

GRSP INFORMAL GROUP ON PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

2nd meeting

Geneva, 10 December 2002

Draft detailed meeting minutes:

1. Welcome

The chairmen, Mr Mizuno and Mr Friedel opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. They emphasised the importance of this meeting in which they want to confirm the content of the informal document to be presented to GRSP in the afternoon. They also pointed out the importance of the action plan which is key for the work of the group.

2. Roll call

Those who did not participate in the first meeting but want to in the future should contact the secretary.

3. Adoption of the agenda and review of the minutes of the first meeting

INF GR / PS / 11 agenda: Mr Ries mentioned that ACEA accident data can be presented as well and this will be included under item 6. It was too late to be sent to the secretary before the meeting.

The agenda was adopted with this amendment.

There were two amendments to the meeting minutes of the first meeting (INF GR / PS / 8):

- page 2, second light bullet point add "Phase 2 could be modified subject to the findings of a feasibility assessment scheduled to be finalised during 2004."

- page 4, item 5.2 4th sentence "Mr Ries (OICA) suggested to continue with subsystem tools but these should be correlated to the respective tests" to read "Mr Ries (OICA) suggested to continue with subsystem tools but these should be correlated to real accident data."

The minutes were adopted with these amendments

4. Final confirmation of the informal document (INF GR / PS / 9)

Mr Ries mentioned the same amendment should be included as in the meeting minutes:

- page 2, second light bullet point add "Phase 2 could be modified subject to the findings of a feasibility assessment scheduled to be finalised during 2004."

The document was adopted and reissued as INF GR / PS / 9 Rev 1.

5. Final confirmation of the action plan (INF GR / PS / 10)

Mr Mizuno introduced the action plan and clarified that 'IHRA (Japan)' means that Japan will report the results from IHRA. For the pedestrian GTR proposal, the EU is assigned however this need to be discussed before a final decision is made. When OICA is indicated in the table, also CLEPA can make contributions. If governments can provide any data, they should inform the chairmen and secretary so that they can be mentioned in the action plan as well.

The timing was set out to take into account the WP29 and GR meetings timing. The goal for the step 1 report is end 2003. This means that the group will have to table a document during the June 2003 session of GRSP. The step 2 goal is end 2005, this means the group will have to table a proposal during the GRSP session of May 2005.

The action plan was adopted and will be used as guideline.

6. Pre-check of the accident information received by November 15

Mr Van der Plas summarised the accident data received to date:

INF GR / PS / 12: GIDAS data provided by OICA

INF GR / PS / 13: GIDAS graphs provided by OICA

INF GR / PS / 14: Italian accident data provided by Italy

INF GR / PS / 15: UN accident data provided by OICA

INF GR / PS / 16: Spanish accident data provided by Spain

Mr Mizuno asked for a brief explanation of the accident data received especially the GIDAS data.

Mr Ries explained the study was performed by DEKRA and DaimlerChrysler. The basic conclusion is that most injuries are related to the head and the leg which is in line with the IHRA findings and the preliminary conclusions of this group. He offered to give a detailed explanation during the next meeting.

Mr Friedel explained he is familiar with the data collection and has some questions on the absolute figures. He supported the offer from Mr Ries to have a presentation from DaimlerChrysler or DEKRA.

Mr Ries also briefly introduced the ACEA data. This was coordinated by CEESAR. The information contains several datablocks, one of which is about pedestrians containing 311 pedestrians in 290 accidents. Many parameters are collected amongst other the AIS / body region (similar but not identical to IHRA), personal data, trip during which the accident happened, vehicle data, location of deformation / dents on cars. However it is not easy to connect the vehicle data with the pedestrian data (difficult to find which body part has come into contact with which part of the car). The results show that the head / face are the first priority and that the leg is the second priority. Again this is similar to the IHRA findings. Also pedestrian accidents versus age gives similar results to IHRA.

Mr Ries will provide the data to the secretary. Mr Van der Plas said this would receive the number INF GR / PS / 17 and will be distributed to the group.

Mr Friedel asked if we could still expect input from the Netherlands and EEVC.

Mr Ammerlaan replied that he had contacted SWOV and he will forward the data to the secretary.

Mr Césari explained that EEVC is trying to collect data and want to check this data first during one WG17 meeting before releasing the data. He doesn't expect the data to be different from what has been collected so far. If it would be different, they will notify the group, otherwise, the group can work with the accident data available to it.

Mr Friedel suggested to make a conclusion on the other accident (UN and Italian) data in order to check the preliminary conclusions.

Mr Mizuno asked if based on this accident data anyone had a suggestion to change the preliminary conclusions of the previous meeting.

There were no remarks so the conclusions of the first meeting should not be changed now. The meeting in January can still change conclusions if other accident data would point in another direction.

Mr Friedel summarised the data saying that giving the high number of fatalities and injuries still remaining as shown in the accident data, there is a need to work on a GTR on pedestrian safety.

Mr Ries asked for an explanation of the Spanish data.

Mr Ferris explained they are still studying the data and will explain in detail during the next meeting.

7. Next meeting

7.1 Items to be discussed during the January meeting

The meeting will be held at IDIADA on January 15 and 16.

The January meeting will be important since the step 1 report has to be ready for presentation during GRSP in June 2003. The agenda will be based on the action plan and will be prepared by the chairmen and the secretary.

Mr Van der Straaten suggested to also include the need for a discussion on alternative safety solutions.

This was agreed by Mr Mizuno. He emphasised that GRSP's main focus is passive safety but the terms of reference includes active safety and it is also included in the action plan.

7.2 Recommendation for the drafting of the preliminary report to be presented to GRSP/33 in June 2003

Mr Mizuno asked that if there were any suggestions to inform these to the chairmen and the secretary.

8. Any other business

Mr Mizuno suggested to have another meeting on May 15 and 16 in Japan. This is the week before the ESV conference. The meeting place will be either Nagoya or Tokyo. This was agreed and the exact place will be communicated later.

Mr Nishimoto gave a brief update on the developments in the Japanese legislative discussions. The work will be finalised in March 2003 with enforcement between 2005 and 2011. Japan intends to harmonise with the GTR as a next step in their legislation.

Mr Mizuno thanked the participants for their input and closes the meeting.