

DV TASK FORCE PROGRESS

JOHANNES PETER BAUER & IAIN KNIGHT





INTRODUCTION

- Differentiation between vehicle types
- Technical clarification of proposals and conversion of VRU distance and volume
- Quantifying the impact of proposals on industry
- Specification of limit values to whole assessment zone or separately to each side

N3G AWD

- At last VRU Proxi concerns raised over possible incentive to make vehicles AWD to avoid vision requirements, particularly in electrified powertrains of the future
- TF considered extremely unlikely for ICE vehicles
- TF considered unlikely but theoretically possible for future EVS
- TF propose that, if necessary, this possibility should be excluded in the fundamental definition of N3G. Dedicated discussion needed because it could affect other legislation too.



TASK FORCE PROPOSAL FOR DIFFERENTIATION

Vision Category	Limit Principle	Vehicle type (descriptive)	Vecto Group
A	Xm^3	Urban & regional distribution rigids (N3) Regional Distribution Tractors (N3) 6*4, 8*2, 8*4 rigids (N3, often construction or utility sector)	3, 4-UD, 4-RD, 9-RD 5-RD, 10-RD 11-S, 15-S, 16-S
B	$Ym^3 < X$	Long Haul Tractor units (N3) Long Haul Rigids (N3) Extreme off road (N3G-AWD)	5-LH, 10-LH 4-LH, 9-LH, 11-EMS, 15-EMS, 16-EMS, 17 Subset of other Vecto groups
B+	$Y+1m^3$	Off road vehicles (N3G exc AWD)	Subset of other Vecto groups

CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUS PROPOSALS

- Some confusion in last VRU Proxi in where exact numbers in the presentation of proposals came from.
- Source: conversion of VRU distance (m) to visible volume (m³)
 - Decision to use correlation lines and increase in sample size
 - Decision to consider combined and separated approaches
 - Use of correlation formulae in different graphs/presentations
- Solution:
 - Use the LDS spreadsheet V2
 - Do not sum the sides to get a total when considering “separated” approach
 - Full methodology “explainer” presentation with corrected values available on VRU Proxi Wiki for this meeting

INDIVIDUAL LIMIT VALUE PROPOSALS CONSIDERED



Category	ACEA/OICA (Applied whole zone) M ³	VRU Proxi Rev 1 (applied to each side) M ³			
		Total	DriverSide	Front	DriversSide
A	8.5	11.4		2.2	4.4
B	6	8.2		1.8	2.7
B+	7	NA		NA	NA

Category	ACEA/OICA (Applied whole zone) M	VRU Proxi Rev 1 (applied to each side) M ³			
		Total	DriverSide	Front	DriversSide
A	2.0	1.6	2.5		0.6
B	2.4	2.1	3.0		0.93
B+	2.3	NA	NA		NA

Note: VRU Proxi Chair also suggested an option of VRU distance 2.5 drivers, 1.7 front and 1m drivers side in a combined approach, or less stringent requirements if a separated approach



IMPACT ON INDUSTRY

- Large proportion of vehicles will be off-market with unrealistic requirements especially if enforced by the separated approach
- Due to compliance law direct impact per manufacturer is forbidden to be communicated
- Further info in ACEA presentation

LIMIT VALUES & COMBINED –VS – SEPARATED APPROACH

- Discussions were effectively deadlocked between OICA proposal and LDS proposal
- Overview of proposals. No agreement found within task force:
 - OICA: **Combined** volume A 8.5m³; B 6.0m³, B+ 7.0m³
 - LDS: Separated approach Cat B front 1.79m³, passenger 3.69m³, drivers 2.74m³ (comparison value combined 8.0 m³); Cat A TBD (comparison value combined 11.2m³)
- OICA main objections to LDS proposal
 - Separated approach is excessively design restrictive (e.g. for narrow cab)
 - Limit values are too ambitious – not technically feasible for some applications with knock on effect on freight industry – does not properly account for “possible” and “specificities of different vehicle types” part of GSR statement
- LDS Main objections to OICA proposal
 - Insufficiently ambitious – does not eliminate blind spots to “the greatest extent possible”
 - Combined approach allows clear possibility that designs will improve by much more to the side of vehicles to the front, limiting benefits to pedestrians killed when vehicle moves off from rest
- Deadlock could not be broken on economic grounds due to absence of evidence
- Final attempt was made to “brainstorm” possible solutions to reconcile differences: see separate presentations ACEA/T&E