



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/27
15 September 2000

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

World Forum for Harmonization of Vehicle Regulations (WP.29)

Working Party on Passive Safety (GRSP)

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON PASSIVE SAFETY
ON ITS TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

(8 - 12 May 2000)

1. GRSP held its twenty-seventh session from 8 May (afternoon) to 12 May (morning) 2000 under the chairmanship of Mr. C. Lomonaco (Italy). Experts from the following countries participated in the work following Rule 1(a) of the Rules of Procedure of WP.29 (TRANS/WP.29/690): Austria; Bulgaria; Canada; Czech Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Japan; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Romania; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; United Kingdom; United States of America. A representative of the European Commission (EC) participated. Experts from the following non-governmental organizations participated: International Touring Alliance / International Automobile Federation (AIT/FIA); International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); European Association of Automotive Suppliers (CLEPA); European Enhanced Vehicle-safety Committee (EEVC).

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

DRAFT REGULATION ON AIRBAGS

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/1999/40; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/4; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/5; informal document No. 10 of annex 1 to this report.

3. The expert from Switzerland presented documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/4 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/5. He explained to GRSP that the proposals contained in both documents were the concrete proposals to amend Regulations Nos. 94 and 95 respectively to avoid hearing damage due to an airbag deployment. He also modified the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/4 by deleting in new paragraph 5.3.1.1. the words "for front seats, and is (are) built in."

4. The expert from the United States of America reminded GRSP about the state of the art of the study on the new concept of an "auditory damage unit (ADU)" and expressed his hope that a report should be transmitted to GRSP for consideration at the November 2000 session.

5. The expert from OICA also reminded GRSP that in ISO research concerning this issue was in progress and suggested not to take any decision before having considered the final report of it. For this reason he introduced a study reservation.

6. The experts from France and Spain made reservations for both documents.

7. The expert from France introduced informal document No. 10 concerning the research of hearing damages in relation to airbag deployment. In his opinion the relation had not been demonstrated and the data reported until now was so limited that it was premature to support any proposal for introducing a concrete noise limit applicable to the deployment of an airbag and a method for measurement of this noise.

8. The expert from Germany announced that a study focusing on the same matter was being conducted at the Hannover University. He also supported the idea of the necessity of continuing research before considering a concrete proposal.

9. GRSP agreed to continue consideration of this issue not only on the basis of the proposals transmitted by the expert from Switzerland but also taking into account the results of the studies from the United States, Germany and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). To facilitate future discussion, GRSP requested the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 10 with an official symbol for consideration at the next session.

10. Before considering document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/1, transmitted by the expert from Germany, the expert from CLEPA made a general declaration to point out that replacement airbags were not subject to an international trade, and that in his opinion a Regulation on replacement airbags was not necessary.

11. Concerning the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/1, he noted that the expression "as far as possible" of paragraph 5.2.1. was not clear enough to be applied by a technical service, and noted his reservation concerning paragraphs 5.2.1. and 5.4.2.2.

12. GRSP adopted document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/1 with the amendments reproduced below, and agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their November 2000 sessions, together with the text of the proposal for the draft Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/1999/40).

Paragraph 5.3.5., amend to read:

".... Regulation No. 94, 01 series of amendments.
In case of doubt, carried out by the technical service."

Paragraph 6.2.3., amend to read:

".... Regulation No. 94, 01 series of amendments.
In case of doubt, carried out by the technical service."

13. The expert from the United Kingdom informed GRSP that a research programme following airbags behaviour in accidents in his country had been concluded and expressed his expectation that the full report would be distributed to GRSP at the next session.

AMENDMENTS TO ECE REGULATIONS

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

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/1999/38; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/11; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/7; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/8; informal documents Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 9 of annex 1 to this report.

14. GRSP agreed to consider the "ISOFIX" issue (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/11 and informal document No. 5 in conjunction with Regulation No. 44 (Child restraint systems, paras. 54-70 below)).

15. Concerning the proposal for a global technical regulation (gtr) on safety-belt anchorages, which had been tabled by OICA at the twenty-sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, paras. 28 and 29), the expert from OICA presented document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/7 which contained the requirements applied in comparison between the American Safety Standard FMVSS 210, Regulation No. 14 and Japan. He also introduced informal document No. 7 containing some amendments to his proposal, following the comments received from the expert from Japan, and some additional internal considerations.

16. GRSP requested the secretariat to distribute the proposal for a global technical regulation (informal document No. 3 of the twenty-sixth session), as amended by informal document No. 7, with an official symbol, to be considered jointly with document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/7 at the November session.

17. The expert from the Netherlands suggested that a global technical regulation should be self-contained and should not include any reference to another standard as was proposed in paragraphs 3.3. and 4.5. of informal document No. 7. This suggestion was supported by the expert from Germany. GRSP agreed to consider this question at the next session and requested the secretariat to put in square brackets paragraphs 3.3. and 4.5. when publishing the document mentioned in para. 16 above.

18. The expert from the United Kingdom said that the future global technical regulation should include a three-point safety-belt anchorage requirement for the rear centre position.

19. The proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/1999/38 for a reduction of the lateral distance between the lower effective anchorages at the centre rear position was re-considered. The expert from Germany indicated that a car had been prepared with the lateral distance of the concerned anchorages reduced in compliance with TRANS/WP.29/1999/38 and invited the experts to examine the feasibility of buckling the safety-belts. The expert from Spain presented a test device demonstrating the same feature.

20. The expert from Germany completed his presentation in favour of the reduced lateral distance between lower effective anchorages at the rear centre position, showing a diagram and explaining that in a simulated 15 km/h frontal impact, a force in the pelvis area of 4 kN expected for the new proposed distance (240 mm) was lower in comparison with the force corresponding to the current distance of 350 mm. He said that this reduction was caused by elimination of the crossing of safety-belts. He also said that the biomechanical limit for a pelvis cross force was 7 kN for a 25 per cent probability of having an AIS 2 class injury. */

21. The expert from Romania presented a study (informal document No. 5) concerning the reduction of lateral distance between lower effective anchorage points. Consequently, he was in favour of the reduced distance proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/1999/38.

22. After a round-table examination of opinions it was noted that Finland opposed the proposal, the United States of America and the United Kingdom reserved their positions due to some concerns about the installation of the child restraint systems and the expert from Sweden expressed his reservation, although he did not oppose submission of the proposal to WP.29.

23. Considering that a majority of experts supported the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/1999/38, GRSP agreed to return it not modified to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their sessions of November 2000.

24. The expert from CLEPA informed GRSP that, after the re-consideration by the experts of his organization, the proposal contained in document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/8 should be withdrawn.

*/ AIS = Abbreviated Injury Scale

25. The expert from Spain presented a proposal for clarifying the definition of an "effective anchorage" (informal document No. 9). To allow for its consideration, the secretariat was requested to distribute informal document No. 9 with an official symbol for the next session.

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

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 7 and 14 of the twenty-sixth GRSP session; informal document No. 3 of annex 1 to this report.

26. As agreed at the twenty-sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, para. 32) GRSP considered informal document No. 14 of that session, proposing a 50 per cent reduction (from 0.2 daN to 0.1 daN) of the lower limit of the retracting force of the strap. No agreement being reached, however, the discussion was expected to continue (see paras. 27 and 30 below).

27. Presenting informal document No. 3, the expert from Japan indicated that among the proposals contained in it, the proposal indicated in para. 26 above was also included. He explained to GRSP that informal document No. 3 also included references to national Japanese and the United States of America's requirements, and the possibility of using of an alternative accelerating slide test device, as proposed for Regulation No. 44 (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/3).

28. The experts from the Netherlands, Germany, the Russian Federation and Sweden stated their preferences for not making references to national legislative requirements in ECE Regulations.

29. Concerning the possibility of allowing an accelerating slide test device, the expert from OICA expressed his support for the proposal and suggested to take the text from document TRANS/WP.29/2000/24 related to Regulation No. 14.

30. GRSP agreed to continue consideration of the proposals of informal document No. 3 and requested the secretariat to distribute it with an official symbol for the next session.

31. As agreed at the twenty-sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, para. 33) GRSP considered and adopted informal document No. 7 of that session. It was also agreed to transmit the proposal, reproduced below, to WP.29 and AC.1 for their sessions of November 2000.

Paragraph 6.4.1.3.2., amend to read:

".... between 100 and 300 mm at chest level. In the case of a harness belt, the minimum displacements specified above may be reduced by half. These displacements are the displacements in relation ..."

(c) Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6/Rev.1.

32. Before considering the proposal transmitted by the expert from Spain (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6/Rev.1), the expert from OICA stated that the amendments proposed to allow a better access to vehicles were only a comfort issue and opposed the proposal. The expert from Italy introduced a general reservation on the proposal by Spain.

33. The following amendments to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6/Rev.1 were in principle agreed by GRSP.

Paragraph 5.1.7., amend to read */:

".... of the seat or the part of the seat, according to annex 10, for which they are intended.
....."

Annex 10,

Paragraph 1.1., amend to read:

"... R point, the seat as a hole or in parts must be displaced/rotated
....."

Paragraph 1.2., amend to read **/:

"... single-handed or single footed should be able to operate"

Paragraph 1.3.1., amend to read:

".... by the hand or the foot of a person located directly behind the seat, doors and windows being closed."

Paragraph 2.1., amend to read ***/:

"... between the seat and the B or C pillar of 300 mm measured horizontally, at 350 mm above the R point."

*/ Reservation by OICA.

**/ Reservation by the Netherlands.

***/ Reservation by OICA concerning the figures.

34. GRSP requested the expert from Spain to elaborate a Revision 2 of the proposal with the amendments indicated in paragraph 33. above, and including also transitional provisions, in order to apply the proposed amendments only to new types of vehicles. It was also agreed to resume consideration of this proposal at the next session.

35. Concerning document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/1, GRSP noted that no new data had been provided to demonstrate a need for further improvement of Regulation No. 17.

36. The expert from Italy explained to GRSP that a corrigendum should be prepared to correct an error in annex 9, paragraph 3.1. of Supplement 1 to the 07 series of amendments to Regulation No. 17. In his opinion, the free running speed of 50 +2/-0 km/h should be 50 +0/-2 km/h as indicated in Regulation No. 44, annex 7, appendix 1. Consequently, he suggested the undermentioned corrigendum to the Regulation. GRSP agreed to resume consideration of this subject at the next session.

Annex 9, paragraph 3.1., correct the value of "50 + 2/-0 km/h" to read "50 +0/-2 km/h".

(d) Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1998/17; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/11; informal document 1 of annex 1 to this report.

37. The expert from Germany informed GRSP about the first meeting (Madrid, 3 and 4 February 2000) of the drafting group in charge of transmitting to GRSP a proposal for amendments to Regulation No. 21 (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, para. 43). The report of this first meeting was distributed as informal document No. 1.

38. He explained to GRSG that two targets had been identified by the drafting group. Target 1, related to clarifications and/or amendments to the current Regulation No. 21, should be presented as a short-term solution. Target 2, a draft global technical regulation, should be presented to GRSP in the longer term.

39. He said that in target 1, the following issues had been identified: extension of the scope to N1 categories; exemption of the design requirements for the head impact area, if it was demonstrated that the head and the chest would not impact the instrument panel or the steering wheel; reconsideration of the rear part of the centre console; leaving soft material in place as a general requirement and including it in the radius of curvature assessment; introducing window-winder requirements; establishing requirements for gaps similar to those of grilles, and including the requirements of the new European Commission Directive for power operated windows, partition, and roof panel systems.

40. At the request of the expert from OICA it was clarified that the extension of the scope of the Regulation to N1 vehicles would be a part of the long term proposal and that the exemption of design requirements would only apply if the manufacturer of vehicles could demonstrate that no impact of the head and chest would be possible on the instrument panel and steering wheel.

41. The expert from the Netherlands requested that the future prescriptions of the Regulation should consider both restrained passengers and unrestrained passengers.

42. The next meeting of the drafting group was announced for 17 and 18 May in Köln, Germany, and it was agreed that the group would focus on the short-term target. GRSP noted that, depending on the results of the work, an official proposal to amend Regulation No. 21 could be received for consideration already during the November session.

(e) Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1998/13; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/1.

43. Before continuing consideration of the amendment of the scope of Regulation No. 29, the expert from EEVC made a clarification concerning the extension of the scope of the European Community Directive 96/79/EC. He said that the European Union's recommendation was to consider the extension of the scope of the above-mentioned Directive to all N1 categories of vehicles, and that consequently the phrase "derived from M1" should be deleted from para. 44 of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26. He suggested that the scope of Regulation No. 94 should be amended in a similar way.

44. Concerning the scope of Regulation No. 29, the expert from Italy suggested the following drafting.

Paragraph 1., amend to read:

"1. SCOPE

This Regulation applies to vehicles of category N with separate driver's cab and a maximum permissible mass greater than 2.5 tonnes. Vehicles of category N1, derived from vehicles of category M1 are excluded from the scope of this Regulation.

This Regulation does not apply to agricultural tractors and machinery."

45. The expert from the Russian Federation insisted on keeping his proposal for the scope of the Regulation (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/1).

46. The expert from the United States of America informed GRSP that he would express his view on this issue at the next session.

47. The expert from the United Kingdom announced that, taking into consideration the division of the scope in three parts as suggested at the twenty-sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, para. 47), he would transmit a proposal for vehicles with a gross vehicle mass above 7.0 tonnes.

48. GRSP agreed to continue consideration of the scope of the Regulation at the next session before adopting definitively document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1998/13.

(f) Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/12; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/2; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/3; informal documents Nos. 2, 6, 11 and 13 of annex 1 to this report.

49. The Chairman introduced informal document No. 2 expressing doubts about the equivalence of the severity of the test for obtaining the curve of the trolley's deceleration if the alternative accelerating device proposed in document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/3 was used.

50. GRSP agreed that in case of approval of the alternative (accelerating device) the severity of the test should be the same as that for the current test using a decelerating device and asked if some comparison test had been made with the two kinds of devices.

51. The experts from the Netherlands and France indicated that in their countries tests were being conducted but that it was too early to have any result. The expert from Japan explained to GRSP that with the use of the accelerating device his country did not have any difficulty.

52. GRSP agreed to continue consideration of this issue, awaiting the results from the comparison tests made by the expert from France or by another country's technical service. It was also noted that the same problem could affect Regulations Nos. 16 and 17.

53. GRSP considered and adopted informal document No. 11, transmitted by the expert from CLEPA and containing a Corrigendum to Regulation No. 44, in order to adapt the Conformity of Production to the general rules. It was also agreed to transmit the proposal, reproduced below, to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their sessions of November 2000 as a Corrigendum 4 to the 03 series of amendments to Regulation No. 44.

Paragraph 11., correct to read:

"11. Conformity of Production

The conformity of production procedures shall comply with those set out in the Agreement, appendix 2 (E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.2), with the following requirements.

11.1. Any child restraint system approved to this Regulation shall be so manufactured as to conform to the type approved by meeting the requirements set forth in paragraphs 6 to 8 above.

11.2. The minimum requirements for conformity of production control procedures set forth in Annex 16 to this Regulation shall be complied with.

11.3. The authority which has granted type approval may at any time verify the conformity control methods applied in each production facility. The normal frequency of these verifications shall be twice a year."

54. Concerning the ISOFIX System, the expert from the United Kingdom resumed the conclusions of the informal group (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, para. 19). The expert from OICA pointed out that the conclusions of the informal group were not reached by unanimity.

55. The expert from Germany explained to GRSG that it had not been demonstrated that a third support (top tether or leg support) was necessary to avoid rotation and suggested an ISOFIX system with only the two lower supports fulfilling all the requirements of Regulation No. 44. He also expressed his opinion that in such a case the misuse of both the top tether or the support leg would be avoided.

56. The expert from France underlined that GRSP was not in a position to choose one of the two mentioned solutions, and recommended not making a decision until having all the necessary data. He suggested that the three following points should be considered.

- (i) A universal system (ISOFIX) should be introduced in the Regulations,
- (ii) The misuse of the systems should be avoided,
- (iii) The ISO standardization work had been finished only for the two lower points and the work concerning the third support was still in progress.

57. He also suggested to act in two steps. In a first step, Regulation No. 44 should incorporate, as soon as possible, the ISOFIX system with the two lower anchorages in certain seating places of vehicles, and in a second step the third support should be harmonized.

58. The Chairman informed GRSP about the Australian position favouring the top tether (informal document No. 6). The expert from CLEPA expressed his view that a system to avoid rotation was necessary, and urged GRSP to make a decision concerning the third fixation point as soon as possible.

59. After consideration of the suggestions made by the experts from Germany and France (paras. 55-57 above) and taking into account that they were not able to choose a solution concerning the third support, a majority of the GRSP experts were in favour of the French proposal for acting in two steps.

60. The experts from Canada, Japan and the United States of America requested to accept the top tether solution. The expert from the United Kingdom was strongly opposed to introducing in a first step the two lower ISOFIX anchorages only, and favoured strongly the top tether solution. The expert from the Netherlands expressed his concerns related to a first step with only two low ISOFIX anchorages.

61. With the remarks of para. 60 above, GRSP decided to introduce the two lower ISOFIX anchorages for Regulation No. 14 and to continue the research with the trolley to amend consequently also Regulation No. 44.

62. Concerning the number of seats equipped with ISOFIX anchorages, GRSP agreed in principle that there should be at least two places, one of which should be the front passenger seating place.

63. The expert from the United Kingdom considered the adopted solution dangerous and introduced a reservation. His view was supported by the expert from the Netherlands.

64. The expert from France was requested to produce for the November session a document with the proposal for the first step. He volunteered to table at the same time a technical document for the second step.

65. The Chairman agreed to inform WP.29 at its session of July about the decision adopted.

66. GRSP considered also document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/2, containing a proposal for introducing a floor pan in the test trolley, in order to test adequately and enable the use of a supporting leg with the ISOFIX child restraints systems.

67. When considering the proposal it was suggested to amend figure 2 "L-profile beam location" in order to define better the position of the L-beam profile.

68. The expert from Spain tabled informal document No. 13 with the aim of replacing the complete proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/2 by only one paragraph, allowing more freedom to technical services to prepare a test trolley in compliance with the child restraint system tested. His proposal is reproduced below:

"Annex 6,

Insert a new paragraph 1.2., to read:

"1.2. The technical service involved in the test shall prepare the test trolley, if needed, according to the child restraint system manufacturer's instructions, in order to avoid the movement of the support leg during the test."

69. The expert from Sweden announced that he would consider both possibilities for amending document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/2 and report to GRSP at the next session.

70. Considering the adopted solution for "ISOFIX" (see para. 61 above), the expert from the United Kingdom stated that the issues associated with the level of confidence in the performance of a universal "ISOFIX" child restraint system, would also apply to the semi-universal approach adopted. He also explained to GRSP that unexpected results could occur and that it would be more likely for a semi-universal approach to cover a large range of vehicles.

(g) Regulation No. 94 (Frontal collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/5; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/4.

71. GRSP noted that the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/4 had been considered jointly with the development of the draft Regulation on airbags (paras. 2-9 above).

72. Following the consideration of the proposal to improve the warnings about hazards from airbags (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/5), containing the pictogram and a text, the expert from OICA expressed again the difficulties of having a text, given the number of languages to be inserted. He asked GRSP to include into Regulation No. 94 the pictogram used in the FMVSS and if a text was needed, he requested to reduce it as much as possible in order to allow a number of languages together in one label.

73. The expert from OICA was requested to prepare a proposal to be considered at the next session, including the possibility of using the FMVSS pictogram, a possible text, the possibility of switching-off of the passenger airbag, and the alignment of Regulation No. 94 to the European Community Directive 99/98/CE.

(h) Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/5; informal document No. 8 of annex 1 to this report.

74. GRSP noted that document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/5 had been considered jointly with the development of the draft Regulation on airbags (paras. 2-9 above).

75. The expert from EEVC informed GRSP that the final report of the study of mobile barrier design (MBD) was available at the EEVC Internet site "www.EEVC.org" under "EEVC public documents".

76. He informed GRSP that, for the next GRSP session, a concrete proposal should be available. He confirmed that a full test programme was being done and that the programme also included requirement to produce a design of a MBD by Summer with a final recommendation to be available by the end of the year.

77. The expert from France confirmed that several meetings were scheduled to define a new universal barrier, and that the discussion would probably be finished by the end of the year.

78. GRSP thanked the expert from EEVC and agreed to continue consideration of this item during the next session.

79. GRSP considered and adopted a Corrigendum 1 to the French text of the 01 series of amendments to Regulation No. 95 which was transmitted by the expert from OICA (informal document No.8), and reproduced below. It was also agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 to their sessions of November 2000.

Paragraphe 7.2., modifier comme suit :

"..... ou effective au moins les essais de mesurage."

Annexe 4, appendice 1, modifier le dernier alinéa comme suit :

"... de la tête en mètres par seconde carrée divisé par 9,81."

OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) Exchange of information on national and international requirements on passive safety

Documentation: Informal document No. 15 of annex 1 to this report.

80. The expert from the European Community informed GRSP that the draft European Community Directive on pedestrian protection was still under consideration at the Commission level. He also envisaged that the Motor Vehicles Working Group of the European Commission would consider it in a near future.

81. Concerning frontal and lateral collision, he said that the report from EEVC would be considered by the Committee for the Technical Progress, and that the second step of the mobile design barrier consideration should begin after that.

82. He tabled informal document No. 15 containing the latest European Community Directives published, and informed GRSP experts that they were available free of charge only during 40 days after the publication at the following INTERNET address: "<http://europa.en.int/eur.lex>".

83. The list of the European Directive recently published are reproduced below:

Directive 1999/98/EC of the Commission of 15 December 1999 (Frontal impact) - O.J. L9 of 13 January 2000

Directive 2000/3/EC of the Commission of 22 February 2000 (Safety-belts and restraint systems) - O.J. L53 of 25 February 2000

Directive 2000/4/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 February 2000 (Interior fittings) - O.J. L87 of 8 April 2000

Directive 2000/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 (Fuel tanks) - O.J. L106 of 3 May 2000

84. The expert from the United States of America informed GRSP that FMVSS No. 208 (occupant Crash Protection) concerning airbags had been published recently and that the publication was available at the following website: "www.nhtsa.dot.gov".

(b) Regulation No. 22 (Protective helmets)

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 4 and 14 of annex 1 to this report.

85. The expert from Italy presented informal document No. 14, which superseded informal document No. 4 and contained a draft corrigendum to the 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 22.

86. GRSP amended and adopted informal document No. 14 as reproduced in annex 2 to this report. It was agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their November 2000 sessions.

(c) Sled test procedure for dummy test in rear impacts

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

87. As a follow-up of the study report distributed without a symbol at the twenty-sixth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/26, paras. 74-75), the expert from Germany introduced informal document No. 12, containing a working draft for a test procedure for the evaluation of the injury risk to the cervical spine in a low speed rear-end impact. This project was the result of a research group work.

88. He asked GRSP to use this document as a basis for consideration of a new Regulation at the next session. He explained that, in his view, amendments to Regulations Nos. 17 and 25 should also be necessary.

89. The Chairman expressed his intention to report to WP.29 in July on the state of discussions in GRSP, in order to obtain some advice on the above issue.

AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SESSION

90. For the twenty-eighth session, to be held in Geneva from 27 November (14.30h) to 1 December (12.30h) 2000 1/ 2/, GRSP agreed on the following agenda:

1. Draft Regulation on airbags - development
2. Amendments to ECE Regulations
 - 2.1. Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorages)
 - 2.2. Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)
 - 2.3. Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats)
 - 2.4. Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)
 - 2.5. Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles)
 - 2.6. Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)

- 2.7. Regulation No. 94 (Frontal collision protection)
- 2.8. Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection)
- 3. Other business
 - 3.1. Exchange of information on national and international requirements on passive safety
 - 3.2. Regulation No. 22 (Protective helmets)
 - 3.3. Sled test procedure for dummy test in rear impacts.

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/ At its on-hundred-and-twenty-first session, held in Geneva from 4 to 7 July 2000, WP.29 agreed to allocate to GRSP one additional day for its twenty-eighth session (TRANS/WP.29/735, para. 23).

Annex 1

LIST OF INFORMAL DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT A SYMBOL DURING THE SESSION

No.	Transmitted by	Agenda item	Language	Title
1.	Germany	2.4.	E	Report of the first GRSP ECE-R21 ad-hoc meeting
2.	Chairman	2.6.	E	Comments to Japanese proposal to amend Regulation No. 44
3.	Japan	2.2.	E	Draft proposal for the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 16 (safety-belts)
4.	Italy	3.2.	E	Proposal for an editorial corrigendum to document TRANS/WP.29/1999/39
5.	Romania	2.1.	E	Study of the reduction of lateral distance between lower effective anchorage points
6.	Australia	2.1., 2.6.	E	Causfix (2 rigid anchorages with upper tether) Australian position paper
7.	OICA	2.1.	E	Draft global technical regulation safety-belt anchorages
8.	OICA	2.8.	F	Proposal for a corrigendum to Regulation No. 95
9.	Spain	2.1.	E	Proposal for modification of item 2.4. of Regulation No. 14
10.	France	1.	E	Sound exposure limit for airbag deployment
11.	CLEPA	2.6.	E	Draft corrigendum to Regulation No. 44
12.	Germany	3.3.	E	Test procedure for the evaluation of the injury risk to the cervical spine in a low rear end impact
13.	Spain	2.6.	E	Proposal for the modification of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/2
14.	Italy	3.2.	E	Proposal for an editorial corrigendum to document TRANS/WP.29/1999/39
15.	European Community	3.1.	E	List of Directives recently adopted by the E.C.
-	Germany	2.1.	E	Lateral distance between the anchorages of the rear centre seat 350mm/240mm

Annex 2DRAFT CORRIGENDUM TO THE 05 SERIES OF AMENDMENTS TO REGULATION No. 22
ADOPTED BY GRSP AT ITS SEVENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Paragraph 7.4., amend to read:

"7.4. Test for projections and surface friction. An appropriate size of helmet shall be subjected to the test described in paragraph 7.4.1. or to the test described in paragraph 7.4.2."

Paragraph 7.4.2.2.9., amend the figure of "5 ± 0.1 m/sec" to read "4 ± 0.1 m/sec".

Paragraph 7.8.3.2.1.1., correct the reference to "ISO/CIE 10256" to read "ISO/CIE 10526".

Paragraph 10.6.1.1., amend to read:

"10.6.1.1. The holder of an approval must divide the visors into ... "

Paragraph 14.7., correct the references to "paragraphs 13.6.1. to 13.6.6." to read "paragraphs 14.6.1. to 14.6.6.".

Annex 14, the table, amend the following values:

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 490 the value for blue "7.8852" shall read "7.8862",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 640 the value for blue "0.9685" shall read "0.9695",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 660 the value for the last column "0.4020" shall read "0.4629",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 670 the value for yellow "6.7692" shall read "0.7892",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 720 the value for blue "1.2056" shall read "0.2055",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 740 the value for blue "0.0518" shall read "0.0516",

In the row for a value of Wavelength (nm) 760 the value for red "0.0046" shall read "0.0045",
