

UNECE GRSP IWG Equitable Occupant Protection (EqOP) Task Force 2 – Rear-end impact

Minutes of the fifth meeting.
On-line meeting, November 04, 2024.
20 participants.

Adoption of the agenda

Adopted.

Approval the minutes from last meeting

Approved.

Wrap up workshop in Stockholm

The chair provided her wrap-up of the workshop and introduced a discussion.
See further chair presentation.

Are there easy ways to see if there are poor seat designs? The technical expert of Sweden commented that it is difficult to visually determine differences between good and poor designs in terms of protective safety. Thus, a visual inspection does not suffice. The issue is more complicated. There is a need for dynamically testing of seats to tell the difference regarding poor designs.

Another question remaining from Stockholm was how to proceed with the NL proposal. NL responded that the proposal aimed to prevent physical gaps in headrests (gaps defined as not providing protection or load-taking). The idea was not to change requirements but apply the existing requirements over the full height of the headrest. The technical expert of CLEPA has already raised the concern that a sole focus on the strength of the headrest when applying a load as being done in the backset evaluation test, does not address the issue of whiplash and may even become counterproductive.

The Swedish technical expert reminded us about what was at display in Stockholm and that the whole seat is involved in providing protection.

The chair raised the question of including a test with BioRID in two positions. The representative of Austria/co-chair supports both the idea to start doing dynamic tests and to have two different “test points”. CLEPA asked the representative of USA about NHTSA’s work on BioRID. The representative from the USA thanked the IWG for the question and interest and shared later at the 8th IWG meeting on November 6th that NHTSA’s work is still on-going. As such, NHTSA is not in a position to share updates on this work at this time.

We came back to the question on making the dynamic test mandatory. It was noted that for example Euro NCAP, which performs dynamic testing with BioRID, does only include passenger vehicles. Making the test mandatory in R17 would apply to all types of light vehicles and even heavier vehicles. The representative of NL stated that a mandatory dynamic test could be applied to light vehicle only. The technical expert of CLEPA noted that we must be careful about adding regulatory tests. One seat can come in many versions, and

it will be demanding to make production CoP dynamic tests of all. It will also be a difficult process to only test worst-case variants. NL responded that this is business as usual. The concern of variants does apply to many vehicle approval areas. The technical expert of OICA reminded us that we decided to include an optional solution in the work of GTR7 as we regarded the alternatives to equally well evaluate the seats, moreover for good and practical reasons, for instance the dynamic alternative in GTR7 does allow testing with either BioRID or HIII.

The chair put the mid-term solution of a load-taking seatback evenness up for discussion. The representative of Austria/co-chair responded that the idea of creating a semi-static load-taking will risk becoming much more complicated than it looks and may take longer time to define than agree on a mandatory dynamic test.

IIHS noted its ongoing parametric model study on BioRID and EvaRID, which aims to be completed in March 2025. IIHS will share results in TF2 later.

CLEPA Proposal

The technical expert of CLEPA made a presentation of the proposal and responded to the questions which had been posed on the proposal in previous meetings. See further the subject CLEPA presentation. CLEPA will investigate further whether it will be feasible to apply the new requirement from 2026, as the R17-11 new series will apply from 2026. NL comes back to the idea of a more complete proposal as the CLEPA proposal only solves parts of the issue yet will require a new series of amendments. CLEPA responded that the backset test and requirement, as well as other requirements, will remain, and the CLEPA proposal will just improve the situation. NL noted that equity means that we should consider the 5th percentile females through 95th percentile males when formulating the new requirements. CLEPA suggested that Contracting Parties decide among them regarding how to see the proposal in this respect.

Confirmation of consensus on any action items and next steps/meetings

1. Next meeting mid-January. The secretary will send out a meeting poll regarding dates.
2. IIHS will investigate the possibility to present the status of its related parametric study.