Experts and it was agreed to transmit it to the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles and to the Administrative Committee AC.1 for consideration at its seventh session (November 1997) as a draft Corrigendum 3 to the 03 series of amendments to Regulation No. 44.

Paragraph 7.1.4.4.1.2.3., correct to read:

"7.1.4.4.1.2.3. Child restraints other than group 0 not supported by the dashboard:

The head of the manikin shall not pass the planes FD, FG and DE, as shown in Figure 4 below.

In the case there is a contact of such a child restraint with the 100 mm diameter bar and all performance criteria are met, there shall be one further dynamic test (front impact) with the heaviest dummy intended for such child restraint and without the 100 mm diameter bar; the requirements for this test are that all criteria other than forward displacement shall be met.

(Figure 4, not modified)"

(c) Automobile Safety Information

Documentation: Informal document No. 13 of annex 1 to this report.

47. A short presentation was given by the expert from Japan to inform the Meeting of Experts about the promotion of safety by the National Organization for Automotive Safety & Victims' Aid.

(d) Tribute to the experts from the United States of America

48. The Meeting of Experts wished to acknowledge the personal contribution of Mr. J. Kaniathra towards its work during the last seven years and congratulated him on his new appointment within the NHTSA. With great sadness it was noted that Mr. Delarm had passed away, who had been attending WP.29/GRSP sessions from 1987 to 1989 and was expected to replace Mr. J. Kaniathra. The Meeting of Experts extended its warmest welcome to Mr. R.S. Fan in his new function as an expert of the United States of America to WP.29/GRSG at the present and forthcoming sessions.

AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SESSION

49. For the twenty-second session, to be held in Geneva from 1 December (14.30 h) to 4 December (12.30 h) 1997 1/, the Meeting of Experts agreed on the following agenda:

1. Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats)
2. Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection) - development
3. Amendments to ECE Regulations
 - 3.1. Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorages)
 - 3.2. Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)
 - 3.3. Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles)
 - 3.4. Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)
4. Draft Regulation on airbags - development
5. Regulation No. 22 (Protective helmets) 2/
6. Other business
 - 6.1. Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)
 - 6.2. Regulation No. 94 (Frontal impact protection) - introduction of provisions for electric vehicles

- 1/ As part of the secretariat's efforts to reduce expenditure, all the official documents distributed prior to the session by mail will not be available in the conference room for distribution to session participants. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies of documents to the meeting.
- 2/ Consideration to commence not earlier than 3 December 1997 (afternoon), if working documents were prepared by the informal group.

Annex 1

LIST OF INFORMAL DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT A SYMBOL DURING THE SESSION

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
1.	United States of America	7.2.	E	Department of Transportation, NHTSA, 49 CFR Part 571 [Docket No. 96-095; Notice 3] RIN 2127-AG50: FMVSS; Child Restraint Systems; Tether Anchorages for Child Restraint Systems; Child Restraint Anchorage System: Notice of proposed rulemaking
2.	United States of America	4.5.	E	Proposal for draft amendments (Suppl. 3 to the 01 series) to Regulation No. 21 (interior fittings) - draft TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.163/Add.1
3.	France	2.	E/F	Proposal for 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 94
4.	France	3.	E/F	Proposal for 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 95
5.	OICA	4.2.	E	Draft proposed amendments to ECE Regulation No. 14 - OICA proposal for amendments to doc. TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.145
6.	Australia	7.2.	E	Informal comment for 21st GRSP: US NPRM on Child Restraint systems
7.	United Kingdom	7.2.	E	Proposal to revise ECE Regulation 44.03 to provide for the inclusion of a dedicated universal connection system, based on discussions within ISO/TC22/SC12/WG1
8.	United Kingdom	1.	E	Agenda item 1: Regulation 17 (Strength of seats) - Child dummy hip and shoulder excursions on R44:03 dynamic tests
9.	United Kingdom	2.	E	Proposal for 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 94

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|------|---|---|
| 10. | United Kingdom | 2. | E | Proposal for 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 95 |
| 11. | United States of America | 7.2. | E | Child restraint systems |

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
12.	Russian Federation	4.4.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 29
13.	Japan	7.3.	E	Automobile Safety Information 1997.2 (National Organization for Automotive Safety & Victims' Aid)
14.	France	4.3.	E/F	Occupant Protection in Frontal Impacts; Front Seat Restraint System; Safety Seatbelt with belt tension limiter: French Proposal for adapting Directive 77/541 (seat belts) combined with an airbag
15.	France	2.	F	Règlement 94: compatibilité avec les autres règlements
16.	United Kingdom	1.	E	Proposal for additional draft amendments (06 series) to Regulation No. 17 (document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.129/Rev.2)
17.	Spain	1.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 17
18.	Italy	4.3.	E	Proposal for additional draft amendments (Supplement 8 to the 04 series to Regulation No. 16 (document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164)
19.	Secretariat	7.2.	E	Corrigendum 2 to the 03 series of amendments to Regulation No. 44 (document TRANS/WP.29/560)
20.	WP.29/GRSP	7.2.	E	Draft letter from GRSP to NHTSA on Child Restraint Anchorages
-	CLEPA	7.2.	E	Summary of test results in which a rear facing child restraint contacted the 100 mm bar (<u>Note</u> : Relates to Regulation No. 44, 03 series, para. 7.1.4.4.1.2.3. - see also informal document No. 19 above)

Annex 2

ADDITIONAL DRAFT AMENDMENTS (SUPPL. 8 TO THE 04 SERIES) TO REGULATION No. 16
ADOPTED BY THE MEETING OF EXPERTS
(Document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/R.164)

The title of the Regulation, amend to read:

"UNIFORM PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE APPROVAL OF:

- I. SAFETY-BELTS AND RESTRAINT SYSTEMS FOR OCCUPANTS
OF POWER-DRIVEN VEHICLES

- II. VEHICLES EQUIPPED WITH SAFETY-BELTS"

Paragraph 1., amend to read:

"1. Scope

This Regulation applies to safety-belts and restraint systems for installation in power-driven vehicles with three or more wheels and intended for separate use, i.e. as individual equipment, by person occupying forward or rearward-facing seats and also to vehicles equipped with such safety-belts."

Paragraphs 2.18.1. to 2.18.3. (former), renumber as paragraphs 2.18.(a) to 2.18.(c).

Paragraph 6.4.1.2.4., should be deleted.

Paragraph 6.4.1.2.4.1., renumber as paragraph 6.4.1.2.4. and amend to read:

"6.4.1.2.4. In the case of safety-belt with a preloading device the minimum displacement specified in paragraph 6.4.1.3.2. below may be reduced by half."

Paragraph 6.4.1.2.4.2., should be deleted.

Paragraph 7.9.1., should be deleted.

Paragraph 7.9.2., renumber as paragraph 7.9.1.

Paragraph 8.1.11., Figure 1, the caption below the figure, delete the text reading "the diameter of the pictogram is at least 60 mm."

Paragraph 8.1.12., amend the words "a rearward-facing child restraint" to read "any rearward-facing child restraint"

Insert a new paragraph 8.3.5., to read:

"8.3.5. In order to inform the vehicle user(s) of the provision made for the transport of children, the requirements of annex 17 shall be met."

Paragraphs 15.1.2. and 15.1.3., amend to read:

"15.1.2. As from 1 October 1999 for vehicles of category M2 with a maximum mass not exceeding 3,500 kg and as from the sixtieth day after the entry into force of Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments to this Regulation for all other vehicles of categories M and N, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation shall grant ECE approvals only if the requirements of this Regulation, as amended by Supplement 8 to the 04 series of amendments, are satisfied.

15.1.3. As from 1 October 2001 for vehicles of category M2 with a maximum mass not exceeding 3,500 kg, and as from 1 October 1999 for all other vehicles of categories M and N, Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may

Insert a new Annex 17, to read the text of paragraphs 5. to 5.2. of annex 13 to the Consolidated Resolution R.E.3 (document TRANS/WP.29/78/Amend.8).

Insert new Annex 17 - Appendices 1 and 2, to read the text of annex 13 - appendices 2 and 3 to the Consolidated Resolution R.E.3 (document TRANS/WP.29/78/Amend.8).
