

**Minutes of the 7th meeting of the Informal Group on Global Technical Regulation No. 9 –
Phase 2 (IG GTR9-PH2)**

Venue	Web meeting
Date	3 July 2013
Status: Draft	

A) List of Attendees

Bilkhu	Sukhbir	Mr.	Chrysler (U.S.A.)	ssb@chrysler.com
Borde	Patrick	Mr.	Faurecia (France)	Patrick.Borde@faurecia.com
Buckman	Jennifer	Ms.	Ford (U.S.A.)	jbarnard@ford.com
Burleigh	Mark	Mr.	Humanetics (United Kingdom)	mburleigh@humaneticsatd.com
Chaka	Michelle	Ms.	Ford (U.S.A.)	mchaka@ford.com
Damm	Richard	Mr.	Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) (Germany)	Richard.Damm@bmvs.bund.de
Dausse	Irina	Ms.	Renault (France)	Irina.Dausse@renault.com
Edwards	Randy	Mr.	Auto Alliance (U.S.A.)	wreandt@aol.com
Gay	Patrick	Mr.	Cellbond	Patrick.Gay@cellbond.com
Gehring	Dirk-Uwe	Mr.	BGS Boehme & Gehring GmbH (BAST's test lab) (Germany)	gehring@boehme-gehring.de
Hardy	Brian	Mr.	Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) (U.K.)	bhardy@trl.co.uk
Hernandez	Mike	Mr.	Toyota Motor North America (U.S.A.)	Mike_Hernandez@tma.toyota.com
Isshiki			Japan Automobile Research Institute (JARI) (Japan)	
Kinsky	Thomas	Mr.	General Motors Europe/Opel (Germany)	Thomas.Kinsky@de.opel.com
Knotz	Christoph	Mr.	Concept Tech GmbH (Austria)	christoph.knotz@concept-tech.com
Kolb	Jan-Christopher	Mr.	Bertrandt (Germany)	jan-christopher.kolb@de.bertrandt.com
Konosu	Atsuhiko	Dr.	Japan Automobile Research Institute (JARI) (Japan)	akonosu@jari.or.jp
Marks	Matthew D.	Mr.	SABIC Innovative Plastics	matthew.marks@sabic.com
Martin	Peter	Dr.	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (U.S.A.)	peter.martin@dot.gov
Medri	Marisol	Ms.	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (U.S.A.)	marisol.medri@dot.gov
Otubushin	Abayomi	Dr.	BMW (Germany)	Abayomi.Otubushin@bmw.de
Pfeifer	Sascha	Dr.	Association of the Automotive Industry (VDA) (Germany)	Pfeifer@vda.de
Roth	Franz	Mr.	Audi (Germany)	franz.roth@audi.de
Schmitt	Winfried	Mr.	BMW (Germany)	Winfried.Schmitt@bmw.de
Stammen	Jason	Mr.	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (U.S.A.)	jason.stammen@dot.gov
Takagi	Shunsuke	Mr.	National Traffic Safety and Environment Laboratory (NTSEL) (Japan)	stakagi@shinsa.ntsels.go.jp
Takahashi	Yukou	Mr.	Japan Automobile Standards Internationalization Center (JASIC) (Japan)	Yukou.Takahashi@n.t.rd.honda.co.jp
Yahia	Karim	Mr.	PSA Peugeot Citroen	karim.yahia@mpsa.com
Yoon	Yongwon	Mr.	Korea Automobile Testing & Research Institute (KATRI) (Korea)	yw.yoon@ts2020.kr
Zander	Oliver	Mr.	Federal Highway Research Institute (BAST) (Germany)	zandero@bast.de

B) List of Actions

(Note: Modified wordings for open action items A-4-03 and A-5-08 are indicated in **bold letters**.)

ID	Open Action Item	Responsibility	Due
A-4-03	Review of TEG FlexPLI thresholds / criteria	All	8 th meeting
A-6-04	Update manual again under consideration of IG comments, if any	Humanetics	early November 2013
A-6-05	Deliver feedback on document GTR9-6-25	Alliance, all	8 th meeting
A-6-09	Review all available information on this (GTR9-6-07, GTR9-6-11, GTR9-6-21) to come to a conclusion on the rebound issue	All	8 th meeting
A-7-01	Work with BAsT and OICA to get agreement on the open wording of document GTR9-6-02r1	Chair/ Secretary	8 th meeting
A-7-02	Provide spread sheets for documents GTR9-7-05c and GTR9-7-06c to Humanetics	JASIC	ASAP
A-7-03	Review all comments on drawing package and manual	Humanetics	8 th meeting
A-7-04	Update drawing package under consideration of IG comments	Humanetics	early November 2013
A-7-05	Prepare proposal for preparation of the impactor for the vehicle testing	OICA	8 th meeting
A-7-06	Review documents GTR9-7-10, GTR9-7-11 and GTR9-7-12 (information from logbooks of the three master legs) and provide comments, if needed	ALL	8 th meeting
A-7-07	Provide information on how many legs met all corridors of the certification tests and add information on master legs (documents GTR9-7-16 and GTR9-7-17)	BAsT	8 th meeting
A-7-08	Review femur data from available tests and provide an assessment of those data	JARI/BAsT	8 th meeting

A-7-09	Review wording on maxima and zero crossing in the presentation on the Biofidelic Assessment Interval (document GTR9-6-07), following the comments received in this meeting	BASt	8 th meeting
A-7-10	Propose a wording for the preamble for a possible transition from the EEVC legform to the FlexPLI	OICA	8 th meeting

(Note of the secretary: Following action item A-7-07, the requested information was provided before these draft minutes were shared. The information was already added to the records of this meeting as revised documents GTR9-7-16r1 and GTR9-7-17r1 to assure that all information needed is available.)

C) List of Meeting Documents

(Note: Documents which were submitted on the eve of or during the meeting are indicated in **bold letters**.)

Document No.	Rev.	Handed in by	Document title
GTR9-4-03	2	Chair	Status of activity list items
GTR9-5-20		BASt	Verification of Draft FlexPLI prototype impactor limits and application to FlexPLI serial production level
GTR9-5-28		Chair	Operating Principles and Terms of Reference for the IG GTR9-PH2, updated version 5th meeting
GTR9-5-31	1	Humanetics	FlexPLI version GTR drawing package
GTR9-6-02	1	Chair/ Secretary	Minutes of the 5th meeting of the Informal Group on Global Technical Regulation No. 9 - Phase 2 (IG GTR9-PH2) – 2nd Draft
GTR9-6-03		OICA	FlexPLI Testing: Propelling Accuracy
GTR9-6-06		Humanetics	FlexPLI GTR User Manual Rev. E 2013
GTR9-6-07		BASt	Definition of FlexPLI Biofidelic Assessment Interval
GTR9-6-10		BASt	FlexPLI Pre- & Post-Test Procedure
GTR9-6-11		JASIC	Consideration of the Rebound Phase
GTR9-6-20		OICA	Discussion on Impactor Thresholds
GTR9-6-21		OICA	Flex-PLI Rebound Issue: Industry Proposal (Update)
GTR9-6-23	2	Cellbond	FlexPLI Drawings Review
GTR9-6-28		OICA	Certification test results of the OEM legform used in document GTR9-6-20
GTR9-7-01	1	Chair/ Secretary	Agenda for the 6th meeting of the Informal Group on Global Technical Regulation No. 9 - Phase 2 (IG GTR9-PH2) - Final
GTR9-7-02		Chair/ Secretary	Draft minutes (this document)

GTR9-7-03		Chair	Draft running order of the provisional agenda
GTR9-7-04		Secretary	Information on drawing package kindly provided by Humanetics
GTR9-7-05	c	JASIC	Result of drawing review (surface level)
GTR9-7-06	c	JASIC	Result of manual review
GTR9-7-07		JASIC	Injury Probability Function for Tibia Fracture and MCL Failure
GTR9-7-08		JASIC	Development of Flex-GTR Master Leg FE Model and Evaluation of Validity of Current Threshold Values
GTR9-7-09		JASIC	Flex-GTR Master Leg Level Impactor Test Data - Pendulum Test
GTR9-7-10		BASt	FlexPLI Logbook - legform SN-01
GTR9-7-11		BASt	FlexPLI Logbook - legform SN-03
GTR9-7-12		BASt	FlexPLI Logbook - legform E-Leg
GTR9-7-13		JASIC	FlexPLI Rebound Phase
GTR9-7-14		BASt	Detailed Review of Drawing Package and Itemized Check against Master Leg Impactor SN03
GTR9-7-15		BASt	BASt comments on GTR9-7-13:JASIC position on FlexPLI rebound phase
GTR9-7-16	1	BASt	Collation of FlexPLI Pendulum Certification Test Results
GTR9-7-17	1	BASt	Collation of FlexPLI Inverse Certification Test Results

(Note of the secretary: Revised documents GTR9-7-16r1 and GTR9-7-17r1 were kindly provided immediately after the meeting; see also footnote under section B.)

D: Summary of Meeting

1. Welcome

Mr. Damm welcomed all attendees to the 7th meeting of the Informal Group.

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Damm (chair) and Dr. Konosu (vice-chair) and the secretariat was provided by Mr. Kinsky.

2. Roll call of participants

See attendance list.

3. Adoption of the agenda

(this document; running order refer to document GTR9-7-03)

The chair introduced the agenda and mentioned that a running order had been developed on request of some attendees.

The secretary added that several documents were received. These are mentioned in the revised version of the agenda (document GTR9-7-01r1).

No further comments on the agenda were received so the revised version was adopted.

4. Review of the draft minutes of the 6th Meeting

(all)

(document GTR9-6-02)

The secretary noted that several comments were received on the draft minutes and thanked those who provided their comments. The proposed changes to the minutes were reviewed in detail. Agreement could be reached for most details.

However, on agenda item 8 of the 6th meeting, 3rd paragraph, Mr. Bilkhu noted that the sentence "The method of shifting the injury severities is a well-known process that is widely accepted." may need to be discussed in more detail.

On agenda item 9.1, 3rd last paragraph (starting with "Also, some discussion came up...")

Mr. Zander added that further details on the certification of the impactor used in document GTR9-6-24 is covered by document GTR9-6-28. So, the respective activity mentioned in this paragraph is finalized.

Finally, the secretary explained that contradicting comments were received from BAST and OICA on the 11th paragraph under agenda item 12.1 (starting with "Regarding the OICA presentation, ...") It

was agreed that this section of the minutes will remain in a draft status and that chair and secretary will work for a common agreement on the wording by BAST and OICA (**action item A-7-01**).

5. Further results from the individual reviews of drawing package and manual (all) (documents GTR9-5-31, GTR9-6-06, GTR9-6-23r2, GTR9-7-04, GTR9-7-05c, GTR9-7-06c, GTR9-7-14) A-6-01, A-6-02, A-6-03

The chair reminded the group that a revised drawing package is available as folder GTR9-5-31r1 on the website. The secretary explained that he had some discussion with Mr. Burleigh on the requests of several attendees to deliver further information. The secretary had summarized the information provided by Mr. Burleigh in document GTR9-7-04. These comments were reviewed.

Mr. Gay wondered whether further information can be added on the materials which are a bit more precise; Mr. Burleigh promised to consider this.

Regarding the pusher plate, Mr. Burleigh answered the request of Mr. Gay for more detailed information that this depends on the test equipment used. However, Mr. Burleigh promised to respond to all individual requests on this as soon as possible when they come up.

Mr. Takahashi introduced documents GTR9-7-05c and GTR9-7-06c and explained the rationale behind the proposed amendments. Mr. Burleigh promised that Humanetics will consider the comments accordingly and requested JASIC to preferably provide the respective spread sheets. Mr. Takahashi promised to do so immediately (**action item A-7-02**).

Mr. Gehring presented document GTR9-7-14 on behalf of BAST. He explained the activities at BAST in detail and summarized that in fact the most mistakes or open issues were found to be uncritical. Mr. Burleigh was able to comment some of the Mr. Gehring's remarks on short notice.

On request of the chair, Mr. Burleigh promised to double check all comments received by the 8th meeting and to deliver an update then (**action item A-7-03**). He then will target to finalize all open issues on the drawings by early November to have the information available in due time before the December 2013 GRSP session (**action item A-7-04**). Also, the action item A-6-04 on the review of the manual will be preferably finalized by then.

The chair will also liaise with Mr. Burleigh to get the title block of the drawings changed as it is needed for the M.R.1.

Finally, Mr. W. Schmitt added that regarding the manual a more detailed description should be foreseen for the preparation of the vehicle testing. He promised to deliver a proposal to be added

to the manual during the 8th meeting (**action item A-7-05**).

Regarding the action items of the last meeting, it was noted that action items A-6-02 and A-6-03 are considered to be solved. For action item A-6-01 on the need of a solid (3D) model of the impactor, the chair explained that it was clarified in WP.29 that such 3D models will not be needed for the processes at UNECE. Therefore, this action item was also closed.

6. Testing activities with the FlexPLI (update)

- 6.1. Information provided to BAST on master leg testing and from logbooks as well as from testing with other legforms (BAST, all) (documents GTR9-7-09, GTR9-7-10, GTR9-7-11, GTR9-7-12, GTR9-7-16, GTR9-7-17)
- | |
|--------|
| A-6-06 |
| A-6-07 |
| A-6-08 |

Dr. Konosu introduced document GTR9-7-09. He explained that Japan did not participate in the master legform round robin testing but that the information presented refers to an impactor that has the same build level according to the information shared at the last meeting. Dr. Konosu concluded that from Japanese side there are no concerns to use the FlexPLI as it is under normal conditions of use.

Mr. Zander explained that BAST summarized the information from the logbooks of the three master legs, legforms SN-01, SN-03 and the so-called E-Leg. He explained that there may not be a need to review this in detail during this meeting. It was finally agreed that all attendees may double check and comment the documents GTR9-7-10, GTR9-7-11, GTR9-7-12 by the 8th meeting the latest (**action item A-7-06**).

Also, Mr. Zander presented documents GTR9-7-16 and GTR9-7-17. He explained that the presentations cover the information made available to BAST following the request during the last meeting (action items A-6-06 and A-6-07). The information includes legforms that are currently in use, master legforms as well as other legforms on master leg build level owned by test labs. So, the test results combine information from different labs with different legforms and therefore provide a good overview. However, he again noted that it was pointed out during the last meeting to deliver only the information for legforms that represent the build level of the master legs.

At the end of the presentation, Mr. Hardy wondered how many legs passed all corridors of the certification tests. Mr. Zander promised to double check this and to provide this information during the next meeting at the latest (**action item A-7-07**). On request of Mr. Knotz it was agreed to also add the information then that legforms 1, 2 and 3 in the presentation are the master legs. ***(Note of the secretary: Revised documents GTR9-7-16r1 and GTR9-7-17r1 were kindly provided immediately after the meeting; see also footnote under section B.)***

On request of Dr. Otubushin, Mr. Zander stated that no conclusions were drawn and no clear tendency was noted. Mr. Stammen added that a tendency could be seen for mean values in the pendulum tests to be higher compared to the mean value of the new corridors while they seem to

be lower in inverse tests. Mr. Zander stated that he cannot generally confirm this for the time being but that his main point was that signals were in the majority of cases in the corridors.

It was finally noted that with the discussion above, action items A-6-06, A-6-07 and A-6-08 can be closed as the actions are covered.

- 6.2. Definition of the flight conditions during the free flight before vehicle impact
(OICA, BAST, all)
(documents GTR9-6-03 and GTR9-6-10)

The chair reminded the group on the discussion on this subject. He wondered whether further comments are available. No further comments were received so it was agreed to consider the subject accordingly when the new wording of the gtr No 9 amendment will be drafted.

- 6.3. Exclusion of the FlexPLI rebound phase from the test result evaluation A-6-09
(BAST, JASIC, OICA, all)
(documents GTR9-6-07, GTR9-6-11, GTR9-6-21, GTR9-7-13, GTR9-7-15)

Mr. Takahashi presented document GTR9-7-13. He explained that JASIC sees issues with the definition of the Biofidelic Assessment Interval (BAI) proposed by BAST. For some vehicles, the length of the interval could affect the maxima due to its definition. Here, due to the length of the interval, it does not seem to be biofidelic in all cases. In addition, in the beginning of the contact phase with the vehicle some local maxima may occur that could be misinterpreted when using the BAI. However, Mr. Takahashi stated JASIC may accept the interval as a solution for the current discussion as long as it is not called "Biofidelic Assessment Interval" but just "Assessment Interval".

In response Mr. Zander presented document GTR9-7-15. He finalized to still see the biofidelity of the legform within this interval. For the local maxima at the beginning of the contact phase he proposed to exclude all peaks that still are in the corridors of the pre-contact phase as covered by agenda item 6.2.

Dr. Otubushin supported Mr. Takahashi's opinion of the limited biofidelity but stated to see the BAST proposal as the best solution currently available. Mr. Gehring wondered whether biofidelic really refers to the human-like behavior. After some further discussion it was concluded that the proposal itself seems to be acceptable but that the name may be modified. The chair reminded the group that discussion is not finalized here and experts are invited to come up with a better proposal if possible.

Before concluding the subject Mr. Takahashi wondered whether the assessment should include the femur data since these are not needed for passing the FlexPLI requirements. Mr. Martin proposed to also develop femur criteria. The chair added that currently an assessment of the femur is not subject of the discussion. The idea here is to assess the human-like behavior of the legform during the rebound phase while a general human-like behavior may not be given for the femur of the FlexPLI. This may need to include other technical solutions in the future, such as e.g.

an upper body mass. The chair also reminded the group that the aim was to finish the discussion preferably by the end of this year which may not be possible if a possibility to assess femur injuries needs to be developed. Mr. Martin responded that, however, if femur measurement results are taken into account a certification possibility should exist for the respective data channels.

Mr. Takahashi and Mr. Roth supported Mr. Damm regarding the tight timing of the work of this Informal Group. Dr. Otubushin wondered whether it would be possible to just develop a corridor e.g. for the time history curves. This may solve NHTSA's concerns. Mr. Burleigh noted that the certification of the overall assembly is already done. So, there is no need to test the femur on its own. Mr. Zander added that static tests for both, the tibia and the femur, are already included in the draft gtr No 9 amendment. Mr. Martin suggested that it also may be sufficient to just define the common zero crossing.

After some further detailed discussion on pros and cons Dr. Konosu proposed that JARI could review the data to assess the issue (**action item A-7-08**). The chair noted that Mr. Zander will support JARI with BAsT data. Also, the chair welcomed the activities but added that he somehow doubts whether there is a need for this especially since femur data are useless in their current form for any assessment. The chair finally emphasized that, if there were a problem, it would be questionable whether the Informal Group could stick to its schedule.

Finally, Mr. Hardy added that it should be made clear in the wording for the "Biofidelic Assessment Interval" that "maximum" refers to positive maxima and does not include negative maxima (meaning minima). In addition, he wondered whether in the BAsT document on the BAI the wording "In the case of not all bending moments having a zero crossing during the common zero crossing phase..." should read "... the common femur and tibia zero crossing phases..." (document GTR9-6-07, page 14). It was agreed that BAsT will check this (**action item A-7-09**).

(Note of the secretary: Since action item A-6-09 could not be closed it will be maintained for the 8th meeting.)

- 7. Discussion on injury criteria / impactor thresholds
- 7.1. Information on the different approaches to derive the injury criteria / impactor thresholds (BAsT, JASIC, all) (documents GTR9-7-07, GTR9-7-08) A-6-10,
A-6-11

Mr. Takahashi shortly presented document GTR9-7-07. He explained that this was considered to be a kind of homework from the last meeting to meet a respective request from NHTSA. Mr. Zander added that he also had provided the requested information to NHTSA on a bilateral basis. NHTSA had agreed that it may not be needed to provide all these details again to the whole group.

Dr. Konosu presented document GTR9-7-08 on behalf of JASIC. JASIC developed a FlexPLI master leg FE model. Then, it was confirmed that the model has a good correlation with the human FE model. Moreover, it was found that there is no need to modify the current threshold values for the

FlexPLI master leg level. Mr. Zander replied to not see a good correlation. Dr. Konosu replied that JASIC believes that the model has a good correlation. However, JASIC does not want to argue this. No further comments were received on this.

- 7.2. Definition of new impactor thresholds (BAsT, OICA, all) (documents GTR9-5-20, GTR9-6-20, GTR9-6-28) A-4-03

The chair noted that document GTR9-6-28 had been added after the last meeting to meet the request of BAsT and can be commented at the 8th meeting if necessary.

Mr. Zander highlighted that the request of OICA to not lower the limits (document GTR9-6-20) should consequently mention that an uncertified impactor was used for this. At least in one test one of the measuring channels did not meet the criteria. The chair proposed to discuss the details during the next meeting, if needed.

The chair informed the participants that Germany will agree on the limits for the injury criteria as proposed by the former TEG for the first introduction phase of the FlexPLI.

On request of the chair Dr. Otubushin confirmed that OICA requests to maintain the impactor thresholds as suggested by the former TEG.

Mr. Martin added that NHTSA requests to put all thresholds into square brackets. Decisions on this need to be made on a higher decision level. Also, Mr. Martin added that NHTSA wishes to understand which injury risks are associated with the different criteria.

The chair explained that anyway all decisions in the group are subject to discussion in the UNECE working groups. Several other parties may need to also provide their opinion on this. However, it is unclear where NHTSA wishes to have a decision on this to be made. Mr. Martin responded that NHTSA is currently clarifying this.

Regarding the injury risks associated with the criteria, Mr. Zander explained that two different approaches were developed in the former Technical Evaluation Group. Mr. Martin wondered which approach would be preferred by the Informal Group. The chair explained that the idea is to bring both approaches into the preamble since no agreement exists on one of the methods.

Also, coming back to agenda item 7.1 Mr. Martin wondered whether the FE model used by JASIC will be available for the assessment of the thresholds as well as for the future work with the FlexPLI. Dr. Konosu replied that JASIC does not plan to make the FE model shown commercially available. Mr. Zander proposed NHTSA to use a FE model which has been developed by consortium including Humanetics.

The chair concluded that the agenda item will be maintained for the next meeting.

(Note of the secretary: Since action item A-4-03 could not be closed it will be maintained for the 8th meeting.)

8. Review of activity list, work plan and identification of further open issues
(Chair, all)
(documents GTR9-5-28, GTR9-4-03r1)

The secretary explained that document GTR9-4-03r1 summarizes the status of the activity list items from the ToR (latest version see document GTR9-5-28). The document was reviewed to see where further activities of the Informal Group are needed. The secretary promised to provide a revision 2 of the document (document GTR9-4-03r2) as soon as possible.

During the discussion on the document it was not that several items can be changed from “yellow” – meaning “under discussion” – to “green” – representing a “clear status”. On request of Mr. Edwards it was explained again that clear status does not necessarily mean agreement but that this refers to having a common understanding within the informal group. For example, for the activity list item “feasibility” the “clear status” means that the feasibility is not questioned in general (e.g. for standard sedan-type vehicles) but that it was noted that it may be an issue for certain vehicles (large SUV’s and pick-up trucks). This was explained in detail in the earlier meetings and is understood. The chair promised that he will explain such issues in detail in the preamble of the gtr No. 9 amendment.

Finally, it was agreed that for the activity list items “b) assessment of biofidelity”, “c) assessment of costs and benefit”, “e) evaluation of durability”, “h) review and exchange of test results”, “i) evaluation of reproducibility and repeatability” and “k) assessment of technical feasibility” the status can be set to “clear” but it was also noted that it needs to be reset to “under discussion” for the item “g) certification tests” following the discussion in this meeting on possible femur certification criteria.

9. Review of action list
(Secretary)

The action items resulting from this meeting (see above) were reviewed; no further comments were received.

Regarding the open action items of the 6th meeting it was noted that action item A-5-08 can be closed: The chair clarified with GRSP chair and UNECE secretariat the details on how to bring the amendment into the gtr 9. Action item A-6-05 was not on the agenda of this meeting and will consequently be postponed to the next meeting.

10. A.O.B.

Before concluding the meeting Dr. Otubushin wondered how the following can be made clear especially to parties which were not directly involved in the discussion of this informal group: Certainly, the Informal Group will propose the FlexPLI for a second phase of the gtr No. 9. With this, industry of course wishes to change to one impactor for all markets when designing new models. On the other hand, it may be needed to maintain the EEVC legform impactor for models that already had been launched also for markets that just start with pedestrian safety testing.

The chair noted that the issue is well understood. He proposed that Dr. Otubushin may draft a wording for the next meeting that can be used to explain the issue in the preamble. Dr. Otubushin agreed to do so (**action item A-7-10**).

11. Next meeting

Please note: The next meeting has already been agreed to take place on 9 – 10 Sept. 2013 at OICA offices in Paris.

It was confirmed that the next meeting will be held on 9 – 10 Sept. 2013 at OICA offices in Paris, 4 rue de Berri, 75008 Paris.

The secretary noted that on 11 Sept. 2013 the next meeting of the Task Force “Bumper Test Area” (TF-BTA) will be held and that all attendees to the IG GTR9-PH2 meeting are welcome to stay for this meeting. However, for organizational reasons this meeting cannot be held at OICA but will be held at the offices of the French Automobile Manufacturers’ Association CCFA, 2 rue Presbourg, 75008 Paris. It is noted that these offices are in walking distance to OICA directly opposite to the famous Arc de Triomphe.