

## Unique Identifier (UI)

### Discussion document for SLR-20


#### *Proposal for Revision 3 of the 1958 Agreement*

ECE/TRANS/WP.29/2016/2

#### Schedule 5

#### Circulation of approval documentation

3. If the type approvals applicable to a wheeled vehicles, equipment or parts are stored on the secure internet database, then the approval markings required by UN Regulations may be replaced by a Unique Identifier (UI) preceded by the symbol (UI), unless specified otherwise in the UN Regulations. Such unique identifier shall be generated by the database automatically.

<p>If the type approvals applicable to a wheeled vehicles, equipment or parts are stored on the secure internet database,</p>		<p>then the approval markings required by UN Regulations may be replaced by a Unique Identifier (UI) preceded by the symbol (UI), unless specified otherwise in the UN Regulations. Such unique identifier shall be generated by the database automatically.</p>
---	---	--

#### **ASSUMING THE FIRST CONDITION IS MET:**

**The approval markings** required by UN Regulations **may be replaced** by a Unique Identifier (UI), **unless specified otherwise** in the UN Regulations.

<b>Interpretation #1</b>	<p>In a UN Regulation it may be specified that <u>UI shall replace</u> existing “E markings”, i.e. only UI allowed in that specific Regulation.</p>	<p><b>This option would solve the GRE problems:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of space for existing markings</li> <li>- handling of the markings in case of new series of amendments applying only to some devices (simplification of Regulations)</li> </ul>
<b>Interpretation #2</b>	<p>In a UN Regulation it may be specified that <u>UI shall NOT replace</u> existing “E markings”, i.e. UI NOT allowed in that specific Regulation.  → <i>In this case, is it necessary to specify in the UN Regulation that no UI is allowed, or it is implicit?</i></p>	<p>This option would not solve the GRE problems. The current E-marking will remain the only option like today, i.e. lighting Regulations will never benefit of the DETA.</p> <p><b>In this case there would be no value in having DETA available</b></p>
<b>Interpretation #3</b>	<p>In a UN Regulation it may be specified that <u>UI MAY replace</u> existing “E markings”, i.e. both existing “E markings” and UI allowed in that specific Regulation.</p>	<p>This option would be the worst case because it would increase the GRE problems. An optional use of the UI would mean that the existing E-marking would be an ongoing requirement, <u>in addition</u> to the UI that may still be requested by some CPs. <b>In this case there would be no value in having DETA available</b></p>

**Question:** who should decide if a specific UN Regulation may/shall/shall not use UI? The GRs (on the basis of the consensus among CPs), each individual CPs or industry?