



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRE/2006/13
23 January 2006

Original: ENGLISH
ENGLISH AND FRENCH ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

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

Working Party on Lighting and Light-Signalling (GRE)
(Fifty-sixth session, 4-7 April 2006,
agenda item 14.)

PROPOSAL FOR DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO REGULATION No. 112

(Headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam)

Transmitted by the expert from the Working Party "Brussels 1952" (GTB)

Note: The text reproduced below was prepared by the expert from GTB in order to correct an error in the reference value for bend lighting minimum illumination in case of failure as well as in order to remove the provision concerning user's interference in devices, incorporated in headlamps. The modifications to the existing text of the Regulation (Supplement 5 to the original version) are marked in **bold** characters.

Note: This document is distributed to the Experts on Lighting and Light-Signalling only.

GE.06-20293

A. PROPOSAL

Paragraph 5.9.2., amend to read:

"5.9.2. in the case of failure the illumination to become a bend lighting, a minimum illumination of at least 3 lux shall be fulfilled in test point 25 V (V-V line, D 75 cm)."

Part B,

Paragraph 5.9.4., should be deleted.

B. JUSTIFICATION

Paragraph 5.9. addresses the requirements for mechanical, electro-mechanical or other devices incorporated in the headlamp to produce alternately a driving/passing beam or a passing beam and/or a driving beam to become a bend lighting.

When paragraph 5.9.2. was introduced by Supplement 2 to the original version, the value of 5 lux was copied from the corresponding failure provisions in paragraph 5.5.2. of Regulation No. 98, without taking into account the different measuring procedure in paragraph 6.1.3. of Regulation No. 112. The proposal is intended to specify the correct value.

According to paragraph 5.9.4., the device must be so constructed that the user cannot with ordinary tools change the shape or position of the moving parts. After a review of this provision, Technical Services represented in GTB Working Group Photometry have come to the conclusion that it is not applicable in practice: there is no definite test procedure and the headlamp would have to be destroyed for the test.

As there have been no adverse consequences from not performing such tests, the provision could be deleted without negative effects for safety.
