

## **UNECE GRSP IWG Equitable Occupant Protection (EqOP) Task Force 3 – Virtual Crash Testing**

Draft minutes of the 5th meeting.  
On-line meeting, 29<sup>th</sup> August, 2024.  
28 participants.

### **Adoption of the agenda & minutes of last meeting**

Agenda was approved by the participants.  
Minutes of the 4th meeting were accepted and will be uploaded (see [https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/240975979/EqOP-TF3-04-02e\\_Minutes\\_final.pdf?api=v2](https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/240975979/EqOP-TF3-04-02e_Minutes_final.pdf?api=v2))

### **Review of load-case selection requirements from last meeting:**

The chair showed the chart which was created by the group in the last meeting and explained the different parts to the group (see <https://wiki.unece.org/download/attachments/240975979/EqOP-TF3-04-03e-2024-05-17-TF-VCT-M4.pdf?api=v2>)

### **Discussion on final requirements for load-case selection:**

The selected load-case for the proof of concept should fulfill:

1. Relevance to equitable occupant protection
  - a. Address a problem in the field.
  - b. Lead to more equitable occupant protection.
2. Coverage of different levels of complexity
  - a. Simple load-case (testable, quick introduction, relevance limited, use of available ATDs,...)
  - b. Complex load-case (not completely testable, long-term introduction, high impact on equitable protection, use of more biofidelic occupant surrogates e.g HBM, ...)

The group discussed the two requirements in detail which was documented by the chair in a technical diagram (see [Technical Diagram](#)).

OICA commented that on the need for a testable backup scenario in the case of type approval as also smaller companies are represented by the organization. These low volume companies may not be able to conduct the required virtual testing.

Adient asked for clarification that the group is discussing load-case requirements for use in regulation. This was confirmed by the chairs.

Based on the inquiry from CLEPA, the group added to the simple load-case scenario also the option for small changes in the boundary conditions which are still testable.

IIHS stated that the two load-cases should not be seen as separate paths: the simple load-case can be used to develop the complex load-case. HIC Research added that the two columns are not independent as the simple load-case might be needed for validation of the complex load-case.

CLEPA added, that the group should not only look for black&white scenarios. Scaling of complexity and grey zones are important to cover too as each load-case can be designed in a simple or complex way. Currently, only left / right borders are sketched. Therefore, a step-by-step approach could help to develop the desired complexity.

CLEPA also asked if the group should focus on any certain injury. In the context of the work of this group any load case to be addressed which leads to equitable occupant protection is useful for the proof of concept, so no special focus currently.

The importance of the proof of necessity was highlighted by OICA as well as NHTSA: how much need to be done and which tools are sufficient/necessary. They also referred to the report which is currently drafted by Task Force 1.

The chair made it clear that the other Task Forces will not wait till this report is finalized and underlined the importance to keep moving in the other topics. The report that TF1 will provide will put the worktable in written form, but not lead to new conclusions. The chair of Task Force 1 confirmed that the report is not going to tell why the differences occur and therefore does not affect the current discussions in TF3.

BASt summarized the discussion: the chosen load-case should not be too complex, but the group need to keep the more complex load-case in mind from the beginning, as non-testable conditions require different requirements for the procedure and therefore this cannot be developed independently. Validation on component level or even load-case level should be taken into consideration also.

Possible candidates for load-cases are frontal impact and rear impact using HBM for assessment and ATD for validation purpose.

The group agreed to continue the discussion in person at the planned meeting in Stockholm.

**Next meeting:**

Online meeting on 22nd November 2024 12:30 – 14:00 CET.