# **Motorcycles — Test and analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles —**

**Part 2: Definition of impact conditions in relation to accident data**

ICS 43.140



NO COPYING WITHOUT BSI PERMISSION EXCEPT AS PERMITTED BY COPYRIGHT LAW

### **National foreword**

This British Standard reproduces verbatim ISO 13232-2:2005 and implements it as the UK national standard.

The UK participation in its preparation was entrusted to Technical Committee AUE/14, Motorcycles and mopeds, which has the responsibility to:

- aid enquirers to understand the text;
- present to the responsible international/European committee any enquiries on the interpretation, or proposals for change, and keep UK interests informed;
- monitor related international and European developments and promulgate them in the UK.

A list of organizations represented on this committee can be obtained on request to its secretary.

#### **Cross-references**

The British Standards which implement international publications referred to in this document may be found in the *BSI Catalogue* under the section entitled "International Standards Correspondence Index", or by using the "Search" facility of the *BSI Electronic Catalogue* or of British Standards Online.

This publication does not purport to include all the necessary provisions of a contract. Users are responsible for its correct application.

**Compliance with a British Standard does not of itself confer immunity from legal obligations.**

#### **Summary of pages**

This document comprises a front cover, an inside front cover, the ISO title page, pages ii to vi, pages 1 to 54, an inside back cover and a back cover.

The BSI copyright notice displayed in this document indicates when the document was last issued.

#### **Amendments issued since publication**



This British Standard was published under the authority of the Standards Policy and Strategy Committee on 26 January 2006

© BSI 26 January 2006

# INTERNATIONAL **STANDARD**

# **[ISO](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U) [13232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U)**

Second edition 2005-12-15

### **Motorcycles — Test and analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles —**

### Part 2:

### **Definition of impact conditions in relation to accident data**

*Motocycles — Méthodes d'essai et d'analyse de l'évaluation par la recherche des dispositifs, montés sur les motocycles, visant à la protection des motocyclistes contre les collisions —* 

*Partie 2: Définition des conditions de choc en fonction des données sur les accidents* 



### **Contents** Page



### Figures



### **BS ISO 13232-2:2005**

Tables



### **Foreword**

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

International Standards are drafted in accordance with the rules given in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2.

The main task of technical committees is to prepare International Standards. Draft International Standards adopted by the technical committees are circulated to the member bodies for voting. Publication as an International Standard requires approval by at least 75 % of the member bodies casting a vote.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

[ISO 13232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U) was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 22, *Road vehicles*, Subcommittee SC 22, *Motorcycles*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first version (ISO 13232-2:1996), which has been technically revised.

ISO 13232 consists of the following parts, under the general title *Motorcycles — Test analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles*:

- ⎯ *Part 1: Definitions, symbols and general considerations*
- ⎯ *Part 2: Definition of impact conditions in relation to accident data*
- ⎯ *Part 3: Motorcyclist anthropometric impact dummy*
- ⎯ *Part 4: Variables to be measured, instrumentation and measurement procedures*
- ⎯ *Part 5: Injury indices and risk/benefit analysis*
- ⎯ *Part 6: Full-scale impact-test procedures*
- ⎯ *Part 7: Standardized procedures for performing computer simulations of motorcycle impact tests*
- ⎯ *Part 8: Documentation and reports*

### **Introduction**

ISO 13232 has been prepared on the basis of existing technology. Its purpose is to define common research methods and a means for making an overall evaluation of the effect that devices which are fitted to motorcycles and intended for the crash protection of riders, have on injuries, when assessed over a range of impact conditions which are based on accident data.

It is intended that all of the methods and recommendations contained in ISO 13232 should be used in all basic feasibility research. However, researchers should also consider variations in the specified conditions (for example, rider size) when evaluating the overall feasibility of any protective device. In addition, researchers may wish to vary or extend elements of the methodology in order to research issues which are of particular interest to them. In all such cases which go beyond the basic research, if reference is to be made to ISO 13232, a clear explanation of how the used procedures differ from the basic methodology should be provided.

ISO 13232 was prepared by ISO/TC 22/SC 22 at the request of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Group for Road Vehicle General Safety (UN/ECE/TRANS/SCI/WP29/GRSG), based on original working documents submitted by the International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA), and comprising eight interrelated parts.

This revision of ISO 13232 incorporates extensive technical amendments throughout all the parts, resulting from extensive experience with the standard and the development of improved research methods.

In order to apply ISO 13232 properly, it is strongly recommended that all eight parts be used together, particularly if the results are to be published.

### **Motorcycles — Test and analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles —**

### Part 2: **Definition of impact conditions in relation to accident data**

### **1 Scope**

This part of ISO 13232 specifies minimum requirements for the collection and analysis of all motorcycle accident data, in order to provide:

- a standardized and representative sub-set of car/motorcycle accident data; and
- a sub-set of car/motorcycle impact conditions based on the analysis of this standardized accident data.

ISO 13232 specifies the minimum requirements for research into the feasibility of protective devices fitted to motorcycles, which are intended to protect the rider in the event of a collision.

ISO 13232 is applicable to impact tests involving:

- two-wheeled motorcycles;
- the specified type of opposing vehicle;
- $-$  either a stationary and a moving vehicle or two moving vehicles;
- ⎯ for any moving vehicle, a steady speed and straight-line motion immediately prior to impact;
- $\overline{-}$  one helmeted dummy in a normal seating position on an upright motorcycle;
- the measurement of the potential for specified types of injury by body region; and
- ⎯ evaluation of the results of paired impact tests (i.e. comparisons between motorcycles fitted and not fitted with the proposed devices).

ISO 13232 does not apply to testing for regulatory or legislative purposes.

### **2 Normative references**

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

[ISO 13232-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134672U), *Motorcycles — Test and analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles — Part 1: Definition, and general considerations* 

[ISO 13232-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134662U), *Motorcycles — Test and analysis procedures for research evaluation of rider crash protective devices fitted to motorcycles — Part 7: Standardized procedures for performing computer simulations of motorcycle impact tests*

AIS-90:1990, Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine (AAAM), Des Plaines, IL, USA *The abbreviated injury scale, 1990 revision*

### **3 Definitions**

The following terms are defined in [ISO 13232-1.](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134672U) For the purposes of this part of ISO 13232, those definitions apply. Additional definitions which could apply to this part of ISO 13232 are also listed in [ISO 13232-1:](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134672U)

- cell;
- cell range;
- centre line of the OV or MC:
- corner of the OV;
- MC front unsprung assembly;
- MC contact point;
- MC impact speed;
- nominal values;
- OV contact point;
- OV impact speed;
- overall length of the OV or MC;
- relative heading angle (rha):
- structural element of the MC.

### **4 Requirements**

#### **4.1 Impact variables**

The following impact variables shall define an impact test or impact data for an accident:

- relative heading angle;
- ⎯ opposing vehicle (OV) impact speed;
- motorcycle (MC) impact speed;
- OV contact point;
- MC contact point.

These variables shall be as defined in 4.3 for impact tests and in Annex A for accident reports.

#### **4.2 Standardized accident configurations**

Standardized accident configurations shall be used for overall evaluations of rider crash protective devices, for failure mode and effects analyses of such devices, and for full-scale impact tests intended to verify such analyses.

The standardized accident configurations and corresponding frequencies shown in Annex B, which are the result of applying the requirements of 4.2.2.1 and clause 5 to the combined accident data listed in Annex C, shall be used for such purposes.

NOTE The accident databases listed in Annex C were the only ones which met the requirements of this part of ISO 13232 and which were made available in a timely way to the group preparing ISO 13232.

#### **4.2.1 Data collection for future revisions**

In future revisions of ISO 13232, Annex B may be revised to account for different accident databases which may be included in Annex C. In this case, the requirements of 4.2 and clause 5, which are also subject to revision, shall be applied to the contents of Annex C. The results of such revisions to the standardized frequency of injury data, given in Annex D, along with the resulting frequency of occurrence data, given in Annex B, should be considered in potential revisions to the full-scale impact configurations, given in 4.3.

#### **4.2.2 Accident sampling**

The following impact configurations shall be used in defining impact conditions in relation to accident data.

#### **4.2.2.1 Defining frequency of occurrence of various impact configurations**

The accident database for each region shall include at least 200 MC accidents and shall be uniformly sampled data from all reporting facilities for a given region (i.e., a randomized sample). The samples shall be the result of indepth investigations including on-site measurements and reconstructions. The subsample used, as determined in 5.1.1, shall consist only of those accidents involving impacts between motorcycles and passenger cars. The database shall include all of the impact variables listed in 4.1 and A.1 and shall be available for analysis and potential publication as part of ISO 13232.

#### **4.2.2.2 Defining frequency of injury of various impact configurations**

Additionally, for each accident the following injury data for each injury, as defined in A.2, shall be included:

- injury body region;
- injury type;
- injury severity, as defined by the AAAM abbreviated injury scale (AIS).

The database shall also include the variables listed in A.3 and should include the variables listed in A.4.

#### **4.3 Impact configurations for full-scale tests**

The following impact configurations shall be used for full-scale tests.

#### **4.3.1 Required configurations**

The impact configurations for full-scale tests shall include those shown in Figure 1 and listed in Table 1, as a preliminary assessment of the proposed protective device.



**Figure 1 — Target impact geometries at first MC/OV contact for seven required impact configurations** 

Configuration number	<b>OV</b> contact point code (Figure 2)	<b>MC</b> contact point code (Figure 3)	<b>Relative heading</b> angle code (Table 2 & Figure 4)	OV speed m/s	<b>MC</b> speed m/s
			3	9,8	
$\overline{2}$			4	6,7	13,4
3	4		3	6,7	13,4
4	4		2	6,7	13,4
5			4	6,7	13,4
6	2	2	5	$\Omega$	13,4
			3		13,4

**Table 1 — Impact configurations for preliminary assessment** 

The impact configuration code shall comprise a series of three digits describing the OV contact point, the MC contact point, and relative heading angle, respectively, as generally defined in Figures 2, 3, and 4 and Table 2, followed by a hyphen (-), the OV impact speed, and the MC impact speed.

For OV corner contact (e.g., configuration 225-0/13,4 of Figure 1) the reference point on the MC shall be the most outboard structural element on the MC front unsprung assembly.

For testing purposes, the impact geometry may be reflected about the OV centre line (e.g., E45 instead of 225).

#### **4.3.2 Permissible configurations from failure mode and effects analysis**

Other impact configurations for which a proposed rider crash protective device might be harmful may be identified through computer simulation according to [ISO 13232-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134662U), or other analysis techniques, by analysing those configurations listed in Annex B. These failure mode configurations may be tested in order to verify the results of such analysis.

For full-scale tests and computer simulations, the impact geometries shall be as shown in Figures 1 and B.1, with the following general rules:

- $-$  OV corner contact points shall be the 45 $\degree$  tangent points, as shown in Figure 1;
- $\sim$  OV front and rear contact points shall be at the centre line of the OV;
- ⎯ OV side front, side middle, and side rear contact points shall be the points corresponding to 1/4, 1/2 and 3/4 of the overall length of the OV, respectively, as measured from the foremost point on the OV;
- ⎯ MC front contact point shall be such that the projection of the MC centre line, forward of the foremost part of the front wheel, at first contact between any portion of the MC or dummy and the OV, intersects a vertical line through the specified OV contact point;
- MC rear contact point shall be such that the projection of the MC centre line, rearward of the rearmost part of the rear wheel, at first contact between any portion of the MC or dummy and the OV, intersects a vertical line through the specified OV contact point;
- MC side contact shall use the conventions given in 4.3.1 and shown in Figure 1 (i.e., for OV front or rear contact use the 143-9,8/0 type of geometry; for OV corner contact use the 225-0/13,4 type of geometry);
- ⎯ The relative heading angles shall be at the nominal values defined in Table 2 and Figure 4.

For testing purposes, the impact geometry may be reflected about the OV centre line (e.g., E45 instead of 225).

### **5 Analysis methods**

#### **5.1 Using accident data to determine frequency of occurrence of various impact configurations**

Use the following methods when determining frequency of occurrence and injury.

Sort the accident data as described below.



**Figure 2 — OV contact point codes** 



Figure 3 — MC contact point codes Figure 4 — Relative heading angle







#### **5.1.1 Sub-sample definition**

Combine the databases listed in Annex C. From the combined, overall database, select all of the cases which have all of these conditions:

- passenger car impact;
- single rider;
- seated rider.

#### **5.1.2 Categorization**

For each case selected in 5.1.1, and for each impact variable, determine within which cell range the case lies and assign code numbers for the OV and MC contact points and relative heading angle, and nominal values for the OV and MC speeds, based on Tables 2 and 3 and Figures 2, 3, and 5.

#### **5.1.3 Sorting**

Sort all the subsample accident data into a matrix describing the combinations of the above cells. Determine the number of accidents which lie within the boundaries of each of the cells.

If the OV contact point involves the left side of the OV, then reclassify the OV and MC contact points and relative heading angle according to Table 4. In addition, reclassify all accidents that occur in the sorted geometry codes to the reclassified geometry codes as listed in Table 5, in order to resolve minor inconsistencies which may be present in the original accident data.

Remove all accidents in the cells listed in Table 6 which, as a result of categorization, correspond to untestable configurations.

#### **5.1.4 Representation**

Associate the number of accidents (frequency of occurrence) in each cell with the OV and MC contact point codes, relative heading angle codes, and OV and MC speed nominal values which will be considered to represent each cell.

<b>Cell range</b>	<b>Nominal value</b>		
m/s	m/s		
$0 \leq speed \leq 4.0$			
$4,0 <$ speed $\le 8,5$	6,7		
$8,5 <$ speed $\leq 13,3$	9,8		
$13,3 <$ speed $\leq 17,5$	13,4		
$17,5 <$ speed	20,1		

**Table 3 — OV and MC speed** 



Direction of OV x axis, relative to MC x axis, with MC x axis in direction 1 (a relative heading angle of "4" is shown)

**Figure 5 — Diagram of relative heading angle (angle of OV x axis relative to MC x axis, regardless of relative positions of OV and MC) with code numbers** 

<b>Sorted</b>	<b>Reclassified</b>				
OV contact point code					
A	6				
B	5				
C	4				
D	3				
F	$\overline{2}$				
MC contact point code					
2	4				
4	2				
Relative heading angle code					
2	8				
3	7				
4	6				
6	4				
7	3				
8	$\overline{2}$				

**Table 4 — Reclassification for left side OV contact point codes** 

**Table 5 — Reclassification of geometry codes** 

<b>Sorted</b>	<b>Reclassified</b>	<b>Sorted</b>	<b>Reclassified</b>	<b>Sorted</b>	<b>Reclassified</b>
113	143	216	114	442	412
116	114	217	143	443	413
117	143	221	131	523	513
121	131	223	313	524	514
125	115	224	314	542	512
126	114	231	131	543	513
127	143	232	132	611	711
128	132	233	143	612	712
133	143	236	226	613	513
137	143	237	227	614	514
138	132	244	114	621	711
141	131	245	115	622	712
142	132	323	313	642	512
144	114	324	314	643	513
145	115	342	312	721	711
212	312	343	313	722	712
213	313	423	413	741	711
215	115	424	414	748	712

<b>OV contact</b>	<b>MC contact</b>	<b>Relative heading</b>	OV speed	<b>MC</b> speed
point code	point code	angle code	m/s	m/s
$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{1}$	$1-2, 8$	All	All
$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	$2 - 4$	All	All
$\mathbf{1}$	3	$4 - 6$	All	All
$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	$6 - 8$	All	All
$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$	1, 4, 8	All	All
$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	2, 8	$\mathsf{All}$	All
$\overline{2}$	3	$4-5, 8$	$\mathsf{All}$	All
$\overline{2}$	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	$6 - 8$	All	All
$3-5$	$\mathbf{1}$	$1, 5-8$	All	All
$3-5$	$\overline{2}$	$1-2, 5-8$	All	$\mathsf{All}$
$3-5$	$\mathsf 3$	$1 - 8$	All	$\mathsf{All}$
$3-5$	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	$1, 4-8$	All	All
$\,6\,$	1, 2	$5-8$	$\mathsf{All}$	All
$\,6\,$	$\overline{2}$	3	OV speed $> 0$	All
$\,6\,$	3	$1 - 8$	All	All
6	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	$4 - 7$	All	All
$\overline{7}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$3 - 7$	All	All
$\overline{7}$	$\overline{2}$	$3 - 7$	All	All
$\overline{7}$	3	$1 - 8$	$\mathsf{All}$	$\mathsf{All}$
$\overline{7}$	$\overline{\mathbf{4}}$	$2 - 7$	All	All
1, 2	$1 - 4$	$\mathbf{1}$	All	$All \geq OV$ speed
$\mathbf{1}$	$1 - 4$	2, 8	All	All > OV speed
$3 - 7$	$1 - 4$	$1 - 8$	All	$\mathsf 0$
$1 - 7$	$\ensuremath{\mathsf{3}}$	$1 - 8$	$\mathsf{O}\xspace$	All
$6 - 7$	$\mathbf{1}$	1, 2, 8	All	$All \leq OV$ speed
$6 - 7$	$\mathbf{1}$	3, 4	OV speed $> 0$	$\mathsf{All}$
$1 - 7$	$1 - 4$	$1 - 8$	$\mathsf{O}\xspace$	$\mathsf{O}\xspace$

**Table 6 — List of removed configurations** 

### **5.2 Using accident data to determine frequency of injury by body region and injury type of various impact configurations**

Sort the accident data using the same method as described in 5.1, except determine the number of accidents which have at least one injury of the selected body region, injury type and severity which lie within the boundaries of each of the cells. A recommended list of body regions and injury types and severities is included in Annex A.

Perform the analysis for the following injuries:

 $-$  head concussions, AIS ≥ 2;

- $\text{— upper leg fractions, AIS ≥ 2;}$
- lower leg fractures,  $AIS \geq 2$ .

For head concussion injuries, only include in the sorting process accidents where a helmet was worn.

### **6 Documentation and reporting**

All individual motorcycle accidents shall be documented and reported using the motorcycle accident report form given in Annex A. Any aggregations of accident data should use the following column headings:

- reference number;
- OV contact point;
- MC contact point;
- OV impact speed;
- MC impact speed;
- relative heading angle;
- helmet use;
- number of reported injuries;
- maximum AIS;
- injury description, using a three digit code which defines:
	- injury body region,
	- injury type,
	- injury AIS.

### **Annex A**

(normative)

### **Motorcycle accident report**

### **A.1 Impact data (required)**

Case identification (or reference number): example and the state of the state o

Collision category (single vehicle, multi-vehicle, object, pedestrian, etc.):

Motorcycle type (conventional, sport, scooter, moped, etc.):

Motorcycle engine size (cc):

Opposing vehicle type (saloon car, truck, etc.): **computer** 

### **A.1.1 Contact points (primary damage region) circle one**





Geometry code: \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_  $MC$  **A.1.2 Relative heading angle (angle of OV x axis relative to MC x axis, regardless of relative positions of OV and MC)** 



### **A.1.3 Impact speed**

OV (m/s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

MC (m/s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

### **A.2 Injury data (required)**

Include data for each injury, up to 42 injuries (attach additional pages if necessary):



Maximum AIS over all injuries: \_\_\_\_\_

l

<sup>1)</sup> As defined in AAAM, AIS90

### **A.3 Helmet data (required)**

Helmet present (y or n)?\_\_\_\_\_; Retained on head (y or n)? \_\_\_\_\_\_;

### **A.4 Protective clothing data (recommended)**

Leather clothing worn, check as many as appropriate:

Combination suit: \_\_\_\_; Jacket: \_\_\_\_; Trousers: \_\_\_\_; Gloves: \_\_\_\_\_; Boots: \_\_\_\_\_\_;

<b>Body region</b>	Code
Head	1
Face	2
Neck	3
<b>Upper extremity</b>	4
Chest	5
Abdomen	6
Thoracic spine and/or lumbar spine	7
Pelvis and/or hips	8
Thigh	9
Knee	10
Lower leg	11
Ankle and/or foot	12
Other injury location	13

**Table A.1 — Injury body region codes** 





### **Annex B**

(normative)

### **Resulting frequency of occurrence for the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases**

The Los Angeles and Hannover databases have been combined and sorted by frequency of occurrence. The impact configuration geometries are shown in Figure B.1. The OV and MC speeds and frequencies of occurrence for the geometries are given in Table B.1. The three digits of the codes used in this Annex correspond to the OV contact point code, the MC contact point code, and the relative heading angle code, respectively.





#### **Table B.1 — Opposing vehicle and motorcycle speeds and frequencies of occurrence for 200 combined Los Angeles and Hannover impact configurations**

Dimensions in metres per second



### **Annex C**

(normative)

### **Example accident data**

Table C.1 defines the column headings and units used in Tables C.2 and C.3. The Los Angeles example data are given in Table C.2. The Hannover example data are given in Table C.3. These are the original data and are presented in non-SI units (miles per hour).



### **Table C.1 — Legend for Los Angeles and Hannover databases**

### **Table C.2 — Los Angeles data**



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 















Ref OV MC OV MC RHA<br>
<u>no cp cp sp sp deg</u><br>
Total Cases: 410 No MAIS Injuries BR TAIS inj

Cases with Injury: 312

### **Table C.3 — Hannover data**

÷











**33**





Cases with Injury data: 208

### **Annex D**

(normative)

### **Resulting frequency of injury by body region and injury type for the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases**

The combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases have been additionally sorted by frequency of injury by body region and injury type and severity. The results are given in Tables D.1, D.2, and D.3. The three digits of the codes used in this Annex correspond to the OV contact point code, the MC contact point code, and the relative heading angle code, respectively.

#### **Table D.1 — Head injury configurations (helmeted concussions, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 67 accidents**



Dimensions in metres per second

### **Table D.2 — Lower leg injury configurations (fractures, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 80 accidents**

Dimensions in metres per second



### **Table D.3 — Upper leg injury configurations (fractures, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 37 accidents**



### **Annex E**

(informative)

### **Frequency of occurrence data in non-SI units**

The frequency of occurrence for the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases are presented in non-SI units of miles per hour. Table E.1 corresponds to Table B.1, E.2 to D.1, E.3 to D.2, and E.4 to D.3.

#### **Table E.1 — Opposing vehicle and motorcycle speeds and frequencies of occurrence for 200 combined Los Angeles and Hannover impact configurations**

Dimensions in miles per hour



### **Table E.2 — Head injury configurations (helmeted concussions, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 67 accidents**



### **Table E.3 — Lower leg injury configurations (fractures, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 80 accidents**

Dimensions in miles per hour



### **Table E.4 — Upper leg injury configurations (fractures, AIS** ≥ **2) involving 37 accidents**



### **Annex F**

(informative)

### **Rationale for [ISO 13232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U)**

NOTE All references cited in Annex F are listed in Annex B of [ISO 13232-1.](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134672U)

### **F.1 Specific portion of the Scope**

One purpose of [ISO 13232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U) is "to provide a statistical basis for defining impact test conditions": that is, which impact configurations occur relatively frequently in the real world and which configurations result in relatively frequent injuries to certain body regions, based upon actual, large, randomized samples of motorcycle accidents.

Another purpose of [ISO 13232-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134667U) is to provide "a standardized and representative set of accident data". Up until 1992, there was no agreed upon set of accident data upon which definitions of impact test conditions could be based. There has been a wide variety of accident studies (e.g., cited in TRRL, 1991; IMMA, 1992); however, most of these were small, biased, and informal samples, and/or were lacking the variables needed to define an impact test. A "standardized set of accident data" provides researchers with a common formal basis for test definition, using accident data which meet certain minimum quality requirements. It is hoped that the "standardized set" will be updated with data from other nations and over time.

"Representative" denotes use of suitably large randomized samples of accidents, from several regions worldwide, which comprise "stratified samples" of a worldwide sample of the global population of accidents. Stratified sampling is a common statistical sampling technique used for large populations.

Impact conditions based on an analysis of this standardized and representative set of accident data were selected based upon their real world frequency of occurrence, or their frequency of injury to a particular body region, or their providing special physical insight into the crash dynamics (e.g., because of the relatively high level of physical exposure of a particular body region or because of mainly frontal or mainly lateral motions). These selected test conditions could be referred to as a sub-sample of the "standardized and representative set of accidents".

The "representative sample" (equivalent to "standardized set of accident data") can be used for two purposes: "overall evaluations" (equivalent to "risk/benefit analyses") of proposed protective devices; or "failure mode and effects analysis" (FMEA) of such devices. Both of these types of analysis are relevant to the evaluation of safety related systems, and a "representative sample" of conditions is needed for both types of analysis.

Overall and FMEA evaluations of proposed devices can be done, at the user's option, using computer simulation or other analysis techniques. While computer simulation of a representative sample of impacts provides one means to do overall or FMEA analysis (e.g., Zellner, et al., 1991), it is not implied that computer simulation is the only conceivable means to do such analyses. Testing the entire representative sample of impacts, for example, would provide another means.

### **F.2 Requirements**

### **F.2.1 Impact variables (see 4.1)**

In general, for existing full-scale test facilities, in order to do an impact test between a motorcycle (MC) and opposing vehicle (OV), one must define relative heading angle (i.e., the angle between the vehicle centre lines at the moment of contact, or from a test facility standpoint, the angle between the planned tracks of the two vehicles); OV impact speed; MC impact speed; OV contact point; and MC contact point.

If one or more of these variables is unknown, then there exists the potential for uncertainty or variability in the test definition and results. Similarly, it follows that all five of these variables are needed to describe actual accidents, in

order for a sample of accidents to be used to define impact conditions for testing. Of these five variables, "relative heading angle" and "impact speed" often were not included in past accident studies.

The "relative heading angle" is the relative Euler angle between the two vehicles, and as such, is a fundamental variable of physics. It is defined as the yaw angle between the vehicle's x axes, regardless of their relative positions. It is not dependent on the shape or orientation of the vehicle external surfaces; nor on the contact points or speeds of the two vehicles, and as such, it is an independent variable. Note that "impact angle" (the angle between a car surface and the motorcycle centre line) is not a good alternative to relative heading angle, since it is difficult to define for car corner impacts or impacts to the rear of the motorcycle, for example. Likewise, "approach (or path) angle" is not a good alternative, because it depends on the motorcycle and opposing vehicle speeds, i.e., it is a dependent variable, when what is needed for a test definition and set up is an independent variable. "Relative heading angle" is the unique independent variable which describes the two vehicles' relative inertial orientation at the time of impact.

#### **F.2.2 Standardized accident configurations (see 4.2)**

For accident samples which meet the above criteria, it is desirable to define standardized frequencies of occurrence as a basis for full-scale impact configuration test selection for all researchers in this field, overall (risk/benefit) analysis, as a description of the accident population, and FMEA analysis, as a description of the conditions of use.

Currently, all of the frequency tables are based upon the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases, each of which meet the above criteria. The raw data are given in Annex C. It is hoped that other data for other nations and regions can be added in the future. The Los Angeles and Hannover data are considered to be stratified samples of a worldwide sample. Therefore, they (and any other available, suitable sample) are merged together, as an approximation of a worldwide sample. The frequency of occurrence (FO) numbers listed in Annex B are the number of accidents which lie in each cell, from the combined Los Angeles/Hannover data, using the analysis procedures described in 5.1. The frequency of injury numbers listed in Annex D are the number of accidents in which there was at least one injury of the specified region, type, and severity, using the analysis procedures described in 5.2. Multiple injuries occurring within one accident are counted as one injury, in order to be able to compare the individual cell counts to the total number of analysed accidents (i.e., to calculate a percentage of accidents in which a given injury occurred). The data in Annex B are listed in order of the most frequent geometry (referring to the three digit code) to least frequent geometry, and lowest speed to highest speed combinations within each geometry. Cells with zero population are not listed. The data in Annex D are listed in the same general order as those in Annex B.

#### **F.2.2.1 Defining frequency of occurrence of various impact configurations (see 4.2.2.1)**

One way to select pertinent impact configurations for testing is to select configurations which occur relatively frequently in the real world. For example, proposed protective devices should be at least non-harmful in impacts which occur relatively frequently. In order to determine "frequently occurring impacts", the sample needs to meet several minimum requirements.

Large randomized samples of the accident population are needed in order to provide a statistically suitable basis for describing the distribution of impact conditions. "Randomized" refers to the sampling protocols used, for example, including all motorcycle accidents from all reporting services (e.g., police, ambulance, hospitals, fire, etc.) within the sampling region. If the sample is biased (e.g., hospital only), the data will emphasize certain categories of accidents and injuries, and can not be used validly to describe the population of accidents. "Large" means in comparison to the number of variables of interest and number of ranges of the variables of interest. If, for example, there were five impact variables, and for each variable there were four ranges of values (or "cells"), there would be a total of  $4<sup>5</sup>$  = 1 024 possible cells. In order to determine the distribution of accidents among these cells, in general, it is desirable, that the sample be large enough to populate this number of cells. For example, in this case the sample should be ideally of the order of 10<sup>3</sup> accidents or more. In the past, the largest motorcycle accident samples which meet the other criteria have been of the order of several hundred accidents. It is suggested that about 200 accidents would be an appropriate minimum sample size, since that is the approximate number of identifiable impact configurations which occur in existing data bases in see Annex B.

"In-depth investigations, including on-site measurements and reconstructions" are necessary. These typically involve measurements of distances and positions; estimation of impact speeds from physical evidence;

determination of likely geometry at the time of impact (reconstruction drawing); and documentation of the accident reconstruction on a case-by-case basis.

"All of the impact variables" are needed to describe impacts properly. Many past studies do not include all five variables. If one or more of the impact variables is missing, an accident cannot be placed in the appropriate cell. The accident (and corresponding crash test) outcome can be strongly influenced by a missing variable. For example, for offset frontal impacts, is the impact to the front or side of the MC? For a car side 90° impact, what is the MC speed? etc.

The data needs to be "available for analysis" because "independent verifiability" is a basic principle of this research International Standard, in general. If the accident database meets all of the other criteria, but is not available for analysis, it can not be analysed using the techniques described in clause 5.

#### **F.2.2.2 Defining frequency of injury of various impact configurations (see 4.2.2.2)**

Another way to select impact configurations for testing is by frequency of injury to specified body regions. For example, a proposed protective device should reduce injury potential to a specified body region in impact configurations where such injuries occur relatively frequently. In effect, the "frequent injury" impact configurations form a main part of the design goals for a given protective device, and would ordinarily be the first conditions to be tested.

Data describing all injuries for each accident by body region, type, and severity are needed in order to classify injuries properly. For example, if the "type" descriptor is missing, all leg injuries, e.g., fractures, soft tissue injuries, contusions, lacerations, abrasions, burns, etc., would be counted the same, even though the mechanisms of injury and proposed protective devices would be completely different. Therefore, in order to define impact configurations which result in specific injuries, it is necessary to define the injuries clearly.

#### **F.2.3 Impact configurations for full-scale tests (see 4.3)**

The current selection of impact configurations for testing was based upon a combination of statistical, test facility, and prior test experience factors.

A rigorous method for selecting a representative sub-sample for full-scale testing has yet to be defined, even when data for frequency of occurrence and injury exist (annexes B and D). One of the difficulties in defining a selection method is the very broad and relatively even distribution of accidents which occur. Other potential problems are the limitations and capabilities of current test facilities. These are further discussed below.

The impact geometries for four of the seven required impact configurations described in Table 1 correspond to the three most frequent impact geometries in the combined Los Angeles/Hannover database. (Note that there are two speed combinations for impact geometry 413). The fifth and sixth test configurations correspond to the fifth and sixth most frequent impact geometries. These five impact geometries account for 40% of the combined Los Angeles/Hannover accidents, as shown in Table B.1 (i.e., 198 out of 501 accidents).

The selection of the geometry for the seventh impact configuration, the offset frontal impact, 225, is based upon its historical use in leg protection research (e.g., Tadokoro, 1985; Sakamoto, 1988; Chinn and Karimi, 1990; Rogers, 1991a); and the apparent degree of physical exposure of the lower leg in this configuration. For the latter reason, 225 is considered to provide special physical insight into one type of leg injury mechanism. Note, however, that 225 is not a frequent impact geometry in terms of either occurrence or injury (18th of 21 ranks for occurrence; fourth of seven ranks for lower leg injury; fifth of six ranks for upper leg injury).

The choice of OV and MC speeds within each of the five top geometries was based upon a combination of statistical and practical factors. Among the practical factors are the facts that:

- some test facilities can only perform moving-moving tests where there is an integer speed ratio between MC and OV speeds (e.g., 2:1, 1:2, etc.);
- in the absence of active rider control, impacts involving low MC speeds (6,7 m/s or less), are very difficult to do, because of large variations in MC roll angle at these speeds. These variations tend to reduce repeatability.

For these reasons, the selected speed combinations were limited to those involving integer OV/MC speed ratios; and MC speeds either equal to zero or greater than 6,7 m/s.

#### **F.2.4 Required configurations (see 4.3.1)**

l

The attributes of the seven required impact configurations are as follows:

- 143-9,8/0<sup>2)</sup>: In Table B.1, geometry 143 is ranked second of 21 ranks in frequency of occurrence, and in Tables D.1 through D.3 first of eight ranks in head injury frequency, second of seven ranks in lower leg injury frequency, and third of six ranks in upper leg injury frequency. Within 143, this speed combination had no head injuries, is third of three ranks in lower leg injury, and first of one rank in upper leg injury.
- 114-6,7/13,4: Geometry 114 is ranked first of 21 ranks in frequency of occurrence, first in lower and upper leg injury frequency, and second of eight ranks in head injury frequency. Within 114, this particular speed combination is ranked second of three ranks in head injury frequency, first of three ranks in lower leg injury frequency, and first of two ranks in upper leg injury frequency.
- 413-6,7/13,4: Geometry 413 is third of 21 ranks in frequency of occurrence, third of eight ranks in head injury frequency, fourth of seven ranks in lower leg injury frequency, and fourth of six ranks in upper leg injury frequency. Within 413, this speed combination is ranked second of two ranks in head injury frequency and first of one rank in lower leg injury frequency.
- 412-6,7/13,4: Geometry 412 is ranked sixth of 21 ranks in frequency of occurrence, eighth of eight ranks in head injury frequency and seventh of seven ranks in lower leg injury frequency, with no upper leg injuries. Within 412, this speed combination is first of five ranks in frequency of occurrence and had no head or leg injuries. Of all the required impact configurations in Table 1, 412-6,7/13,4 is the most frequently occurring impact configuration.
- 414-6,7/13,4: Geometry 414 is ranked fifth of 21 ranks in frequency of occurrence, fourth of eight ranks in head injury frequency, fourth of seven ranks in lower leg injury frequency, and fourth of six ranks in upper leg injury frequency. Within 414, this speed combination is second of four ranks in frequency of occurrence.
- 225-0/13,4: As noted above, 225 was selected for its apparent physical exposure of the leg, and for historical reasons.
- 413-0/13,4: Within 413, this speed combination is first of two ranks in head injury frequency and had no leg injuries. In addition, it is a relatively easy test to perform, because of the stationary OV. Also, because of this, it provides special insight, because of the relatively simpler (frontal only) motion of the MC and rider.

Taken together, the seven impact configurations account for 6,2% of all the accidents in Table B.1.

#### **F.2.5 Permissible configurations from failure mode and effects analysis (see 4.3.2)**

This sub-clause refers to tests which may be used to verify the failure mode and effects analyses, as described in [ISO 13232-7.](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134662U) Obviously, if these tests were done, they may also be used to refine and validate any risk/benefit analyses which may be done, described in [ISO 13232-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.3403/30134664U).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2)</sup> The first three digits denote the geometry code. The pair of numbers following the hyphen are the OV and MC speeds, respectively.

### **F.3 Analysis methods**

#### **F.3.1 Sub-sample definition (see 5.1.1)**

"Overall database" refers to the set of all of the stratified (regional) sub-samples of MC accident data which meet the criteria of 4.1 and 4.2. Currently, this includes the Los Angeles and Hannover databases.

Within each regional sub-sample, the analysis is limited to a certain category of MC accidents (passenger car impact with single, seated rider). The reasons for this are as follows:

- it is consistent with the defined scope of ISO 13232, and the scope of most of the related research, to date;
- "passenger cars" are the OV because they predominate in the accident data (Hurt, et al., 1981a, 1981b; Otte, 1980). To mix in other opposing objects (e.g., trucks, or bridge supports) would be to mix in other patterns of occurrence and injuries. This would distort the standardized population sample, which is intended to be of use in the research and testing of MC/passenger car impacts;
- ⎯ "single riders" and "seated riders" are the focus because "multiple riders" or "standing riders", for example, could distort the occurrence and injury patterns, from those which are the main ones of interest in ISO 13232 (i.e., those used for defining relevant test configurations and injuries for single, seated riders).

### **F.3.2 Categorization (see 5.1.2)**

In order to describe the frequency of various impact configurations, it is first necessary to create a system of impact "categories"; and then to "sort" the accidents into the appropriate categories.

The category system involves dividing each of the five impact variables defined in 4.1 into several ranges or "cells".

The philosophy which was used to define the cells included the following considerations, resulting from a 1988 meeting among MC accident researchers (Hurt, Pedder, Newman):

- ⎯ the approximate "resolution" for each of the impact variables, related to the estimated accuracy of the reconstruction;
- reaching a balance between cell sizes which are "too coarse" (resulting in vastly different kinds of impacts being grouped inappropriately together); and cell sizes which are "too fine" (resulting in an enormous number of potential configurations, with very few accidents in each one);
- ⎯ attempting not to split the natural grouping or "clustering" of accidents for some variables, notably speeds and relative heading angle;
- the desirability of using equally sized cells for each variable, so that the cell mid-point (used for testing) would not be too far (too dissimilar) from the cell edges.

In addition, for testing and simulation purposes, it was necessary to represent each cell with a "nominal value", in order to be able to perform an impact test or simulation corresponding to that cell. With the few exceptions noted below, the cell nominal value was chosen to be the mid-point of the respective cell.

The application of these considerations is described in more detail below.

For "OV contact point" the car is divided into 12 contact zones (see Figure 2) with a contact point representing each zone. These were selected:

- so as to differentiate between very different kinds of impact (e.g., "side middle" where the rider may tend to impact the roof structure versus "side front" where the rider may tend to travel over the bonnet);
- so as to have some association with the different structural zones of typical cars (front versus rear wheel arches, front versus rear corners, etc.);

⎯ for measurement convenience (e.g., 1/4, 1/2, 3/4 of overall length, etc.).

For "MC contact point" (see Figure 3), the MC is divided into four zones ("front", "left side", "right side", "rear") with a nominal value for each. As with the OV contact points, the nominal values are chosen to be evenly spaced in terms of the MC overall length. For testing and simulation purposes, it is necessary to define a lateral offset for the "side" contact points (e.g., to identify a target point for MC "side" impacts with the OV "corners"), in addition to the longitudinal position. This was chosen to be 5 cm outboard from the most outboard structural element on the MC front unsprung assembly, the intention being that this would allow clearance of the front forks (and therefore, the "front") of most MC's, and yet still ensure contact with the MC "side" region.

For "relative heading angle" (see Table 2 and Figure 5), eight relative angles were selected, at 45° increments corresponding to a compass rose (e.g., north, north-east, east, etc.). The reason for the use of 45° increments were twofold:

- ⎯ the accident reconstructionist discussion (Hurt, Pedder, and Newman, 1988 meeting) indicated this to be the approximate worst case resolution of reconstruction (for example, in many accidents it is difficult to determine from tyre skid marks and damage patterns more than that the OV and MC were "perpendicular" or "parallel" or "angled". For other cases, nevertheless, the accident data (see Annex C) contain a continuous, fine resolution of angles);
- the distribution of the raw Los Angeles/Hannover accident data across relative heading angles (shown in Figure F.1, where left and right OV side impacts have been summed) shows that the accidents are "clustered" (or have "modes") at  $0^\circ$ ,  $90^\circ$  and  $135^\circ$ , suggesting a  $45^\circ$  increment. Whether this pattern is associated with traffic geometry, or with the aforementioned reconstruction resolution problem, is unknown; but in either case, the pattern is clear. There is no indication in the Figure F.1 data of any modality at 30° increments. To the extent that distributions can be effectively represented by their modes, 45° is an appropriate angle increment, from an accident data standpoint.

The cells are defined to be  $\pm 22.5^{\circ}$  ranges about each of the eight relative heading angle directions.

In the future, addition of new accident databases could result in proposed changes in the relative heading angle increments and codes used in Table 2 and Figure 5. In this case, a general method that could be used to determine the relative heading angle increment and code numbers in Table 2 and Figure 5, for all accident databases, and which for the Los Angeles and Hannover databases results in a 45° increment, is as follows:

- combine the available accident databases from all regions;
- graph the histogram of percentage of total accidents versus relative heading angle, at 1° relative heading angle increments;
- ⎯ identify the three largest peaks in the histogram;
- determine the largest common denominator for the relative heading angles of the three largest peaks and 180 $^{\circ}$ , to the nearest 5°;
- $\equiv$  set the relative heading angle increment to be equal to the largest common denominator, or 15°, whichever is greater;
- ⎯ set the cell nominal values and ranges, beginning with a nominal value of zero, and progressively adding one relative heading increment to this value; and dividing the cell ranges into equal portions, centred on each nominal value;
- assign relative heading angle codes, beginning with a relative heading angle of zero and a code of one, proceeding clockwise, increasing the code number by one for each relative heading angle increment.







Note that this method is applicable to the process of revising ISO 13232 in the future, but should not be incorporated into the text of ISO 13232. To do so would suggest that it could be applied to any accident database at any time, without international coordination. This could result, once again, in different test facilities using different test angles, which is contrary to the purposes of an International Standard. Instead, the stated method could be used to revise the numbers entered in Table 2 and Figure 5, in possible future revisions of ISO 13232.

For "OV and MC speed" (see Table 3), five speed ranges were selected. This was based on estimates of the reconstruction resolution, and on a study by Hurt, et al. (1981b) wherein the same physical data were analyzed in a "round robin" manner, by several reconstructionists. Those results indicated agreement to within  $\pm$  5 mi/h  $(± 2.2 \text{ m/s})$  for nearly all cases examined. Therefore, 10 mi/h  $± 5$  mi/h was selected as the speed increment.

The cell boundaries were selected to be at 9, 19, 29 mi/h (4, 8,5, 13,3, 17,5 m/s), etc., so as to avoid splitting clusters which might be centred at, e.g., 10, 20, 30, mi/h, etc.

The nominal values were selected to be in the middle of each speed range, except for the lowest and highest ranges. For the lowest range, the nominal value was chosen to be 0 m/s, because it allows for test simplification (e.g., one stationary vehicle) and also because MCs may have large roll angle variations at, say, 5 mi/h. For the upper range, the nominal value was chosen to be the lower boundary of the range (17,5 m/s), to allow integer MC and OV speed ratios to be used (e.g., 3:1 or 2:1, etc.) for compatibility with existing testing facilities.

### **F.3.3 Sorting (see 5.1.3)**

All of the accidents in the database are sorted into the matrix containing all of the cells of the five variables. This results in a matrix of 9 600 theoretically possible cells (twelve OV contact points times four MC contact points times eight relative heading angles times five OV speeds times five MC speeds). The OV is considered to be symmetric, so that after sorting:

- the left side OV contact points  $(A-E)$  are reclassified as right side OV contact points (see Table 4);
- the associated MC side contact points are reversed (i.e., 2 replaces 4 and 4 replaces 2);
- ⎯ the associated relative heading angle codes are reclassified to give a "mirror image" of the relative heading angle (i.e., the relative heading for the OV left side contact point, subtracted from 360°).

This is done in order to minimize the total number of cells used to sort the impact test configurations.

Certain geometries are reclassified (Table 5) in order to resolve minor inconsistencies in the original accident data. Examples of this reclassification procedure are shown in Figure F.2, where the MC contacts had originally been coded as "side" (presumably from damage patterns). From a test set up viewpoint, it is more consistent to designate such configurations as MC "front", although the principal damage may be to the MC "side". In other cases, the geometries were restored to being physically realizable by, for example, changing the motorcycle contact point from the right side to the left side, changing the relative heading angle to its mirror image (as noted above, i.e., 360° minus the relative heading angle), or by changing the motorcycle contact point from the "side" of the motorcycle to the "front". An alternative approach, not used here, would have been simply to reject such inconsistently coded cases.

Certain cells were removed (Table 6) because, although correctly coded, after categorization, the resulting configuration was physically unrealizable (e.g., MC front contact with the OV side at 90° at zero speed); or because they were cells in which the front (leading edge) of the motorcycle was impacting the corner of the opposing vehicle, which is very difficult to test or simulate accurately and repeatably. Some examples of removed cells are shown in Figure F.3.

### **BS ISO 13232-2:2005**



**Figure F.2 — Examples of geometry reclassification** 



**Figure F.3 — Examples of removed configurations** 

#### **F.3.4 Using accident data to determine frequency of injury by body region and injury type of various impact configurations (see 5.2)**

The procedure for determining injury frequency is the same as that used for occurrence frequency, except that the sorting is done for a specific body region, injury type, and injury severity. The sorting is performed only for head concussions and upper and lower leg fractures with AIS greater than or equal to 2 because these are among the primary types of injures occurring in motorcycle/car accidents (e.g., Hurt, et al., 1981a, 1981b; Otte, 1980; Otte, et al., 1981); and they are capable of being monitored by the MATD dummy and injury indices; and because these AIS levels correspond to "moderate" or worse injuries (e.g., "slight" injuries are not considered in this analysis). The sorting is done on the basis of whether at least one injury of the specific region, type, and severity occurred. Multiple repeat injuries are not considered.

Sorting for head concussive injuries is limited to "helmeted" cases. This is done to ensure consistency with the scope of ISO 13232. Also, the impact configurations (and corresponding protective devices) for unhelmeted head injury may be different from those for helmeted head injury, so that the inclusion of unhelmeted cases may bias, inappropriately, the selection of impact configurations for testing.

### **F.4 Annex A (normative) Motorcycle accident report**

Clause A.1 lists the impact variables needed for the analyses described in 4.1 and 4.2. In addition, MC type and engine size are included to the extent this may be useful in the future in understanding the applicability of a particular protective device for a given class of MC.

Clause A.2 contains injury descriptions which are believed to be compatible with both the 1990 AIS system and the Los Angeles and Hannover databases (Biokinetics, 1990).

Clauses A.3 and A.4 describe protective gear, in so far as they may influence the injuries analyzed in 5.2, as discussed below.

### **F.5 Annex B (normative) Resulting frequency of occurrence for the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases**

These geometries and frequencies of occurrence result from the application of the categorization and sorting method to the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases.

The resulting 25 geometries in Figure B.1 are presented in order of decreasing frequency, from left to right then top to bottom.

The geometries for the resulting 200 impact configurations in Table B.1 are listed in the same order as the geometries in Figure B.1. Those configurations (of the 9 600 theoretically possible configurations) which do not appear in Table B.1 had zero frequency of occurrence in the Los Angeles/Hannover combined databases.

### **F.6 Annex C (normative) Example accident data**

These data have been provided in order to be of use in verifying the analysis procedures and results, and to serve as a basis for possible future expansion to include other databases or refined analysis procedures. They are summary data files which have been provided by D. Otte (Hannover data) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (Los Angeles data), via H. Hurt, Biokinetics and Associates, and Dynamic Research.

### **F.7 Annex D (normative) Resulting frequency of injury by body region and injury type for the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases**

These geometries and frequencies of injury result from the application of the categorization and sorting method to the combined Los Angeles and Hannover databases.

As noted above, the head injuries are for helmeted heads; and all of the injuries are for AIS equal to or greater than 2 ("moderate" or worse injuries).

The geometries for each of the injury producing configurations are listed in the same order as in Figure B.1.

### **F.8 Annex E (informative) Frequency of occurrence data in non-SI units**

These data tables are included for the convenience of users of ISO 13232.

## **BSI — British Standards Institution**

BSI is the independent national body responsible for preparing British Standards. It presents the UK view on standards in Europe and at the international level. It is incorporated by Royal Charter.

#### **Revisions**

British Standards are updated by amendment or revision. Users of British Standards should make sure that they possess the latest amendments or editions.

It is the constant aim of BSI to improve the quality of our products and services. We would be grateful if anyone finding an inaccuracy or ambiguity while using this British Standard would inform the Secretary of the technical committee responsible, the identity of which can be found on the inside front cover. Tel: +44 (0)20 8996 9000. Fax: +44 (0)20 8996 7400.

BSI offers members an individual updating service called PLUS which ensures that subscribers automatically receive the latest editions of standards.

#### **Buying standards**

Orders for all BSI, international and foreign standards publications should be addressed to Customer Services. Tel: +44 (0)20 8996 9001. Fax: +44 (0)20 8996 7001. Email: orders@bsi-global.com. Standards are also available from the BSI website at http://www.bsi-global.com.

In response to orders for international standards, it is BSI policy to supply the BSI implementation of those that have been published as British Standards, unless otherwise requested.

#### **Information on standards**

BSI provides a wide range of information on national, European and international standards through its Library and its Technical Help to Exporters Service. Various BSI electronic information services are also available which give details on all its products and services. Contact the Information Centre. Tel: +44 (0)20 8996 7111. Fax: +44 (0)20 8996 7048. Email: info@bsi-global.com.

Subscribing members of BSI are kept up to date with standards developments and receive substantial discounts on the purchase price of standards. For details of these and other benefits contact Membership Administration. Tel: +44 (0)20 8996 7002. Fax: +44 (0)20 8996 7001. Email: membership@bsi-global.com.

Information regarding online access to British Standards via British Standards Online can be found at http://www.bsi-global.com/bsonline.

Further information about BSI is available on the BSI website at http://www.bsi-global.com.

#### **Copyright**

Copyright subsists in all BSI publications. BSI also holds the copyright, in the UK, of the publications of the international standardization bodies. Except as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 no extract may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means – electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise – without prior written permission from BSI.

This does not preclude the free use, in the course of implementing the standard, of necessary details such as symbols, and size, type or grade designations. If these details are to be used for any other purpose than implementation then the prior written permission of BSI must be obtained.

Details and advice can be obtained from the Copyright & Licensing Manager. Tel: +44 (0)20 8996 7070. Fax: +44 (0)20 8996 7553. Email: copyright@bsi-global.com.

**BSI** 389 Chiswick High Road London W4 4AL