**Criteria of Extension and Revision of UN-R0**

This document is to confirm the criteria of Extension and Revision of UN-R0 stated in the Draft UN-R0 Q&A drafted by OICA.

|  |
| --- |
| **Q15: In which cases can an IWVTA be modified via a revision or via an extension?** |
| **Answer to Q15:** |
| The definition when a revision and when an extension are applicable is given in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 of Schedule 3 annexed to the 1958 agreement. For practical guidance the following scheme can be used:   1. Is there a change in Annex 5 Part I (variants and versions changed or added)? if yes: **Extension** 2. A) Is there a change in Annex 5 Part III (system approvals extended or added)? if yes: consider part B) of this question B) Does the change affect variants and versions of the IWVTA type? if yes: **Extension** 3. Does a change in Annex 5 Part II (information document) also affect the communication form (Annex I) if yes: **Extension** 4. Answer to all previous questions is no: **Revision**   *Remark concerning the second question: since the type definitions of some equipment and parts differ from that for IWVTA, a separate approval could cover vehicles not belonging to the IWVTA type in question. If the change in such an approval affects only vehicle not included in the IWVTA, a Revision can be used.* |

Confirmation point

1: Above draft mentions that it is designated as an extension in case variants and versions changed or added. Is it because further inspection is required? (Paragraph 2.6 (a) of schedule 3)  
In the previous Pre-test TF, Japan proposed it can be a Revision. (See SGR0-20-14)

Response PS: yes, addition of additional variants or versions always means that further inspections are required. These inspections don´t necessarily mean that additional testing is necessary (can be covered by existing worst case), but this has to be scrutinized which in my understanding means an inspection in the sense of Schedule 3. For that reason addition of variants or versions could not be done by revision in my understanding.

2: Above draft does not include the cases related to a series change. Should it be added to this Q&A?

1. A later series of UN-R0  
   Response PS: if a U-IWVTA is upgraded to a later series then there have to be changes in the separate approvals to maintain the U-status. Therefore, the answer to Question 2.A)+B) above will always be “yes” meaning it has to be an extension. (Upgrading an L-IWVTA to a later series without changing the attached separate approvals makes no sense so there is no need to cover it.)
2. A later series of individual UN-R listed in Part III of information document  
   Response PS: in that case, the answer to Question 2.A)+B) is “yes” meaning it has to be an extension.

Both cases are included in SGR0-20-14.  
Response PS: In summary, I believe these cases are included via answering question 2.A)+B).

3: Above draft adds the following sentence related to notice of Revision.

*Remark concerning notice of Revision: Notice of Revision is not necessary to be communicated to the Contracting Parties but is to be uploaded on a secure internet database.  
Response PS: I´m not sure about the intention of this paragraph. If it is your proposal to add this remark to the Q+A then I fully agree.*

For comparison between SGR0-20-14 and DRAFT R0Q&A, see next page.

Comparison between SGR0-20-14 & DRAFT UN-R0 Q&A

Extensions and revisions (examples)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SGR0-20-14 | | | Draft Q&A | |
|  | Change made | Ext./rev. for R0 | Ext./rev. for R0 | Remarks |
| 1 | Only specs. of Part II of R0 changed | Rev. | Rev. |  |
| 2 | Variant/version changed  (change made to Part I/II/III) | Rev. | **Ext.** | PS: As argued above I believe this cannot be handled by revision |
| 3 | Change of the extension number for an approval to one of the individual UN-Rs in Part III | Rev. | Rev. |  |
| **Ext.** | In case variant and Version (contained in IWVTA) changed or added |
| 4 | New type approved to one of the individual UN-Rs in Part III added | Rev. | Rev. |  |
| **Ext.** | In case variant and Version (contained in IWVTA) changed or added |
| 5 | Type approved to a new series of amendments of one of the individual UN-Rs in Part III | Ext. | **Rev.** |  |
| Ext. | In case variant and Version changed or added  I believe this is an extension in all cases |
| 6 | An individual UN-R added to Part III | Ext. | **Rev.** |  |
| Ext. | In case variant and Version changed or added  I believe this is an extension in all cases because you can only add approvals that cover variants/versions within the IWVTA type |
| 7 | Commercial name/company address changed | Ext. | Ext. |  |
| 8 | Type approval to a new series of amendments of R0 | Ext. | **Rev.** |  |
| Ext. | In case variant and Version changed or added  PS: As argued above I believe this can never be handled by revision |
| 9 | Revision of one of the individual UN-Rs | No notification required | / | Agree, but this is also covered because the answer to all questions in Q15 is “no”. |