



# TF-DPPS Comments Marking + Deployed Position

3<sup>rd</sup> TF meeting Nov. 2017

---

# TF-DPPS Comments

Current Requirements INF GR/PS/141 Rev.1

## Current requirements based on INF GR/PS/141 REV. 1:

Marking up the vehicle in deployed position. In case of a technology that makes it impossible to mark up in deployed position (for example external airbags) it can be agreed between the manufacturer and the Technical Service to mark up in undeployed position.

### Test Procedure Item 3:

The system reaches and remains in the intended position before head impact;  
The system can be supported in a representative way <sup>2)</sup>

<sup>2)</sup> “Supported in a representative way” could mean e.g. by a spring system.

# TF-DPPS Comments

OICA Proposal based on GRSP-58-31

## OICA Proposal based on GRSP-58-31:

Par. 3.1. / 3.13.: ‘Adult / Child headform test area’ ...In case of deployable systems, the determination of that area is conducted in the deployed position of the outer surface as defined in paragraphs 3.19. or 3.31. respectively.

In case of a technology that makes it impossible to mark up in deployed position, the mark-up is conducted in undeployed position.

## OICA Proposal based on GRSP-58-31:

3.19. ‘Deployed position’ means the position of the lifted vehicle outer surface specified by the manufacturer. The lifted vehicle outer surface shall reach a position equal to or above the deployed position during the time between the Total Response Time and the Head Impact Time that corresponds to the rear end of the test area.

3.32. ‘Outer surface’ means those components of the vehicle within the test areas, which are contacted by the pedestrian in case of an accident. The outer surface may include the bonnet, the fenders, but also external airbags or other components within the test area.

# TF-DPPS Comments

**The advantage of the current OICA Proposal (based on GRSP-58-31) is that all available systems are covered and it is in line with the current requirements based on INF GR/PS/141 Rev. 1**

The scope of the TF-DPPS is to **clarify** the existing test procedure

Therefore we strongly propose:

- To keep these principles also for the marking in the deployed position and the definition of the deployed position
- Not to mandate the marking in the undeployed position for any technical system
- To accept a guaranteed (intended) height for the testing of a deployable system and NOT only a fully deployed system (needed for consumer metrics)  
Intended height is a minimum height specified by the manufacturer to fulfil legal requirements.  
Higher positions of “lifted vehicle outer surfaces” cause better performances.

# TF-DPPS Comments

## **Conclusion:**

Otherwise these requirements would be design restrictive and lead to an intensification of the current requirements.

## **Request:**

- Principles mentioned in document DPPS-1-11 shall be considered
- Decisions about items in document DPPS-2-03Rev1 to be aligned first within TF-DPPS