



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/31  
2 August 2002

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 (GRSP)  
ON ITS THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

(13 - 17 May 2002)

1. GRSP held its thirty-first session from 13 May (afternoon) to 17 May 2002 (morning) under the chairmanship of Ms. J. Abraham (United States of America). 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): Australia; Belgium; Canada; Czech Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Japan; Netherlands; Norway; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; United Kingdom; United States of America. A representative of the European Commission (EC) participated. Experts from the following non-governmental organizations participated: International Organization for Standardization (ISO); 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); Consumers International (CI); European Enhanced Vehicle-safety Committee (EEVC).

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

GE.02-23347

## 1998 AGREEMENT

### 1. Draft global technical regulation on pedestrian safety

Documentation: Informal document No. 10 of annex 1 to this report.

3. The expert from Japan confirmed that the Chairman of the IHRA pedestrian working group would assume the Chairmanship of the informal group in charge of drafting a global technical regulation. In his capacity as Chairman of the IHRA pedestrian working group, the expert from Japan made a summary presentation of its activities. He said that the presentation was available at the GRSP web site, and that the final report to IHRA would be available at the IHRA web site  
<http://www-ihra.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pedestrian/pedestrian.html>.

4. The expert from the European Commission introduced informal document No. 10, which contained a proposal for the terms of reference of the GRSP informal group on pedestrian safety. Several experts provided comments on the proposal. GRSP adopted the terms of reference as reproduced in annex 2 to this report.

5. The expert from OICA stated that its position on developing a gtr was not committed by the opinions expressed by its experts represented in previous forums, and clarified that these opinions were made on a personal basis. The expert from the United States of America stated that the gtr should cover not only passenger cars, but also light trucks and vans, and that the overview of the current work on the subject should not be limited to that of the IHRA and EEVC but rather take into account any available research and evaluations performed by governmental and non-governmental institutions. The expert from CI offered the experience of Euro-NCAP tests for developing the gtr.

6. The expert from Japan announced that the first meeting of the informal group could be held as early as June or July 2002 and kindly requested the expert from the European Commission to assume the task of the Secretary of the informal group. The Chairwoman requested the experts interested in participating at the informal group to contact the expert from Japan in order to facilitate the organization of the first meeting.

### 2. Draft global technical regulation on lower anchorages and tethers for child restraints

7. The expert from the United States of America informed GRSP that Canada and his country have been working on ISOFIX systems for more than ten years, and that their national rules deviated from ISO prescriptions neither in the configuration nor in the geometry of anchorages, but in the strength of the forces applied. He also stated that his position was strongly in favour of the use of the top tether as a third support.

8. The Chairwoman said that GRSP should be careful with defining ISOFIX systems in light of the direction given by WP.29 to begin work on developing a global technical regulation in this area. She noted that current prescriptions applied in some non-European countries, such as the United States of America and Canada were more stringent than those of the ISO standards.

### 3. Draft global technical regulation on door retention components

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

9. The Chairwoman reminded GRSP that WP.29 had agreed on establishing an informal group to develop the gtr (TRANS/WP.29/841, para. 163 and annex 4), and confirmed that the United States of America would assume the Chairmanship of the informal group.

10. The expert from the United States of America presented informal document No. 15, explaining that the table contained the main differences between FMVSS 206 and Regulation No. 11. He said that this document could be

a basis for the work of the informal group. He requested the experts interested in participating in the informal group to contact him. He suggested September 2002 as a possible date for the first meeting of the informal group. The expert from OICA stated that his organization had done considerable work on this subject and would be interested in participating in the work of the informal group.

4. Draft global technical regulation on head restraints

Documentation: Informal document No. 11 of annex 1 to this report.

11. The expert from the United States of America presented informal document No. 11, which contained a summary of the proposed prescriptions for FMVSS 202 currently under consideration in his country. The document also highlighted the differences between the United States of America proposed requirements and Regulations No. 17 and 25. He said that the differences were small and expressed his hope for a potential gtr on this subject.

12. GRSP agreed to consider this document at its next session. GRSP experts were requested to keep and bring informal document No. 11 for consideration at the December 2002 session.

5. Exchange of views on side impact dummy

13. The Chairwoman informed GRSP that a WorldSID newsletter dated May 2002 was available, reviewing the progress in developing the WorldSID dummy.

14. GRSP accepted the offer from the expert from Australia, Chairman of the IHRA side impact working group, to make a presentation at the December 2002 GRSP session about the progress of harmonized research in the area of side impact, including progress on WorldSID.

6. Exchange of views on crash compatibility

15. GRSP accepted the suggestion of the Chairwoman to invite the Chairman of the IHRA working group on compatibility, in order to give a general overview of the activities of the working group. The expert from OICA suggested that experts could look for information about IHRA activities at its web site: <http://www-ihra.nhtsa.dot.gov/>.

7., 8. Exchange of views on possible establishing of draft global technical regulations on safety-belts anchorages and on safety-belts

16. The Chairwoman informed GRSP that at its one-hundred-and-twenty-sixth session, WP.29 had not included these items as priorities for developing gtr (TRANS/WP.29/841, para. 163 and annex 4). Nevertheless, she indicated that WP.29 would reconsider its priorities in its November 2002 session.

17. The experts from OICA and CLEPA expressed their disappointment with excluding these two important items from the programme of work for developing gtrs, and indicated that both draft gtrs were important for the global industry. The expert from Italy expressed his wishes that these two items would become part of the priorities at some point in the future and offered to collaborate with both OICA and CLEPA experts.

## **1958 AGREEMENT**

### **1. AMENDMENTS TO ECE REGULATIONS**

#### **1.1. Regulation No. 11 (Door latches and door retention components)**

18. GRSP noted that this item had been moved to the part of the agenda under the 1958 Agreement (see paras. 9 and 10 above).

1.2. Regulation No 14 (Safety-belt anchorages)

1.2.1. Effective anchorages

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/10; informal document No. 16 of annex 1 to this report.

19. The expert from Spain introduced informal document No. 16, which superseded document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/10. The document outlined various anchorage configurations for which Spain seeks clarification. He confirmed his intention to transmit a definitive proposal for consideration at the next GRSP session.

1.2.2. Draft global technical regulation (gtr)

20. GRSP noted that this item had been moved to the part of the agenda under the 1998 Agreement (see paras. 16 and 17 above).

1.2.3. Technical amendments

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/4; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/7.

21. GRSP adopted in document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/4 proposed by Japan and agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their November 2002 sessions as draft Supplement 4 to the 05 series of amendments to Regulation No. 14. The proposal would require that category N vehicles be equipped with safety-belts on the rear seats. If the proposal is adopted by WP.29, regulations Nos. 14 will become equivalent to Japan's regulation (Safety Regulation Art. 22-3) and to the United States regulation (FMVSS No. 208). Some objections were raised by the expert from CI regarding the proposal by Japan, which did not call for 3-point belts in these seating positions. It was agreed that consideration of the issue of 3-point safety-belts could take place in future sessions.

22. GRSP noted that the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/7 had been resolved at the previous session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/30, para. 16).

1.3. Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts)

1.3.1. Technical amendments

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/19/Rev.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/5; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/12; informal document No. 13 of annex 1 to this report.

23. As concerns the updated proposal to extend the allowance for driver's torso and face contact with the steering column to the front passenger (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/19/Rev.1), the expert from OICA welcomed the proposal transmitted by the expert from Spain, and presented informal document No. 13 in which he extended to other occupants the extended limits allowed in the current version of the Regulation and in the Spanish proposal. He clarified that the passengers' safety was guaranteed because, in all the cases, the requirements of Regulations Nos. 12 and 21 should be fulfilled.

24. Several experts expressed their concerns with the proposals. GRSP agreed to resume discussion of the proposals at the December 2002 session. The expert from Spain was requested to provide data about the contact with the dashboard by the passenger. The secretariat was requested to distribute informal document No. 13 with an official symbol for consideration at the thirty-second session.

25. GRSP adopted the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/5, amended as reproduced below, and agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their November 2002 sessions as draft Supplement 14 to the 04 series of amendments to Regulation No. 16. The proposal is consistent with that of Regulation No. 14.

Insert new paragraphs 15.3. to 15.3.3., to read:

"15.3. Transitional provisions

These transitional provisions only apply to the installation of safety-belts on vehicles and do not change the approval mark of the safety-belt.

- 15.3.1. As from the official date of entry into force of Supplement 14 to the 04 series of amendments, no Contracting Party applying this Regulation shall refuse to grant ECE approvals under this Regulation as modified by Supplement 14 to the 04 series of amendments.
- 15.3.2. Upon expiration of a period of 36 months following the official date of entry into force referred to in paragraph 15.3.1. above, the Contracting Parties applying this Regulation shall grant approval only if the vehicle type satisfies the requirements of this Regulation as amended by the Supplement 14 to the 04 series of amendments.
- 15.3.3. Upon the expiration of a period of 60 months following the official date of entry into force referred to in paragraph 15.3.1. above, the Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may refuse to recognize approvals not granted in accordance with Supplement 14 to the 04 series of amendments to this Regulation."

26. The expert from Italy withdrew document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/12.

1.3.2. Global technical regulation (gtr) concerning safety-belts

27. GRSP noted that this item had been moved to the part of the agenda under the 1998 Agreement (see paras. 16 and 17 above).

1.4. Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6/Rev.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/20; informal document No. 2 of annex 1 to this report.

28. As concerns the proposals of documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1997/6/Rev.1 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/20, GRSP agreed to resume their consideration at its December 2002, session awaiting updated proposals by Spain and the Czech Republic. Nevertheless, the expert from the Czech Republic urged GRSP to adopt the amendment to the figure of annex 5 of his proposal (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/20), because the current figure was not clear enough.

29. The expert from CLEPA presented informal document No. 2, which was an updated proposal for partitioning systems components. He said that this proposal contained the GRSP comments to informal document No. 20 of the thirtieth session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/30, paras. 29 to 32).

30. He gave the corresponding explanations to the concerns of several experts on the proposal. Nevertheless, he kindly requested these experts to send him written amendments, in order to incorporate them in a new updated proposal he intended to prepare for consideration at the next GRSP session.

1.5. Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1998/17.

31. The expert from the United States of America reminded GRSP that for updating Regulation No. 21 two phases were planned. He said that the first phase had been finished and the corresponding proposal would be considered by WP.29 and AC.1 at their June 2002 sessions (TRANS/WP.29/2002/33). As concerns the second phase, GRSP had shown interest in incorporating the current FMVSS prescriptions into the Regulation. The expert from Germany, Co-chairman of the informal group, confirmed that for the second phase, they were awaiting the final data from the United States of America concerning the free motion

headform and new test procedures from EEVC. The expert from EEVC confirmed that a new test method would be probably proposed to GRSP at the end of 2002. The expert from the United States of America informed GRSP that in his country the work was only in a research stage. GRSP agreed to retain this agenda item for further consideration.

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

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1998/13; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/1999/1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/3; informal document No. 9 of annex 1 to this report.

32. The expert from the Russian Federation presented informal document No. 9, which had been transmitted for WP.29 at its March 2002 session (TRANS/WP.29/841, para. 18). He recalled that the scope of Regulation No. 29 initially covered all N vehicles, and said that there was no reason to exclude delivery vehicles (vans). He acknowledged that the Regulation needed to be adapted to the new criteria, but insisted to keep under its scope N1 vehicles and to incorporate a test for the rear wall of the cabs.

33. The experts from Italy, the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic, Germany, Sweden and OICA stated that the Regulation should apply to vehicles with separate cabs and reminded GRSP that Regulation No. 94 would cover N1 vehicles under a maximum mass of 2.5 t.

34. The expert from the United Kingdom offered to update his proposal (informal document No. 7 of the twenty-ninth session) incorporating all the proposals expressed by the experts into it, with the exception of the Russian proposal, which he considered to be quite divergent. He said that the rear wall test had no great value according to research made in his country.

35. The Chairwoman concluded the discussion inviting the experts concerned to work together to find a consensus for the scope of the Regulation. She requested the expert from the United Kingdom to circulate a proposal among the experts concerned for comments, and submit it to the secretariat for distribution at the December 2002 session, during which GRSP should find a solution.

1.7. Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints)

1.7.1. Technical amendments

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/15; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/16; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/4; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/8; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/13; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/21; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/3; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/10; informal documents Nos. 7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of annex 1 to this report.

36. The expert from the Netherlands introduced document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/10, which consolidated of the proposals of documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/15, TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/16, TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/8, TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/21 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/3.

37. GRSP considered the proposals of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/10 and agreed in principle the amendments reproduced below, including also the proposals of informal documents Nos. 7 and 22.

Insert a new paragraph 7.1.4.1.9., to read:

"7.1.4.1.9. A child restraint with a support leg shall be tested as follows: In the case of semi-universal category the tests shall be conducted with the support leg adjusted to both its maximum and minimum positions. During the tests the support leg shall be supported by the trolley floor pan as described in annex 6. In the case of support legs out of the plane of symmetry, the worst case shall be selected by the Technical Service for the tests above. In the case of specific vehicle category the support leg shall be adjusted as specified by the child restraint manufacturer."

Paragraphs 7.1.4.1.9. to 7.1.4.1.9.2. (former), renumber as paragraphs 7.1.4.1.10. to 7.1.4.1.10.2.

Paragraph 9.1., amend to read:

" .... (including the deceleration curve of the trolley and the registration .... and any failure or breakage."

Paragraph 11.4., should be deleted (the current text remains)

Annex 6,

Paragraph 3.3.1.1., amend to read:

"3.3.1.1. The floor pan shall be rigidly mounted on the trolley. The height of the floor pan relative to the CR-point, dimension X in figure 2 of appendix 3 to this annex, shall be adjusted to meet the requirements of paragraph 7.1.4.1.9."

Annex 6, appendix 3, figure 2, amend the floor pan height value of "200" to read "X"

Annex 18,

Paragraph 1., amend to read:

"..... of the child seat. In the case of carry cot devices where a symmetrical installation of the dummy is not possible according to the device and manufacturer instructions, the lower limit of area at which material complying with annex 17 shall be used, shall be all areas beyond dummy's shoulder in the head direction, when measured with this dummy in the carry cot in its worst position consistent with the manufactures instructions and the carry cot positioned on the test bench.

If a symmetrical installation of the dummy in the carry-cot may be possible, the whole inner surfaces shall be covered with material complying with annex 17; this material has to fulfill its purpose together with the inner side structure; the technical service may assess this aspect with further tests."

38. As regards the proposal for testing the Child Restraint System (CRS) equipped with a top tether but without putting it in function (new paragraphs 7.1.4.1.10. to 7.1.4.1.10.2.), GRSP did not reach an agreement, and decided to consider this issue under agenda item 2 (ISOFIX).

39. For the registration of the rebound movement (paras. 7.1.4.4.1.1. to 7.1.4.4.1.2.3.), GRSP agreed that it should be a type approval criterion. The expert from Italy disagreed and expressed his reservation. The expert from OICA suggested not amending the current text of the Regulation, and the expert from France expressed his concerns about the reproducibility of the rebound movement.

40. As regards the registration of dynamic behaviour (paras. 8.4. to 8.4.2.) GRSP settled to put them between square brackets, and agreed to consider the issue again at the December 2002 session. The Chairwoman expressed her hope that the consideration of the proposal could be finalized at that GRSP session.

41. The expert from Japan withdrew the proposals of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP 2001/4, and informed GRSP that this issue would be solved on a national basis.

42. The expert from France suggested accepting the proposal for Conformity of Production (COP) procedure (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/13) that paralleled the procedure of Regulation No. 22. The expert from Italy agreed, but pointed out

that this COP procedure should only be applied for these two Regulations, given that both helmets and child restraint systems could be obtained outside the control of manufacturers. Finally, GRSP agreed to continue consideration of the proposal at the next session

43. The expert from France tabled informal documents Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 containing draft Supplements to Regulation No. 44. GRSP gave the proposals a favourable review. However, there remain some outstanding issues, to be discussed at the next technical meeting led by France. GRSP decided to resume their consideration at the next session in December 2002. GRSP requested the secretariat to distribute them under a single official symbol for consideration at the next session.

44. The expert from CI made a presentation of a field study research concerning the misuse of child restraint systems, mainly addressed to those equipped with harness. She said that action should be taken for ensuring the correct label position and to eliminate flag style labels. CI also recommended that GRSP should review the shell size and legroom requirements for CRS of group 0+ in order to enable children to be kept in rear-facing CRS longer, to introduce requirements for mandatory adjustment of the harness to all sizes of children, a better indication of frontward and rearward CRS, and for improving the application of requirements for permanent marking. As regards the introduction of ISOFIX requirements, she insisted that clear and effective information to the consumer should be provided for placing ISOFIX CRS in ISOFIX equipped vehicle seats.

45. The expert from Germany informed GRSP that in another study on misuse made in his country, results showed that after entering into force of the current version of the Regulation, the misuse had dropped from 50 per cent to 25 per cent. Several experts expressed their opinion that only misuses with severe consequences on the child safety should be taken into account.

#### 1.8. Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection)

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/6; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/11; informal documents Nos. 4 and 14 of annex 1 to this report.

46. The expert from EEVC recalled his report to GRSP concerning the EEVC mobile deformable barrier (MDB) face specification (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/30, para. 56). He said that document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/6 contained the amendments to the Regulation for incorporating the new mobile deformable barrier. The amendment provides more specifications for the materials of the barrier's face, in order to reduce observed barrier caused differences in the performance of the dummies.

47. The expert from OICA expressed his support to the proposal, but stated that additional validation tests should be required before adopting the proposal. The expert from Japan, presenting informal document No. 4, asked for amending the static corridors for blocks 1 and 3 and for block 4, in order to guarantee no difference in the performances and reproducibility of the mobile deformable barriers, with a better relationship between the static and dynamic characteristics.

48. GRSP noted the Japanese opposition, although, the majority of the delegates decided to adopt the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/6 with the amendments reproduced below, and agreed to transmit it to WP.29 and AC.1 for consideration at their November 2002 sessions as draft 02 series of amendments to Regulation No. 95.

Insert new paragraphs 11. to 11.3, to read:

"11. TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

11.1. As from the official date of entry into force of the 02 series of amendments, no Contracting Party applying this Regulation shall refuse to grant ECE approval under this Regulation as amended by the 02 series of amendments.



- 11.2. As from 12 months after the entry into force of the 02 series of amendments Contracting Parties applying this Regulation shall grant ECE approvals only to those types of vehicles which comply with the requirements of this Regulation as amended by the 02 series of amendments.
- 11.3. As from 60 months after the entry into service of the 02 series of amendments Contracting Parties applying this Regulation may refuse first national registration (first entry into service) of vehicles which do not meet the requirements of this Regulation as amended by the 02 series of amendments."

Annex 5,

Paragraph 2.1.3.1., amend to read:

" ... dimensions shall be 19 mm  $\pm$  10 per cent ... "

Paragraph 2.1.3.5., the square brackets should be deleted.

Paragraph 2.1.3.1., amend the value of " 45  $\pm$  5 kJ", to read " 45  $\pm$  3 kJ".

The note after paragraph 2.1.5.16., should be deleted.

After paragraph 2.2., paragraphs 2.1.1. to 2.6.1., renumber as paragraphs 2.2.1. to 2.7.1.

Paragraph 5.3., the square brackets should be deleted.

Paragraph 6., the square brackets should be deleted.

Paragraph 6.6.5.2., the square brackets should be deleted.

49. The expert from the Netherlands introduced document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/11 containing a proposal to replace the EUROSID-1 dummy by the ES-2 dummy. Much discussion took place regarding the dummy and some concerns pertaining to the dummy's directional sensitivity, inter-rib homogeneity, damping stiffness characteristics and interaction of the back plate with vehicle seat were raised.

50. The expert from OICA made a presentation about his concerns with the proposal not only with respect to the technical performance of ES-2, but also recalling the work in progress by ISO in developing the WorldSID dummy (informal document No. 14). He concluded that the introduction at the current stage of the ES-2 into Regulation No. 95 would be premature and counter-productive in light of the anticipated completion of WorldSid by 2004. He offered the presentation to be placed in the GRSP web site.

51. The expert from the Netherlands pointed out that ES-2 should be considered as an intermediate stage before the final adoption of the WorldSID dummy, as it provides improvements and additional benefits over the current dummy. He informed GRSP that the Working Group 12 of EEVC had established the ES-2 characteristics.

52. The expert from the United States of America informed GRSP that his country is currently evaluating ES-2. He made a presentation of limited test results and expressed concerns with the back plate seat interaction. Finally, GRSP agreed to continue consideration of this item at its December 2002 session.

2. ISOFIX

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/14/Rev.1;  
TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/15/Rev.1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/16/Rev.1;  
TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/2; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/8;  
informal documents 8 and 12 of annex 1 to this report.

53. GRSP acknowledged that informal document No. 8 clarified that the proposal for accepting the use of both rigid and non-rigid ISOFIX anchorages (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/8) was made by the Chairman of the ISO SC12/WG1/US T.A.G. and the Chairman of SAE Children's Restraint Systems Committee.

54. The expert from the United States of America made a presentation related to the anchorage strength requirements of ISOFIX anchorages in his country. He said that concerning the force applied, the duration of its application and the displacement criteria, the prescriptions were not identical to those of the ISO standard. He also informed GRSP that his country had published two notices of rulemaking concerning CRS, available at the Internet address: <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov>, and indicated that he would appreciate the comments to them from GRSP experts. GRSP thanked the expert and requested him to provide his presentation to the secretariat in order to place it in the GRSP web site.

55. The expert from the United Kingdom introduced a proposal for an additional single test for CRS equipped with top tether, without the top tether strap attached (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/2). The experts from Germany, Sweden and CI supported the concept. The expert from France pointed out that the proposal would contain two different levels of prescriptions, depending on the attachment or not of the top tether strap. In his opinion, this only could introduce more confusion to the consumer and increase the misuse of CRS. For these reasons, he expressed his reservation to the proposal.

56. The expert from Spain advised GRSP that the inclusion of a mandatory test with limits for assuring a minimum level of safety in case of a misuse could represent a bad precedent. He said that it could be a risk of having this minimum safety level as the standard level required into the Regulation and imply that the top tether, or another system to avoid rotation, was not necessary to assure the child safety. The expert from Italy insisted that the Regulation and a possible gtr should permit other technical solution than the top tether for avoiding child restraint rotation.

57. The expert from Germany introduced informal document No. 12 in which he proposed to amend the current ISOFIX proposals to allow universal ISOFIX CRS with only two lower anchorages, under the condition that the seat cushion of the vehicle seating position had higher stiffness than the seating cushion of Regulation No. 44 test bench. GRSP rejected the proposal.

58. The expert from France made a presentation summarizing the main principles for ISOFIX in Regulations Nos. 14, 16 and 44 (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/14/Rev.1, TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/15/Rev.1 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/16/Rev.1). To the suggestion of the expert from the United States of America to deviate from ISO standards on the strength of the forces applied, it was stated that proposals of the three documents represented a consensus reached in the informal group under the 1958 Agreement for the time being, and that this should not preclude future harmonization with the United States of America and Canada under a gtr.

59. The expert from Italy recalled his intervention at the previous GRSP session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/30, para. 43), and proposed that for very small vehicles only one ISOFIX position should be required, due to the impossibility to fix two of them. The experts from the United Kingdom and the United States of America shared the Italian concerns regarding the small vehicles. The experts from United Kingdom and CI requested that for any ISOFIX position it should be a top tether anchorage. Both questions were left open for further consideration by the drafting group and by GRSP itself at the next session.

60. After detailed consideration of documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/14/Rev.1 and TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/16/Rev.1, GRSP invited the expert from France to

revise the proposal taking into account the agreements reached and comments provided. It also agreed that a drafting group would meet in Paris on 10 and 11 September 2002 to update the proposals and send them to the secretariat on time to distribute them with official symbols at the December 2002 session. It was also agreed that document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/15/Rev.1 would be updated in line with the other two documents.

61. GRSP also discussed the proposal of document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/1 and agreed that the drafting group should consider it.

62. The expert from France requested GRSP experts to send him their comments as soon as possible as the only way to allow him to elaborate the updated proposals and to comply with the agreement reached (see para. 60 above) concerning the submission of the official proposals to be considered by GRSP at its December 2002 session.

### 3. Acceleration test devices

Documentation: TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/3; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2000/12; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/2; informal documents Nos. 5 and 6 of annex 1 to this report.

63. The expert from the Russian Federation introduced document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/2 that contained the amendments to Regulation No. 16 needed for the use of an acceleration test device. The expert from Japan made a presentation of a study on the equivalent CRS test using decelerating and accelerating sled (informal document No. 5). He also indicated that informal document No. 6 contained the amendments to Regulation No. 17 to allow the use of the acceleration sled device. The expert from France informed GRSP that at similar pulses the results of accelerating and decelerating devices were similar.

64. Due to the lack of time, GRSP agreed to continue consideration of this item at the December 2002 session and kindly requested the experts to bring their copies of informal document No. 5 for its consideration and the secretariat to distribute informal document No. 6 with an official symbol.

### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

#### 4.1. Exchange of information on national and international requirements on passive safety

65. Due to the lack of time, GRSG agreed not to consider this item.

#### 4.2. New draft Regulation concerning whiplash injury avoidance in rear-end accidents

66. Due to the lack of time, GRSG agreed to consider this item in a further session.

#### 4.3. Restraining of children travelling in buses and coaches

67. GRSP acknowledged that WP.29 had given its mandate to study the appropriate means to restrain children travelling in buses and coaches (TRANS/WP.29/841, para. 46). It agreed to consider this issue at the next sessions.

### AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SESSION

76. Substantive discussion took place regarding the agenda and the lack of sufficient time to address all items. The Chairwoman suggested that due to limited time, GRSP should explore the possibility of discussing certain items at every other meeting rather than every meeting. She indicated that she will look carefully at the agenda for the next meeting and discuss a shortened version with the Secretariat. For the thirty-second session, to be held in

Geneva from 10 December (14.30 h) to 13 December (12.30 h) 2002 1/, GRSP had tentatively agreed on the following items pending modifications by the Chairwoman 2/:

A. 1998 Agreement

1. Draft global technical regulation on pedestrian safety
2. Draft global technical regulation on anchorages and tethers for child safety seats
3. Draft global technical regulation on door retention components
4. Draft global technical regulation on head restraints
5. Draft global technical regulation on side impact dummy

B. 1958 Agreement

1. Amendments to ECE Regulations (1958 Agreement)
  - 1.1. Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorages), development
  - 1.2. Regulation No. 16 (Safety-belts), development
  - 1.3. Regulation No. 17 (Strength of seats), development
  - 1.4. Regulation No. 21 (Interior fittings), development
  - 1.5. Regulation No. 29 (Cabs of commercial vehicles), development
  - 1.6. Regulation No. 44 (Child restraints), development
  - 1.8. Regulation No. 95 (Lateral collision protection), development
2. ISOFIX
3. ACCELERATION TEST DEVICES
4. OTHER BUSINESS
  - 4.1. Exchange of information on national, regional and international requirements on passive safety
  - 4.2. Sled test procedure for the dummy test in rear impacts
  - 4.3. Restraining of children travelling in buses and coaches

---

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/ The thirty-second GRSP session will begin with gtr under 1998 Agreement followed by ISOFIX and accelerating devices covering all the affected Regulations, Regulation No. 44, and Regulation No. 95. The other agenda items will only be considered if possible.

---

Annex 1

LIST OF INFORMAL DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT A SYMBOL DURING THE SESSION

No.	Transmitted By	Agenda Item	Language	Title
1.	GRSP Chairwoman	-	E	Proposed amendments to the provisional annotated agenda for the thirty-first GRSP session (TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/9)
2.	CLEPA	1.4.	E	Draft amendments to Regulation No. 17: (Strength of seats)
3.	GRSP Chairwoman	-	E	Proposed meeting running order
4.	Japan	1.8.	E	Proposal concerning the deformable barrier specifications proposed in TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/6
5.	Japan	3.	E	A study on equivalent CRS test. Difference between decelerating sled and accelerating sled
6.	Japan	3.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 17 (Seat strength)
7.	CLEPA	1.7.1.	E	Proposal for draft amendments (Supplement 4 to the 03 series) to Regulation No. 44
8.	Secretariat	2.	E	Corrections to document TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/8
9.	Russian Federation	1.6.	E	Proposals concerning specifying some provisions of ECE Regulation No. 29 with respect to vans
10.	European Commission	0.1.	E	Proposal for terms of reference for a working group on pedestrian safety
11.	United States of America	0.4.	E	Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 202. Head restraints. Summary of Jan. 4, 2001. Notice of proposed rulemaking
12.	Germany	2.	E	Conditional use of top tether anchorage in the ISOFIX proposals (Reg. 14, 16, 44)
13.	OICA	1.3.1.	E	OICA proposal to amend the draft Corrigendum to ECE Regulation 16 submitted by Spain - TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/19/Rev.1
14.	OICA	1.8.	E	ECE Regulation 95 - Lateral impact Proposal TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2002/11
15.	United States of America	0.3.	E	Comparison between FMVSS No. 206 and ECE R11

No.	Transmitted By	Agenda Item	Language	Title
16.	Spain	1.2.1.	E	Proposal for draft amendments to Regulation No. 14 (Safety-belt anchorage)
17.	France	1.7.1.	F/E	Proposition de corrigendum du Règlement No. 44
18.	France	1.7.1.	F/E	Proposition de corrigendum du Règlement No. 44
19.	France	1.7.1.	F/E	Proposition de corrigendum du Règlement No. 44
20.	France	1.7.1.	F/E	Proposition de corrigendum du Règlement No. 44
21.	France	1.7.1.	F/E	Proposition de corrigendum du Règlement No. 44
22.	Netherlands, Sweden, Germany and CI	1.7.1.	E	Proposal to amend Regulation No. 44 (2002/10)
--	ISO	1.8.	E	WorldSID
--	Japan	0.1.	E	Summary of IHRA Pedestrian Safety WG Activities
--	France	2.	E	ISOFIX French proposal (documents TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/14Rev1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/15Rev1; TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2001/16Rev1)
--	CI	1.7.1.	E	Child Restraint Systems A field study of misuse
--	OICA	1.8.	E	ES-2 concerns
--	United States of America	2.	E	Notice of proposed rulemaking
	United States of America	2.	E	Anchorage strength requirements
	United States of America	1.8.	E	ES-2 Back Plate/Seat Interaction

Annex 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE GRSP INFORMAL GROUP ON PEDESTRIAN SAFETY  
ADOPTED BY GRSP AT ITS THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

The development of the informal group within GRSP on the topic of pedestrian safety should be seen as a concentration of effort within GRSP and not a duplication of existing groups.

The work could examine and combine the efforts of the work done by Japan, the United States of America, EEVC, IHRA and any other governmental and non-governmental organizations in the area of pedestrian safety. It could then further develop the knowledge and requirements.

The aim of the group is to report and present a performance-based proposal for the testing and qualification of vehicles, including passenger cars, vans, and light trucks, with respect to pedestrian safety, which could reasonably be incorporated in a global technical regulation (gtr).

In developing such a report, the informal group should give consideration to:

- clarification of the number and source of the injuries (e.g., hood, windshield, pavement), the relative importance of fatal injury mechanisms and areas of the body affected;
- objective(s) and benefits of any new regulation (or amendments to existing regulations) with reference to present levels and sources of knowledge;
- use of the best available technology and improvements in technology that will provide significant steps in developing methods and in achieving and improving benefits, including both active and passive safety measures;
- the costs, both monetary and social, that may be attendant to each level of regulatory stringency or performance;
- the relationship or potential interaction of any proposed technical regulation to other regulations currently in force or to be adopted either individually by any Contracting Party or under existing Agreements administered by WP.29.

The informal group will have the responsibility of preparing and bringing forward a proposal for a gtr, based upon the research and development work done so far by different institutions and the industry and take account of any additional work that is being undertaken.

The preparation of the proposal shall consist of two phases:

Phase 1

The informal group shall prepare a written analysis of the feasibility and desirability for a gtr on pedestrian safety and submit it to the Executive Committee (AC.3) by the end of 2003.

The group shall investigate recommendations and methods of implementation with a view to the development of a global technical regulation.

Phase 2

Assuming that the Executive Committee of the 1998 Global Agreement maintains its previously expressed support for the development of a gtr, the informal group shall develop complete and detailed recommendations, in compliance with paragraph 6.3.4. of Article 6 of the 1998 Agreement, by the end of 2005.

---