A comparison of tibia bending moment time histories has shown that the exaggerated secondary peak of the FlexPLI model relative to the human model may affect the maximum value for some specific vehicles.

The conditions under which this inconsistency takes place have been developed and validated against existing test data (example: GTR9-5-08).
Understanding of Issue

- Despite the technical issues identified,
  - The identified inconsistency is relevant infrequently
  - There are some other minor issues with regard to biofidelity inherent in a mechanical substitute of a human body
  - No cases critical against the proposed injury criteria have been identified so far
  - The conditions under which this inconsistency is identified has not been validated against vehicle structures completely different from the current vehicles
JASIC Position

● Considering these situations, the issue does not necessarily need to be further discussed and agreed for GTR9 Phase-2, prioritizing the current ToR schedule of the IWG

● Provided that some issues will be resolved, the BASt proposal can be acceptable, although not fully supported due to the lack of considerations on this issue
The BASt definition may result in an unexpected definition of the effective time range.

**Definition of Timing**

The definition of the first local maximum needs to be modified.

- **Effective time range**
  - Femur Moment Time History
  - Tibia Moment Time History
  - Ligament Elongation Time History

- **Intended time range**

The last zero crossing of Femur

The last zero crossing of Tibia

The definition of the first local maximum needs to be modified.
Issues with BASt Proposal

**Terminology – Biofidelic Assessment Interval (BAI)**

- JASIC recognizes the biofidelity issue of the exaggeration of the secondary peak of the tibia bending moment.
- The word ‘Biofidelic’ is recommended to be eliminated – ‘Assessment Interval’ would be supported.