

~~International ISO WG4 Objective Metrics TS Document Revision~~

~~**ISO/DTS 18571**~~

~~ISO/TC 22/SC 36/AWG4~~

~~Date: 2022-06-26~~

~~ISO/TS 18571~~

~~Secretariat: ANSI, AFNOR~~

~~Date: 2023-09-21~~

Road vehicles — Objective rating metric for non-ambiguous signals

~~Véhicules routiers — Mesures pour l'évaluation objective de signaux non ambigus~~

~~ISO/DTS 18571~~

~~<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/c42e1ac3-c5d0-433b-9516-50cd7be3ac10/iso-dts-18571>~~

FDIS stage

ISO/DTS 18571:(E)

© ISO ~~2022~~ 2023

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, or required in the context of its implementation, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO Copyright Office [copyright office](#)
CP 401 • [Ch. de Blandonnet 8](#)
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva
Phone: + 41 22 749 01 11
Email: [E-mail: copyright@iso.org](mailto:copyright@iso.org)
Website: www.iso.org

Published in Switzerland.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/DTS 18571

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/c42e1ac3-e5d0-433b-9516-50cd7be3ac10/iso-dts-18571>

Contents

Foreword Error! Bookmark not defined.

Introduction..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

1 Scope..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

2 Normative references..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

3 Terms and definitions Error! Bookmark not defined.

4 Abbreviated terms and symbols..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.1 Abbreviated terms..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.2 General..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.3 Corridor score..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.4 Phase, magnitude and slope scores..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.5 Overall ISO rating..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

5 General data requirements Error! Bookmark not defined.

6 ISO metric Error! Bookmark not defined.

6.1 General..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

6.2 Calculation of the overall ISO rating Error! Bookmark not defined.

6.3 Corridor score..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

6.4 Phase, magnitude and slope scores..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

7 Meaning of the overall ISO rating..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

8 Pre-processing of the data..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

8.1 General..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

8.2 Synchronization of the signals Error! Bookmark not defined.

8.3 Sampling rate Error! Bookmark not defined.

8.4 Filtering..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

8.5 Interval of evaluation Error! Bookmark not defined.

9 Limitations Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.1 General..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.2 Type of signals..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.3 Metric validation Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.4 Meaning of the results Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.5 Multiple responses Error! Bookmark not defined.

(informative) Case studies Error! Bookmark not defined.

Bibliography Error! Bookmark not defined.

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.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

~~Attention is drawn~~ ISO draws attention to the possibility that ~~some of the elements~~ implementation of this document may ~~be involve~~ the ~~subject~~ use of (a) patent(s). ISO takes no position concerning the evidence, validity or applicability of any claimed patent rights in respect thereof. As of the date of publication of this document, ISO had not received notice of (a) patent(s) which may be required to implement this document. However, implementers are cautioned that this may not represent the latest information, which may be obtained from the patent database available at www.iso.org/patents. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. ~~Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see).~~

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation of the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

This document was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 22, *Road vehicles*, Subcommittee SC 36, *Safety and impact testing*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first edition (ISO/TS 18571:2014), which has been technically revised.

The main changes are as follows:

- ~~More~~more descriptions about window size for Dynamic Time Warping were provided. Ten percent of data length was used as window size.
- ~~For~~for slope score calculation, a modified algorithm was developed. In the new algorithm, a nine-point moving average method was used to keep data point symmetry and slope curve smooth.
- ~~In~~in original Annex data sets, some time intervals ~~are~~were not consistent with variations at thousandth digit. Now, data sets were cleaned up and time interval variations were eliminated. New rating results on Annex data sets were provided and all figures and tables were updated accordingly.

Any feedback or questions on this document should be directed to the user's national standards body. A complete listing of these bodies can be found at www.iso.org/members.html.

Introduction

Computer Aided Engineering (CAE) has become a vital tool for product development in the automobile industry. Various computer programs and models ~~are~~ have been developed to simulate dynamic systems. To maximize the use of these models, the validity and predictive capabilities of these models are assessed quantitatively. Model validation is the process of comparing CAE model outputs with test measurements in order to assess the validity or predictive capabilities of the CAE model for its intended usage. The fundamental concepts and terminology of model validation have been established mainly by standard committees including the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA)^[2], the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Standards Committees on verification and validation of Computational Solid Mechanics^[3] and Computational Fluid Dynamics and Heat Transfer^[4], the Defense Modeling and Simulation Office (DMSO) of the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD)^[5], the United States Department of Energy (DOE)^[6] and various other professional societies ^{[19],[20](, ,)}.

One of the critical tasks to achieve quantitative assessments of models is to develop a validation metric that has the desirable metric properties to quantify the discrepancy between functional or time history responses from both physical test and simulation result of a dynamic system^{[7],[16],[17](, ,)}. Developing quantitative model validation methods has attracted considerable researchers' interest in recent years ^{[11],[12],[13],[15],[17],[18],[23],[24],[26](, , , , , , , , ,)}. However, the primary consideration in the selection of an effective metric should be based on the application requirements. In general, the validation metric is a quantitative measurement of the degree of agreement between the physical test and simulation results.

This document is the essential excerpt of the ISO/PDTR 16250^[1] which provides standardized calculations of the correlation between two signals of dynamic systems, and it is validated against multiple vehicle safety case studies.

(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/DTS 18571

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/c42e1ac3-e5d0-433b-9516-50cd7be3ac10/iso-dts-18571>

Road vehicles — Objective rating metric for non-ambiguous signals

1 Scope

This document provides validation metrics and rating procedures ~~to be used~~ to calculate the level of correlation between two non-ambiguous signals obtained from a physical test and a computational model and ~~it~~ is aimed at vehicle safety applications. The objective comparison of time-history signals of model and test is validated against various loading cases under different types of physical loads such as forces, moments, and accelerations. However, other applications ~~might can~~ be possible too, but are not within the scope of this document.

~~Note: Annex A~~NOTE Annex A gives some examples of the application of this document.

2 Normative references

There are no normative references in this document.

3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

ISO and IEC maintain terminology databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ~~ISO~~ Online browsing platform: available at <https://www.iso.org/obp>
- ~~IEC~~ Electropedia: available at <https://www.electropedia.org/>

3.1 filtering

smoothing of signals by using standardized algorithms

3.2 level of correlation

similarity of two signals

3.3 interval of evaluation

time domain that is used to calculate the correlation between two signals

3.4 rating

calculated value that represents a certain *level of correlation* [3.2] (objective rating)

3.5 sampling rate

recording frequency of a signal

3.6 time sample

pair values (e.g. time and amplitude) of a recorded signal

3.7 time-history signal

physical value recorded in a time domain; ~~those signals are non-ambiguous~~

ISO/DTS 18571:(E)

Note 1 to entry: Time-history signals are non-ambiguous.

4 Abbreviated terms and symbols

4.1 Abbreviated terms

- ~~CAE~~ — Computer Aided Engineering
- ~~CORA~~ — CORrelation and Analysis
- ~~DTW~~ — Dynamic Time Warping
- ~~EEARTH~~ — Enhanced Error Assessment of Response Time Histories
- ~~SME~~ — Subject Matter Expert

- CAE Computer Aided Engineering
- CORA CORrelation and Analysis
- DTW Dynamic Time Warping
- EEARTH Enhanced Error Assessment of Response Time Histories
- SME Subject Matter Expert

4.2 General

- ~~$C, C(t)$~~ ~~Analyzed signal (CAE signal)~~
- ~~$T, T(t)$~~ ~~Reference signal (test signal)~~
- ~~Δt~~ ~~Interval between two time samples~~
- ~~t~~ ~~Time signal (axis of abscissa)~~
- ~~t_0~~ ~~Time zero of an event (e.g., test, crash, impact)~~
- ~~t_{start}~~ ~~Starting time of the interval of evaluation~~
- ~~t_{end}~~ ~~Ending time of the interval of evaluation~~
- ~~N~~ ~~Total Analyzed signal (CAE signal)~~
~~number of~~
~~sample~~
~~points (e.g.,~~
~~time steps)~~
~~between the~~
~~starting time~~
~~and ending~~
~~time $C, C(t)$~~
- $T, T(t)$ Reference signal (test signal)
- Δt Interval between two time samples
- t Time signal (axis of abscissa)
- t_0 Time zero of an event (e.g. test, crash, impact)
- t_{start} Starting time of the interval of evaluation
- t_{end} Ending time of the interval of evaluation
- N Total number of sample points (e.g. time steps) between the starting time t_{start} and ending time t_{end}

4.3 Corridor score

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Z | Corridor score |
| $Z(t)$ | Corridor score at time t (curve) |
| | Exponent factor for calculating the corridor score between the inner and outer corridors |
| | Relative half width of the inner corridor |
| | Relative half width of the outer corridor |
| δ_i | Half width of the inner corridor |
| δ_o | Half width of the outer corridor |
| $\delta_i(t)$ | Lower/upper bounds of the inner corridor at time t (curve) |
| $\delta_o(t)$ | Lower/upper bounds of the outer corridor at time t (curve) |
| $N_{\neq 0}$ | All natural numbers without zero |
| T_{norm} | Absolute maximum amplitude of the reference signal |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Z | <u>Corridor score</u> |
| $Z(t)$ | <u>Corridor score at time t (curve)</u> |
| k_Z | <u>Exponent factor for calculating the corridor score between the inner and outer corridors</u> |
| a_0 | <u>Relative half width of the inner corridor</u> |
| b_0 | <u>Relative half width of the outer corridor</u> |
| δ_i | <u>Half width of the inner corridor</u> |
| δ_o | <u>Half width of the outer corridor</u> |
| $\delta_i(t)$ | <u>Lower/upper bounds of the inner corridor at time t (curve)</u> |
| $\delta_o(t)$ | <u>Lower/upper bounds of the outer corridor at time t (curve)</u> |
| $N_{>0}$ | <u>All natural numbers without zero</u> |
| T_{norm} | <u>Absolute maximum amplitude of the reference signal T</u> |

4.4 Phase, magnitude, and slope scores

4.4.1 General

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| $C^{ts}, C^{ts}(t)$ | Truncated and shifted CAE curve |
| C^{ts+w} | Warped CAE curve of |
| C_0^{ts+d} | Derivative CAE curve of |
| C^{ts+d} | Derivative CAE curve of after averaging |
| $T^{ts}, T^{ts}(f)$ | Truncated and shifted test curve |
| T^{ts+w} | Warped test curve of |
| T_0^{ts+d} | Derivative test curve of |
| T^{ts+d} | Derivative test curve of after averaging |
| $C^{ts}, C^{ts}(t)$ | <u>Truncated and shifted CAE curve</u> |
| C^{ts+w} | <u>Warped CAE curve of C^{ts}</u> |
| C_0^{ts+d} | <u>Derivative CAE curve of C^{ts}</u> |

ISO/DTS 18571:(E)

| | |
|--|--|
| $C^{\text{ts+d}}$ | <u>Derivative CAE curve of C^{ts} after averaging</u> |
| $T^{\text{ts}} \text{ } _ T^{\text{ts}}(j)$ | <u>Truncated and shifted test curve</u> |
| $T^{\text{ts+w}}$ | <u>Warped test curve of T^{ts}</u> |
| $T_0^{\text{ts+d}}$ | <u>Derivative test curve of T^{ts}</u> |
| $T^{\text{ts+d}}$ | <u>Derivative test curve of T^{ts} after averaging</u> |

4.4.2 Phase score

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| E_{P} | Phase score |
| k_{P} | Exponent factor for calculating the phase score |
| ε_{P}^* | Maximum allowable percentage of time shift |
| m | Time steps moved to evaluate the phase error |
| n_{ε} | Number of time shifts to get |
| ρ_{E} | Maximum cross correlation of all $\rho_{\text{L}}(m)$ and $\rho_{\text{R}}(m)$ |
| $\rho_{\text{L}}(m)$ | Cross correlation – signal is moved to the left |
| $\rho_{\text{R}}(m)$ | Cross correlation – signal is moved to the right |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| E_{P} | <u>Phase score</u> |
| k_{P} | <u>Exponent factor for calculating the phase score E_{P}</u> |
| ε_{P}^* | <u>Maximum allowable percentage of time shift</u> |
| m | <u>Time steps moved to evaluate the phase error</u> |
| n_{ε} | <u>Number of time shifts to get ρ_{E}</u> |
| ρ_{E} | <u>Maximum cross correlation of all $\rho_{\text{L}}(m)$ and $\rho_{\text{R}}(m)$</u> |
| $\rho_{\text{L}}(m)$ | <u>Cross correlation – signal is moved to the left</u> |
| $\rho_{\text{R}}(m)$ | <u>Cross correlation – signal is moved to the right</u> |

4.4.3 Magnitude score

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| E_{M} | Magnitude score |
| k_{M} | Exponent factor for calculating the magnitude score |
| ε_{M}^* | Maximum allowable magnitude error |
| ε_{mag} | Magnitude error |
| n | Number of data samples of time shifted and truncated curves (and) |
| | Local cost matrix to perform the dynamic time warping |
| $d(i, j)$ | Local cost function to perform the dynamic time warping |
| $d_{\text{TW}}[i, j]$ | Cumulative cost matrix |
| D_{TW} | Dynamic time warping distance |
| $D_{\text{TWopt}}(i, j)$ | Cost of the optimal warping path |
| | Index number of time shifted and truncated CAE curve |
| | Index number of l -th warping path of curve |
| | Index number of time shifted and truncated test curve |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| l | Index number of l -th warping path of curve |
| l | Index number of any warping path |
| n | Number of data samples of the optimal warping path |
| w | Optimal warping path |
| w_l | The l -th warping path cell |
| E_M | Magnitude score |
| k_M | Exponent factor for calculating the magnitude score E_M |
| ε_M^* | Maximum allowable magnitude error |
| ε_{mag} | Magnitude error |
| n | Number of data samples of time shifted and truncated curves (C^{ts} and T^{ts}) |
| d | Local cost matrix to perform the dynamic time warping |
| $d(i, j)$ | Local cost function to perform the dynamic time warping |
| $d_{\text{tw}}[i, j]$ | Cumulative cost matrix |
| D_{TW} | Dynamic time warping distance |
| $D_{\text{TWopt}}(i, j)$ | Cost of the optimal warping path |
| i | Index number of time shifted and truncated CAE curve C^{ts} |
| i_l | Index number of l -th warping path of curve C^{ts} |
| j | Index number of time shifted and truncated test curve T^{ts} |
| j_l | Index number of l -th warping path of curve T^{ts} |
| k | Index number of any warping path |
| \tilde{k} | Number of data samples of the optimal warping path |
| w | Optimal warping path |
| w_l | The l -th warping path cell |

4.4.4 Slope score

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| E_S | Slope (topology) score |
| k_S | Exponent factor for calculating the slope score E_S |
| ε_S^* | Maximum allowable slope error |
| $\varepsilon_{\text{slope}}$ | Slope error |
| E_S | Slope (topology) score |
| k_S | Exponent factor for calculating the slope score E_S |
| ε_S^* | Maximum allowable slope error |
| $\varepsilon_{\text{slope}}$ | Slope error |

4.5 Overall ISO rating

| | |
|-------|---|
| R | Overall ISO rating |
| w_Z | Weighting factor of the corridor score Z |
| w_P | Weighting factor of the phase score E_P |
| w_M | Weighting factor of the magnitude score E_M |

ISO/DTS 18571:(E)

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| w_S | Weighting factor of the slope score E_S |
| r | Rank of the sliding scale of the ISO metric |
| $S_{\text{clower}}(r)$ | Lower threshold of rank r |
| $S_{\text{cupper}}(r)$ | Upper threshold of rank r |
| R | Overall ISO rating |
| w_Z | Weighting factor of the corridor score Z |
| w_P | Weighting factor of the phase score E_P |
| w_M | Weighting factor of the magnitude score E_M |
| w_S | Weighting factor of the slope score E_S |
| r | Rank of the sliding scale of the ISO metric |
| $S_{\text{clower}}(r)$ | Lower threshold of rank r |
| $S_{\text{cupper}}(r)$ | Upper threshold of rank r |

5 General data requirements

The metric described in this document requires non-ambiguous curves (e.g. time-history curves). Furthermore, it is required that the reference curve $T(t)$ and the evaluated curve $C(t)$ are both defined between starting time t_{start} and ending time t_{end} . Both curves shall have the same number of sample points N with a constant time interval Δt within the evaluation interval.

6 ISO metric

6.1 General

The approach of this document is to combine different types of algorithms to get reliable and robust assessments of the correlation of two signals. The calculated score provides fair assessment for poor and for good correlations of two signals. The two most promising metrics are identified in Reference [1], they are the CORA corridor method and EEARTH. A combined metric based on the improved CORA corridor method and EEARTH is then proposed for this document which has been fully validated using responses from multiple vehicle passive safety applications.

Figure 6.1 shows the structure of the overall ISO metric. While the corridor method calculates the deviation between curves with the help of automatically generated corridors, the EEARTH method analyzes specific curve characteristics such as phase shift, magnitude, and shape. Hence, the ISO metric consists of the two best available algorithms.




Figure-6.1 — ISO metric structure

6.2 Calculation of the overall ISO rating

The combination of the four metric ratings (corridor, phase, magnitude, and slope) will provide a single number R for the correlation of the analyzed signals which represents the final overall objective rating. The overall objective rating R is calculated by combining the separate sub-ratings of corridor (Z), phase (E_P), magnitude (E_M) and slope (E_S). Four individual weighting factors are defining the influence of each metric on the overall rating [see Formulae (6.1) and (6.2)]. The corresponding weighting factors are shown in Table 6.1.

$$R = w_Z w_Z \cdot Z + w_P w_P \cdot E_P + w_M w_M \cdot E_M + w_S w_S \cdot E_S \tag{6.1}$$

$$w_Z + w_P + w_M + w_S = 1 \tag{6.2}$$

Table-6.1 — Weighting factors of the ISO sub-ratings


| Parameter | Value | Description |
|-----------|-------|--|
| w_Z | 0,4 | Weighting factor of the corridor score |
| w_P | 0,2 | Weighting factor of the phase score |

| Parameter | Value | Description |
|-----------|-------|---|
| w_M | 0,2 | Weighting factor of the magnitude score |
| w_S | 0,2 | Weighting factor of the slope score |

6.3 Corridor score

6.3.1 General

The corridor metric calculates the deviation between two signals by means of corridor fitting. The two sets of corridors, the inner and the outer corridors, are defined along the mean curve. If the evaluated curve C is within the inner corridor bounds, a score of "1" is given and if it is outside the outer corridors bounds, the score is set to "0". The assessment declines from "1" to "0" between the bounds of inner and outer corridors resulting in three different rating zones as shown in Figure 6.2. The compliance with the corridors is calculated at each specific time t ; and the final corridor score Z of a signal is the average of all scores $Z(t)$ at specific times t .



Key

- 1 rating = 0
- 2 $0 < \text{rating} < 1$
- 3 rating = 1

Figure- 6.2 — Rating zones of the corridor metric (corridors of constant width)

The philosophy of the ISO approach is to use a narrow inner corridor and a wide outer corridor^[14]. It limits the number of "1" ratings to only good correlations and gives the opportunity to distinguish between poor and fair correlations. If the outer corridor is too narrow, too many curves of a fair or moderate correlation would get the same poor rating of "0", like signals of almost no correlation with the reference. Basically, the width of the corridors can be adjusted in order to reflect the specific signal characteristic. The width can be constant for the whole duration of the dynamic responses or vary at the different time intervals. This document applies the most common approach of using constant corridor widths for the whole duration of the dynamic response^[125].

6.3.2 Calculation

The parameters a_0 and b_0 define the relative half widths of the inner and the outer corridors. Both shall be between "0" and "1", and a_0 shall be less than b_0 . The absolute half widths of both corridors are defined as the product of relative half width and the absolute maximum amplitude T_{norm} of the reference signal T . Formula (6.3) shows the calculation of T_{norm} and it is calculated within the interval of evaluation.

$$T_{\text{norm}} = \max\{|\min(T)|, |\max(T)|\} \quad T_{\text{norm}} = \max\{|\min(T)|, |\max(T)|\} \quad (6.3)$$

The absolute half width of the inner corridor (absolute distance from the reference signal to the outer bounds of the inner corridor) is defined by Formula (6.4). The calculation of the absolute half width of the outer corridors (see Formula (6.5)) is similar to that of the inner corridors.

$$\delta_i \delta_i = a_0 \cdot T_{\text{norm}} \quad T_{\text{norm}} \quad 0 \leq a_0 \leq 1 \quad (6.4)$$

$$\delta_o \delta_o = b_0 \cdot T_{\text{norm}} \quad T_{\text{norm}} \quad 0 \leq b_0 \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a_0 < b_0 \quad (6.5)$$

Based on these definitions the lower and upper bounds of the inner corridor are defined by Formula (6.6) and the lower and upper bounds of the outer corridor are defined by Formula (6.7).

$$\delta_i \delta_i(t) = T(t) \pm \delta_i \quad (6.6)$$

$$\delta_o \delta_o(t) = T(t) \pm \delta_o \quad (6.7)$$

Formula (6.8)

Formula (6.8) shows the calculation of the corridor score for the correlation between the reference signal T and the analyzed signal C at each evaluation time t_i . If the absolute difference between the signals T and C is less than the half width of the inner corridor (δ_i), then the score is set to "1". The score is calculated by Formula (6.8) when the absolute difference between both signals is in between $\delta_i \leq |T(t) - C(t)| \leq \delta_o$. If the absolute difference between both signals is greater than the half width of the outer corridor (δ_o), then the score is set to "0". The parameter k_z assesses the location of the analyzed signal within the outer corridor, and it applies the appropriate penalty on the score. A linear ($k_z = 1$), quadratic ($k_z = 2$), cubical ($k_z = 3$) or any other regression relationship can be defined accordingly.