

**Remarks to ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/2006/20
(Regulation No. 58: Rear underrun protection)**

A. PROPOSAL

Insert new paragraphs 7.4. to 7.4.2., to read:

"7.4 For vehicles fitted with a platform lift at the rear, [the fitting of] the underrun device may be interrupted for the purposes of the mechanism. In this case, the following special requirements apply:

7.4.1 the lateral distance between the fitting elements of the underrun device and the elements of the platform lift, which make the interruption necessary, may amount to no more than 2.5 cm.

7.4.2. The individual elements of the underrun protection device must have an effective surface area, in each case, of at least 350 cm²."

Insert new paragraphs 25.8. to 25.8.2., to read:

"25.8. For vehicles fitted with a platform lift at the rear, the [fitting of the] underrun device may be interrupted for the purposes of the mechanism. In this case, the following special requirements apply:

25.8.1. the lateral distance between the fitting elements of the underrun device and the elements of the platform lift, which make the interruption necessary, may amount to no more than 2.5 cm;

25.8.2. the individual elements of the underrun protection device must have an effective surface area, in each case, of at least 350 cm²."

Annex V, paragraph 3.2., amend to read:

"3.2. If the points defined under paragraph 3.1.2. are located within the interruption area mentioned in paragraph 7.4. or 25.8. of this Regulation, the required points will be located in the middle of any lateral section of the rear underrun protection device."

B. JUSTIFICATION

The European Commission and France have formulated a proposal for amending Regulation No. 58 in document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSG/2006/20. One of the proposals formulates in Annex 5, paragraph 3.2. new requirements for the situation where a platform lift is fitted to the rear of the vehicle. Annex 5 is dealing with test conditions and procedures. The Netherlands has some doubts whether the introduction of the new requirements in Annex 5, paragraph 3.2. is done on the correct place.

Annex 5, paragraph 3.2.1., limits a certain distance between the RUPD and the lift while paragraph 3.2.2. regulates the effective surface of the individual elements of the RUPD. These requirements can not be considered as “test conditions” or “test procedures”. Only paragraph 3.2.3. can be regarded as a test condition or procedure as mentioned in the title of this Annex.

It is necessary to have somewhere in the paragraphs a reference to Annex V for applying the paragraph 3.2. of Annex V. The references to Annex V are as follows:

- PART I, approval of a RUPD as a technical unit.

PART I, paragraph 7.3. refers to Annex V, but only in relation with the resistance against forces and the horizontal deflection and not for the distance and effective surface as mentioned in paragraph 1. above. This means that there is no legal basis for paragraphs 3.2.1. and 3.2.2. in case of the approval of a RUPD as a technical unit.

- PART III, vehicle approval with regard to its rear underrun protection (RUP)

Paragraph 25.6. refers to Annex V, but only in relation with the resistance against forces and the distance between the rear of the RUP and the “rear of the vehicle” during and after the test. This also means that there is no legal basis for paragraphs 3.2.1. and 3.2.2. of Annex V in case of a vehicle approval with regard to its RUP.

Part II, approval of a vehicle with regard to the installation of an already approved RUPD contains no reference to Annex V, but to our opinion this is not needed.

The Netherlands suggest that the text of Annex V, paragraphs 3.2.1. and 3.2.2. should be integrated in paragraph 7. (requirements for the approval of a RUPD) and in paragraph 25. (requirements for vehicle approval with regard its RUP). Paragraph 3.2.3. of Annex V can stay in that annex, but only in an amended wording.
