



DATE: November 15, 2007

TO: NWRA Member Companies

FROM: NWRA Board of Directors

RE: ANSI Z26 "MARKING" STANDARD –VERY IMPORTANT

As you have probably heard, the Automotive Glazing Committee of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) has submitted a revised version of its Z26 Automotive Glazing Standard to ANSI for approval. The draft standard has been released by ANSI for public comment. All comments are due to ANSI by **December 24, 2007**.

If passed as drafted, the new Z26 will have very serious implications for those who repair windshields, and will also affect anyone that applies treatments such as Aquapel®, Rain-x® or Window Tint.

Z26 STANDARD BACKGROUND

The SAE defines the committee's scope as follows:

Z26.1 Automotive Glazing Standard Committee

The committee shall develop and maintain SAE standards, recommended practices and information reports pertaining to safety glazing materials and their use in ground vehicle applications in the global market.

The committee shall facilitate the harmonization of safety glazing material requirements through a liaison with regulatory and standard development bodies such as: the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the United States Department of Transportation (DOT), the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the European Economic Community (EEC), the Transport Canada, the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the Japanese Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (JMLIT).

The committee shall define and promote safety glazing material performance through the development of SAE standards, recommended practices and informational reports that establish performance criteria of safety glazing material constructions.

Z26's main "claim to fame" is that it is referenced by the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) as promulgated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. But it is also referenced in many other Standards and regulations. A quick review shows it referenced in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regulations, Canadian regulations (which govern OE and aftermarket) and International Standards as well.

Z26 DRAFTED LANGUAGE THAT AFFECT REPAIR

"7.3 Modified Glazing Markings: All modifications to the glazing materials made by someone other than the original glazing manufacturer shall be permanently marked on the glazing. Such modifications include but are not limited to a change in size, drilling, chemical treatment or repair. All such modifications, even when done with the expectation that compliance to this standard will be retained, shall be designated by subsequent permanent markings in characters at least 1.78mm (0.070") in height. The markings shall indicate the nature of the change, the date (month and year), the location in which the change occurred, and a unique code that designates the change agent (e.g., body shop code, etc). The following codes shall be used as the leading character:

S = Size change
R = Repair
H = Holes added
T = Treatment or other change

For example, modification code S 0811 AZ 234239 represents glazing that is installed by cutting down a larger piece of glazing during August, 2011 in Arizona by shop 234239."

Though the chair and certain committee members contend that the standard is limited only to OE applications, the language in section 7.3 clearly moves beyond OE applications. Additionally, there is nothing in the committee's scope that limits the Standard to OE. The standard is being used by other entities beyond OE applications and the language of 7.3 specifically states that if modifications are made by "someone other than the original glazing manufacturer" the glass should be marked.

IMPLICATIONS

NWRA believes that implementation of this draft Standard would mean, immediately, that all work done on cars at dealerships before purchase would require etching. We also believe that would quickly expand to all repairs and, as the new version of Z26 gets incorporated, would expand to other areas quickly as well. Thus the draft of Z26 represents a serious threat to the entire repair industry.

HOW DID THIS HAPPEN?

ANSI has very strict procedures with regard to openness of process and participation. It appears little was done to follow those procedures by this committee. The chair sees this as a purely OE issue, even though the language developed by the laminated and glass manufacturers on the committee, goes way beyond that.

ANSI requires that names of committee members be public; we have yet to be able to obtain a list of the committee members; it requires that interested groups—stakeholder groups—have access to process. This process was completed devoid of input from the repair community. Indeed the Standard that governs repairs in the aftermarket, the Repair of Laminated Auto Glass Standard (ROLAGS), considered (and decided against) marking the windshield with notation of repair.

As early as June, when NWRA first became aware of this issue, the association has been attempting to get minutes, names of committee members, agendas and other documentation with no success. As recently as Tuesday, the committee chair, John Turnbull, was made the representation to our consultant that this issue did not affect the repair industry.

Nonetheless, this is what we are facing and we have a little over six weeks to effectuate change.

WHO ELSE WILL THIS AFFECT?

NWRA has identified a number of groups that will be affected by such a change in Z26.

These include:

- § Any company engaging in repair (except the original glazing manufacturers themselves who, ironically are exempt from this provision throughout);
- § Any company applying any type of treatment such as Aquapel, Rain-X, etc.;
- § Any company applying film or tint if the adhesive backing is considered a ‘chemical treatment’;
- § Insurance companies;
- § Salvage yards that provide used windshields;
- § Any company that cuts glass to be used in a replacement;
- § Any company that drills holes in the glass;
- § Third party administrators such as LYNX and Harmon;
- § Car dealerships;
- § Used car lots.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

ANSI procedures require that any comments about the proposed draft Standard be provided to SAE by **December 24, 2007**. We believe a full frontal assault by as many

3. Committee made up of entities that have a special interests in seeing repair limited (i.e. large glass manufacturers, current and former employees of PVB manufacturers have been permitted out of balance representation on the committee);

B. Deficiencies of Scope:

1. Committee says it limits its scope to OE yet the language in 7.3 clearly moved beyond OE applications;
2. Exemption of original glazing manufacturer from the provisions of 7.3 clearly aim the Standard away from the OE glazing manufacturer and toward others;
3. If the original glazing manufacturer is exempt from the provisions of 7.3 and the draft Standard is only tailored for OE, then the language should be removed all together;
4. Do-it-yourself repair kits, Rain-X and other applications are all available to the end consumer, negating the ability to provide accurate markings;
5. There is no statement of a problem with regard to repair. Why are repairs to be marked?
6. As proposed, the Standard will also cover exterior and interior mirrors. Etching these mirrors will prove unsightly and reduce the visibility.
7. As written, the draft Standard requires any chemical treatment to be marked on the glass. With the exception of some sidelites, almost all replacement glass requires the application of primer (i.e. a chemical treatment) before installation. Etching every piece of primed replacement glass as required goes way beyond the perceived intent of this Standard and would create its own set of chain of custody issues.

C. Deficiencies as a Result of Competing Standards:

1. ROLAGS is the Standard that governs aftermarket repair. The ROLAGS committee considered, and rejected, inclusion of marking on windshields. Thus the proposed Z26 Standard is at odds with ROLAGS.

D. Deficiencies of Content:

1. Unlike the addition of a chemical treatment or the cutting down of glass, the windshield repair is really not the “modification” to the glass. The modification was the initial break that made the repair necessary. Repair does not modify the glass; it corrects a modification.
2. Many windshields had 2-3 repairs. Marking is not practical;
3. Permanent marking is itself a modification to the windshield. Under the theory promulgated by this Standard we should be marking the fact that a mark was made, which is ridiculous;
4. How do we know that marketing will not affect the structural integrity of the windshield?
5. For what purpose is this marking information to be collected? And who will do the collecting?
6. No definitions are provided for repair or chemical treatment, so we have no way of knowing what constitutes a repair in the committee’s view.

E. Deficiencies of Enforceability:

1. The Standard requires a shop number, yet there is no mechanism in place to create or maintain such numbers?
2. If there were, who would do so?
3. The Standard asks for information yet provides no mechanism to enforce that shops comply;
4. A lack of enforcement means that compliance will be limited to a small number of companies that provide marking, letting the rest avoid following the Standard with no repercussions;
5. The removal of a windshield and its use in a different vehicle is a major safety issue. Yet replaced windshields require no marking. How can this be consistent with a concern for safety?
6. It will be impossible to enforce.

F. Deficiencies that Result in a Restraint of Trade

1. Requiring such markings on windshields will severely limit the use of repair and result in higher insurance and repair prices (please don't make this one your only argument);
2. Requiring marks for repairs from a committee made up of many companies that stand to gain greatly if the amount of repairs are reduced is a restraint of trade issue;
3. The acceptance of replacement without marking, while requiring it for repair, smacks of bias such as that shown in the *Hydrolevel* decision years ago.

WHERE TO SEND YOUR LETTERS

Forward all correspondence concerning Z26 to:

Secretariat at the Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc.,
Attn: John Turnbull
755 W. Big Beaver, Suite 1600
Troy, MI 48084
Email: jwturnb@aol.com

Carbon Copy the following persons:

1. Suzanne Hurst

ANSI, Executive Assistant to General Council
189 L Street, NW
6th floor
Washington, DC 20036

2. Anne Caldas

ANSI, Director of Procedures & Standards Administration
25 West 43rd Street, 4th Fl.
New York, New York, 10036

3. Jack Pokrzywa

SAE Automotive Headquarters Operations Manager

755 W. Big Beaver, Suite 1600

Troy, MI 48084

Email: jackp@sae.org

4. Micheline Brussow

SAE Vehicle Systems Group, Standards Specialist

755 W. Big Beaver, Suite 1600

Troy, MI 48084

Email: mbrussow@sae.org

5. Patrick Smith

NWRA

P.O. Box 569

Garrisonville, VA 22463

Email: psmith@nwrassn.org