

UN ECE Regulation No. 107
8th meeting of the GRSG Informal Group on
Service Doors, Windows and Emergency Exits of buses and coaches
24-25 January 2012

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development Division LA 20 - Innovative
and communicative Vehicle Technologies, Automotive Engineering (Vehicle safety)
Robert-Schuman-Platz 1 D - 53175 Bonn
Germany

DRAFT REPORT

1. Welcome by the Chair

2. Approval of the minutes of the 7th meeting

Document: SDWEE -07-05 (Secretariat)

It was pointed out that in item 4.(e-f-o), reference should be made to SDWEE-02-07-rev4 (and not 02-04-rev4)

The Secretariat committed to check the availability of the relevant documents on the UNECE website.

The minutes were adopted with the changes mentioned above.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Document: SDWEE-08-01 (Secretariat)

The agenda was adopted, with additional references to document SDWEE-08-02, the email dated 23 January 2012 about transitional provisions, and the position of VanHool per email dated 23 January 2012.

4. Revision of working documents

Document:SDWEE-02-07-Rev.5 (Secretariat)

Background: SDWEE-02-07-Rev.5 provides the state of play of the work performed by the informal group at the time of the 8th meeting.

The Secretariat committed to make the format of the GRSG document as clear as possible for the experts who did not attend the informal group meetings.

a. Windows in the driver's compartment (paragraph 7.6.1.7.1.)

INSIA questioned why the escape hatches would see their dimensions increased, while the emergency windows would keep their current dimensions. The experts convened to discuss this point again when the group will reach the paragraphs on hatches. See item "j" below.

b. Driver's door provided in vehicles of classes A or B (paragraph 7.6.1.9.)

Wording improved for better clarity.

Paragraph 7.6.1.9.4.: A lengthy debate took place concerning the meaning of this paragraph. It was suggested to inspire the wording from the text of regulation N°52 where the meaning is clear. The group adopted the text proposed by Mr. McKenzie.

c. Number of passengers in the upper deck in the case of double-deck vehicles (paragraph 7.6.1.11.)

Spain challenged the threshold, as A/C is a must in Spain. The Chair suggested Spain to negotiate the available space with the A/C suppliers, as it would be a pity to jeopardise occupants' safety for the sake of A/C dimensions. It was suggested to keep the figure and increase the transitional provisions for the application of this figure. Germany mentioned that some vehicles in current production fulfil these requirements.

Conclusion:

- Spain committed to get information from the domestic A/C suppliers.
- The provisions were considered acceptable in accordance with the adoption of the proposed transitional provisions (see item 5 below)

d. Hatches in positions presenting a danger (paragraph 7.6.1.12.)

NL committed to check whether the referenced regulations cover the dangers that this paragraph aims to address.

Conclusion: sentence to be put between [].

e. Intercommunication staircases of a double-deck vehicle

Paragraph 7.6.1.15.: the group adopted the format as improved by the Secretary.

f. Direction of traffic (paragraph 7.6.2.1.1.)

The group found relevant that the applicant indicates the type of vehicle (left vs. right hand steering wheel), hence adopted a reference to the declaration for Type Approval.

g. Escape hatch on vehicles of class A

Paragraph 7.6.2.2.4.: the group agreed to delete this paragraph as the provision is covered by paragraph 7.6.2.5.

h. Door in the rear face (paragraph 7.6.2.2.5.)

This was discussed again in accordance with some input from the NL. The informal group convened that no manufacturer currently designs such kind of service door, and NL was keen to forbid this at least on vehicles of category I, II, III.

Conclusion: paragraph deleted.

i. Emergency exit in the rear face (paragraph 7.6.2.5.)

Document: position of VanHool per email dated 23 January 2012

This item was discussed again in view of the comments of VanHool. It was recalled that the previous decision was made in particular for the vehicles for the Scandinavian market. At least 2 members of the informal group were keen to keep the possibility of permanently closed off compartments (Alexander Denis and VanHool). The experts recognized a conflict of interests between these manufacturers and the rest of the group in this particular case. It was suggested to solve this problem thanks to extended transitional provisions. In addition, the question was raised whether the markets would accept this restriction.

The informal group was in majority in favour of deleting a paragraph excluding vehicles with a cargo bay from the mandatory fitment of an emergency exit in the rear face. The experts found no argument in favour of a cargo bay, save the possibility to keep a certain particular market. In addition, it was feared that such allowance would promote “blind face” architecture among the vehicle manufacturers with the logical side-effect on the safety. It was suggested that such architecture could be produced under a national exemption regime.

Conclusion: the final text of the paragraph to confirm the general requirement for an emergency exit in the rear face of the vehicles with exemptions for Classes I and A, and for the lower deck of a double deck vehicle.

j. Dimensions of the exits on the sides of the vehicles (paragraph 7.6.3.1.5.)

It was decided not to increase the dimensions of the exits on the sides of the vehicles:

- Space on the top is limited, while the currently required dimensions for the side exits are already considered sufficient.
- The size of the hatches was also increased as an answer to the request from the rescue services (German research) to pass injured passengers through the hatches.
- Usually, most of the time when the vehicles is standing on its wheels in case of emergency, the service doors are used for escaping, rather than the side emergency exits

k. Plastic films on side emergency windows (paragraph 7.6.8.7.)

Spain proposed to provide a corresponding national regulation. The group however was of the opinion that the currently proposed wording was acceptable as 1st step, with space for improvement in a later stage.

D informed the group about some internal domestic discussions to be started in the near future on the way to implement such plastic films. Spain clarified that their national regulation prohibits these films in the field of vision of the driver and in the case of emergency exits.

Conclusion: Spain committed to check at home whether the proposed text would be sufficiently accurate.

l. Markings (paragraph 7.6.11.)

The group decided to transfer all the requirements of paragraph 7.6.11 to paragraph 7.19. All requirements would ideally go to the bottom of the 7.19.

Basics of the agreement:

- Unanimity for requirement that an emergency exit shall be marked as such
- The pictogram is mandatory but can be supplemented by some text as appropriate

- Pictogram to be legible from both the inside and the outside of the vehicle
- If present the supplementary text needs only to be visible from inside the vehicle
- Paragraph 7.11. to go between 7.19.1.1. and 7.19.1.1.1. (i.e. as a new 7.19.1.2.)
- AMcK to provide an attempt to the informal group and the editorial Task Force in due time (before the 9th of February – done on 26 January 2012).

m. Emergency lighting (Paragraph 7.8.3.)

Document: SDWEE-08-02 (Germany)

The group revised document SDWEE-08-02 and adopted its amended version.

n. Safety signs (Paragraph 7.19.)

The group convened that the fitment of leaflets (proposal from VanHool per email dated 23 January 2012) would not be a proper alternative to safety signs as leaflets cannot fit the Type Approval requirements and feedbacks from the operators indicate that they would be taken away by the vehicle users. Leaflets could be present in addition to safety signs, but not as an alternative.

It was considered that the testing of safety signs for external use should not be under the responsibility of the Type Approval authority.

o. Emergency controls

The group agreed the value of 2 Nm for rotary controls of emergency exits. However, due to lack of time, the experts agreed that the final working document, to be tabled at GRSG-102 on behalf of the SDWEE informal group, would not contain the proposed requirements gathered in the table of item 4 (p) to the minutes of the 7th meeting.

5. Transitional provisions

Document: email dated 23 January 2012 (Germany)

The experts unanimously agreed that all amendments be introduced as follows:

New Types:	48 months
Existing Types:	60 months

The informal group trusted the Secretary for drafting the transitional provisions.

6. Justifications

The experts committed to provide input about the proposed justifications.

7. Next steps

- Editorial TF to meet on the 9th of February 2012 in Paris.
- Outcomes to be distributed to the informal group around the 10th of February
- Comments to be sent prior to 8 March to informal group Secretary
- Final proposal to be sent to the UNECE Secretariat around the 19th of March