

Proposal for Terms of Reference
For a Working Group on Pedestrian Safety

Transmitted by the European Commission

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years accidents involving pedestrians and other vulnerable road users have been given increased attention. These accidents cause a substantial number of fatalities and injuries per year world-wide: - 9,000 deaths and 200,000 injuries in the EU alone.

For several years now test prescriptions aimed at designing "pedestrian friendly cars" have been studied at the European level, and more recently at the world-wide level. The EEVC - European Enhanced Vehicle-safety Committee has been performing pioneering scientific research and delivering technical requirements in this field.

A first report of the EEVC Working Group on Pedestrian Safety (WG 10) was presented in November 1994. The report contained a set of prescriptions for designing "pedestrian friendly cars", based on 4 different tests:

- child head against the bonnet;
- adult head against the bonnet;
- lower leg (tibia) against the bumper;
- upper leg (femur) against the "bonnet leading edge" (frontal part of the bonnet).

Following this a cost benefit analysis was prepared in 1996 which was up-dated by MIRA (Motor Industry Research Association, UK) in 1997. EEVC WG17 delivered an updated scientific report early in 1999.

Based on the last report and according to the prescriptions contained in the technical annexes, the full compliance of future cars could lead to a 23 % reduction of fatalities (2.100 lives saved per year) and 10% reduction of injured victims¹ (19-20.000 serious injuries saved per year).

1. INDUSTRY PROPOSAL

In a letter of February 2000, the European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA) asked the Commission to explore the possibility of an agreement based on a voluntary commitment by industry, as done in the case of the CO₂ emissions reductions from new passenger cars. At a first meeting with the Commission ACEA presented a proposal concerning technical test requirements. These proposals were subsequently discussed and studied to evaluate if they could be considered as equivalent to the EEVC test prescriptions and basis for an agreed commitment.

2. EC POSITION ON INDUSTRY PROPOSAL

In the Commissions opinion, the ACEA Commitment corresponds to the mandate given by the Commission. The Commission takes the view that the proposed agreement would:

- ?? be a concrete expression of the Community's desire for a new approach to regulation;
- ?? build on the new regulatory partnership between industry and the public authorities heralded by the CO₂ agreement, thereby promoting a greater involvement of the private sector in the definition, practical implementation and enforcement of policy objectives;
- ?? reflect more purely the technical considerations at stake;
- ?? be quicker to implement than a directive, so that pedestrian-friendly cars would be sold on the EU sooner;
- ?? contain review clauses allowing more flexible responses to new research or technology than a directive.

However, before taking a decision on whether to accept the Commitment, the Commission would like to consult the European Parliament and the Council about the content of the Commitment and the Commissions assessment, and give them the opportunity to express their views.

¹ Source: EEVC, ETSC (European Transport Safety Council)

3. IHRA

The International Harmonised Research Agenda (IHRA) was established in 1996 at the 15th ESV Conference. The objective of IHRA is to co-ordinate research within certain defined fields. Drafting regulatory requirements is not within its scope.

Six working groups were initiated, one of which has the topic of pedestrian safety with an original time-scale of five years. However, at the 17th ESV Conference (June 2001) the IHRA steering committee gave approval for the pedestrian safety working group to continue, with the objective being to present finalised proposals for pedestrian safety test procedures by 2005. The work of the IHRA pedestrian safety working group has been presented to the UN/ECE GRSP.

The membership of IHRA includes the EEVC, which, as mentioned above, itself has a working group on pedestrian safety.

4. UN/ECE POSITION

At its 126th meeting in March 2002 WP.29 set out a Program of Work, under the 1998 Global Agreement, which listed topics and provided an indication of the need to form Informal Working Groups under the existing working parties. Under the working party GRSP the topic of Pedestrian Safety was seen as requiring one such working group.

5. UN/ECE GRSP INFORMAL WORKING GROUP

The development of an ad hoc working group within GRSP on the topic of pedestrian safety should be seen as a concentration of effort within GRSP and not a duplication of existing groups. The work could rightly take an overview, and combines the efforts of, the work done by EEVC and IHRA in the area of pedestrian safety. It could then further develop the knowledge and requirements by reference to organisations world-wide. The aim of the group should be to report and present a proposal for the testing and qualification of vehicles with respect to pedestrian safety which could reasonably be incorporated in a Global Technical Regulation (GTR).

In developing such a report, the group should give consideration to:

- clarification of the importance of injury mechanisms and areas of the body effected;
- objective(s) and benefits of any new regulation (or amendments to existing regulations) with reference to present levels and sources of knowledge;
- use of the best available technology and improvements in technology that will provide significant steps in developing methods and in achieving and improving benefits, including both active and passive safety measures;
- the costs, both monetary and social, that may be attendant to each level of regulatory stringency or performance;
- the relationship or potential interaction of any proposed technical regulation to other regulations currently in force or to be adopted either individually by any Contracting Party or under existing Agreements administered by WP.29.

The formation of an ad hoc working party should be clearly defined as a supplement to existing work and with a defined time-scale to achieve set targets.

The group will have the responsibility of preparing and bringing forward a proposal for a GTR, based upon the research and development work done so far by different institutions and the industry and take account of any additional work that is being undertaken.

The preparation of the proposal shall consist of two phases:

Phase 1

In compliance with paragraph 6.3.1 of Article 6 of the 1998 agreement, the working group shall prepare a written justification for a GTR on pedestrian safety and submit it to the Executive Committee by the end of 2003.

The group shall investigate recommendations and methods of implementation with a view to the development of a General Technical Regulation.

Phase 2

Assuming that the Executive Committee maintain its previously expressed support for the development of a GTR, the ad hoc group shall develop complete and detailed recommendations, in compliance with paragraph 6.3.4 of Article 6 of the 1998 agreement, by the end of 2005.