



Australian Government

Department of Infrastructure and Transport

GPO Box 594
Canberra ACT 2601

VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

Telephone: 61 2 6274 7111
Facsimile: 61 2 6274 6013

NEW VEHICLE LOW VOLUME VEHICLE SCHEME

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES MANUAL

May 2011

CONTROLLED COPY NUMBER: **Uncontrolled Copy**

COPYHOLDER: **Internet**

The information contained within this Evidence Examination Manual is the property of the
Department of Infrastructure and Transport.
It must not be used for commercial or other purposes without the consent of the
ADMINISTRATOR OF VEHICLE STANDARDS.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

SECTION 1 GENERAL

1.0 Control Sheet

SECTION 2 LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

1.0 Scope
2.0 Responsibilities
3.0 Purpose
4.0 Background
5.0 Levels of Evidence
6.0 Related Documents

SECTION 3 EXAMINATION PROCESS

1.0 Examination Preparation
2.0 Evidence - Assurances
3.0 Evidence - Alternative Procedures
4.0 Evidence - Normal Procedures
5.0 General Cautions in Examining Evidence

SECTION 4 LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL (ADRs primarily for motor cycles, trailers) (and heavy vehicles are not included)

LV 1 Reversing Lamps
LV 2 Side Door Latches and Hinges
LV 3 Seats and Seat Anchorages
LV 4 Seatbelts
LV 5 Anchorages for Seatbelts
LV 6 Direction Indicator Lamps
LV 8 Safety Glazing Material
LV 10 Steering Column
LV 11 Internal Sun Visors
LV 13 Installation of Lighting and Light-Signalling Devices on other than L-Group Vehicles
LV 14 Rear Vision Mirrors
LV 18 Instrumentation
LV 21 Instrument Panel
LV 22 Head Restraints
LV 23 Passenger Car Tyres
LV 25 Anti-Theft Lock
LV 28 External Noise of Motor Vehicles
LV 29 Side Door Strength
LV 30 Diesel Engine Exhaust Smoke Emissions
LV 31 Hydraulic Brake Systems for Passenger Cars
LV 34 Child Restraint Anchorages and Child Restraint Anchor Fittings
LV 35 Commercial Vehicle Brake Systems
LV 42 General Safety Requirements
LV 43 Vehicle Configuration and Dimensions
LV 45 Lighting and Light-Signalling Devices not Covered by ECE Regulations
LV 46 Headlamps

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

LV 47	Reflex Reflectors
LV 48	Rear Registration Plate Illumination Devices
LV 49	Front & Rear Position (Side) Lamps, Stop Lamps and End-Outline Marker Lamps
LV 50	Front Fog Lamps
LV 51	Filament Globes
LV 52	Rear Fog Lamps
LV 58	Requirements for Omnibuses Designed for Hire and Reward
LV 60	Centre High-Mounted Stop Lamp
LV 61	Vehicle Marking
LV 62	Mechanical Connections Between Vehicles
LV 65	Maximum Road Speed Limiting for Heavy Goods Vehicles and Heavy Omnibuses
LV 69	Full Frontal Impact Occupant Protection
LV 72	Dynamic Side Impact Occupant Protection
LV 73	Offset Frontal Impact Occupant Protection
LV 74	Side Marker Lamps
LV 75	Headlamp Cleaners
LV 76	Daytime Running Lamps
LV 77	Gas Discharge Headlamps
LV 78	Gas Discharge Light Sources
LV 79	Emission Control for Light Vehicles
LV 80	Emission Control for Heavy Vehicles
LV 81	Fuel Consumption Labelling for Light Vehicles
LV 82	Engine Immobilizers
LV 83	External Noise
LV 84	Front Underrun Impact Protection

ATTACHMENT 1

Abbreviations

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

1.0 SCOPE

- 1.1 These procedures apply to all formal examinations of evidence submitted for new or amended Low Volume Identification Plate Approval (LV IPA) applications for new vehicles (commonly called Compliance Plate Approval). They are also to be used where additional evidence is provided for approval.
- 1.2 This manual needs to be read in conjunction with Administrator's Circular 0-4-1, which sets out procedures for the certification of new vehicles supplied in low volume, and Administrator's Circular 0-2-13, which sets out arrangements for new low production passenger cars.

2.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

- 2.1 The Section head responsible for new low volume vehicle certification is responsible for ensuring the currency of these procedures and for their proper use generally.
- 2.2 Individual examining officers using these procedures are assumed to be engineers or technical officers with relevant automotive or technical experience and are responsible for acting in accordance with these procedures.

3.0 PURPOSE

- 3.1 Evidence examination is an integral part of the LV IPA assessment, and has two aims to ensure that :
 - there is evidence for all applicable Australian Design Rules (ADRs); and
 - the evidence for all applicable ADRs is to a standard that gives reasonable confidence that the subject vehicles comply with all the requirements of the ADRs. This means that it should be consistent with the guidelines provided in the Administrator's Circulars (AC).

NOTE: The "Administrator's Circulars" are public documents whose purpose is to provide guidance and promote uniformity of decisions in administering the Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989.

- 3.2 It is important to note that the low volume procedures outlined in this document are intended to provide a concessional basis to examine evidence of compliance with the applicable Australian Design Rules for the make/model of vehicles being examined. There are no concessions against meeting the Australian Design Rules themselves.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

4.0 BACKGROUND

4.1 General Principles

4.1.1 Evidence submitted is deemed to be on behalf of the applicant, either directly or by way of authority for a consulting engineer to act on the applicant's behalf.

4.1.2 Evidence examination is an audit process and not an exhaustive one. This leaves the ultimate responsibility for accuracy with the applicant, but it is important for process efficiency that:

- a consistent approach is taken on the type and depth of the evidence sought;
- the audit focus is on the areas where problems are likely to exist;
- each application is treated on its merits without reference to decisions taken on other applications; and
- the approach by examination officers is in-line with this document and direction by the Administrator of Vehicle Standards.

4.1.3 The evidence provided in a submission should meet the test, "does the evidence provided logically lead the examiner to conclude, in relation to the vehicle concerned, that to the extent reasonably possible the vehicle meets all the requirements of the ADR under consideration". The level of proof should be substantial but does not need to be absolute.

4.1.4 All evidence relied upon by the applicant in support of a LV-IPA application must be readily available from the applicant, on request, during this examination phase or in response to subsequent audits.

4.1.5 For the purpose of applicability of new ADRs to low volume vehicles, if the same make/model of vehicle has been previously issued with an approval under low volume procedures a vehicle model is considered not to be a "new model vehicle".

4.2 Process

4.2.1 Evidence examination follows the "Lodge" and "Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD)/ Eligibility" processes, and leads to one of three different outcomes:

- a Low Volume Inspection (referred to often as a Single Uniform Type Inspection (SUTI)) in the case of a new or substantially upgraded IPA application;
- the issue of an upgraded approval to an existing IPA holder. This is usually for the addition of new ADRs to the approval; or
- formal recognition of additional evidence that may or may not require an amended RVD document. This is typically for an additional engine type or different components.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

5.0 LEVELS OF EVIDENCE

There are three levels of evidence:

5.1 Assurance:

5.1.1 Evidence is to be provided in the form of a definite assurance and not as a general statement that the applicant stands aside from.

5.1.2 Any alternative evidence that is offered should be supplemental and give confidence that the assurance is well considered. It should not seek to displace the formal assurance or qualify it. The assurance should remain as a 100% "guarantee" of compliance.

5.1.3 The Licensee is required to retain a record of the basis of the assurance for conformity of production (COP) audit purposes.

5.2 Alternative Procedures:

5.2.1 Evidence is to be objective and substantive in so far as it is practical to provide it. The evidence must be presented as a case in relation to the ADR. The evidence should present a sound engineering argument which leads to the conclusion that the vehicle should comply with the ADR. It is not for the examiner to draw the connection between the evidence and the ADR. There are four basic styles, giving decreasing levels of confidence from (a) to (d) as below, though the evidence in a particular situation may be a mix of any of these:

- (a) Evidence may be in relation to a "mark" (such as an "E mark") denoting compliance with a standard (such as an ECE approval) where such a standard is recognised as an alternative standard in the ADR concerned. In this case the existence of such a mark is sufficient evidence unless there is reason for concern.
- (b) Evidence may be inferred, that a vehicle complies with the requirements of the ADR, from the standard applying to the construction of a vehicle (or a component part) by virtue of the origin and history of the vehicle:
 - where that standard is acknowledged in the ADR as an alternate standard it will be accepted as sufficient evidence so long as there is no policy or practice to the contrary or any specific reason giving concern that the evidence should not be accepted;
 - where that standard is not formally acknowledged as an alternate standard in the ADR, it is necessary to link the requirements of that standard to those in the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

The link may be established by comparing the major points of the standard and the ADR in a table. Any deficiencies or lesser requirement/s in the alternate standard should be accounted for by technical argument or additional evidence. The applicant should make a final statement claiming equivalence in the light of the evidence presented, and in the case where no deficiencies have been recognised formally include this in the statement. The final decision to accept or reject this evidence may include any concern the examiner has about the presentation and quality of the evidence overall.

- (c) Evidence may be based on a direct comparison with other components from other vehicles relating to the ADR. This may be by showing that the part number/s are the same as for a full volume IPA vehicle, or that a substantial comparison of the physical dimensions of the parts, and including a reference to their source, shows they are the same as in the vehicle under consideration.
 - Evidence on the materials of construction used may also be required if there is a concern that different or inferior materials have been used for a part that otherwise appears identical.
- (d) Evidence may be generated by an abbreviated alternative test procedure or engineering argument, including by calculation, that in practical engineering terms may be regarded as demonstrating that the item does meet the requirements of the ADR,
 - The weight to be given to the evidence depends on the sophistication of the test and/or calculations. Calculations that are not substantial (ie. simple calculations for a complex matter) or very crude physical tests should not be regarded as satisfactory if the safety implications are substantial and particularly where it is practical to provide evidence that gives more assurance.
 - The use of general descriptions and references to nominal standards should only be accepted as background advice and not as the principal evidence except where it is not practical to do otherwise.

5.3 Normal Procedures:

- 5.3.1 Evidence is required to be on SE and SF (where applicable) forms. The standard of evidence is the same as that for a full volume IPA and this means that the applicant must have, or have direct access to, the full test report/s and documentation behind the SE, and SF forms.
- 5.3.2 The basic requirement to have full access to the original test data is not always entirely practical; for example some seat belt manufacturers will provide additional information to the examiner but do not normally provide this to their client.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

- 5.3.3 The evidence should relate to a vehicle, of the make, model and year range in question. If this is not apparent it is for the applicant to provide a substantive case that the evidence provided is valid. For seatbelts this principally means that the anchorage points (and including ELR positions) for the subject vehicle must be less than 100 mm removed from the actual test points. For emissions evidence this means that each criterion in the ADR needs to be addressed.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME EVIDENCE EXAMINATION

RELATED DOCUMENTS

- 6.1 The procedures within this manual do not stand alone.

The procedures in this manual must be read in conjunction with:

Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989;
Motor Vehicle Standards Regulations;
Australian Design Rules for Motor Vehicles and Trailers, Third Edition;
Administrator's Circulars;
Vehicle Standards Bulletins, where relevant.

- 6.3 In cases of inconsistency the Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989, Motor Vehicle Standards Regulations and the Australian Design Rules for Motor Vehicles and Trailers are the authoritative references.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

EXAMINATION PROCESS

1.0 EXAMINATION PREPARATION

- 1.1 Check that the vehicle is listed on the "Register of Specialist and Enthusiast Vehicles" (not required for 2nd stage of manufacture vehicles).
- 1.2 Check the scope of the variants and engine families included within the Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD), and ensure that all required evidence multiples are provided.
- 1.3 For ADRs where SF forms (Selection of Fleet) are available, check that SF forms have been provided and cover all variants and options shown on the RVD.

SF forms are required where there is more than one variant even if the evidence required for the ADR is "alternative procedures". In this case, the SF form should be completed as if a test were to be carried out. Once the "worst case" has been selected via the SF form the actual ADR evidence can be an SE form or "alternative procedures" evidence, where this is allowed. The reference to the ADR evidence should be shown on the SF form where a reference to an SE form is required.

- 1.4 Check the detail of the evidence provided for each ADR against the level as outlined in Administrator's Circular 0-2-1 and as per the detailed guideline given in Section 4.

2.0 EVIDENCE - ASSURANCES

- 2.1 A properly worded formal assurance should be something like, "I hereby give an assurance that the requirements of ADR 42/00 are met", and be signed by the assurer. It should not be of the form, "the widget has been to built to comply with ADR 42/00".

NOTE: While an assurance may include elements of evidence to give additional confidence, such alternative evidence will not be accepted in lieu unless it is complete.

- 2.2 Individual assurances are required to be submitted for each relevant ADR. The grouping of all assurances in a single document is not acceptable.

3.0 EVIDENCE - ALTERATIVE PROCEDURES

- 3.1 When a reference is made to something being "E marked" or "ECE approved" the

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

EXAMINATION PROCESS

full mark must be advised. This will always be more than “E₁₃”, but may not be as much as the following for a reversing lamp:

AR (E₁₃) 02 4352.

The “DOT” mark is commonly referred to where USA standards apply, although this is only directly applicable for a couple of ADRs; tyres and glazing for example.

- 3.2 Evidence in relation to the country of manufacture of a vehicle is helpful though of limited value as the build standard of a vehicle will be dependent on the intended market for that vehicle. Most manufacturers have build standards that are tailored to meet the minimum and differing regulatory requirements for the country where the vehicle is to be marketed.
- 3.3 References to standards that are not recognised by the ADR concerned should use the correct name of the standard and include its applicability date as the detail of many standards change (and become more demanding) over time. In the case of Japanese requirements, and contrary to recent custom, applicants should not normally refer to TRIAS as a standard. The TRIAS series are procedures that normally contain no specific performance requirement/s. Applicants should refer to the appropriate Regulation.
- 3.4 Physical descriptions that suggest construction is typical are of little value, and are only acceptable in limited circumstances. Such descriptions are useful as a background against which more detailed test evidence can be examined, but may be accepted for the less complex and more obvious matters. An example of this might be, “The instruments are located directly in front of the driver and the requirements of the ADR are met”, when the vehicle concerned is marketed into a regulated and mature market like the USA or Japan.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

EXAMINATION PROCESS

4.0 EVIDENCE - NORMAL PROCEDURES

- 4.1 The expectation where normal procedures evidence is required is that only the relevant SE and SF forms need to be provided. These are to be fully completed. It is expected that the full test reports behind these forms will be made available on request, when clarification or verification of the SE/SF forms is required.

There are a number of signs where evidence must reasonably be questioned. These include inaccurate references to vehicle details, highly improbable answers, errors in referring to related documents or where there are blank fields. Where there are concerns the applicant should be asked to confirm or correct the situation. Alternatively, the examiner might ask for a certified copy of the original report to validate the SE form. The final decision on the level of assurance needed is one on-balance.

5.0 GENERAL CAUTIONS IN EXAMINING EVIDENCE

- 5.1 A statement that ECE is equivalent to (or is accepted for) a Japanese standard does not mean that the Japanese standard is equivalent to the ECE standard (and therefore the relevant ADR) because the ECE standard may have greater test requirements.
- 5.2 Ambiguous wording is not acceptable. A typical form of ambiguity is, "Approved item shall be used, or a similar item". The words "similar item" effectively means "anything". Words like "for all practical purposes identical too" are preferred where authors properly feel they cannot properly use the word "identical" without qualification. If the word "similar" is to be admitted, the applicant should advise the minimum criteria that will be met.
- 5.3 Other examples of ambiguous wording include referring to a single vehicle, for example, "An examination of Vehicle 123 showed it to have..." when what is sought is information that, "all vehicles of the model 456 have.....". Another example is evidence that implies compliance but does not commit to it, for example, "new tyres that are fitted will be DOT marked". This does not mean that new (complying) tyres will be fitted. Other examples include document titles that indicate only some of a number of variants are covered.
- 5.4 Any non-compliance or possible non-compliance arising out of a comparison between a nominated standard and an ADR should lead to a request for evidence to address the matter. The ultimate level of "proof" required is an on-balance

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

EXAMINATION PROCESS

decision affected by the significance of the matter and the practicality of obtaining evidence.

- 5.5 Particular issues that should be recognised during evidence examination include:
- where “alternative procedures” evidence is acceptable for ≤ 25 approval “normal procedures” evidence may be required for some ADRs where the approval is for ≤ 100 vehicles per annum (see Administrator’s Circular 0-4-1).
 - approvals for ≤ 100 vehicles per annum are not available for Low Production Passenger Cars (see Administrator’s Circular 0-2-13).

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 1/ Reversing Lamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
1/00	Light Intensity – Max. Cd min. Cd Colour	<p>Expect to see evidence of an “E mark” (all of it) in relation to ECE 23 or point by point comparison between a Japanese Regulation (JR) or USA standard and the ADR requirements or the use of an ADR approved lamp (either from a full volume vehicle or approved under the component scheme).</p> <p>A reference to the ADR provision that provides for an alternate standard is required if the only evidence provided is the mark in relation to that alternate standard.</p> <p>Test/analysis re trichromatic coordinates is only required where there is doubt about the colour.</p> <p>Note: Evidence based on Japanese Regulations (JR) or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s first sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s:

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 1/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was sourced in Japan, and
- an analysis (attached) of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (Article 40) shows its requirements are equivalent to those in the ADR.

OR

- the lamps are ECE approved as evidenced by the mark “AR E₁₃ 02 1234”, and as provided for in Clause 1.3 of the ADR.

The examples given are to be supported by the appropriate level of detail evidence, and are only some of the possible general approaches that may be accepted. Example Summary Claims shown for other ADRs may be relevant though the options that can apply will be limited for evidence where “assurance” and “normal procedures” rules apply.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 2/ Side Door Latches and Hinges

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
2/00 2/01	Evidence re longitudinal and transverse loading of hinges and locks.	<p>Expect to see</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval to ECE 11/00 to 11/02 with additional information on lock function/s (for ADR2/00) or - Substantive demonstration by way of part numbers for all the main parts between a full volume reference vehicle and the subject vehicle or - a point by point comparison between a JR or USA standard with ADR requirements or - physical observations and measurements of all main parts on the reference vehicle and the subject vehicle with, if there is any doubt, evidence on the relative physical properties or - a comprehensive stress analysis - note this should include a professional analysis of all the likely modes of failure - If the analysis path is chosen the calculations will have a proper regard to the interaction and combination of shear and bending forces. Overly simplistic assumptions about the behaviour of sheet metal shall be avoided where thin metal sections are involved in combination with high local stresses. - It is not envisaged that the analysis path would be used in preference to a comparison of standards on a mass produced vehicle because, if done properly, it is likely to take more time and then only be directly applicable to one vehicle model. - A reference to the ADR provision that provides for an alternate standard is required if the only evidence provided is the mark in relation to that alternate standard. <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard. Additionally for 2/01 (see Clause 7.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The technical requirements of UN ECE Global Technical Regulation No.1 – Door Locks and Door Retention Components.

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 2/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was sourced in Japan, and
- an analysis (attached) of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (Article 25) shows its requirements are equivalent to those in the ADR.

OR

- the vehicle is fitted with hinge and latch assemblies that are identical with those on the *make model (year)* full volume vehicle.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 3/ Seats and Seat Anchorages

Alternative Procedures (≤ 25)

Normal Procedures (≤ 100)

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
3/02 3/03	<p>Forward longitudinal load Rearward longitudinal load Rearward seat back moment</p> <p>If seat backs hinged - restraining device – inertia - device to be self locking</p> <p>Absence or otherwise of any seat belt anchorages or Child Restraint Anchorages (CRAs) on the seat.</p> <p>Additional load test if CRAs more than 100 mm below top of seat back.</p> <p>Rearward moment. Energy dissipation of seat backs.</p> <p>Additionally for 3/03: Roughness or sharp edges (5.1.4) Head restraints Displaced luggage (5.15)</p>	<p>Except where normal evidence applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evidence re ECE 17/03 or /04 and/or 14/02 (for ADR3/02) or - evidence re ECE 17/07 (for ADR3/03) or <p>For low volume up to 25 vehicles only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expect to see a point by point comparison between a JR or USA standard with ADR requirements or - a substantive demonstration by way of part numbers for all the main parts between a full volume reference vehicle and the subject vehicle or - physical observations and measurements of all main parts on the reference vehicle and the subject vehicle with, if there is any doubt, some assessment of the relative physical properties or - a comprehensive stress analysis - note this should include a professional analysis of all the likely modes of failure or - physical testing (full volume standard not mandatory) or - If the analysis path is chosen the calculations will have a proper regard to the interaction and combination of shear and bending forces. Overly simplistic assumptions about the behaviour of sheet metal shall be avoided where thin metal sections are involved in combination with high local stresses. <p>It is not envisaged that the analysis path would be used in preference to a comparison of standards on a mass produced vehicle because, if done properly, it is likely to take more time and then only be directly applicable to one vehicle model.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s: (for <25 vehicles/annum) (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 3/02 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was sourced in Japan, and
- an analysis (attached) of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (Article 22) shows its requirements are equivalent to those in the ADR, and

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

- physical testing of a seat from a make/model/year, dated *day/month/year*, to demonstrate compliance with the higher rearward moment requirement (530 Nm) in the ADR

OR

- the seat is identical to that in the make/model/year full volume vehicle as determined
 - : by a general comparison of the seats, and
 - : the fact of identical part numbers appearing in the original manufacturers spare parts micro-fiche for the Australian delivery and Japanese delivery vehicles.

Example Summary Claim/s: (for <100 vehicles/annum)

Submission of a completed SE03/02 or SE3/03 form.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 4/ Seatbelts

Normal Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
4/03 4/04	<p>All relevant fields in the SE form to be completed.</p> <p>Extension sheets listing all tests carried out, including belt fitment tests.</p> <p>“RVCS Blank Sheet” to be submitted for front OE belts, addressing all belt related items re ADR 69/00 exemption.</p>	<p>SE forms to be provided for each seating position except where provision for Original Equipment (OE) belts under ADR 69 exemptions apply.</p> <p>SE forms to be provided for all belts for all variations over the model range.</p> <p>Test data (to be retained by Licensee & supplied to VSS on request) is to relate to the subject vehicle directly, or by way of a layout drawing comparing the anchorage coordinates for, and overall anchorage differences between, the reference and subject vehicles.</p> <p>ADR SE form is not required for the front seating positions in vehicles meeting ADR 69/00 when new OE equipment is fitted provided the belts meet the seat belt related items detailed for ADR 69/.. in this manual.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at and of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 4/03 is claimed on the basis that:

- normal evidence has been provided for each belt (model/part no.) required to fit each position in all vehicle variants in this application, and
- the applicant has or has direct access to the original test report/s concerned.

Note - in the case of some test houses the above ‘report/s’ may be original SE form/s with VSS having the capacity, if the need arises, to inquire of the test house in respect of the details of the original test.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 5/ Anchorages for Seatbelts

Alternative Procedures (≤ 25)

Normal Procedures (≤ 100)

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
5/04 5/05	Load capacity - lap anchorages : lap only and lap/torso - final torso anchorage - anchorages on pillars Anchorage bolt size Anchorage location Positions with ELRs	<p>Except where normal evidence applies:</p> <p>Expect to see a point by point comparison between an overseas standard which the vehicle complies with and ADR requirements or a comprehensive stress analysis - note this should include a professional analysis of all the likely modes of failure or physical testing (Full Vol standard not mandatory) or evidence in relation to ECE 14/02 or higher (ADR 5/04), ECE 14/06 or higher (ADR 5/05).</p> <p>It should be made clear if OE mounting points are being used or not and whether any adaptor plates have been used.</p> <p>On anchorage position/s a general statement will be sufficient for US and Japanese vehicles that are sold in volume.</p> <p>Expect to see a summary of calculations if other than flat adaptor plates in tension are used and a statement about why <u>any</u> adaptor plate that might be used is regarded as sufficient. A calculation or testing will be required for any fabricated adaptor.</p> <p>Evidence should be provided to show how correct ELR alignment will be assured when adaptor plates are used.</p> <p>Drawings referred to in evidence for adaptor plates should be included on the 0-4-5 Inspection Certificate page 2.</p> <p>7/16 UNF bolts preferred (10.5 mm)</p>

Example Summary Claim/s (for <25 vehicles/annum): (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 5/ is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was built for use in the US, and
- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in the US (FMVSS 210) shows the strength and position requirements for anchorages are equivalent to those in the ADR, and
- all anchorages are as originally made by the manufacturer for the US market, and
- the type of belt fitted to each position is as specified in the Clause 5.2 Table in the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

Example Summary Claim/s (for <100 vehicles/annum):

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 5/ is claimed on the basis that:

- load tests have been conducted according to ADR requirements by a VSS registered laboratory, the results of which are in evidence and show that the subject vehicle has passed, and
- the make/model/year of vehicle was tested in "as originally manufacturerd" condition and is substantially identical to all the the vehicle variants that are the subject of this application and to which these test results are to be applied (except as below).
- all ELR mounting brackets used shall be identical to that tested and approved as part of this application.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 6/ Direction Indicator Lamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
6/00	Light Intensity – Max. Cd min. Cd For each category Cat 1 (front) Cat 2a/2b (rear) Cat 5/6 (side) Colour Angles of visibility	Expect to see evidence of an “E mark” (all of it) in relation to ECE 6/00 or 6/01 or the use of an ADR approved lamp (either from a full volume vehicle or approved under the component scheme) or a comparison between an overseas standard, which the vehicle complies with, and the ADR. A reference to the ADR provision that provides for an alternate standard is required if the only evidence provided is the mark in relation to that alternate standard. Test/analysis re trichromatic coordinates is only required where there is doubt about the colour. Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s first sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 6/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in Japan per the document ISO/TR 9819:1991(E) shows its minimum photometric requirements are equivalent to those in the ADR, and
- physical testing of a (Make/model/year) motor vehicle, dated 5 May 2002, demonstrates that the maximum ADR limits are not exceeded

OR

- each of the Categories of lamp (Cat1, Cat 2 and Cat 5) comply with ECE requirements as indicated by the marking/s E₂ R6 01 1234, E₂ R6 01 2222 and E₂ R6 01 3333 respectively on the lenses and as provided for in Clause 7.1 of the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 8/ Safety Glazing Material

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
8/01	Marks evidence	Facsimiles or detail of the marks on the glass in the vehicle should be provided.
	Material standard	Each image should be labelled with the window/s it relates to.
	Reference to the extent of any tinting.	The standards on which the evidence is based, and where these are provided for in the ADR should be detailed. The mark/s relating to each standard should also be identified.
	Optical transmission	There should be specific reference to how it is known that the windscreen exceeds 75% optical transmission.
	Use of laminated glass	Ensure that 8/01 evidence has a text reference to the need for laminated windscreens. The evidence should identify which marking detail/s it is that shows laminated glass is being used. Tinted windscreens (not just the top band) are assumed not to pass the optical transmission requirement without very convincing evidence to the contrary. Photochromatic windscreens are not acceptable.

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 8/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- all glazing is marked to indicate it complies with a standard recognised in Clause 8 of the ADR, in respect of the windscreen, and in particular,
 - : laminated glass is used as indicated by the marking/s XX or YY ,and
 - : optical transmission is in excess of 75 % is assured because.....

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 10/ Steering Column

Alternative Procedures (≤25)

Normal Procedures (≤100)

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
10/01	<p>Steering wheel intrusion</p> <p>Steering wheel impact force</p> <p>Note: Vehicle exempted if ADR 69 or 73 applies where a driver's air bag is used.</p>	<p>Except where normal evidence applies:</p> <p>Note: This ADR is difficult to demonstrate compliance with, but more than a brief assertion is required.</p> <p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence re ECE 12/, - Evidence re FMVSS 203 with 204, or - Detail of the column structure (collapsible elements, no. of segments, bends etc), fastening and consequences of impact to be detailed and <p>Information on the impact properties of the steering wheel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : by comparison with another standard : by comparison with full volume vehicle component : by physical description and some (simple) physical testing <p>In the case of LH to RH drive conversion, non-symmetry needs to be discounted as a possible compromising factor.</p> <p>Chain box conversion need consideration of the new mounting arrangements.</p> <p>ADR 69/00 or 73/00 using air bag gives exemption from this requirement.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s (for <25 vehicles/annum): (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 10/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was built for use in Japan, and
- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (xxxxxxx) shows the steering wheel properties are equivalent to those in the ADR, and

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

- the construction of the steering driveline is consistent with modern practice; it features a compression element between the firewall and steering box (as indicated by parts catalogue), a rack and pinion unit mounted rearward of the front axle cross member and universal jointed and offset steering shaft

OR

- the steering column arrangements are identical to those in the full volume vehicle as determined
 - : general observation of the layout; both feature a rack and pinion unit, marked XXX mounted on the front cross member which is operated through an 18 mm shaft with universal joints located at 300 mm and 625 mm back along the shaft from the rack and pinion unit.
 - : close examination of the steering wheel indicates that it is identical to that fitted on the make/model/year full volume vehicle marketed in Australia. Both units bear the number A1234 on the rear of the hub mounting.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 11/ Internal Sun Visors

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
11/00	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The visors were built to comply with..."</p> <p>Alternative procedures evidence may be provided in lieu if the evidence provided it is comprehensive and complete.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the sun-visors fitted on the subject vehicle comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 13/ Installation of Lighting & Light-Signalling Devices on other than L-Group Vehicles

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
13/00	Type of lamps fitted No's of lamps Colour of lamps Location of lamps Lamp geometric visibility Lamps function/s Absence or existence of non conforming lamps.	Expect to see a completed SE form or - details of the numbers and colour of each type of lamp and a statement that these comply with ADR requirements AND - a definitive statement that the height, separation, location and geometric visibility of each of the lamps have been physically checked and found to comply AND - that all lamps are appropriately grouped and their operation and any other matters comply Where any changes need to be made for a lamp/s to comply these changes should be detailed. ADR1/, 6/ , 46/ and 49/ are ADRs in their own right and evidence for these should not be buried in ADR 13/00.

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 13/00 is claimed on the basis that the lamps and reflectors provided meet the requirements of the ADR. More specifically:

- the colour and numbers of lamps fitted are
 - : headlamps white 2
 - : rear position red 2
 - : rear stop red 3
 - :
 - : etc
- the separation, location and geometric visibility of each lamp is in compliance with the requirements of the ADR. This has been determined by a physical examination and simple measurement of each lamp compared with the requirements of the ADR.
- all lamps are grouped appropriately and operate in the manner/s prescribed in the ADR. This has been determined by an individual check of each lamp type against the specific requirements in the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 14/ Rear Vision Mirrors

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
14/02	<p>The mirrors that are fitted</p> <p>Which mirrors are flat and if any are convex</p> <p>Internal mirror mounting</p> <p>The field of view</p> <p>Size and side projection</p> <p>If LHD to RHD conversion mirror angles achievable</p>	<p>Provision of Internal and right external mirrors evidenced</p> <p>Details of all mirrors concerning flatness noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reason for view that 1200mm min. radii requirement is met shall be provided <p>Internal mirror break-away performance (LEP & M group only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detail comparison with full volume vehicle/part or - ECE mark or - comparison of standard <p>A statement on the specific field of view requirement to be met, and that this is met, with detailed evidence on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - area and side projection for other than MA, MB, MC and L group vehicles, and - for LHD to RHD conversions, to show LH external mirror view angles comply. <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s first sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 14/02 is claimed on the basis that:

- the internal and RH external mirrors are flat.
- the LH external mirror is convex with simple field of view calculations suggesting its curvature is approximately 2000mm and therefore greater than the 1200 mm minimum permitted.
- the vehicle was built for use in Japan, and
- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (xxxxxxxxxx) shows its requirements for (internal) rear vision break-away are equivalent to those in the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 18/ Instrumentation

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
18/02	Location of Group 1 Location of Group 2 Speedometer - units and accuracy for all tyre options Odometer - units and range illumination ADR 69 related	A general statement about compliance when instruments are directly in front of the driver for vehicles sold into the volume/international market, otherwise instrument details and hard geometric data should be provided. Statement re speedometer units and accuracy, including basic accuracy and how all the nominated tyre options affect this. Worst case calculation/s to verify this. Statement on odometer capacity and units. Statement on illumination where applicable (MA, LEP only). Advice re seat belt warning lamp (MA and LEP) 6 digits does not necessarily mean 999999 km and is not an acceptable description.
18/03		Expect to see: Evidence that the vehicle meets the technical requirements of ECE R39 <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> An assessment against the intent of each clause in section 5 of appendix A of ADR 18/03.

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 18/02 is claimed on the basis that:

- the subject vehicle is marketed throughout Japan and Europe and the group one instruments are directly in front of the driver while not being obscured by the steering wheel, and
- the speedometer and odometer capacity, units and accuracy requirements are met, and
- variable illumination is provided, and
- a seat belt warning lamp is fitted in relation to ADR 69.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 21/ Instrument Panel

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
21/00	<p>Impact performance of the consol</p> <p>Interior compartment door latch performance under inertial load</p>	<p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comparison of standard with ADR, or - indicative measurement comparing subject vehicle with a full volume vehicle or - demonstration that console is same as a full volume vehicle. <p>For both the console and the latch performance. Mathematical analysis of the masses and forces involved and/or with indicative testing will be regarded as sufficient.</p> <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p> <p>Where LHD to RHD conversion is involved, evidence that the original console stiffness/performance has not been changed must be provided. Where the materials and/or construction are different the performance will need to be shown to be similar and/or be shown to be satisfactory much as would be expected for a vehicle not sold into the volume/international market.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 21/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was built for use in Japan, and
- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (ccccccccc) shows its requirements for instrument panel properties are equivalent to those in the ADR, and
- with a glove compartment lid and latch mechanism identical to that employed in the Make/Model/Year full volume vehicle

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 22/ Head Restraints

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
22/00	Dimensional criteria Strength and deflection	Expect to see: - a comparison with nominated standard/s covering both dimensional requirements and strength/deflection or - a reference to ECE approval ECE R 25/01 to 05, or ECE R17/03 to 05, or FMVSS 202 or - physical measurement, test and analysis data addressing ADR dimensional, strength and deflection requirements. AND - where there is any deficiency in the requirements of a nominated reference standard that the approach to addressing this deficiency is outlined. Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s first sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 22/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was built for use in Japan, and
- an analysis of the requirements of the Japanese rule (bbbbbbb) shows they are identical to those in the ADR except in regard to:
 - : the minimum height where measurement of the subject vehicle shows the seats exceed the minimum of xxx mm and are 740 mm, and
 - : the minimum impact surface height of the seats in the subject vehicle exceed that minimum of yyy mm and are 140 mm

OR

The subject vehicle is marketed throughout Europe and the seats are marked **E₂** R17 03 1234, as provided for at Clause 22.6.2 of the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 23/ Passenger Car Tyres

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
23/01	Tyre standard Condition Size/s Speed rating	Expect to see that the tyres to be fitted are: - DOT, ECE or ADR approved (SET), - new (for COP reasons), and - a statement indicating that the tyres to be fitted are marked in accordance with ADR requirements. : size, speed rating and load capacity. JIS marked tyres are permitted, but they are not acceptable just because they are marked JIS. Tyre sizes and combinations detailed to be not less than those detailed on the placard required as part of ADR 24/.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 23/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle is fitted with new passenger car tyres that are E marked or DOT approved, and
- the tyres are not asymmetric and require no labelling in this regard, and
- the tyres are clearly marked on both sides with the load and speed rating, the manufacturers name and other marking requirements in the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 25/ Anti-Theft Lock

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
25/02	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The locks were built to comply with..."</p> <p>Alternative procedures evidence may be provided in lieu if the evidence provided it is comprehensive and complete.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name, Second_Name, Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the anti-theft locks fitted on the subject vehicle comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 28/ External Noise of Motor Vehicles

Normal Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
28/01	<p>Completed SE and SF forms</p> <p>Vehicles complying with ADR 83/00 External Noise, need not comply with this ADR.</p>	<p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a completed SE form for each engine family nominated in the RVD form (for all practical purposes this means each engine type listed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : the vehicle tested should be the worst case for noise ie. that with the lightest mass and the highest engine power (and greatest final drive ratio) : evidence is not expected for manual and automatic gear box combinations unless there are unusual circumstances including a near fail with one of the transmissions. - engine power and RPM to match RVD - muffler part no./details to be noted in the SF form, not be recorded as "std" <p>Evidence must be provided for each engine family. If an applicant chooses to argue that two similar engines are from the same family he should be asked for evidence to address each of the criteria detailed in the ADR/Administrator's Circulars on this.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 28/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle tested was a worst case variant having considered the final drive/gear ratio and vehicle mass that would promote the highest engine revs and greatest speed increase over the test distance, and
- a noise test has been conducted for every engine model/power rating/type because the engine family provisions do not apply, and
- the vehicle/s tested have exhaust and air intake system/s identical to those in the vehicle variants that are the subject of the application, and to those that will be fitted on each vehicle to which a Identification Plate will be fitted, and
- the applicant has or has direct access to the original test report behind each SE form provided .

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 29/ Side Door Strength

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
29/00	<p>Strength</p> <p>Deflection</p> <p>Vehicles complying with ADR 72/.. are exempt from the requirements of this ADR.</p>	<p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - statement re ADR 72/.. exemption or - evidence of FMVSS compliance or - comparison of a nominated build standard with ADR requirements or - technical analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : from first principles : based on comparison with similar vehicle. <p>Analysis should be substantial with a proper regard to the consequences of high stresses in combination with thin metal sections (sheet metal) where this is appropriate.</p> <p>Particular attention should be paid to the end fixing of the intrusion bars as a failure/s at this point could be expected to lead to serious injury.</p> <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p> <p>If a comparison with another bar is made, the section properties, length, vehicle mass and end fixation details all need to be addressed. Words like, "the bar is similar to.... are not good enough. Recognition of the potential range of materials that might be used in the reference bar should also be given and allowed for.</p>

Example Summary Claim/s: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 29/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle was built for use in Japan, and
- an analysis of the standard applicable for registration in Japan (bbbbbb) shows that the requirements of that standard are equivalent to those in the ADR. **OR**
- a detailed comparative analysis of the side intrusion bar with that in the make/model/year full volume vehicle, having a regard for vehicle mass, door width, end fixing detail, section properties and material show the performance of the proposed bar to be at least equivalent to that in the full volume vehicle.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 30/ Smoke Emission Control for Diesel Vehicles

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
30/01	Compliance with ADR or similar standard	Expect to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evidence that the vehicles comply with ADR 30/01 or evidence that the vehicles comply with one of the standards listed in clause 7 of ADR 30/01 or - that the vehicle complies with a similar overseas standard, together with a comparison of the overseas standard's requirements compared to the ADR requirements or - physical test results

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 30/01 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- having previously been built for use in the US, and
- being required to comply with Opacity of Smoke Emission of the USA Code of Federal Regulations, Part 86 – Control of Air Pollution from new and in-use motor vehicles and new and in-use motor vehicle engines certification and test procedures – Subpart A 40CFR 86.098-11 Emission standards for 1998 and later model year diesel heavy-duty engines and vehicles;

complies with an acceptable alternative standard as provided for in ADR 30/01 at Clause 7 on alternative standards.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 31/ Hydraulic Brake Systems for Passenger Cars

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
31/01	Service brake performance Brake Fade Performance Parking brake Reservoir capacity Warning lamps ABS (if fitted) SF form if more than one variant or braking system on the RVD	Expect to see: - for vehicles sold into the volume/international market: general description indicating why performance should be expected to be satisfactory with at least one suitable data point for: = service brake deceleration (av. M/sec^{-2}) = brake fade (kg/m^2 total swept area) = parking brake (% grade) with specific advice in relation to reservoir capacity and the provisions for service brake failure warning lamps <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> A comparison of a nominated standard with ADR requirements. - If the vehicles are fitted with ABS either: : Demonstration that the braking system complies with ECE R 13-H. <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> : Demonstration that the ABS at least meets the requirements for a Category 3 anti-lock system as described in Annex 6 of ADR 31/01. This may be demonstrated by conducting tests traversing from a high μ (eg dry bitumen) to a low μ (eg wet grass or loose gravel) surface, and traversing from a low μ to a high μ surface while applying the brakes with sufficient force to activate the ABS. The vehicle speed at the change of μ should be approximately 50 km/h. The vehicle would be considered acceptable if there was no wheel locking or only brief periods of wheel locking (as per CI 5.3.6 of Annex 6). <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> : Demonstration that the same ABS (control unit, valves, sensors etc) is fitted to a vehicle which has demonstrated compliance with ADR 31/01. If the service brakes are not the same as the certified vehicle, it should be demonstrated by engineering analysis that the anti-lock system will maintain the same effective friction utilisation (eg aggregate brake effort) as the approved system.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- For vehicles not sold into the volume/international market the evidence provided shall be more substantial than detailed above if the evidence is based on physical tests, and in the event that a comparison with a nominated standard was preferred, substantial evidence as to why that standard is applicable is required. <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p>
--	--	--

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 31/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle is mass produced and is sold widely in Japan and the US, and
- limited physical testing shows its service brake effectiveness and parking brake performance exceeds that required by the ADRs. Comparative analysis of the likely fade performance compared with make/model/year full volume vehicle using vehicle mass/swept area ratios indicates that this will also meet minimum requirements.
- the brake system is a conventional vacuum assisted hydraulic system and an examination of it shows that reservoir and warning light requirements of the ADR are also complied with.

OR

- the vehicle was built for use in *Country*, and
- an analysis (attached) of the standard applicable for registration in *Country* (Rule xxxx) shows its requirements are equivalent to those in the ADR and by which compliance with ADR requirements is assured.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 34/ Child Restraint Anchorages and Child Restraint Anchor Fittings

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
34/01	Location and number of anchorages OE and non OE anchorages Design and installation of any non OE anchorages Threads used Supply of fittings No. fitted, no. supplied Information to be provided with vehicle.	Expect to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a comparison of a nominated standard with the ADR requirements or - details on the number and the location of each anchorage, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : the location to be shown accurately in a drawing if the anchorage is non OE - where the anchorage is non OE, the design of the anchorage, its manner of installation and a statement or calculation to show why the anchorage is known to be sufficient - a statement on accessibility - details of the threads used for attaching fittings to the anchorages - details of what fittings are supplied or fitted and where - a facsimile of the information to be supplied with the vehicle <p>All anchorage plates are to be fitted under the body panel</p> <p>All anchorages/adaptors/brackets that involve large offsets between the mounting surface and the 'plane' of the fitting shall be shown by calculation or test to be sufficient.</p> <p>Calculations shall be competent and substantial. Simple calculations utilising shear only without proper recognition of bending moment, the interaction of shear and bending stresses and behaviour of thin metal sections shall not be accepted.</p> <p>Generally designs incorporating load bearing welds will not be acceptable.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 34/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- anchorages are used that comply with the location and thread dimension requirements of the ADR, and for which calculation confirms that the anchorages are sufficiently strong, and
- fittings are attached to each of the anchorages provided, and
- the information concerning anchorage location, and safety warnings as required by the ADR are included in the owners handbook to be provided with each vehicle.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 35/ Commercial Vehicle Brake Systems

Alternative Procedures (≤25)

Normal Procedures (≤100 and for omnibuses – see Admin. Circ. 0-4-1)

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
	An overview of the system	Except where normal evidence applies:
35/01	Service Brake Effectiveness	To demonstrate compliance with each element of performance in the column to the left of this one, expect to see: Compliance with the requirements of ECE R13 incorporating any of the series of amendments from 01 to 10 or a comparison with JR or FMVSS standard, or at least limited physical testing or a comparison of components with those of a full volume vehicle. Evidence based on components being identical to a full volume approved vehicle is acceptable so long as the case is comprehensive. Water effectiveness may be argued in materials, brake construction and heritage terms without testing (35/01 only). Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.
35/02	Fade Performance	
	Partial Failure Performance	
	Parking Brake	
	Warning lamps	
	Reservoir capacities	
	Inadvertent release of handbrake	
	Time response (where applicable)	
	ABS (if fitted)	
	Load proportioning brake systems (if fitted)	
	SF form if more than one variant or braking system on RVD	

Example Summary Claim: (for < 25 vehicles/annum) (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 35/01 is claimed on the basis that:

- a description of the brake system shows that basic design requirements are met including for energy reserves, provision for warning lights and inadvertent release of the park brake (requirements in relation to air brakes for towed trailers do not apply), and
- limited physical testing shows that service brake effectiveness, fade performance, partial failure effectiveness and park brake performance meet ADR requirements

OR

- a detailed analysis of the arrangement and individual component parts shows that the brake system is identical to that in the *make/mode/year* full volume vehicle and whose mass is the same as that for the vehicle to which this application applies.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 42/ General Safety Requirements

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
42/04	Address each clause	Expect to see: An SE form and a copy of the tyre placard. or A brief report addressing Clauses 5 to 25 of the ADR, including a copy of the tyre placard.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 42/04 is claimed on the basis that:

The vehicle has been physically inspected against the requirements of the applicable clauses of the ADR and found to comply, as summarised in attached report number (1234)

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 43/ Vehicle Configuration and Dimensions

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
43/04	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The dimensions of the vehicle comply with..."</p> <p>The applicant may provide detailed evidence, but if this is to be to the exclusion of a formal assurance, the evidence provided must be complete.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the subject vehicle model/s comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 45/ Lighting and Light-Signalling Devices not Covered by ECE Regulations

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
45/01	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The lamps were built to comply with..."</p> <p>Alternative procedures evidence may be provided in lieu if the evidence provided is comprehensive and complete. It should cover both lamp types that are not fitted as well as those that are.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the subject vehicle model/s comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 47/ Reflex Reflectors

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
47/00	Colour Photometric performance Resistance to water Resistance to corrosion Resistance to fuels Resistance to heat	Expect to see evidence that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the reflector/s are ECE R3/02 approved or - compares the standard of manufacturer for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved, or - uses a combination of the above.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 47/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the reflectors comply with ECE requirements as evidenced by the marking **E**₁₃ R3 02 1234.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 48/ Rear Registration Plate Illuminating Devices

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
48/00	Colour Angle of incidence Photometric characteristics	<p>Expect to see evidence based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECE R4 approval or - a comparison with a full volume vehicle by way of either <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : the use of identical parts and installation, or : a combination of observation and analysis of : the light source and its location or - comparison with other standards, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved or - physical tests <p>If registration plates are mounted further out (typically to allow them to fit) confirmation of suitable illumination should be provided.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 48/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the level of reflected light at a distance of 1 m is not less than that from a make/model/year full volume vehicle, and
- observation indicates that the uniformity of illumination is as consistent as that for the above full volume vehicle, and
- the light incident on the surface of the registration plate is not greater than 82 degrees.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 49/ Front & Rear Position (Side) Lamps, Stop Lamps and End-Outline Marker Lamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
49/00	<p>For each lamp type:</p> <p>Colour</p> <p>Brightness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - min. Cd - max. Cd <p>Contrast (ie. rear/stop lamps)</p> <p>Angle of light distribution</p>	<p>Expect to see in respect of each lamp type fitted, evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrating ECE R7 approved or - that compares the standard of manufacture for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved or - uses a combination of the above. <p>Colour evidence may be by observation.</p> <p>Evidence concerning maximum and minimum brightness should be by measurement. Evidence on contrast should be by measurement unless the lens and the reflector are the same in which case light globe power may be the basis.</p> <p>Where evidence is required concerning excessive intensity at least one measurement should be reported for the brightest part of the light field. If evidence is required to determine minimum intensity (typically at the edge of the light field) at least four measurements will be taken, these being left up/down and right up/down, and an additional one on the optical axis if this is in issue.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 49/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the lamps are E marked as indicated by the mark **E₂** 01 12345 and as indicated in the evidence provided.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 50/ Front Fog Lamps (optional)

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
50/00	Colour Brightness - min. Cd - max. Cd Angle of light distribution	Expect to see evidence: - demonstrating ECE R19 approved or - that compares the standard of manufacture for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved, or - uses a combination of the above. Colour evidence may be by observation. Evidence concerning maximum and minimum brightness should be by measurement. Evidence concerning the angle of distribution of the light should be by measurement.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 50/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- measurements taken in relation to the requirements of the ADR, and as reported in evidence, show that the light intensity requirements of the ADR are complied with, OR
- the lamps are E marked as evidenced by the mark **E**₁₃ R19 01 1234

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 51/ Filament Globes

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
51/00	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The globes were built to comply with...."</p> <p>The provision of alternative evidence in lieu of an Assurance by citing a standard of manufacture for the globes as provided for in the ADR will be accepted. These standards are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECE R37/03 - FMVSS 108 - SAE J573 DEC89 - JIS C7506-1994

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the filament globes fitted on the subject vehicle comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 52/ Rear Fog Lamps (optional)

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
52/00	Colour Brightness - min. Cd - max. Cd Angle of light distribution	Expect to see in evidence: - demonstrating ECE R38 approved or - that compares the standard of manufacturer for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved, or - uses a combination of the above. Colour evidence may be by observation. Evidence concerning maximum and minimum brightness should be by measurement. Evidence concerning the angle of distribution of the light should be by measurement.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 52/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- measurements taken in relation to ADR 52/00, and as reported in evidence, show that the light intensity requirements of the ADR are complied with, and
- the colour is red, OR
- the lamps are E marked as evidenced by the mark **E**₁₃ R38 1234

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 58/ Requirements for Omnibuses Designed for Hire and Reward

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
58/00	Address each Clause of the ADR	Expect to see in evidence: A brief report addressing each clause of the ADR. For assessment purposes: - An <i>Aisle</i> may be taken to mean a passageway between seats. - <i>Adjacent</i> may be taken to mean lying near or close; adjoining; neighbouring. - A <i>Row</i> (of seats) may be taken to mean a line of adjacent seats facing the same way.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 58/00 is claimed on the basis that:

The vehicle is a stretch limousine and complies with each applicable clause of the ADR as outlined in the attached report (1234).

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 60/ Centre High-Mounted Stop Lamp

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
60/00	Colour Intensity Light Distribution Area Position Geometric Visibility (obstructions)	Expect to see in evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrating compliance with either ECE R7 and R48, or FMVSS 108 or - that compares the standard of manufacturer for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is VSS/ADR approved, or - uses a combination of the above. <p>Colour evidence may be by observation.</p> <p>Evidence concerning intensity, both maxima and minima should be by measurement.</p> <p>Evidence concerning the angle of distribution of the light should be by measurement.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 60/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle having been built for use in the US and accordingly having had to comply with FMVSS 108, as provided for as an alternative standard in Clause 60.5 of the ADR 60/00, OR
- the lamps are E marked as evidenced by the mark **E**₁₃ R7 1234 and installed in accordance with ECE 48/01 as evidenced by the analysis provided in evidence.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 61/ Vehicle Marking

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
61/02	VIN format Identification Plate Engine number Provisions for registration plates	Expect to see a brief reference in relation to each of the items in the column to the left of this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the location and style of VIN, and the standard it is provided against, - the location and method of fixing the Identification Plate, - the location and style of marking of the engine number - that the provision/s made for affixing registration plates comply with the requirements of the ADR (and addressing possible impacts on ADR 48/00 compliance if modification is involved) The statements made are to be clear and unambiguous.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 61/02 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle carries a unique VIN in accordance with the requirements of the ADR, and
- the vehicle is fitted with an approved Identification Plate, and
- the engine is identified with a legible and permanently marked number as required by the ADR, and
- provision has been made to fit standard un-modified registration plates to the front and rear of the vehicle as detailed in Figure 1 of the ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 62/ Mechanical Connections Between Vehicles

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
62/01	Connection type Strength Marking Safety chains Vehicle structure	Expect evidence to address each of the items in the column to the left in the form of either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a reference to a standard recognised in the ADR and the reason it's known the standard applies, or - a comparison with a standard not recognised in the ADR with the detail requirements of the ADR, or - compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - calculation with a proper regard for fatigue and safety factors/stress raisers and/or working stresses as provided for in an appropriate national standard, or - uses a combination of the above. <p>Any hole drilled in the rear structure of a vehicle in which a ball coupling could be mounted will be either permanently closed or be shown to comply with the requirements of this ADR.</p> <p>A mechanical coupling from an OE manufacturer will still need to be shown to comply with the requirements of the ADR</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

This ADR is not applicable because mechanical connections are not provided, OR

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 62/ 01 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle is fitted with an ADR approved tow facility manufactured by a third party, being properly labelled and having the approval number XXXXX and the vehicle structure having adequate strength as shown in the attached calculations.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 65/ Maximum Road Speed Limiting for Heavy Goods Vehicles and Heavy Omnibuses

Normal Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
65/00	Completed SE form.	Expect to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- an SE form for the worst case engine/transmission/drive axle combination (see Administrator's Circular 65/00-2-1).

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 65/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle tested was a worst case variant having considered engine/transmission/drive axle combination that would promote the highest vehicle speed over the test distance, and
- the applicant has or has direct access to the original test report behind each SE form provided .

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 69/ Full Frontal Impact Occupant Protection

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
69/00	<p>Compliance with ADR 69/.. or an equivalent standard</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Compliance with ADR 73/.. and fitted with dual front air bags.</p>	<p>Expect evidence to demonstrate compliance with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADR 69/.. or - FMVSS 208 or - Japanese Technical Standard for Occupant Protection in Frontal Collision or - Evidence demonstrating compliance with the requirements detailed for ADR 73/.., provided that the vehicle has dual front air bags. - seat belt warning light. <p>The document, "Interim arrangements – low volume procedures for ADR 69/00" (issued in 1996) relates (see copy below). When this ADR applies, new OE belts are allowed in front positions, ADR complying belts to be fitted in the rear (some additional matters apply in the case of US cars).</p> <p>For LHD conversions where a passenger's air bag is moved from the RHS to the LHS of the vehicle the air bag must be symmetrical when it deploys or otherwise shown to be suitable for use on the opposite side of the vehicle.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 69/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle having been built for use in Japan, and
- having been constructed to comply with the Japanese Occupant Protection Standard which is equivalent to ADR 69, and
- having new OE seat belts installed in the front positions and new ADR compliant belts installed in the rear positions.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

Copy of document issued September 1996

Interim arrangements - low volume procedures for ADR 69/00.

Low volume vehicles requiring certification to ADR 69/00 fall into 3 broad categories:

- 1 Vehicles which have been built in Japan as right hand drive vehicles and comply with the Japanese requirements for occupant protection in frontal collisions.
- 2 Vehicles built to American FMVSS 208 as left hand drive vehicles which have been converted to right hand drive for which a sound technical argument for continued compliance with FMVSS 208 can be mounted.
- 3 Vehicles which cannot demonstrate compliance with any similar overseas standard or ADR 69/00, eg stretched limousines, sports car replicas, American FMVSS 208 vehicles for which continued compliance cannot be argued.

The first two categories can be dealt with under current arrangements by provision of technical arguments which demonstrate compliance with the ADR via "alternative procedures".

The third category have no basis to demonstrate compliance via "alternative procedures" and it is proposed that these vehicles be considered as non standard vehicles (section 14 of the MVSA). These vehicles require new procedures to be implemented. These procedures will be considered by the AMVCB and forwarded to the Minister for endorsement before they are implemented.

Vehicles from the first two categories will be processed immediately using our current procedures. The technical requirements are outlined below in an extract from the draft circular.

Alternative Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with ADR 69/00 - First Stage of Manufacture Vehicles

2.2 If a RHD vehicle:

- a) Complies with Japanese Technical Standard for Occupant Protection in Frontal Collision No 11-4-30 it will be considered to comply with ADR 69/00, provided it retains lap sash seat belts to the original manufacturer's specifications; or
- b) Complies with FMVSS 208 it will be considered to comply with ADR 69/00, provided it is fitted with seat belts complying with ADR 4/02 or it retains lap sash seat belts to the original manufacturer's specifications which comply with the applicable Japanese, North American or ECE standards and these belts meet the following requirements:
 - (i) ELRs on these belts will lock when the webbing is extended.
 - (ii) ELRs on these belts will lock when the vehicle decelerates.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

- (iii) The seat belts are of the lap sash type and the lap and sash components can not be disconnected from each other.

2.3 If a RHD vehicle has been converted from a LHD vehicle which complied with FMVSS 208 and it can be demonstrated that it is structurally symmetrical each side of the longitudinal axis forward of the rear of the front seats (an engineering argument must be provided to demonstrate this) it will be considered to comply with ADR 69/00, provided it is fitted with seat belts complying with ADR 4/02 or it retains lap sash seat belts to the original manufacturer's specifications which comply with the applicable Japanese, North American or ECE standards and these belts meet the following requirements:

- (i) ELRs on these belts will lock when the webbing is extended.
- (ii) ELRs on these belts will lock when the vehicle decelerates.
- (iii) The seat belts are of the lap sash type and the lap and sash components can not be disconnected from each other.

2.4 Manufacturers may also put forward other technical arguments, giving a similar level of assurance of compliance, for consideration.

Alternative Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with ADR 69/00 - Second Stage of Manufacture Vehicles

2.5 If:

- a) the vehicle mass is not increased; and
- b) the structure forward of the A pillars is unchanged; the original manufacturer's compliance will be considered as still being applicable.

2.6 If:

- a) the vehicle mass has been increased; or
- b) the structure forward of the A pillar has been changed;

the manufacturer may put forward a technical argument as to the vehicle's continuing compliance, or if continuing compliance cannot be demonstrated the vehicle will be treated as outlined below [*ie non standard vehicle - requirements not yet finalised*].

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 72/ Dynamic Side Impact Occupant Protection

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
72/00	All aspects of ADR through an equivalent test, unless special arrangements are agreed.	Expect to see evidence in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADR 72/00 and/or ECE R95 test results, or - FMVSS 214-35R "Side Door Strength...", or - a comparison of ADR requirements and the requirements of another standard not recognised by the ADR. <p>Note: Evidence based on JR or FMVSS is only valid for vehicle/s sourced in Japan or the USA respectively. Vehicles sold into other markets may be to a lower standard.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 72/00 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- having been built in the US, complies with FMVSS 214, amended per 58 FR 14169, as provided for in Clause 6 of the ADR where provision for the recognition of alternative standards is made.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 73/ Offset Frontal Impact Protection

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
73/00	All aspects of ADR through an equivalent test, unless special arrangements are agreed. or Compliance with ADR 69/.. and fitted with dual front air bags.	Expect to see evidence in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADR 73/00 and/or ECE R94 test results, or - for vehicles complying with the above requirements in Left Hand Drive configuration, an engineering argument to demonstrate that the Right Hand Drive vehicles are structurally a mirror image of the Left Hand Drive vehicles around their longitudinal axis forward of the rear of the front seats, or - a comparison of ADR requirements and the requirements of an other standard not recognised by the ADR, or - Evidence demonstrating compliance with the requirements detailed for ADR 69/.., provided that the vehicle has dual front air bags.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 73/00 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- Is certified as complying with ECE R94 in Left Hand Drive configuration
- The attached engineering report demonstrates that the Right Hand Drive vehicles are structurally a mirror image of the Left Hand Drive vehicles around their longitudinal axis forward of the rear of the front seats.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 74/ Side Marker Lamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
74/00	<p>Colour</p> <p>Brightness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - min. Cd - max. Cd <p>Angle of light distribution</p>	<p>Expect to see evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrating ECE R91 approved or - that compares the standard of manufacture for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - that demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is CRN/ADR approved or - uses a combination of the above. <p>Colour evidence may be by observation.</p> <p>Evidence concerning maximum and minimum brightness should be by measurement.</p> <p>Where evidence is required concerning excessive intensity at least one measurement should be reported for the brightest part of the light field. If evidence is required to determine minimum intensity (typically at the edge of the light field) at least four measurements will be taken, these being left up/down and right up/down, and an additional one on the optical axis if this is in issue.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 74/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the lamps are E marked as indicated by the mark **E₂** R91 01 12345 and as indicated in the evidence provided.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 75/ Headlamp Cleaners

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
75/00	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The headlamp cleaners were built to comply with..."</p> <p>Alternative procedures evidence may be provided in lieu if the evidence provided it is comprehensive and complete.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the subject vehicle model/s comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 76/ Daytime Running Lamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
76/00	<p>Colour</p> <p>Brightness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - min. Cd - max. Cd <p>Angle of light distribution</p>	<p>Expect to see evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrating ECE R87 approved or - that compares the standard of manufacture for the lamps to the requirements of the ADR, or - that demonstrates compliance on the basis of (abbreviated) physical tests, or - that the lamp is CRN/ADR approved or - uses a combination of the above. <p>Colour evidence may be by observation.</p> <p>Evidence concerning maximum and minimum brightness should be by measurement.</p> <p>Where evidence is required concerning excessive intensity at least one measurement should be reported for the brightest part of the light field. If evidence is required to determine minimum intensity (typically at the edge of the light field) at least four measurements will be taken, these being left up/down and right up/down, and an additional one on the optical axis if this is in issue.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 76/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the lamps are E marked as indicated by the mark **E₂** R87 01 12345 and as indicated in the evidence provided.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 77/ Gas Discharge Headlamps

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
77/00	Colour Brightness - min. Cd - max. Cd Angle of light distribution Passing beam dips to correct side Automatic levelling Headlamp cleaning devices	Expect to see: - evidence that the lamps comply with: ECE R98 or physical test results or that the lamp is CRN/ADR approved - evidence of compliance with ADR 13/00 requirements for automatic levelling (ADR 13/00 clauses 6.2.6.2.1 & 6.2.9) - headlamp cleaners in accordance with ADR 13/00 requirements (ADR 13/00 clause 6.2.9) ie ADR 75/00

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 77/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the lamps are E marked as indicated by the mark **E₂** R98 01 12345 and as indicated in the evidence provided.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 78/ Gas Discharge Light Sources

Assurance

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
78/00	A formal assurance	<p>Expect to see a formal assurance.</p> <p>The assurance should be in the first or third person, ie. "I hereby give my assurance that..." or, "The manufacturer gives his assurance that..." . The assurance should not be stated as an objective fact, ie. "The gas discharge light sources were built to comply with..."</p> <p>Alternative procedures evidence may be provided in lieu if the evidence provided it is comprehensive and complete.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

I, *First_Name*, *Second_Name*, *Surname*, do hereby give my assurance that the subject vehicle model/s comply with all the requirements of this ADR.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 79/02 Emission Control for Light Vehicles Alternative Procedures – 79/02

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
79/02	Compliance with ADR or equivalent standard	<p>(See clause 4.1.5 of this Manual for applicability) Expect to see evidence that the vehicles comply with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADR 79/02 or - ECE R83/05 or - Directive 2002/80/EC amending directive 70/220/EC (for ADR 79/02) or - USA Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements for cars and light trucks, Tier 2 bin 6 or lower, including a copy of the test results and the limits specified by this standard for the vehicle type for which certification is being sought. <p>Where testing is conducted to ADR 79/02 the following dispensations apply:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Where there are several engine and/or transmission variants within an <i>engine family</i> only the worst case variant need be tested. The worst case can be established by comparing test results, for each variant, from testing carried out to similar overseas standards.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Type 4 (evaporative emissions) test need not be done if it can be demonstrated that the vehicle complies with the US EPA evaporative emissions requirements.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Type 5: (durability) Deterioration factors set in ADR should be used.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The vehicles must be fitted with OBD but need not be tested to the ADR 79/02 requirements. The Licensee should conduct a simple test to check that the OBD system on the vehicle is operating (e.g disconnect oxygen sensor and check for tell tale on dash).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Any distance accumulated by the vehicle prior to testing need not be in accordance with the requirements of the rule.</p>

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 79/02 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle has been certified to ECE R83/05.

*Refer to *page 68* for Second-Stage-Of-Manufacturer emissions evidence where there is an increase in GVM

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 80/ Emission Control for Heavy Vehicles

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
80/00 80/01 80/02	Compliance with ADR or similar standard	<p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the vehicle complies with a similar overseas standard, together with a comparison of the overseas standard's requirements compared to the ADR requirements or - physical test results or <p>For 80/00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evidence that the vehicles comply with ADR 80/00 or - evidence that the vehicles comply with one of the standards listed in clause 7 of ADR 80/00 or <p>For 80/01</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evidence that the vehicles comply with ADR 80/01 or - evidence that the vehicles comply with one of the standards listed in clause 7 of ADR 80/00 or 80/01 or <p>For 80/02</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evidence that the vehicles comply with ADR 80/02 or - evidence that the vehicles comply with one of the standards listed in clause 6 of ADR 80/02 - evidence that the vehicles comply with the USA Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 86, including test results and the levels set by the Standard. See: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/crttst.htm

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 80/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle has been certified to 1999/69/EC amending directive 88/77/EEC.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

SECOND-STAGE-OF-MANUFACTURE EMISSIONS EVIDENCE WHERE THERE IS AN INCREASE IN GVM

Low volume procedures for ADR 79/xx and 80/xx

1. Introduction

Important:

If the vehicles are all of M or N category and with a GVM *less than or equal* to 3.5 tonnes, then only 79/xx is applicable, if vehicles are all of M or N category and with a GVM *more than* 3.5 tonnes, then only 80/xx is applicable.

1.1 When “Normal” evidence is applicable:

If the ADR79/xx or ADR80/xx evidence is unaffected by the second-stage-of-manufacture (e.g. no change in reference mass), then the “normal” carry-over of evidence arrangements continue.

Where a second-stage-of-manufacture vehicle is an MA, MC or NA category vehicle and is based on an MA, MC or NA category completed vehicle respectively,

OR

becomes an MD1 or MD2 category vehicle,

THEN

valid carry-over ADR79/xx evidence is considered to be “Normal” evidence.

1.2 When “Non-standard” evidence is applicable:

ECE Regulation 83 clause 7. EXTENSION OF APPROVAL allows a manufacturer who increases the “reference mass” of a vehicle type to extend the ECE Regulation 83 approval to allow for the change in mass.

Where a second-stage-of-manufacture vehicle is an NB, MD3 or MD4 category of vehicle and is based on an MA, MC or NA category completed vehicle,

THEN

acceptable carry-over ADR79/xx evidence is considered to be non-standard evidence of compliance, and a subsequent “Non-standard” Approval may be issued based on this acceptable “extension” of the ADR79/xx evidence. This extension of the ADR79/xx evidence negates the need for evidence of compliance with ADR80/xx to be provided.

(See 1.3 Application for Extension Checklist before proceeding).

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

1.3 Application for Extension Checklist

Ensure the following checklist is met to determine if an acceptable “extension” of the ADR79/xx evidence is allowed.

<p>For the purposes of seeking a second-stage-of-manufacture Approval, the completed second-stage vehicle will be deemed to be of the same “vehicle type” as the completed first-stage vehicle Approval, apart from the differences in their "reference mass".</p> <p><i>Reference Mass</i> means the “Unladen Mass” of the vehicle increased by a uniform figure of 100kg for test according to annex 4 (of ECE Reg 83).</p> <p>It is expected that the second-stage-of-manufacture applicant will require the technical support of the first-stage manufacturer in providing evidence for an Extension of Approval including details of the “reference mass” of the first-stage completed vehicle variants tested. This may also reveal the availability of relevant ADR80/xx evidence as per <i>step 1.3.2</i> below.</p> <p>Has this criteria been met?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Before seeking an extension of ADR79/xx evidence second-stage-of-manufacture applicants should satisfy themselves whether relevant ADR80/xx is available from the first-stage manufacturer. The completed first-stage vehicle Approval documentation will note where ADR80/xx evidence is available for second-stage-of-manufacture carry over.</p> <p>Has this criteria been met?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>ECE Regulation 83 clause 7.1.1.1 limits the extension to vehicle types of a “reference mass” requiring the use of the next two highest equivalent inertias above that of the vehicle tested. (Refer to ECE Regulation 83 Annex 4 clause 5.1).</p> <p>Has this criteria been met?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Table 1 of ECE Regulation 83 limits the extension for vehicles fuelled with diesel fuel, to vehicles having a “reference mass” not more than 2840kg.</p> <p>Has this criteria been met?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

1.4 Compliance Plate Approval

An applicant for second-stage-of-manufacture approval is required to submit via the Road Vehicle Certification System, Summary-of-Evidence for ADR79/xx or ADR80/xx as applicable to the second-stage-of-manufacture vehicle category.

1.4.1 If "Normal" evidence is found to be applicable:

- A blank form RVCS submission against ADR79/xx can be made
- Refer to latest ECE Reg. 83 Extension of Approval to see what provisions currently apply
- The Road Vehicle Descriptor must declare for all variants the associated "Reference Mass"

Where ADR79/xx or ADR80/xx evidence for a second-stage-of-manufacture application for approval is carried-over from the first-stage completed vehicle approval, either as unchanged or based on these Extension of Approval provisions, unless otherwise affected by other evidence issues, the resultant Approval will be "Standard".

1.4.2 If "Non-standard" evidence is found to be applicable:

- A blank form RVCS submission against ADR79/xx can be made
- Refer to latest ECE Reg. 83 Extension of Approval to see what provisions currently apply
- The applicant must also submit a blank form RVCS submission against ADR80/xx, declaring non-compliance with ADR80/xx, but in lieu seeking Extension of Approval against ADR79/xx. The Road Vehicle Descriptor must declare for all variants the associated "Reference Mass"
- The Road Vehicle Descriptor must declare for all variants the associated "Reference Mass"

Where a second-stage-of-manufacture vehicle is required to comply with ADR80/xx but seeks to carry-over ADR79/xx evidence from the first-stage completed vehicle approval, based on this Extension of Approval provisions as above, the resultant Approval will be issued as "Non-Standard".

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 81/ Fuel Consumption Labelling for Light Vehicles

Alternative Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
81/01 81/02	Technical argument demonstrating compliance with the ADR or equivalent overseas standard.	Expect to see evidence in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADR 81/01 or 81/02 test results, or - compliance with the requirements of another standard not specifically recognised by the ADR, or - an argument that the fuel consumption will not differ substantially from that of a tested vehicle, or - an argument that testing which has been carried out will provide similar results to the ADR 81/01 or 81/02 requirements or that the vehicle will be a 'worst case' compared to the tested vehicle. - details of label location and a facsimile of the label.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 81/01 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- Is a 2nd stage of manufacture vehicle base on an Australian Certified vehicle.
- The GVM of the vehicle has been increased.
- This increase in mass would not lead to a 'worst case' (ie the modified vehicle would not use less fuel).
- Therefore, retesting to ADR 81/01 should not be required and the ADR 81/01 testing carried out by the original manufacturer will provide similar results.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 82/ Engine Immobilisers

Alternative procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
82/00	Compliance with a relevant standard or Technical argument	Expect to see evidence in relation to: - An SE 82/00 form with the 'evidence summary' section satisfactorily completed. or - Compliance with ECE R97. or - Compliance with EEC directive 74/61/EEC. or - Compliance with AS/NZS 4601:1999. or - A technical argument to demonstrate that the vehicle should meet the requirements of one of the above standards.

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 82/00 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- Is sold in Europe and has been certified to ECE R97 as demonstrated by the attached ECE certification documentation.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 83/ External Noise

Normal Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
83/00	Completed SE form	<p>Expect to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a completed SE form for each engine family nominated in the RVD form (for all practical purposes this means each engine type listed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : the vehicle tested should be the worst case for noise ie. that with the lightest mass and the highest engine power (and greatest final drive ratio) : evidence is not expected for manual and automatic gear box combinations unless there are unusual circumstances including a near fail with one of the transmissions. : Testing to annex 5 is not required. - engine power and RPM to match RVD <p>Evidence must be provided for each engine family. If an applicant chooses to argue that two similar engines are from the same family he should be asked for evidence to address each of the criteria detailed in the ADR/Administrator's Circulars on this.</p>

Example Summary Claim:

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 83/00 is claimed on the basis that:

- the vehicle tested was a worst case variant having considered the final drive/gear ratio and vehicle mass that would promote the highest engine revs and greatest speed increase over the test distance, and
- a noise test has been conducted for every engine model/power rating/type because the engine family provisions do not apply, and
- the vehicle/s tested have exhaust and air intake system/s identical to those in the vehicle variants that are the subject of the application, and to those that will be fitted on each vehicle to which a Identification Plate will be fitted, and
- the applicant has or has direct access to the original test report behind each SE form provided .

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ADR 84/ Front Underrun Impact Protection

Normal Procedures

Version	Minimum Scope	Bench Marks
84/00	Completed SE form	Expect to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- a completed SE form for each FUPD type fitted.- tested in accordance with Annex 5

Example Summary Claim: (see ## at end of ADR 1)

Compliance with the requirements of ADR 84/00 is claimed on the basis that the vehicle:

- Is certified to ECE R93 as demonstrated by attached ECE certification documentation.
- Complied to a static test conducted for each FUPD at loadings equivalent to the worst case mass option.
- Applicant has or has direct access to the original test report behind each SE form provided.

EVIDENCE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

ATTACHMENT 1

LOW VOLUME ADR DETAIL

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Administrator's Circulars
ADR	Australian Design Rule
ALVA	Assessment of Low Volume Application
CA	Compliance Application (the principal form)
COP	Conformity of Production
CRA	Child Restraint Anchorage
DOT	US Department of Transport
IPA	Identification Plate Approval
ISO	International Standards Organisation
JIS	Japanese Industrial Standard
JR	Japanese Regulation/s (the Safety Regulations for Road Vehicles) (and related Technical Standards)
FMVSS	Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (US)
LV	Low Volume
LV IPA	See LV and IPA
NVS	New Vehicle Specification (principal form for Registration Authorities)
OE	Original Equipment (as supplied by original manufacturer)
RVCS	Road Vehicle Certification System (a VSS internet connected computer system for vehicle certification).
RVD	Road Vehicle Descriptor (vehicle specification sheet used in RVCS for Registration Authority use – replaces the NVS)
SE Form	Summary of Evidence form (used for presenting normal evidence)
SF Form	Summary of Fleet form (shows models covered by SE forms)
SSR	SUTI Summary Report (non compliances identified at SUTI)
SUTI	Single Uniform Type Inspection (related more to full volume inspection)
TRIAS	Technical Approval Test Procedures (Japanese)
US or USA	United States of America
VSS	Vehicle Safety Standards Branch (part of the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Regional Services)
0-4-5 Certificate	The certificate provided (for each vehicle manufactured) by the consulting/certifying engineer prior to a SUTI being conducted (and prior to subsequent Identification Plates being issued). The number refers to the relevant Administrator's Circulars document.