



**Informal document No. 25**  
(85<sup>th</sup> GRSG, 21-24 October 2003  
agenda item 11.4)

**OICA DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR AN AMENDMENT TO DOCUMENT  
TRANS/WP29/GRSG/2003/11**

**A. PROPOSAL**

Paragraph 6.17.4., amend to read:

- “6.17.4. The bases of aerials shall not project more than 30 mm when determined according to the procedure of annex 3, paragraph 2. However, in the case of aerials with amplifiers built into the base, these bases may project up to 40 mm.
- 6.17.4.1.** In cases where by the absence of a flexible shaft or part it is not possible to identify what the base is of an aerial this requirement is deemed to be met if, after a horizontal force of not more than 50 daN in forward and rearward direction is applied by a flat-ended ram of not more than 50 mm diameter at the most salient part of the aerial:
- (a) the aerial bends towards the support and does not project more than 30 mm or 40 mm in case an amplifier is installed in the aerial or
  - (b) the aerial breaks off and the remaining part of the aerial does not show any sharp or dangerous part that can be contacted by the 100 mm sphere and does not project more than 30 mm or 40 mm in case an amplifier is installed in the remaining part of the aerial at the outside of the vehicle.”

add a new paragraph 6.17.4.2 , to read:

- “6.17.4.2 Paragraph 6.17.4.1 shall apply only to aerials located on the front half of the vehicle roof.”**

\* \* \*

**B. JUSTIFICATION**

ECE-R 26 paragraphs 5.2 & 5.3 specify the intention of this regulation as general requirements. UN/ECE-R 26 pays particular attention to the protrusion on headlight visor and rims, handle, hinges and push-buttons, wheel and hub nuts, and aerial base with limited projection which will be normally located so that people are possible to contact them easily.

The German institutes BAST and FAT collect accident data in connection with the project GIDAS (German In-Depth Accident Study – email address: [http://www.mh-hannover.de/forschung/unfallforschung/index\\_e.htm](http://www.mh-hannover.de/forschung/unfallforschung/index_e.htm) ). For that project the universities of Hanover

and Dresden investigated about 2,000 accidents per year in the extended areas of Hanover and Dresden since 1999. An analysis of that data base (in June 2003) shows that there were 2,448 accidents between vehicles and cyclists and 904 accidents between vehicles and pedestrians during that time. In only 2 cases of these relevant 3,352 accidents (= 0.06%) an aerial located on front of the roof frame injured the road users. Only one injury (= 0.03%) on a road user was caused by an aerial located on the rear of the roof frame, and it caused minor injuries only. That analysis of the real accident details shows that shark fin aerials injuries are not significant in accident data.

The above accident data show that there is no significant road safety benefit in amending the current regulation as proposed in document GRSG/2003/11 and that the majority of any gain will be achieved by avoiding such aerials near the front of the roof.

For that reason, OICA requests that the prescriptions set in document GRSG/2003/11 address only aerials located on the front half of the roof.

---