UNECE GRSP Task Force
Deployable Pedestrian Protection Systems

2nd meeting, 28 – 29 March 2017

Paris, OICA offices (4 Rue de Berri, 75008 Paris, France)

Minutes (~~Draft~~Final)

1. Welcome and introduction (Chair)

   - Welcome and introduction, attendance list see annex.

2. Review and approval of the agenda (Chair/secretary)
   (document TF-DPPS/2/01)

   - Just a wording mistake corrected, final document TF-DPPS/2/01-Rev.1

3. Review and approval of the minutes of the 1st meeting (Chair/secretary)
   (document TF-DPPS/1/02)

   - Minutes were reviewed and discussed in detail
   - Revised version will be provided as document TF-DPPS/1/02-Rev.1

4. Review of Task List from 1st meeting (Secretary)
   (agenda item 6 of document TF-DPPS/1/02)

   - Task list was reviewed in detail
   - Task 1 – questions or comments to document TF-DPPS/1/11: no further comments
   - Task 2 – website or space for file sharing: will be provided on GRSP website soon
   - Task 3 – details of a milestone plan: will be done during the course of the meeting
   - Task 4 – drawings/illustrations and eventually performance for deploy height vs. fully deployed height: will be provided in a later meeting
   - Task 5 and Task 6 – validation information of headforms: will be provided during this meeting
   - Task 7 – differences between deployed and non-deployed marking: will be provided during this meeting
   - Task 8 – reference for working with simulation models: will be provided during this meeting

- Task 9 – decision process: to be clarified in GRSP, if no compromise can be made
- Discussion on open items from the 1st meeting
- Korea explained that in their self-certification process the OEM gets access to a website where all necessary data can be provided based on authority´s request~~can be stored~~
- Korea will use the data provided for the test preparation and execution; basis is the physical vehicle bought by KATRI
- OICA requests Korea to possibly get more details on this (action item)
- Request to the US: Would such a procedure be acceptable for the US? Can procedures be harmonized?
- Second open item on how to organize dynamic testing will be covered by OICA later in the course of the group

5. Further discussion on possible amendments gtr No. 9 (All)
(documents TF-DPPS/1/08, 09, 10, 11,12 and TF-DPPS/2/03, 04, 05)

- Documents TF-DPPS/1/08 to 12 had been presented in the first meeting, no further comments (TF-DPPS/1/08 is for reference purposes only)
- Review of document TF-DPPS/2/03 presented by Korea, modified details included in document TF-DPPS/2/03r1
- This document is intended to serve as a reference for drafting the regulatory text and requirements alignment
- Additional document of Japan (TF-DPPS/2/10) to explain JNCAP requirements
- Discussion on differences between certification and consumer rating: certification to prove that worst case conditions still meet minimum requirements
- Presentation of expert from Germany (TF-DPPS/2/~~03~~04) on prerequisites for assessment of deployable systems
- Comment from the UK representative that the prerequisites would seem to go ~~may be~~ far beyond the mandate of the group; in particular, the introduction of additional pass pass/fail criteria which applies only to deployable bonnet systems would seem to go beyond the mandate provided by AC3. He suggested that should clarification be required on the remit of the task force, it would seem appropriate to seek guidance from GRSP.
- Discussion on what is exceeding the mandate
- Understanding that everything new going beyond current certification requirements and existing certifications should be considered new
- Chair suggested TF asks GRSP if necessary requirements can be dealt with in the group
- Explanations of OICA members on differences between certification and consumer testing: certification to consider worst case of all variants and only allows pass or fail while consumer testing is ~~just considering~~ focusing on one variant that may have a bad rating but still can be sold
- Certification to guarantee min. level of safety as already pointed out by NHTSA expert during the 1st meeting, no rating of good or poor
- Also, consumer testing must not necessarily have scientific background and could be based on concerns, cost benefit assessment not necessarily available
- Finally noted missing issues in the field (no accident data regarding DPPS)
- Additional comment that this might be too early for this technology (active bonnets)
- Document TF-DPPS/2/12 presented, explaining how simulation models could be validated for the purposes of the gtr (with striking ~~thru~~ through those parts that specifically refer to type-approval processes)

- Noted that, in contradiction to UN R21 and R29, no validation with physical tests is possible since no tests exist representative for Human Body Models
- To be discussed in Geneva (part 2 of Task 8 from the 1st meeting)
- Expert of Germany: document TF-DPPS/2/07 provides comments on TF-DPPS/1/12, not for presentation but for reference purposes only
- Chair commented the complaints: explained in advance that new documents (handed in late or during the meeting) will just be initially presented, discussion during the following meeting
- ~~Comment OICA that Germany, or BASt respectively, or the expert speaking for Germany respectively, should visit OICA's website or contact the OICA General Secretary when there are questions on OICA mandates or OICA internal processes – this is not for discussion in this group~~Comment OICA, or the group's secretary respectively, that questions on whether particular presentations reflect OICA or just some of the members only are not of the business of Germany, or BASt respectively, or the expert speaking for Germany respectively
- On request of the chair, informal presentation of one manufacturer: example for procedure of synchronization for dynamic testing (for reference purposes only, not OICA); an example of synchronization for dynamic testing was offered for the next meeting
- Document TF-DPPS/2/08 presented by OICA, detailed discussion to take place in the next meeting
- Document TF-DPPS/2/13 presented by OICA, detailed discussion to take place in the next meeting
- Document TF-DPPS/2/14 presented by Germany, detailed discussion to take place in the next meeting
- Document TF-DPPS/2/15 presented by Japan, detailed discussion to take place in the next meeting
- Germany and Japan investigated the validation of headforms (documents TF-DPPS/2/14 and 15): no proof that headforms cannot be used at different impact speeds/conditions
- Document TF-DPPS/2/16 presented by Germany, detailed discussion to take place in the next meeting
- Chair noted that he will ask for clarification of some issues to GRSP in Geneva
- (Noted: documents TF-DPPS/2/05-Rev.1 (an already revised version of TF-DPPS/2/05) and TF-DPPS/2/09 not presented due to timing issues)

6. Modified task list resulting from the 2nd meeting (All)

- Task 1: Settled
- Task 2: Settled
- Task 3 (Chair): Further develop details of a milestone plan
- Task 4 (OEMs): Provide drawings/illustrations and eventually performance data to more clearly describe the background of deploy height vs. fully deployed height
- Task 5: Settled
- Task 6: Settled
- Task 7 (OICA): Provide geometry data to highlight the differences between deployed and non-deployed marking
- Task 8, 1st part (Mr. Ballaux): Settled
- Task 8, 2nd part (Chair): Ask for guidance of GRSP on the definition of "appropriate simulation models"
- Task 9 (Chair): Provide proposal for agreement process in the TF-DPPS

TF chair proposal: unclosed issues will be clarified and discussed in GRSP with all contracting parties

- Task 10 (Chair): Provide overview on KATRI procedure for self-certification data provision and timelines (baseline data preparation, additional data can be requested)
- Task 11 (NHTSA): How to manage simulation (CAE or dummies) in US regulations?
- Task 12 (All): Is it acceptable using only simulation models for HIT definition?
- Task 13 (Japan): Specify how the sensing area is determined (incl. differences between current NCAP and legislation proposal)
- Task 14 (OICA): Provide detailed information on PDI-2 development (scope and limitations)
- Task 15 (Chair): Get confirmation for the scope of TF-DPPS (including prerequisites, new requirements etc. into the amendment) from GRSP

7. Date and place of the next meeting, expected outcome (All)

- Next face-to-face on Nov. 21 – 23 in Berlin, meeting location will be announced as soon as possible
- In between, further web meeting(s) may take place on specific topics (dates not yet available)