*In Section I: Statement of Technical Rationale and Justification:*

1. *Renumber Paragraph 0 as Paragraph 0 bis, and add a new Paragraph 0 to read as follows:*

0. FOREWARD: UN Global Technical Regulation (GTR) No. 9, Pedestrian Safety, was established in the Global Registry on 12 November 2008. Development of the original GTR is discussed as “Phase 1” beginning with paragraph 0 bis. The GTR was amended by Corrigendum 1 on 12 November 2009, and by Corrigendum 2 and Amendment 1, affecting only the scope of the GTR, on 10 November 2010. Amendment 2 was established on 14 November 2018 and replaced the European Enhanced Vehicle safety Committee (EEVC) lower legform impactor used for the bumper test with the by a flexible pedestrian legform impactor (FlexPLI). Development of Amendment 2 is discussed as “Phase 2” beginning with paragraph 133. Amendment 3 was established on [insert date when established] and added new requirements for vehicles equipped with a Deployable Pedestrian Protection System (DPPS). Amendment 3 is discussed as “Phase 3” beginning with paragraph 228. The Task Force that developed Amendment 3/Phase 3 notes that paragraph 122 in the discussion of Phase 1 has been superseded for vehicles equipped with a DPPS.

1. *After paragraph 227, add a new subsection C to read as follows:*
2. **Phase 3**

228. Sections 1. to [x]. reflect the development of Phase 3 of UN GTR No. 9 and are related to the development of test provisions for vehicles equipped with deployable pedestrian protection systems (DPPS), including prerequisites, without changing the headform impactors and their corresponding parameters for tests to the bonnet top.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL BACKGROUND**

229. During the fifty-sixth session of GRSP (9-12 December 2014) the expert from Korea proposed the development of test provisions for active devices to further improve vehicle safety performance. GRSP noted already existing guidelines for testing active bonnets (<http://www.unece.org/trans/main/wp29/wp29wgs/wp29grsp/pedestrian_8.html>), however these were considered to be insufficient and consent was sought from WP.29 and AC.3 to extend the mandate of the IWG on the development of phase 2 to GTR No. 9.

230. The proposal from Korea to develop an amendment to GTR9 with regards to test provisions for deployable systems of the outer surface to ensure an adequate protection of pedestrians was endorsed by AC.3 at its forty-eighth session (17 November 2016) and the mandate of the IWG on the development of Phase 2 was extended until December 2017.

231. The development of the test provisions for deployable systems was initiated by a Task Force under the umbrella of the IWG on phase 2 (TF-DPPS). After four meetings of TF-DPPS, the mandate of the IWG expired. Subsequently, AC.3 endorsed at its fifty-second session (14 March 2018) the transformation of ~~the~~ TF-DPPS into a new Informal Working Group (IWG-DPPS).

23. Informal document No. 10 of the thirty-first session of GRSP lays down the terms of reference of the group and the document was adopted by GRSP (INF GR/PS/2).

24. Informal document No. 7 of the thirty-second session of GRSP reported on the result of the first meeting of the informal group (INF GR/PS/9).

25. Informal document No. 2 of the thirty-third session of GRSP (INF GR/PS/47 Rev.1) was the first preliminary report of the informal group and responds to paragraph 5 of documents TRANS/WP.29/2002/24 and TRANS/WP.29/2002/49 as adopted by AC.3 and endorsed during the one-hundred-and-twenty-seventh session of WP.29. The documents were consolidated in the final document TRANS/WP.29/882. The preliminary report was adopted as TRANS/WP.29/2003/99 by AC.3 in November 2003.

26. Informal document No.GRSP-34-2 of the thirty-fourth session of GRSP reported on the action plan of the informal group (INF GR/PS/62).

27. Informal document No. GRSP-35-5 of the thirty-fifth session of GRSP was the second preliminary report of the informal group (INF GR/PS/86 Rev2 and PS/88). This report was considered by AC.3 in June 2004 as informal document No. WP.29-133-7.

28. Informal document No. GRSP-36-1 of the thirty-sixth session of GRSP was the first draft gtr of the informal group (INF GR/PS/116).

29. TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2005/3 was proposed at the thirty-seventh session of GRSP and was a revised draft gtr including the preamble, of the informal group (INF GR/PS/117).

2xx. The TF-DPPS had held the following meetings:

(a) 27-28 February 2017; Paris, France

(b) 28-29 March 2017; Paris France

(c) 7 September 2017; virtual

(d) 21-23 November 2017; Berlin, Germany

2xx. The IWG-DPPS had held the following meetings:

(a) 18-20 April 2018; Frankfurt/Main, Germany

(b) 5-7 September 2018; Brussels, Belgium

(c) 10 December 2018; Geneva, Switzerland

(d) 12-14 March 2019; Paris, France

(e) 3-4 September 2019; London, United Kingdom

(f) 28 November 2019; virtual

(g) 4-5 March 2020; virtual

(h) 15-17 September 2020; virtual

(i) 18 November 2020; virtual

(j) 20-21 January 2021; virtual

(k) 9-10 March 2021; virtual

(l) 27-28 April 2021; virtual

(m) 29-30 June 2021; virtual

(n) 14-15 September 2021; virtual

(o) 16-17 November 2021; virtual

(p) 9-10 February 2021; virtual

2xx. The meetings were attended by representatives of: Canada, France, Germany, European Community (EC), Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Spain, the United States of America (USA), Consumers International (CI), the European Enhanced Vehicle-safety Committee (EEVC) [[1]](#footnote-1)/, the European Association of Automotive Suppliers (CLEPA) and the International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA).

2xx. The meetings were chaired by Mr. Park (Korea), while the secretariat was provided by Ms. Dausse (OICA) for the IWG meetings since November 2018, and by Mr. Kinsky from February 2017 (TF-DPPS1) until September 2018 (IWG-DPPS 2nd session).

**2. HIT**

Because of the comparison with total response time of the system, head impact time should be determined. IWG discussed various ways and pursued to include specific procedure by computer simulation(CAE) for the amendment of phase 1 of IWG-DPPS activities and discuss further generic approach proposed by USA. Japan's proposal ~

Revised wording (MV):

2xx. Head Impact Time (HIT) means the duration from the time of first contact of a pedestrian with the vehicle front to the time of first contact of a pedestrian head to the outer surface of the vehicle. Determination of this time is necessary to compare with the total response time of the DPPS.

2xx. The IWG discussed three methods of determining HIT:

1. Use of human body models (HBM) and finite element (FE) model simulations.
2. Use test dummies and physical testing.
3. Use of a “generic” HIT.

2xx. The IWG ultimately agreed to propose a procedure using HBM certification and FE model simulations based on Euro NCAP TB024.

[Add discussions of US and Japanese alternative proposals – here? Or separate section – Methods for HIT determination?]

[Based on a determination by each Contracting Party or regional economic integration organization, either all requirements shall be demonstrated using the dynamic test in (insert cite), or, when the following conditions are fulfilled, all requirements may be demonstrated using the static test in (insert cite), [if this technical alternative is offered by the vehicle manufacturer].]

[GRSP, agreed, that the request by Japan to allow optional alternatives could be temporarily resolved by including the statement in the preamble (Part A) in brackets. This to give to Contracting Parties further time to consider and a final decision on removing those brackets could be made when the draft is reviewed by GRSP in May 2022.]

[A Contracting Party may choose to alternatively accept to use the physical or numerical simulation tools and method for HIT calculation different from the tool and method defined in \*.\*\* and \*.\*\* of this Annex, respectively, in case the validity equivalency is shown by the manufacturer and is agreed by such Contracting Party.]

This definition needs a revision. Even though a physical tool can be understood as simulating the real world, a more common differentiation is between physical test tools (for experimental tests) and simulation tools (for virtual tests).

Please also note that a simulation tool could also be a dummy.

**3. DEPLOYED POSITION**

**--**

**4. VERIFICATION IMPACTOR**

**4. TEST PROCEDURES FOR THE SENSING SYSTEMS OF DPPS**

2xx. For verification of the functionality of the DPPS sensing system, component tests will be performed with the flexible pedestrian legform impactor (FlexPLI), representing the lower extremities of a 50th percentile male for injury assessment of knee and tibia injuries. The use of the FlexPLI as sensing impactor was agreed following extensive investigations.

2xx. Do we need a paragraph(s) re. the decision to base this only on contact sensors currently?

2xx. Contact biofidelity was considered to be an indispensable property of such a sensing impactor. The IWG-DPPS found that, when verifying the ability of a contact sensor to detect a pedestrian, the relevant properties of an impactor are: the total mass, mass distribution, moments of inertia, centre of gravity, impactor width, bending stiffness and the local stiffness / compression behaviour in impact direction were highly relevant properties of an impactor for the signals in use with contact sensors. While most properties of the FlexPLI were accepted to be very reliable due to its design specifications, two complementary studies were carried out to ensure its biofidelic and repeatable local stiffness.

2xx. The first study, carried out by Concept Tech, investigated time histories of different pedestrian surrogates and human body models for identical load cases. It concluded the FlexPLI had, in principal, an appropriate contact biofidelity to work as a representative pedestrian surrogate for sensing issues (IWG-DPPS-3-03).

2xx. The second study, carried out by BASt/BGS in cooperation with ACEA members, focused on the intrusion during inverse tests at impact speeds typical for the lower deployment threshold of DPPS within the typical time interval for detection of pedestrians. Here, two different setups were used, covering the height dimensions as required by RCAR and UN-R 42 which need to be fulfilled by a high number of vehicles. It could be shown that the double integral of the filtered impactor acceleration signal, representing the intrusion, was within a small range with satisfactory coefficients of variation (IWG-DPPS-6-04, IWG-DPPS-7-09 and IWG-DPPS-9-11~~)~~.

2xx. The IWG-DPPS concluded that the FlexPLI was currently the best available pedestrian surrogate which could be used as an impactor for the sensing verification of the system for the time being.

2xx. The IWG emphasized that, due to the complexity of testing the DPPS, the test provisions laid down represent a limited range of typical load cases. It is therefore seen as due care of the vehicle manufacturer that any DPPS would ensure the necessary protection (e.g. for a variation of speeds and pedestrian statures) in order to act as intended in the event of a collision with a pedestrian for a variety of pedestrian statures.

Add in this section discussion of the issue of ossilation vs. positions referenced in “deployment time” and “deployed position.” Include edited figures but point to original meeting where discussed and original document. Include discussion of differences between intended height/deployed position height/manufacturer guaranteed height. Also, that because the last can be lower, using deployed position would be less stringent for some vehicles so manufacturer specifies deployed position for static tests.

The test provisions laid down in this regulation are to improve protection from injury caused by the vehicle front during a collision with a pedestrian.

Where the vehicle is equipped with a dDeployable Pedestrian pedestrian Protection protection Systemsystem (DPPS ), as defined in this Regulation, these test provisions can, due to the complexity of testing those systems, only represent spot checks. [Nevertheless, it is the due care of the car manufacturer that any active devices of passive pedestrian safety continue to meet the required safety level (in particular, reasonable protection (as provided by passive systems (non-DPPS), outside the test procedure parameters (at speeds below and beyond the sensing velocity range, limitation of total response time TRT, detection of the hardest to detect pedestrian HTD, reasonable actual protection level, reasonable sensing width), in order to act as intended in the event of a collision with a pedestrian.]

**5. HEAD TEST AREA**

~

**6. DETECTION AREA**

~

At the 18 January 2022 drafting meeting, Japan accepted the definition of “detection area,” but asked for discussion in preamble, regarding the pedestrian kinematics of contact with bonnet.

**7. PROTECTION AT HIGHER SPEED, BONNET DEFLECTION DUE TO BODY LOADING**

~

**8. PROTECTION AT SPEED BELOW LOWER THRESHOLD**

~ however, the HIC criteria within the specified head test areas must be met.

**9. TRT MEASUREMENT**

~

**10. HEADFORM TEST CONDITIONS**

~

**2. PEDESTRIAN KINEMATICS**

IWG agreed that DPPS should be activated as intended for pedestrian protection when pedestrians hit a vehicle.

For that reason, IWG included procedures for verifying activation performance and response time of the system.

In order to verify the activation performance, how to conduct the test with pedestrian surrogate was developed, and how to measure the response time was stated.

Finally, IWG agreed that headform impact tests shall or may be conducted with deployed, undeployed, or deploying DPPS depending on the result.

**xx. LIST OF DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED IN THE [TF-DPPS] and IWG-DPPS][IWG ON UN GTR NO. 9 – PHASE 3]**

| *Doc. No.* | *Rev.* | *Name* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DPPS-1-01 |  | 1st Meeting Agenda |
| DPPS-1-02 | 1 | Minutes of the First Meeting |
| DPPS-1-03 |  | Task Force Outline |
| DPPS-1-04 |  | Test Procedure of Deployable Systems for Pedestrian Protection (Korea) |
| DPPS-1-05 | 1 | OICA proposal based on GRSP-58-31 as revised during the meeting – 20170227 |
| DPPS-1-06 |  | Comments on Scope (Japan) |
| DPPS-1-06-Appe |  | Comments on Scope – Appendix (Japan) |
| DPPS-1-07 |  | Euro NCAP Pedestrian Testing Protocol v8.3 December 2016 (Germany) |
| DPPS-1-08 |  | JNCAP Ped Active Device Test Protocol (unofficial) (Japan) |
| DPPS-1-09 |  | Testing Deployable Bonnet Systems within Euro NCAP (Germany) |
| DPPS-1-10 |  | Bonnet Deflection of Deployable Bonnet Systems (Germany) |
| DPPS-1-11 |  | Industry Understanding on Rulemaking (OICA) |
| DPPS-1-12 |  | Input bonnet deflection discussion (OICA) |
| DPPS-2-01 | 1 | 2nd meeting agenda |
| DPPS-2-02 | 1 | Minutes of the 2nd meeting |
| DPPS-2-02-Annexe |  | Annex to the minutes of the 2nd meeting: Attendance list |
| DPPS-2-03 | 3 | Requirements Overview DPPS (Korea) |
| DPPS-2-04 |  | Prerequisites for Deployable Bonnet Systems in Deployed State (Germany) |
| DPPS-2-05 | 1 | Comments on OICA proposal (Japan) |
| DPPS-2-06 |  | Comments on document TF-DPPS/1/05 Rev. 20170227 (Japan) |
| DPPS-2-07 |  | Comments BASt on OICA Input Presentation (Germany) |
| DPPS-2-08 |  | OICA comment for static and dynamic test (OICA) |
| DPPS-2-09 |  | Marking of Deployable Bonnets: Differences of Bonnet Marking Positions and Challenges in Performance Assessment (OICA) |
| DPPS-2-10 |  | Explanation JNCAP details for Items for DPPS Amendment (Japan) |
| DPPS-2-11 |  | Development Head Test Procedure (Germany) |
| DPPS-2-12 |  | Text for validation of simulation methods (OICA) |
| DPPS-2-13 |  | Comments on document TF-DPPS/2/04 (OICA) |
| DPPS-2-14 |  | Development of a Head Impact Test Procedure for Pedestrian Protection (Germany) |
| DPPS-2-15 |  | Validity of a Headform to be used for a Specific Impact Test Speed Condition (Japan) |
| DPPS-2-16 |  | Comments on document TF-DPPS/2/13 (Germany) |
| DPPS-3-01 | Corr 1 | 3rd meeting agenda |
| DPPS-3-02 | Corr 1 | Minutes of the 3rd meeting |
| DPPS-3-03 |  | Definition of sensing area (Japan) |
| DPPS-3-04 |  | Proposal for Definition of Head Impact Test Area (Japan0 |
| DPPS-4-01 | 1 | 4th meeting agenda |
| DPPS-4-02 |  |  |
| DPPS-4-03 |  | Scope and Limitations of the PDI-2 (OICA) |
| DPPS-4-04 |  | Static and Dynamic Testing of Deployable Systems (OICA) |
| DPPS-4-05 |  | Marking + Deployed Position (OICA) |
| DPPS-4-06 |  | JASIC proposals for document TF-DPPS/1/05-Rev.1 (Japan) |
| DPPS-4-07 |  | Validity of Applying the Current Headform at Low Impact Speed (Japan) |
| DPPS-4-08 |  | Dynamic Headform Test (Synchronization) (Korea) |
| DPPS-4-09 |  | Discussion Issues for DPPS Testing (Korea) |
| DPPS-4-10 |  | Alternative Determination of Head Impact Time (BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-01 |  | 1st IWG-DPPS meeting agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-1-02 | 1 | 1st IWG-DPPS meeting notes |
| IWG-DPPS-1-03 |  | IWG-DPPS Terms of Reference |
| IWG-DPPS-1-04 | Corr 1 | Presentation of the Euro NCAP CoHerent Project (Tu Graz) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-05 |  | Comments: Deploy Height vs. Fully Deployed (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-06 |  | Comments: Dynamic Testing (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-07 |  | Comments: Pedestrian Sensing Impactor (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-08 |  | ACEA Input: Definition of Sensing Width (ACEA) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-09 |  | Summary of Compliance Test Procedure for Pedestrian Protection (Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-1-10 |  |  |
| IWG-DPPS-1-11 |  | Head Impact Time of Human Body Models (BASt) |
| IWG-DPPS-2-01 | 1 | 2nd IWG-DPPS meeting agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-2-02 | 1 | 2nd IWG-DPPS Meeting notes |
| IWG-DPPS-2-03 |  | Summary Report Meeting 14 June 2018 (Sub-group Prerequisites) |
| IWG-DPPS-2-04 | 2 | Contracting Parties' positions on DPPS amendments |
| IWG-DPPS-2-05 | 2 | Proposal: Decision on Deployed Testing of DPPS (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-2-06 | 1 | Proposal for a Rev. 4 of Document TF-DPPS/2/03 |
| IWG-DPPS-2-07 |  | Summary of SAE Standard for Full-Scale Pedestrian Dummy (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-2-08 |  | Quick check of proposed logic to not activate DPPS outside of sensing width (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-2-09 |  | 2nd IWG-DPPS Attendance list |
| IWG-DPPS-2-10 |  | JLR Presentation on synchronisation comparison (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-3-01 |  | 3rd IWG-DPPS Agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-3-02 |  | 4th IWG-DPPS Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-3-03 |  | Leg impactors and HBM simulation comparison for detection (CONCEPT) |
| IWG-DPPS-3-04 |  | Study of Application of Upper Leg form to sensing test (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-3-05 |  | Principle of a test procedure for Human Body Model numerical simulation (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-3-06 |  | Attendance list |
| IWG-DPPS-4-01 | 1 | 4th IWG-DPPS Agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-4-02 | 1 | Draft minutes +BAST comments |
| IWG-DPPS-4-03 |  | Task 27 (deploy bonnet) (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-04 |  | System Information Requirement (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-05 |  | Sensing width proposal (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-06 |  | Upper Leg Form Sensing Update (JASIC) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-07 |  | Ped Dummy Test Procedure proposal (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-08 |  | Marking of bonnet deployed/undeployed (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-4-09 |  | Attendance list |
| IWG-DPPS-5-01 |  | Draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-5-02 |  | Draft minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-5-03 |  | Marking (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-5-04 |  | 1st tentative draft |
| IWG-DPPS-5-05 |  | Intended height test condition (JASIC) |
| IWG-DPPS-5-06 |  | Sensing Impactors comparison (JASIC) |
| IWG-DPPS-5-07 |  | Basis for General Wording Proposal (Germany) |
| IWG-DPPS-5-08 |  | GRSP & WP29 report |
| IWG-DPPS-5-09 |  | Detection Area Width (Germany) |
| (from 5bis Skype meeting) |  | IDIADA -HIT calculation feedback (Spain) |
| (from 5bis Skype meeting) |  | HIT calculation feedback (JASIC) |
| (from 5bis Skype meeting) |  | ULF study 2013 (Altran) |
| (from 5bis Skype meeting) |  | Draft skype minutes |
| (from 5bis Skype meeting) |  | ULF study 2013-conclusion for detection (Altran) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-01 | 2 | 6th DPPS draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-6-02 |  | 6th IWG-DPPS Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-6-03 |  | V2 of draft text proposal (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-04 |  | Sensing Impactor for DPPS (Germany) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-05 |  | HIT-WAD calculation (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-06 | 2 | HIT-WAD \_Timing (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-07 |  | Positioning of Ped HBM-v0 (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-08 |  | Draft text proposal- updated (JASIC) |
| IWG-DPPS-6-09 |  | Marking-up sketches (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-01 |  | draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-7-02 |  | IWG-DPPS 7-draft minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-7-03 |  | Dynamic\_Static\_Test (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-04 |  | Test Area (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-05 |  | Draft-Annex (South Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-06 |  | THUMS Overview (Toyota) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-07 |  | Positioning of Ped HBM (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-08 |  | GHBMC\_M50-PS\_Mo (GHBMC) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-08add |  | GHBMC\_addendum-publications (GHBMC) |
| IWG-DPPS-7=09 |  | Flex-PLI as Sensing Impactor for UN-R127 - Contact Fidelity (Germany) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-10 |  | Detection Area Width (Germany) |
| IWG-DPPS-7-11 |  | Generic-Vehicle-Models (TUGraz) |
| IWG-DPPS-8-01 |  | IWG - draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-8-02 |  | Draft minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-8-03 |  | Draft text Annex 2 organisation (Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-8-04 |  | FlexPLI Biofidelity for Detection - intermediate report (BASt/BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-01 |  | Draft Agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-9-02 | 2 | Official minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-9-03 |  | GTR9 Preamble for FlexPLI as detection impactor (BASt/BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-04 |  | Proposal GTR9 DPPS Sensor Detection (BASt/BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-05 |  | UNR127 amendment justification for FlexPLI as detection impactor (BASt/BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-06 |  | GRSP report |
| IWG-DPPS-9-07 |  | Dynamic Static Test comparison (Korea) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-08 |  | Comments on Korea Proposal for Draft Amendment (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-09 |  | Proposal for Condition of Activation of DPPS (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-10 | 1 | OICA – HIT simulation (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-11 |  | Sensing FlexPLI Impactor Final Evaluation (BASt – BGS) |
| IWG-DPPS-9-12 |  | Comment on IWG-DPPS-9-09 (BASt) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-01 |  | Draft Agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-10-02 |  | Draft Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-10-03 |  | IDIADA -Explanation\_pressure\_data-requirement (Spain) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-04 |  | Leg\_Head\_Impact\_Location\_JASIC (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-05 |  | HIT-HBM -TB024 simplification for Regulation (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-06 |  | Ped-HBM-Certification for HIT Draft (OICA) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-07 |  | Decision list |
| IWG-DPPS-10-08 |  | UN webpages proposals to store Generic Vehicle Models (UN Secretariat) |
| IWG-DPPS-10-09 |  | Detection Area- Lateral offset of head-Accident Data (BASt) |
| IWG-DPPS-11-01 |  | Draft Agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-11-02 |  | Draft Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-11-03 |  | Pedestrian Kinematic Assumptions GTR9 (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-11-04 |  | Suggestion on Introduction of HIT Numerical Simulation (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-11-05 |  | Clarification of IWG-DPPS scope (BASt) |
| IWG-DPPS-11-06 |  | Comment for Detection Area (ACEA) |
| IWG-DPPS-11-07 |  | Decision list |
| IWG-DPPS-12-01 |  | Draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-12-02 | 1 | Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-12-03 |  | Sensitivity Analysis Pressure Data Requirement (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-04 |  | Sensitivity Analysis Pressure Data Requirement-GTR9 (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-05 |  | Pressure Data Requirement-UNR127 (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-06 |  | Comments on Priority of HIT Prediction Method (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-07 |  | Pedestrian Kinematic Assumptions GTR9 (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-08 |  | Detection Area II (VDA\_SMMT-CCFA) |
| IWG-DPPS-12-09 | 1 | Clarification for HIT Regression (VDA-SMMT-CCFA) |
| IWG-DPPS-13-01 |  | Draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-13-02 | 1 | Minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-13-03 | 1 | Updated Decision\_List |
| IWG-DPPS-13-04 |  | Consolidated draft proposal of DPPS GTR9 amendment -210906 |
| IWG-DPPS-13-05 |  | revised 5-04 Pressure Data Requirement (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-13-05 | 1 | Rev1 wording for CP options |
| IWG-DPPS-13-06 |  | System Specifications Proposal (IDIADA) |
| IWG-DPPS-13-07 |  | Participant list |
| IWG-DPPS-14-01 | 1 | Official agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-14-02 |  | Draft minutes |
| IWG-DPPS-14-03 |  | Comment on HIT calculation-tool and HIT-WAD diagram (Japan) |
| IWG-DPPS-14-04 |  | Sensing-width (VDA-CCFA) |
| IWG-DPPS-14-05 |  | DPPS-HBM qualification procedure status (IWG subgroup) |
| IWG-DPPS-15-01 | 1 | Draft agenda |
| IWG-DPPS-15-02 |  |  |
| IWG-DPPS-15-03 |  | HBM qualification for GTR draft (TF-HBM subgroup) |
|  |  |  |

1. / The steering committee of the EEVC is composed of representatives from European national governments. The EEVC conducts research in motor vehicle safety and develops recommendations for test devices and procedures that governments can decide to adopt into national regulations. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)