## Use of the FTSS Modular Crash Dummy Models in Frontal Occupant Simulation

Richard Brown, Jaguar Land Rover, Coventry, UK.

## Summary:

Legal and consumer vehicle crash tests use crash dummies as the primary measurement device in the assessment of crash severity. The dummies are themselves complex assemblies, and this must be borne in mind during the development of a frontal occupant crash restraint system. The optimisation of these systems has to consider the interaction of many components, including the dummy, for multiple load cases, and is very challenging. Conventionally it has involved a significant amount of prototype sub-system and vehicle testing.

In a world in which vehicle manufacturers are embracing a CAE-led engineering approach, physical prototype testing is reducing, placing demands on simulation tools to be truly predictive. Sophisticated vehicle crash models, with a substantial heritage of test-based validation to refine and confirm model quality, are now standard in the automotive industry. The use of large-scale finite element vehicle models in the development of frontal occupant components and systems is also now well established. Occupant sub-system 'sled' models can typically contain 1M nodes, and full-vehicle models are much larger than this. The significance of the dummies in the system has led to the creation of detailed dummy models that complement the level of refinement in the vehicle system models. These dummy models are typically responsible for 20% of the CPU time, and there is no strong motivation to reduce their size. In fact, the tendency is to make the dummy models more complex, and the latest version of the FTSS 50% H3 dummy has undergone a significant refinement, which has increased its CPU time by a factor of two.

Recent development in the use of DYNA for frontal occupant modelling at Jaguar Land Rover has seen the construction of simple FE crash models. These replace the previous multi-body dynamics technique for target setting, parametric optimisation, and quick comparison tasks, and are complementary to, and compatible with, the full FE representation. The run time for these models has to be significantly lower than for the full-scale models. However, by reducing the run time, the proportion of CPU time taken by the dummy has increased, and can constitute well over half of the total. In order to avoid the dummy setting a limit on the run time, an alternative approach was needed. The standard FTSS 50% and 5% Hybrid 3 dummy models are now offered in a modular format that allows individual dummy parts to be exchanged for simpler representations. The standard parts are retained where maximum fidelity of measurement is necessary, and the simpler representations selected, where this is adequate. The model structure is shown in figure 1.



This concept is directed at satisfying the need for a predictive model, whilst maintaining the ability to reduce run time in the new, simple DYNA environment. The model geometry and joint configurations are consistent so that any combination of full and simple parts can be selected in the same model by

the user. To make this approach usable in a production environment, simple and standard parts must be interchangeable without excessive user involvement. Dummy model geometry, contact definitions, numbering ranges, the positioning process, and post-processing have to be consistent. Maintaining the same geometry is particularly important, since it allows the model parts to be exchanged without re-aligning seat belts and pre-deforming seat foam; it also makes visual comparison of the behaviour of the standard and simple components easy. In its fully deformable configuration, the modular dummy is identical to the baseline standard model.

A comparison of the simple and complex models has been made for various configurations in a vehicle sled model, and an example is shown in figure 2. In this example, the fully deformable model is compared with a fully rigid, and a part rigid model, and shows acceptable agreement in peak values.



Figure 2. Comparison of fully deformable and part deformable dummy model

The validation process has show that, in many cases, the simple models are an adequate representation of the dummy in areas where the detail of the local behaviour is not required.

The CPU timerequirement can be significantly reduced, and figure 3 shows a progression of reducing CPU time for a sled model as additional parts are replaced by simple models. In this example the run time ranged from over 7 to 3 hours. The figure also shows how the proportion of CPU time spent on the dummy no longer dominates the overall value as the model is simplified.



Figure 3. Progressive reduction in CPU time for decreasing dummy complexity

The criteria for efficient usability, including consistency of geometry, identical positioning process, pre and post-processor techniques, and automatic internal contact definition have been achieved, and minimal user intervention is required. The new, modular model approach has proved to be a very useful extension of the standard FTSS 50% and 5% Hybrid 3 dummy models. It represents a flexible, consistent, and usable tool in the simulation of vehicle frontal occupant crash systems.

## Keywords

Crash simulation, Dummy models.

7 <sup>th</sup> European LS-DYNA Conference 14-15 May 2009	JAGUAR	LAND- -ROVER
Use of the FTSS modular crash dummy mo frontal occupant simulation Richard Brown Jaguar Land Rover, Coventry, UK.	odels in	)
		1
		I
7th European LS-DYNA Conference 14-15 May 2009	JAGUAR	LAND- -ROVER
Content The need for a quicker model Why modular Results comparison Run time evaluation Summary		
		2

















	65	
7 <sup>th</sup> European LS-DYNA Conference 14-15 May 2009	JAGUAR	-ROVER
Modular dummy usability		
Complexity:		
Need to renumber twice	$\frown$	
Need to keep track of configurations		)
Need to do overcheck with fully deformable configuration	n n	
	$\rangle$	
		19
40))		
5%		
7 <sup>th</sup> European LS-DYNA Conference 14-15 May 2009	JAGUAR	LAND- -ROVER
Summary		
Need for a simple DYNA dummy model for simple vehic	cle models	
Modular is predictive, where necessary		
Uses same processes		
Low user involvement to exchange parts	9	
Modular deformable is the standard model	100	9
Refined dummy model size is increasing		
	201	
Modular is a useful addition to the tool box	010-0	
		•
		20