

**Minutes of Kick Off Meeting of
The Informal Group on Frontal Impact**

**Held at Palais des Nations, Geneva
19th of May 2008**

1 Welcome and Introduction

Pierre Castaing opened the meeting, welcomed the delegates.

4. Adoption of the agenda

5. Adoption of Rules of Procedure

6. Presentation of the [document ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRSP/2007/17](#)

Deleted: document ECE

Comments

Netherlands summarized the process to introduce current R94

[France](#): All French proposals come from Working Group recommendations and solve problems of the current test.

Deleted: Chairman

Germany: All changes to the barrier test need to take into account compatibility between vehicles. Do we want to have a wider approach?

[France](#): There is enough data to amend R94 without compatibility considerations. France thinks that it is time to introduce a new regulation to solve problems of the current regulation and adapt it to the new and future generation of cars. The French paper represents a bias.

Deleted: Chairman

Australia: Vehicle design changes and Australia supports investigations on frontal impact. Australia thinks that it is possible to separate self protection and compatibility.

UK: In light of the current and future fleet changes, it is time to know if the current R94 test is still relevant. It is additionally important to know if the potential for reducing self protection can be solved through new testing.

Netherlands: Harmonise front end force is more or less a complete package. The composition of the fleet is changing. Netherlands imagines a mobile deformable barrier to become the baseline.

Chairman: It is still an open research question. The aim of this group is to improve a regulation.

Australia: Based on experience, the MDB test is difficult to achieve. Due to the high complexity of the test, benefits must be very important. Fixed barrier is able to achieve what we are looking for.

Germany: Analysis of accident data and justification of the change of the barrier are required.
Chairman: Cost/benefit analysis has been done by Bast and TRL for partner and self protection but compartment strength and force matching is a pre-requisite to continue regulatory discussion.

Deleted: d

UK: WG15 did not justify the change of the barrier.

Formatted: Right

Chairman: WG16 made some recommendations (bottoming out and test speed). WG15 gave some orientations and listed the problems associated with the current barrier. There is still lot of work to do for vehicle compatibility.

France: Introducing a higher test speed and new deformable element is a first step that goes in the desired direction.

Netherlands: What kind of partners you want to protect?

Japan: There are two tests in Japan: Full width test and offset test. R94 changes might affect full lap test.

Deleted: lap

US: Looking to incorporate an offset test for more benefits. US are looking for an offset test with a new deformable element because there are a large proportion of heavy vehicles and the current obstacle is not adapted (bottoming out). With the current obstacle, there is a potential to increase stiffness of vehicles. NHTSA starts research with PDB because barrier doesn't bottoming out. PDB offers the advantages to reduce the stiffness of the vehicle. Car manufacturers can reduce the stiffness. There is also an issue regarding fuel economy and reduce weight of the vehicle is an answer. US are very interested in the PDB and should be helpful.

7. Definition of the Terms Of References

Comments

Netherlands: PDB is a correct representation of the average collision partner. How does it influence the people we want to protect?

UK: Terms of reference should include an impact assessment and will give an example of an "impact assessment" study. UK thinks that further research is needed.

Deleted: influence

Deleted: what is

Chairman: No research is to be done within this group; research can be brought from research group.

Deleted: influence

EEVC WG15: WG15 is writing news terms of reference and would like to support this group.

Germany: We have to discuss side effects because PDB is a part of a global approach.

Deleted: n A

Japan: Supports the discussion about R94 amendment but wants to also consider effect on compatibility performance.

Chairman asks for items to discuss in this group and we will define order and priority at the next meeting. Delegations are kindly asked to send before the 30th of June to the chairman of issues they want to be discussed.

Deleted: discuss

Adoption of ToR with changes proposed.

Next meetings:

- 6th of October in Paris 9:30 to 17:00
- 9th of December, Palais des Nations – Geneva, Room 5.

7 AOB

E Faerber is nominated as secretary of the group.

Formatted: Right