CLEPA analysis
Future i-Size approval possibilities

FOR IG CONSIDERATION
26 Feb 2013.
5.2 “A type of Child Restraint System approved according to this regulation shall not bear another approval mark according to R44.”

Question to the group:
• How should “type” be interpreted?
• Does this mean that one CRS, identical in shape, form and name, shall not bear both an R44 and i-Size label?
• How different should 2 CRS be, to be allowed to have differs in size, form or name between the?
Existing R44 product

Possible

Name = XYZ
• A seat meeting all req’s of R44

Name = ABC
• A seat meeting all req’s of i-Size

Definition: To identify this situation, you need to buy 2 products.

2 physically different seats!
Existing R44 product

**Not Possible**  “dual approval”

1 seat, containing 2 labels on the same physical product.

Definition: To identify this situation, it’s enough to have 1 product at hand.
However

what do we think about combinations of babyshell with base?

3 possibilities of babyshell + base.
1. R44 babyshell + base = R44
2. R44 babyshell + base = i-Size
3. babyshell + base = i-Size
• A babyshell is quite different compared to a babyshell + base. (looks, mass, volume etc)

• Is this different enough, to be classified as a different “type” in the i-Size definition?
1. Hybrid

2. i-Size containing an R44 element

3. Full i-Size

Meets all i-Size criteria
Clepa Proposition

- Exclude 1. Hybrid
- Allow 3. Full i-Size (of course)
- Allow 2. i-Size + R44 element

1. Hybrid
2. i-Size + R44 element
3. Full i-Size

Besides current R44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for/against</th>
<th>1. Hybrid</th>
<th>2. i-Size + R44 element</th>
<th>3. Full i-Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☹ Is not as safe as 2 or 3 (e.g. no side impact).</td>
<td>☺ more flexibility</td>
<td>☻ best for safety and clearness of i-Size concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☹ 2 approvals next to each other</td>
<td>☺ Allows safe transport, even if base is temporarily not present. (accidental, unplanned transport such as daycare, grandparents, babysit etc)</td>
<td>☻ No carfitting list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☹ Needs carfitting list</td>
<td>☺ Natural phase out when R44 approval for Gr0+ disappears (~2015/16?)</td>
<td>☹ Chance of misuse (belt inst of babyshell) this Archetype is &gt;20 years old; Consumer: “of course a belt can be used; I’ll figure it out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☻ Conflicting user advise (mass/length)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not favoured by CLEPA
Expected misuse; Pebble w.o. hooks
It’s actually so “well” attached, that I can lean my 75kg’s on it….

This foot was not on the floor!
Impression of arrangement of approval marks

- **Current Familyfix**

  - [ECE R44-04 04443907]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + CabrioFix
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class E
    - 0-13 kg
    - Nr. 12345678

  - [ECE R44-04 04443906]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pebble
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class E
    - 0-13 kg
    - Nr. 12345678

  - [ECE R44-04 04443908]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pearl
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class B1
    - 9-18 kg
    - Nr. 12345678

- **1. Hybrid (not favoured)**

  - [ECE R44-04 04443906]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pebble
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class E
    - 0-13kg
    - Nr. 12345678

  - [ECE R44-04 04443908]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pearl
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class B1
    - 9-18 kg
    - Nr. 12345678

- **2. i-Size+R44 component**

  - [ECE R131 04443906]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pebble
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class E
    - 85-105cm
    - Nr. 12345678

- **3. Full i-Size**

  - [ECE R131 04443908]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pearl
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class B1
    - 9-18 kg
    - Nr. 12345678

  - [ECE R44-04 04443906]
    - E4
    - FamilyFix + Pebble
    - Semi Universal
    - IsoFix Class E
    - 85-105cm
    - Nr. 12345678