
DG eCall Steering group meeting

BC 1

Clarification Paper

September 2005



Content



-
- Participants
 - Status of work
 - Open issues
 - Next step

Participants



-
- ❑ This contribution is basically a list of existing studies, assumptions and tests, and a synthesis of this material
 - ❑ A work group was not necessary to do that task. Yann Bouler, Renault SAS, who managed one assumption paper and one work group in 2004, produced this list and synthesis for the whole ECDG background

Status of work



-
- ❑ Clarification paper – BC1 has been shared late august 05 -as agreed-
 - ❑ Scope of available material was extended with Sweden study, EC SEISS study, and Golden Hour concept general assumptions.
 - ❑ No comment so far on this report, confirming **the positive socio economic impact of e-Call introduction in any case, with a large bracket of benefit to cost ratio**

Open issues



- ❑ OBU cost is the major cost element and then would strongly influence benefit/cost ratio analysis. Refined assumption is urgently needed
- ❑ Performance level on the whole service chain is critical in expected benefits. Most if not all material is based on safe and efficient alert after a crash occurs. Benefits could be much lower with “light” solutions.
- ❑ Beside of direct benefits, we can expect positive effects on the whole EC activity and competitiveness (high tech, services, galileo..)

Next steps



- Comment or support BC 1
- Performance target definition by PSAP/EC
- OBU cost from performance target (OES/OEM)
- How e-Call would leverage EC industries beside of citizen benefits ? (EC, MS)