



**Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering**

**ENERGY ABSORPTION ANALYSIS OF LOW SPEED FRONTAL  
IMPACT FOR BUMPER BEAM THROUGH FINITE ELEMENT  
ANALYSIS**

**Muhammad Nasiruddin bin Su**

**Master of Science in Manufacturing Engineering**

**2017**

**ENERGY ABSORPTION ANALYSIS OF LOW SPEED FRONTAL IMPACT FOR  
BUMPER BEAM THROUGH FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS**

**MUHAMMAD NASIRUDDIN BIN SU**

**A thesis submitted  
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science  
in Manufacturing Engineering**

**Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA**

**2017**

## DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Energy Absorption Analysis of Low Speed Frontal Impact for Bumper Beam Through Finite Element Analysis” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature : .....

Name : Muhammad Nasiruddin bin Su

Date :

## **APPROVAL**

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Master of Science in Manufacturing Engineering.

Signature : .....

Supervisor Name : Associate Professor Dr Hambali Arep@Ariff

Date :

## **DEDICATION**

I would like to dedicate this thesis especially to my parent (Su Musa and Rosiah Ahmad) and also my whole family who have been source inspiration. Without their prayer, probably impossible for me to complete this study. Thank you very much.

## ABSTRACT

Bumper beam is a safety feature of a car where it functions to absorb impact energy during collision. It is important to improve the bumper beam design in order to improve vehicle safety. Natural fiber composite has been introduced to replace the use of conventional materials because it has advantages of low density, high specific strength and stiffness. Natural fibers like kenaf and hemp have low cost and low density which can replace the glass fibers. Bertam leaves composite has not been explored before in automotive bumper beam. This thesis provided information on different bumper beam design structures focusing on energy absorption analysis. The aim of the research is to determine the capability of energy absorption for five conceptual cross section designs for low speed impact of three materials namely low carbon steel, bertam leaves fiber reinforced polyester and sheet moulding compound. Explicit dynamic simulation was adopted using Ansys LS Dyna software to simulate the frontal low speed impact of bumper beam according to Economic Commission for Europe Regulation No 42. Five new cross section designs have been proposed. AHP-TOPSIS method was used to determine best design through identified product design specification of frontal low speed impact low carbon steel bumper beam. Through the seven elements identified in product design specification using AHP-TOPSIS method, cross section 4 (C4) design of bumper beam was the best with  $C_i$  value of 0.564. Four parameters namely cross section, wall thickness, materials and ribs influenced the energy absorption and were taken into account for further study. Closed section bumper was slightly better compared to open section bumper beam in energy absorption. C1 closed section bumper beam was capable of absorbing up to 82.79 % of impact energy. Composite material can reduce the bumper beam weight where the bertam leaves fiber reinforced polyester decreased the weight of bumper beam by 87.04 % and sheet moulding compound decreased the weight of bumper beam by 76.75 % compared to low carbon steel. Both composite material with wall thickness of 1.2 mm does not suitable for consideration in automotive bumper beam as the maximum deflection exceed the limit set 30 mm. For wall thickness, as the wall thickness increased, the maximum deflection of bumper beam decreased as well. Two ribs design was added to the C4 bumper beam namely vertical and horizontal rib. A horizontal rib has the highest energy absorption capability which is improved 26.93 % and deflection of bumper beam improved 2 % to 9 %. This thesis can be used as a guideline to design and selecting the best design automotive bumper beam based on the parameters studied and method selection used to determine the best design.

## ABSTRAK

Rasuk bumper adalah ciri keselamatan kereta di mana ia berfungsi untuk menyerap tenaga hentaman semasa perlanggaran. Adalah penting untuk meningkatkan reka bentuk rasuk bumper untuk meningkatkan keselamatan kenderaan. Komposit gentian semulajadi telah diperkenalkan untuk menggantikan penggunaan bahan konvensional kerana ia mempunyai kelebihan kepadatan rendah, kekuatan khusus yang tinggi dan kekakuan. Serat semulajadi seperti kenaf dan rami mempunyai kos yang rendah dan ketumpatan yang rendah boleh menggantikan gentian kaca. Daun bertam komposit belum dikaji sebelum ini dalam penggunaan rasuk bumper automotif. Tesis ini memberikan maklumat mengenai struktur reka bentuk rasuk bumper yang berbeza yang memberi tumpuan kepada analisis penyerapan tenaga. Tujuan penyelidikan ini adalah untuk menentukan keupayaan penyerapan tenaga untuk lima reka bentuk konsep keratan rentas untuk hentaman berkelajuan rendah untuk tiga bahan iaitu keluli karbon rendah, serat daun bertam poliester dan sebatian acuan lembaran. Simulasi dinamik telah diguna pakai menggunakan perisian Ansys LS Dyna untuk mensimulasikan hentaman hadapan berkelajuan rendah rasuk bumper mengikut Peraturan Suruhanjaya Ekonomi Eropah Nombor 42. Lima reka bentuk keratan rentas baru telah dicadangkan. Kaedah AHP-TOPSIS digunakan untuk menentukan reka bentuk terbaik melalui spesifikasi reka bentuk produk yang dikenali hentaman hadapan berkelajuan rendah rasuk bumper keluli karbon rendah. Melalui tujuh elemen yang dikenali dalam spesifikasi reka bentuk produk menggunakan kaedah AHP-TOPSIS, keratan rentas rasuk 4 (C4) adalah reka bentuk rasuk bumper yang terbaik dengan nilai  $C_i$  0.564. Empat parameter iaitu keratan rentas, ketebalan dinding, bahan dan tulang rusuk mempengaruhi penyerapan tenaga diambil kira untuk kajian lanjut. Rasuk bumper tertutup agak lebih baik berbanding dengan rasuk bumper bahagian terbuka dalam penyerapan tenaga. C1 rasuk bumper tertutup mampu menyerap sehingga 82.79% tenaga hentaman. Bahan komposit boleh mengurangkan berat rasuk bumper di mana serat bertam polimer menurunkan berat rasuk bumper sebanyak 87.04 % dan sebatian acuan lembaran menurunkan berat rasuk bumper sebanyak 76.75 % berbanding keluli karbon rendah. Kedua-dua bahan komposit dengan ketebalan dinding 1.2 mm tidak sesuai untuk dipertimbangkan dalam rasuk bumper automotif kerana pesongan maksimum melebihi had ditetapkan iaitu 30 mm. Untuk ketebalan dinding, semakin meningkat ketebalan dinding, pesongan maksimum rasuk bumper akan menurun. Reka bentuk dua tulang rusuk telah ditambahkan ke rasuk bumper C4 iaitu tulang rusuk menegak dan mendatar. Rusuk mendatar mempunyai keupayaan penyerapan tenaga tertinggi iaitu meningkat sebanyak 26.93 % dan pesongan rasuk bumper meningkat 2 % hingga 9 %. Tesis ini boleh digunakan sebagai panduan untuk merekabentuk dan memilih reka bentuk terbaik bumper automotif berdasarkan parameter yang dipelajari dan pemilihan kaedah yang digunakan untuk menentukan reka bentuk terbaik.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Alhamdulillah, praise to Allah for the strength and His blessing for completing this thesis. First and foremost, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere acknowledgement to my supervisor Associate Professor Dr Hambali Arep@Ariff from the Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM) for his essential supervision, support and encouragement towards the completion of this thesis.

I would also like to express my greatest gratitude to Dr Rosidah Jaafar, co-supervisor of this project for her advice and suggestions in evaluation this research. Special thanks to UTeM FRGS grant funding (FRGS/2/2013/TK04/FKP/02/F00179) for the financial support throughout this project.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION</b>	
<b>APPROVAL</b>	
<b>DEDICATION</b>	
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	<b>xviii</b>

## CHAPTER

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Backgrounds	1
1.2 Problem Statement	3
1.3 Objectives	4
1.4 Scope of Study	5
1.5 Significant of Study	5
1.6 Outline of the Thesis	6
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Bumper System	7
2.2.1 Bumper Beam	10
2.2.2 Bumper Beam Standard and Regulation	15
2.2.3 Bumper Beam Material	20
2.2.4 Requirement for Automotive Bumper Beam Design	22
2.3 Energy Absorption	24
2.3.1 Impact Theory	24
2.3.2 Crashworthiness	26
2.3.3 Energy Absorption using Finite Element Analysis (FEA)	27
2.4 Factor Consideration for Bumper Beam Design	33
2.5 Optimizing Energy Absorption Capability	34

2.6	Multi Criteria Decision Method (MCDM)	36
2.6.1	Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)	36
2.6.2	Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)	39
2.7	Summary	42
<b>3.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>44</b>
3.1	Introduction	44
3.2	Project Flow Chart	44
3.3	Product Design Specifications (PDS)	46
3.4	Bumper Beam Design	47
3.4.1	Existing Design	48
3.4.2	Cross Section Design	49
3.5	Finite Element Analysis	50
3.5.1	Engineering Data	51
3.5.2	Explicit Dynamics (design modeler)	53
3.5.3	Explicit Dynamics (Mechanical)	55
3.5.3.1	Geometry	55
3.5.3.2	Connection	57
3.5.3.3	Boundary Condition	58
3.6	Concept Selection	59
3.7	Summary	61
<b>4.</b>	<b>CROSS SECTION DESIGN OF BUMPER BEAMS</b>	<b>62</b>
4.1	Introduction	62
4.2	Existing Bumper Beam Detail Design	62
4.3	Cross Section Design	63
4.3.1	Closed-section bumper beam	64
4.3.1.1	Design of Cross Section 1	64
4.3.1.2	Design of Cross Section 2	65
4.3.1.3	Design of Cross Section 3	66
4.3.2	Open-section bumper beam	67
4.3.2.1	Design of Cross Section 4	67
4.3.2.2	Design of Cross Section 5	68
4.4	Summary	68
<b>5.</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>70</b>
5.1	Introduction	70
5.2	Low Speed Impact Simulation of Low Carbon Steel Bumper Beam	70

5.2.1	Cross Section 1 (C1)	75
5.2.2	Cross Section 2 (C2)	79
5.2.3	Cross Section 3 (C3)	82
5.2.4	Cross Section 4 (C4)	85
5.2.5	Cross Section 5 (C5)	88
5.2.6	Summary Result of Low Carbon Steel Bumper Beam	91
5.3	Concept Selection	94
5.4	Low Speed Impact Simulation of Sheet Moulding Compound (SMC) Bumper Beam	105
5.5	Low Speed Impact Simulation of Bertam Leaves Fiber Reinforced Polyester Composite	110
5.6	Low Speed Impact Simulation of Different Wall Thickness	111
5.7	Validation of Simulation	121
5.8	Discussion	122
5.8.1	The Influence of Different Cross Section in Energy Absorption	123
5.8.2	The Influence of Materials in Energy Absorption	128
5.8.3	The Influence of Wall Thickness in Energy Absorption	138
5.8.4	The Influence of Rib in Energy Absorption	147
5.9	Summary	150
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>152</b>
6.1	Conclusion	152
6.2	Recommendations	154
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>155</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>173</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 2.1	List of United States Patent	12
Table 2.2	Summary of Low Speed Impact Regulations	17
Table 2.3	Natural Fiber Composite Materials used in Automotive Parts	21
Table 2.4	Software used for Crash Finite Element Analysis	29
Table 2.5	Past Research using FEA Analysis	31
Table 2.6	Factors that Affect Bumper Beam Design in Literature	33
Table 2.7	Energy Absorption Optimizations	35
Table 3.1	Sweep Defined	48
Table 3.2	Material Properties for Engineering Data Sources	52
Table 5.1	Results of Low Carbon Steel Bumper Beam	69
Table 5.2	Scale of Pair-Wise Comparison for AHP	91
Table 5.3	Pair Wise Comparison of Criteria with Respect to Overall Goal	95
Table 5.4	Synthesized Matrix for the Criteria	96
Table 5.5	Calculation to Get a New Weight	97
Table 5.6	Consistency Test for the Criteria	98
Table 5.7	Pair Wise Comparison of Criteria with Respect to Sub Criteria C1	98
Table 5.8	Synthesized Matrix for the Criteria	99
Table 5.9	Calculation to Get a New Weight	99
Table 5.10	Consistency Test for the Criteria	100
Table 5.11	The Normalized Sub Criteria Weightings	100

Table 5.12	Input Values of the TOPSIS Analysis	101
Table 5.13	Input Values of the TOPSIS Analysis	102
Table 5.14	The Normalized Decision Matrix	102
Table 5.15	The Weight Normalized Decision Matrix	103
Table 5.16	Determine Separation from Ideal Solution	104
Table 5.17	Determine Separation from Negative Ideal Solution	104
Table 5.18	The Final Evaluation and Ranking of Alternatives	105
Table 5.19	Results of Low Speed Impact of Sheet Moulding Compound (SMC) Bumper Beam of 1.2 mm Wall Thickness	106
Table 5.20	Summary Result of Bertam Leaves Fiber Reinforced Polyester Bumper Beam	110
Table 5.21	Summary Result of Sheet Moulding Compound Bumper Beam with Different Wall Thicknesses	120
Table 5.22	Summary Comparison Simulation Results of Sheet Moulding Compound	136
Table 5.23	Summary Comparison Simulation Results of Bertam Leaves Fiber Reinforced Polyester	137
Table 5.24	Summary Results of C4 Sheet Moulding Compound (SMC) Bumper Beam	148

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1	Common Bumper System	8
Figure 2.2	Fascia	8
Figure 2.3	Energy Absorber	9
Figure 2.4	Bumper Beam	9
Figure 2.5	Different Bumper Beam Cross Section Structure	12
Figure 2.6	Design Flow	22
Figure 2.7	Design Core	23
Figure 2.8	AHP Model Hierarchy	37
Figure 2.9	Overall AHP Procedure	38
Figure 2.10	Application of AHP in Product Development	39
Figure 3.1	Project Flow Chart	45
Figure 3.2	New Product Design Specification (PDS) For Bumper Beam	46
Figure 3.3	Bumper Beam Dimension Concept Of Sweep	47
Figure 3.4	Existing Bumper Beam	49
Figure 3.5	Flow Finite Element Analysis	50
Figure 3.6	Geometry Model of the Test Set Up in Ansys	54
Figure 3.7	Impactor	55
Figure 3.8	Cross Section Design Bumper Beam Geometry Assembly for each Bumper Beam Design	56
Figure 3.9	Focus Area	57
Figure 3.10	Low Speed Impact Model Boundary Condition	59

Figure 3.11	Process of the AHP-TOPSIS Method to Evaluate and Select the Best Design	60
Figure 4.1	Existing Perodua Viva Bumper Beam	63
Figure 4.2	Cross Section 1 Design	64
Figure 4.3	Cross Section 2 Design	65
Figure 4.4	Cross Section 3 Design	66
Figure 4.5	Cross Section 4 Design	67
Figure 4.6	Cross Section 5 Design	68
Figure 5.1	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the Existing Bumper Beam Design	71
Figure 5.2	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the Existing Bumper Beam Design	72
Figure 5.3	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the Existing Bumper Beam Design	73
Figure 5.4	Deformation Area Existing Design	74
Figure 5.5	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the Existing Bumper Beam Design	74
Figure 5.6	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the C1 Bumper Beam Design	75
Figure 5.7	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the C1 Bumper Beam Design	75
Figure 5.8	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the C1 Bumper Beam Design	76
Figure 5.9	Deformation Area C1	77
Figure 5.10	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the C1 Bumper Beam Design	78
Figure 5.11	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the C2 Bumper Beam Design	79
Figure 5.12	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the C2 Bumper Beam Design	79
Figure 5.13	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the C2 Bumper Beam Design	80
Figure 5.14	Deformation Area C2	81
Figure 5.15	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the C2 Bumper Beam Design	81

Figure 5.16	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the C3 Bumper Beam Design	82
Figure 5.17	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the C3 Bumper Beam Design	82
Figure 5.18	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the C3 Bumper Beam Design	83
Figure 5.19	Deformation Area C3	84
Figure 5.20	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the C3 Bumper Beam Design	85
Figure 5.21	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the C4 Bumper Beam Design	85
Figure 5.22	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the C4 Bumper Beam Design	86
Figure 5.23	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the C4 Bumper Beam Design	87
Figure 5.24	Deformation Area C4	87
Figure 5.25	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the C4 Bumper Beam Design	88
Figure 5.26	Graph of Energy Summary versus Time of the C5 Bumper Beam Design	88
Figure 5.27	Graph of Internal Energy versus Time of the C5 Bumper Beam Design	89
Figure 5.28	Graph of Deflection versus Time of the C5 Bumper Beam Design	90
Figure 5.29	Deformation Area C5	90
Figure 5.30	Graph Of Velocity versus Time of the C5 Bumper Beam Design	91
Figure 5.31	Comparison Internal Energy versus Time Graph	92
Figure 5.32	Comparison Deflection versus Time Graph	93
Figure 5.33	Hierarchy Model of Bumper Beam Selection	94
Figure 5.34	Comparison Internal Energy versus Time Graph	107
Figure 5.35	Comparison Deflection versus Time	107
Figure 5.36	Deformation of C1 Bumper Beam Structure	108
Figure 5.37	Deformation of C2 Bumper Beam Structure	108
Figure 5.38	Deformation of C3 Bumper Beam Structure	109
Figure 5.39	Deformation of C4 Bumper Beam Structure	109



Figure 5.40	Deformation of C5 Bumper Beam Structure	109
Figure 5.41	Internal Energy versus Time of 1.2 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	111
Figure 5.42	Internal Energy versus Time of 1.6 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	112
Figure 5.43	Internal Energy versus Time of 2 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	112
Figure 5.44	Deflection versus Time Graph of 1.2 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	113
Figure 5.45	Deflection versus Time Graph of 1.6 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	113
Figure 5.46	Deflection versus Time Graph of 2 mm Wall Thickness Bumper Beam	114
Figure 5.47	Internal Energy versus Time of C1	114
Figure 5.48	Internal Energy versus Time of C2	115
Figure 5.49	Internal Energy versus Time of C3	115
Figure 5.50	Internal Energy versus Time of C4	116
Figure 5.51	Internal Energy versus Time of C5	116
Figure 5.52	Deflection versus Time of C1	117
Figure 5.53	Deflection versus Time of C2	117
Figure 5.54	Deflection versus Time of C3	118
Figure 5.55	Deflection versus Time of C4	118
Figure 5.56	Deflection versus Time of C5	119
Figure 5.57	(a) Energy Absorption (b) Percentage of Energy Absorb	125
Figure 5.58	Specific Energy Absorption (SEA)	126
Figure 5.59	Bumper Beam Deflection	127
Figure 5.60	Bumper Beam Structures	127
Figure 5.61	Deformation Region A and Region B of C5 Sheet Low Carbon Steel Bumper Beam	128
Figure 5.62	(a) Energy Absorption (b) Percentage of Energy Absorption	130
Figure 5.63	Specific Energy Absorption (SEA)	131

Figure 5.64	Comparison of Bumper Beam Deflection	131
Figure 5.65	(a) Energy Absorption (b) Percentage Of Energy Absorption	134
Figure 5.67	Comparison of Deflection	134
Figure 5.68	Percentage of Energy Absorbed by the Bumper Beam with Wall Thickness of: (a) 1.2 mm (b) 1.6 mm (c) 2 mm	139
Figure 5.69	Percentage of Energy Absorbed by the Bumper Beam: (a) C1 (b) C2 (c) C3 (d) C4 (e) C5	141
Figure 5.70	Specific Energy Absorption (SEA)	142
Figure 5.71	Specific Energy Absorption (SEA) of each Bumper Beam	144
Figure 5.72	Comparison Deflection of Bumper Beam	146
Figure 5.73	(a) Horizontal Rib (b) Vertical Rib	147
Figure 5.74	Energy Absorption of C4 Bumper Beam	149
Figure 5.75	Deflection of C4 Bumper Beam	149

## LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Product design specification	173
B	Low speed impact simulation of 1.2 mm wall thickness design concept 1 (C1) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	174
C	Low speed impact simulation of 1.2 mm wall thickness design concept 2 (C2) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	178
D	Low speed impact simulation of 1.2 mm wall thickness design concept 3 (C3) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	181
E	Low speed impact simulation of 1.2 mm wall thickness design concept 4 (C4) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	184
F	Low speed impact simulation of 1.2 mm wall thickness design concept 5 (C5) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	187
G	Low speed impact simulation of 1.6 mm wall thickness design concept 1 (C1) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	190
H	Low speed impact simulation of 1.6 mm wall thickness design concept 2 (C2) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	193
I	Low speed impact simulation of 1.6 mm wall thickness design concept 3 (C3) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	196
J	Low speed impact simulation of 1.6 mm wall thickness design concept 4 (C4) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	199

K	Low speed impact simulation of 1.6 mm wall thickness	202
	design concept 5 (C5) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	
L	Comparison results of energy absorption and deflection bumper beam	205
M	Low speed impact simulation of 2 mm wall thickness	206
	design concept 1 (C1) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	
N	Low speed impact simulation of 2 mm wall thickness	209
	design concept 2 (C2) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	
O	Low speed impact simulation of 2 mm wall thickness	212
	design concept 3 (C3) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	
P	Low speed impact simulation of 2 mm wall thickness	215
	design concept 4 (C4) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	
Q	Low speed impact simulation of 2 mm wall thickness	218
	design concept 5 (C5) sheet moulding compound (SMC) bumper beam	

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

AHP	-	Analytical Hierarchy Process
CMVSR	-	Canadian Motor Vehicle Safety Regulation
CI	-	Consistency Index
CR	-	Consistency Ratio
COR	-	Coefficient of Restitution
EA	-	Energy Absorption
ECE	-	Economic Commission for Europe
FEA	-	Finite Element Analysis
IIHS	-	Insurance Institute for Highway Safety
MCDM	-	Multi Criteria Decision Method
NHTSA	-	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
OEM	-	Original Equipment Manufacturer
PDS	-	Product Design Specification
RCAR	-	Research Council for Automobile Repair
SEA	-	Specific Energy Absorption
SMC	-	Sheet Moulding Compound
TOPSIS	-	Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$J$	-	Joule
$J/kg$	-	Joule per kilogram
$Kg$	-	Kilogram
$m_A$	-	Mass of the impactor
$m_B$	-	Mass of vehicle
$mm$	-	Millimeter
$ms$	-	Millisecond
$v_0$	-	Final velocity of the impactor and vehicle at maximum deflection point
$v_A$	-	Velocity of the impactor before impact
$v_{A2}$	-	Final velocity of vehicle
$v_{B2}$	-	Final velocity of the impactor after separation point

## **LIST OF PUBLICATIONS**

### **Journal**

1. Muhammad Nasiruddin S., Hambali A., Rosidah J., Widodo W.S., and Ahmad M.N., 2017. A Review of Energy Absorption of Automotive Bumper Beam. International Journal of Applied Engineering Research, Volume 12, Number 2 pp. 238-245 (ISSN:0973-4562)

### **Proceeding**

1. Nasiruddin S.M., Hambali A., and Rosidah J., 2017. Energy Absorption Analysis of Different Cross Section Bumper Beam using Finite Element Analysis. Proceeding of Innovative Research and Industrial Dialogue'16 (IRID'16) pp. 97-98 May 2017

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Backgrounds**

The bumper system is mainly to protect the body of the car and passengers against collision. A front bumper system consists of three main components namely fascia, absorber and bumper beam (Sapuan et al., 2005). The fascia is often used to serve aesthetics purpose and decrease aerodynamic drag force, but it cannot tolerate impact energy. Hence, it is considered a non-structural component. The absorber is designed to dampen a portion of the kinetic energy from a collision. The bumper beam is a key structure that helps to absorb the kinetic energy from a high-impact collision and provide bending resistance in a low-impact collision (Davoodi et al., 2008).

There are many types of bumper beam structures which can be categorized as open and closed section. Modern automotive industry has two basic types which are close and open section. The close section is also known as “B” or “D” shape and open section is often known as “C” shape or “hat” sections (Heatherington et al., 2005). These different types of structures have different impact performances.

Energy absorption ability is very important. Bumper beam absorbs most of the kinetic energy during collision. Designers and engineers are facing huge challenges in identifying optimum design, material and process during the development of the bumper beam. Cross section structure of bumper beam affects the performance of bumper beam in