

Minutes for the 21st Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group

at CLEPA, Blvd Brand Whitlock 87, Brussels
Tuesday 10 February 2009 from 10:00 to 15:25

1 Welcome

Mäurer welcomed the participants to the meeting. The participants and apologies are listed in a separate Excel file.

2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was accepted. Jääskeläinen pointed out that he has to leave early.

3 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were accepted.

4 New York: Vehicle Communication Workshop and Demonstrations

Jääskeläinen gave a report about the 15th ITS World Congress. There were 10 000 participants. The opening had been quite informal and successful. Cooperative systems, intersection safety, FOTs, accident causation, nomadic devices etc were among topics and the sessions were excellent, but the audience participation (around 10-20/session) was disappointing.

The demonstrations were also slightly disappointing as GM pulled out in the last minute and the show was sometimes very commercial. The demonstrations in Rüsselheim organised by the Car2Car consortium were more to the point although the automated emergency braking demonstration was very impressive. The traffic information etc. demonstrated in the bus had nothing spectacularly new.

The exhibition was really large and was the most noteworthy success in New York.

There were also successful combined sessions with Japan and the EC.

The international workshop on vehicle communication workshop was the most successful one in the series of such workshops. The global coordination around the issue will continue, and a new cooperation agreement covering cooperative systems and Field Operational Tests was settled and then signed later in January 2009 in Washington D.C. The Americans are looking for combining the cooperative systems with infotainment systems in order to get the in-vehicle communication devices into the vehicles. The COMeSafety newsletter gives a more detailed presentation of the workshop and its results.

The Americans are now talking about IntelliDrive based on the experiences from California and SafeTrip-21, where the intelligence may come into cars with a number of different ways including the nomadic systems.

Jääskeläinen also told about the meetings that occurred during the TRB in January. In the medium term, a road map for cooperative systems is to be developed together with USA and Europe building on three basic blocks: standardisation, 5.9 GHz and the COMeSafety

architecture. This is to be finalised in Stockholm, in connection with the Vehicle Communications workshop to be organised perhaps before the 16th World Congress.

The flash reports by the EC participants in New York and Washington D.C. are available at the EC web site. Shelley Row is coming to visit EC and Europe at the end of March to discuss further cooperation.

Hagleitner asked about the details of U.S. plans, but Jääskeläinen reported that no details are yet available but some of the large budget reserved for transport purposes in the USA will probably be allocated to ITS. Mäurer asked about eCall, and Jääskeläinen told that 70% of USA is covered by E-911. In Japan, the eCall product is available in the market but only 600 000 units have been purchased.

5 Monitoring report

The discussion started by a discussion on what we should cover. Hedlund pointed out that some systems like ESC should soon be taken away as a priority system as soon as it has been regulated. The regulation will soon apply to tyre pressure monitoring.

Hagleitner wished to move blind spot monitoring lower on the list but was told that the order of the list has no significance.

Hallström wished to have alcolock included as a priority system as well as speed alert as an autonomous system. Mäurer pointed out that alcolocks may not be there for a large scale deployment, but speed alert may have large market demand. Scholten told that even the camera based speed alert utilise digital maps in addition to the cameras, i.e. the systems are infrastructure related. Jääskeläinen reminded that TeleFOT will look at the user acceptance of speed alert, among other things. Hagleitner told the EuroFOT will compare the HMI of embedded and aftermarket navigation systems.

Kulmala remarked that it is up to the WG to remove priority systems from the list (such as ESC after European mandate) or to add new systems into the list, after having the approval of the eSafety Forum Steering Group.

Hagleitner wished for an analysis for market penetration concerning the vehicle segments as this would assist in formulating deployment strategies for the different systems, we might wish e.g. to concentrate on the luxury segment for some system and on the medium segment for another. Scholten considered this quite difficult, and told that industry will equip a car if there is market demand, regardless of the segment.

Hallström asked about the lane departure warning system's requirements concerning the minimum standards for lane markings. Risto told that there are common lane marking standards. Scholten remarked that they are not maintained in a uniform manner, unfortunately. Björn reminded that road markings need be visible in wintertime - challenge for snow removal.

Hagleitner gave a short status on headway sensors. About 545 000 sensors (most 77 GHz radar, 115 000 Lidar). Omron is the market leader in Lidar.

There is a big problem for finding out about the penetration of different systems as no public statistics exist. Mäurer told that in Germany, they are collecting this type of equipment data but the data is not public.

We went through the recommendations of the original report. Concerning EuroNCAP, Reinhardt told that speed limiter, ESC and seat belt reminder are included but there is still

uncertainty on how to grade the performance of the systems. Reinhardt promised to send to the WG members a presentation on how the EuroNCAP system may be changed as well the general safety directive, which makes e.g. type pressure monitoring system mandatory. Concerning HMI, the WG has again been activated to update the ESoP if necessary by the autumn of 2009. Concerning the deployment of infrastructure systems, Risto promised to compile the data during spring as the EasyWay reports showing the status at the end of 2008 become available. Reinhardt highlighted the specific needs drivers of commercial vehicles with regard to navigation. Concerning speed alert, Hallström did not see any open issues, but Scholten listed a number of open issues on the European level. A key issue is that there is a high risk that the speed limit information in digital maps is incorrect or not updated. No European wide procedure is implemented today to safeguard the right information. The concept of ISA as a mandatory system is no longer discussed all over Europe today, according to Scholten..

System descriptions need to be improved for some parts: Hallström to improve description of alcolock; Hagleitner, Scholten and Breuer to improve that for obstacle and collision warning. Ferreira reminded that the stabilised descriptions should be included also in the eSafety Support web site.

Schüle asked whether systems for motorcycles should be included in our work. Motorcycles are involved in many fatal accidents, and some systems are very effective. Scholten remarked that these are usually not covered by eSafety Forum. Schüle volunteered to write a chapter 6.16 "Systems for motorcycles" to cover the issues and possible systems for motorcycles.

We need someone to be responsible for RTTI. Schüle will check for a suitable person taking into account the members of the past RTTI Working Group. Scholten highlighted the importance of the member states in this report and the issue of information quality, and Risto reminded about the EasyWay project also working around the RTTI issues including data quality. It is perhaps also time to revive the RTTI Working Group. Ferreira and Reinhardt will take this matter up at the next Steering Group.

Concerning dynamic navigation, Kamalski has not responded to the requests for inputs. Kulmala promised to call him.

With regard to heavy duty vehicles, Mäurer will ask Breuer about possible Daimler person to update that part.

Concerning the deployment monitoring process, there are many possibilities and a number of alternative ways can be used including the monitoring required by the European ITS Action Plan. The in-vehicle and infrastructure systems require different road maps and processes. Hagleitner wondered why the Commission does not require the vehicle identification number to include also information about the systems. The current national accident data bases do not include information about the existence of eSafety systems in the vehicles involved in the accidents. There could be a clear recommendation on such information in the report. The CARE database is being developed all the time.

Kulmala wondered about the Schittenhelm reference and what part of the text was meant. Kulmala will contact Breuer about this directly.

The deadline for the inputs is 1 June 2009.

6 Workshops 2008 and 2009

Jääskeläinen stated that the event in 2008 was a success. The eSafety Awards should be combined with the awards planned by eSafety Aware. Reinhardt told about the situation in more detail.

The problem with the workshop is that eSafetySupport is not in operation after September 2009, and a similar project will not begin to work before January 2010.

We went through the conclusions from the workshop of 2008. Some ideas:

- large scale-deployment
- realistic vision of mobility and intelligent vehicle safety systems until 2020
- pulling down the barriers of deployment

The workshop topic was agreed to be "Realistic Vision 2020". Ferreira, Reinhardt, Kulmala, Mäurer, Hedlund and Hallström (preliminarily) volunteered for the workshop preparatory group - Kulmala to chair the group.

7 Latest developments in eSafety and EC

Jääskeläinen reminded that the eSafety Forum Plenary on 23 March will discuss the economic recovery plan, and the WG input is possible, if required.

Jääskeläinen told that DG-INFISO wishes to include the work already done and to be carried out by the eSafety Forum. Concerning the 24 action points in the plan, perhaps 10 will be under the responsibility of the DG-INFISO and partly under the eSafety Forum. Reinhardt also regarded it very useful to connect eSafety Forum activities to the plan. Jöö

Kenis explained about the situation with the EU ITS Action Plan. There are 24 action points, and currently lead responsibilities have been allocated among the five directorates. This process is ongoing. If the Czech presidency is not able to drive the Action Plan, the Swedish presidency is expected to do so.

8 Results and recommendations of eSecurity WG

This was postponed to the next meeting. Reinhardt told about recent experiences with security problems in goods transport.

9 Any other business

The EC has produced a green paper on Trans European Networks - Transport, and Kenis wished all to comment on it. The paper can be found in the consultation pages of DG-TREN. The consultation is open until the end of April.

10 Next meetings, date and place

We agreed on the next meetings:

- Monday 15 June 2009 in Brussels (DEKRA)
- Wednesday 30 September 2009 in Brussels (CLEPA)
- Monday 23 November 2009 in Brussels

The next workshop will take place in Brussels on Tuesday 24 November 2009

Possible topics for the meeting on 15 June 2009 include

- + Results and recommendations of eSecurity WG
- + Current status of deployment of eSafety systems (Brian Knibb)
- + Implementation issues for intelligent vehicle systems - German study
- + COMeSafety Architecture and other key results
- + Dutch Field Operation Test for the heavy vehicles

11 End of meeting

Kulmala closed the meeting at 15:25