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Vision Zero: No loss of life should be considered acceptable or inevitable

• The Mayor’s Transport Strategy commits to a Vision Zero approach to road danger reduction

   Eliminate death and serious injuries on our transport network by 2041

• The Vision Zero Action Plan

   Safe Speed  Safe Roads
   Safe Vehicles  Safe Behaviours
Developing a Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for HGVs

A measure

• The world’s first and only HGV Direct Vision Standard
• It’s an objective measurement of the visible ‘volume of space’

A rating

• This measurement is converted to a ‘star rating’ from zero (worst) to five (best)
• Loughborough University have worked with the principal manufacturers

Application of DVS

• Informs operator purchasing decisions - most suitable vehicle for the city environment
• Manufacturers can use it to improve future designs
• Future European regulations governing HGV designs – an International DVS
• Accelerated adoption of safer HGVs in London
  • DVS and HGV Safety Permit Scheme
  • GLA/TfL contracts
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A collaborative approach

- **Vehicle Manufacturers**
  - Technical input and innovation

- **Regulators and Government**
  - International, national and regional

- **Academics and Consultants**
  - Independent and objective

- **Vulnerable Road User Groups**
  - Road user voices

- **Development of DVS**

- **Trade Associations**
  - Industry voice

2019: Permit issuing commences
Scheme ‘go-live’

2020: all zero star HGVs banned unless they prove a ‘safe system’

2024: all zero - two star HGVs banned unless they prove a ‘progressive safe system’
Safe System

Phase 1 consultation
Call for more than direct vision alone

Safe System proposal

Phase 2a consultation
Framework for a Safe System

Strong support for Safe System

Safe System Advisory Group
Commissioned research for Safety measures

Phase 2b consultation
Safe system requirements
Obtaining a permit

Contact vehicle manufacturer

VM supplies star rating

Meets the threshold?

Permit conditions met?

Yes

Apply to TfL with evidence of rating

Issue permit

No

Ensure vehicle meets safe system

Apply to TfL with evidence of safe system

No permit cost

Permit length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVS category</th>
<th>Permit length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3*+</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0*-2*</td>
<td>Until 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No permit cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public consultation

Phase 1 consultation
Jan - Apr 2017
Call for more than direct vision alone

Safe System proposal

Phase 2a consultation
Nov 2017 – Jan 2018
Strong support for safe system
Call to align with ULEZ timings

Multi-stakeholder Safe System Advisory Group & amendment of programme

Phase 2b public consultation (Jan 2019)
Final proposals

Finalise scheme proposals based on consultation feedback
Contact

AlinaTuerk@tfl.gov.uk
+44 (0)207 027 9583
Definition and testing of a Direct Vision Standard for Trucks
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DVS Progress since the last VRU Proxy meeting

• Further refinement of the DVS protocol across a number of areas including;

  • The tightening of definitions for a number of variables including tyre sizes and an alternate method for the definition of the steering wheel position which avoids potential variability

  • Discussions are ongoing with manufacturers

  • Manufacturers are now in the process of piloting the DVS protocol

• The 3D scanning of a selection of Euro IV / V vehicles to allow a DVS rating to be produced is ongoing with half of the sample now complete
  • This is to ensure that operators of older vehicles can obtain DVS scores where appropriate
The definition of a ‘real world’ test that can be used for on the spot checks

- At the last VRU Proxy meeting we agreed to explore the design of a physical test that can be used in conjunction with the Virtual Technique

- As discussed at the last meeting the CAD approach should be seen as the gold standard in terms of the accuracy and ability to support the design process for improved direct vision, due to the high resolution nature of the test process

- The following should not be seen as a replacement for the CAD based technique

- In the last meeting we demonstrated how we used simulations of VRUs in CAD to validated the volumetric approach.

- The proposed ‘real world’ method uses a similar approach
Looking out for vulnerable road users

The forward eye point is defined by an offset from the accelerator heel point (AHP)

This eye point was defined with the agreement of manufacturers and is a standardised eye point which can be used with any vehicle

- Multiple other options were considered including using standard hip point (SgRP) definitions and offsets for an eye point as defined in UNECE regulation 46, however these led to some manufacturers gaining an advantage when a full analysis of all trucks was performed due to variability in the use of the SgRP within the H-point envelope

- The eye point has been defined by taking into account the seat positions of all trucks (common h-point location identified), combined with an offset from the seat which replicates average European eye height for a truck driving posture
  - 50th%ile male and female offsets identified for UK, Germany, Holland, France, Italy, Sweden and then this is averaged with a 90:10 male female split.
Reminder – the core DVS methodology

- The ‘eye rig’ is generated to simulate the view of virtual driver to the front, left and right of the cab using the premise defined by reg 125.
Reminder – the core DVS methodology

- The assessment volume is aligned to the truck sides and front
Reminder – the core DVS methodology

- The volume of space visible from the three defined eye points is projected
Reminder – the core DVS methodology

• The visible volumes are intersected with the assessment volume to allow the proportion of the assessment volume that is visible to the virtual driver to be calculated
The use of VRU simulations to validate the volumetric results

- Top Left – The VRUs are shown around the truck
- Bottom left- the visible volume through the left window is shown
- Top right – The head and shoulders of the VRU intersect with the visible volume at the locations shown and the distances of all VRUs from the side of the truck are measured
Looking out for vulnerable road users

The results: Volume plotted against VRU distance

0.97 correlation between volume scores and VRU scores: 0.5 is strong, 1 is perfect
Real world tests that are proposed for prototyping

V1 – using the seat to support an eye rig that can support three small wireless cameras
V2 – Using a rig that fixes to the windows and is then remotely aligned to the correct eye point position
Real world tests that are proposed for prototyping

V1 – using the seat to support an eye rig that can support three small wireless cameras
Rig V1

- Uses three wireless cameras to allow views to be remotely captured outside of the cab
- Uses a weighted form that is supported by the seat to correctly locate the front camera location
- Uses the AHP calculations in SAE 1516
  - The SGRP height defines the foot angle for interaction with the A pedal
Real world tests that are proposed for prototyping

V2 – Using a rig that fixes to the windows and is then remotely aligned to the correct eye point position
Rig V2

• Uses simple templates to locate the rig using suckers on each window

• Three camera rig can then be positioned correctly in the cab to define the DVS eye points using two possible techniques
Rig V2

- Simple 2D template used to align the camera rig position through the window

- Motorised version which automates the process using triangulation of photogrammetry markers
VRU simulations

• In the virtual process we use a simple VRU simulations with the height of a 5th%ile Italian female and ensured that the head and shoulders are visible to the driver in testing.

• The ‘real world’ test would use the a simplified representation of this human simulation where the red section should be seen by the driver, using the same head and shoulder dimension.
VRU simulations

- Each poll would be setup in a specific location and moved along predefined lines until the red section is visible in the camera view.

Lateral pole positions defined as above.
VRU simulations

- Simulated camera views which would be used to align the poles in the correct position
The results: Volume plotted against VRU distance

0.97 correlation between volume scores and VRU scores: 0.5 is strong, 1 is perfect
Looking out for vulnerable road users

The results: Volume plotted against VRU distance

The correlation between Av. VRU distance and Volumetric score is not perfect, due to the lower resolution nature of the VRU test. This leads to examples of vehicles with a similar VRU distance having different star ratings. This is predominantly due to mirror housing design differences. Therefore the look up of a ‘real world’ VRU measure would need to be to a predefined database of results based upon the volumetric score OR a higher resolution real world test needs to be defined and tested.

0.97 correlation between volume scores and VRU scores: 0.5 is strong, 1 is perfect
Potential option for differentiation between Urban/Long Haul/Construction vehicles
Differentiated approach

• The current proposal is that all vehicles should be able to reach the 1 star level as presented at the previous meeting

• However if contracting parties demonstrate that this has an unduly punitive effect a differentiated approach may be required i.e. different rules for Long Haul/Heavy construction vehicles when compared to urban distribution vehicles

• One way in which the Long Haul/Heavy construction vehicles can be differentiated from urban distribution vehicles is simply by vehicle floor height (AHP) above the ground plane

• Previous work has (LDS/TfL 2015*) showed a good correlation between driver’s height above the ground and the direct vision performance with higher vehicles having worse performance

• The kinds of vehicles that we want to exclude from city centres for safety reasons are generally the tallest cab, and they are tall due to engine specification (long haul), or vehicle suspension and tyre configuration (heavy construction), or a combination of the two

*https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/21028
Differentiated approach – Urban/Long Haul/Heavy Construction – an initial proposal

- So, to allow a differentiated approach (e.g. longer lead times for direct vision improvements for Long Haul cabs) any vehicle with a floor height above a certain value could be defined as Long Haul/Heavy Construction at the point of registration, by the manufacturer.

- Taller cabs that are generally used as Long Haul can also be used as Tippers and other heavy construction vehicles.

- The graph shows the highest possible AHP height for a selection of trucks in the sample.

- The vehicles with AHP height above 1500mm are potentially predominately used for Long Haul/Heavy Construction.

- All of the vehicles with an AHP above 1500mm in the graph, are currently zero star.

- We need to explore the detail of this proposal using the data that we have for the full range of vehicles in the sample.
Thank you for your attention, are there any questions?
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