

Erkki LIIKANEN

**Member of the European Commission
Enterprise and Information Society**

**"Europe's path towards large-scale
deployment of intelligent integrated road
safety systems"**

eSafety Forum

Brussels

22 April 2003

Check Against Delivery

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very pleased to see you all here this morning. It shows your commitment to road safety and eSafety. These topics also continue to be high on the list of priorities of the Commission.

Two Communications on Road Safety

The Commission's continuing commitment is manifested by the fact that in June two Communications on Road Safety are expected to be presented to the Council. These are:

- A Communication on the third **Road Safety Action Plan**, prepared by Mme de Palacio, Directorate - General Transport and Energy, laying down the general framework and strategy for Road Safety.

- And a Communication on "**Information and Communication Technologies for Intelligent Vehicles**", prepared by my services, Directorate - General Information Society and Enterprise. This will propose the detailed actions the Commission intends to undertake to promote eSafety and the use of new information and communication technologies for improving road safety in Europe.

The Achievements of First Year of the eSafety Initiative

As you have just heard from Mr. Mosley, who is one of the founding fathers in our drive towards safer roads, we had our first High-Level Meeting on eSafety almost exactly one year ago.

In one year there has been a lot of progress, thanks to the efforts of all the stakeholders and especially ERTICO and ACEA :

- After the first High-Level meeting we established the eSafety Working Group, which produced its **Final Report with 28 Recommendations** on

how to promote road safety with new Information and Communications Technologies.

The Working Group recognised that the greatest potential in applying new technologies for road safety are offered by **Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems**. These address the interplay between the driver, the vehicle and the road environment.

- We organised the second High-Level meeting in November 2002. We adopted then the Final Report as the basis for the next phases of the eSafety initiative, and most importantly, decided to establish this eSafety Forum

But let me say a few words on the eSafety Forum.

The Forum Objectives: Why, What and How

In the first High-Level meeting April last year, we focussed on the **WHY**: we discussed the heavy toll of the road accidents, and the inadequacy of the existing measures for achieving the very ambitious goal of halving the casualties by 2010.

In the second High-Level meeting in November, we focussed on **WHAT**: We discussed the Final Report of the eSafety Working Group that gives us recommendations on how to promote the development, deployment and use of Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems.

The eSafety Forum is about **HOW**. With the Forum we move to the next phase: the implementation. This phase is about deployment of the eSafety technologies, systems and solutions. In other words, how to get eSafety out there into the vehicles and roads, in order to benefit the 375 million road users in Europe.

The main task of the eSafety Forum, as I see it, is to accelerate a process on how to implement eSafety, and to come up with an associated Road Map for implementation.

Forum – the Process

This process involves the following stages:

1. First, forming a **consensus view**. The Forum Working Groups are at the center of this activity. Their purpose is to assemble together all the stakeholders and, when possible, to come up with a consensus view and recommendations.
2. Secondly, formulating **eSafety Forum Recommendations**. The Forum plenaries, like the one today, give us the unique opportunity to discuss the Working Group proposals with all stakeholders, and to come up with Forum Recommendations which present the position of the largest possible number of public and private partners.
3. Thirdly, **implementing the recommendations**. It goes without saying that we expect the Forum Recommendations to lead to actions for all public and private stakeholders, including the various industrial sectors, Member States at national, regional and local level, and the Commission.
4. Last but not least, **monitoring the progress**. In establishing this Forum, we tasked it to monitor the progress of all stakeholders. I will return to this topic in a moment.

In the frontline we have the Forum Working Groups, and four are already working: **eCall**, **Accident Causation Data**, **Human-Machine Interaction** and **Business Rationale**.

This work is highly appreciated, with the understanding that these are not final reports but work in progress. I would like to thank all the members of

our first four Working Groups for the contributions, and especially the chairs Patrice d'Oultremont (Belgacom), Mike Hollingsworth (ACEA), Annie Pauzie (INRETS) and Robert Ledger (Norwich Union).

Rationale for the Working Groups

So why we have we chosen these four topics for the Working Groups?

eCall

The in-vehicle emergency call, or eCall, was chosen as **the first priority** for eSafety in our second High-Level meeting.

We are very close to the moment when the provision in the Universal Service Directive (Art 26.3) should enter into force in the Member States. This Article requires that undertakings which operate public telephone networks make caller location information available to authorities handling emergencies, to the extent technically feasible, for all calls to the single European emergency call number 112.

The Commission is progressing on the preparation of **a Recommendation on the processing of the location-enhanced 112 calls**. This will give further guidance to the Member States in establishing a full service chain for location-enhanced emergency services.

The way forward in providing comprehensive, harmonised pan-European emergency services for motorists is to build on the European E-112 infrastructure which will be established in the Member States.

This means that the calls originating from vehicles, with a more accurate location and other safety-related information, have to be routed to the Public Service Answering Points (PSAPs). This architecture is adopted by the EMERGE project, and we should urgently seek a consensus on how to implement this architecture, provide for standardisation and solve the issue of a positive business case.

Accident Causation Data

Without proper accident causation data, we miss **a crucial element for both industrial and political decision making. But this does not automatically mean regulation.**

On the contrary, it's a priority to avoid unnecessary regulation.

However, understanding of the causes of the accidents and the impact of the possible countermeasures is a prerequisite for the public sector to support actions.

The Working Group on this topic has a crucial role in looking at consolidation of the existing data, and a framework and methodology for collecting more comprehensive data for the future.

Human Machine Interface

When the Commission adopted a few years ago the **Recommendation on Safe and Efficient In-vehicle Information and Communication Systems**, we could hardly predict how rapid the technological development would be, especially on the side of proliferation of “nomadic devices” in the vehicles.

While we all agree that we have to minimise driver distraction and workload, all new systems in the vehicles require some level of driver interaction.

The latest research results on the causes of driver distraction are, at minimum, controversial. There is no question about the dangers associated for example with the use of mobile phone while driving, but some studies seem to indicate that there are many other tasks, normally taken as granted, which are equally or even more distractive.

New research is urgently needed both in **more in-depth understanding the working environment in the vehicles**, and in developing clear guidelines

for user interaction with increasingly more complex systems, including the nomadic systems.

Business rationale

The introduction of Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems based on costly sensors, actuators, electronic components and subsystems **can increase the manufacturing cost, power consumption and weight** of the vehicles, making it also more difficult to meet the environmental requirements imposed to new vehicle production.

Furthermore, problems associated with the reliability of embedded electronics and especially of the software have to be solved.

The industry has demonstrated its capability to innovate and bring active safety systems to the markets, as has been the case with Anti-lock Braking Systems, ABS, and Electronic Stability Program, ESP.

The introduction of these technologies is a very good example of **the two main problems the industry is facing** in bringing new systems on the market.

➤ First, when the pace of market introduction is dictated by the market economies and competition, **it can take a very long time**. ABS was first introduced in 1970's, and now 30 years later still only 91% of new vehicles are equipped with ABS, with a 66% penetration on the whole vehicle parc in Europe.

The introduction of ESP has advanced a bit faster, achieving 38% penetration of new vehicles sold and 16% of the whole vehicle parc in five years after its introduction.

- Secondly, the business case leads to introduction of the new safety features **in the high-end range of vehicles** first, last to the small and compact cars. For example a collision mitigation or adaptive cruise control system, adds 2000€ to the selling price of the vehicles.

The young are the last to benefit as they tend to drive the older and smaller cars.

It is obvious that **the wide-spread take-up of Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems cannot depend on the private business case only**. It also needs the full support of the public sector, contributing to a positive public/private business case.

Many partners need to work together to develop this business case, involving the automobile manufacturers, equipment suppliers, motorway operators, telecommunication operators, service providers, insurance industry, road safety and user organisations, road authorities, emergency service providers, Member States and the European Commission.

And then I would like to move on to the role of key stakeholders.

Member States

Throughout the whole process in eSafety, we have emphasised the crucial importance of Member State participation, as key stakeholders in road safety.

We have encouraged the participation of Member States experts in the eSafety Forum Working Groups, and of course this Forum Plenary for which we have invited, amongst others, all members of the **High-Level Group on Road Safety** which is a body consisting of Member State delegates.

The industry

Mr. Schweitzer will speak on behalf of the automotive industry. Let me just say that I am **very impressed by the efforts and the resources** which the automotive industry is putting on disposal of this exercise. Equally welcome is **the open collaborative attitude towards the other industrial sectors**, such as telecommunications industry, equipment suppliers, motorway operators, service providers and insurance industry. I hope that throughout the day we will hear contributions from these industry sectors as well.

The European Commission

The European Commission has two roles in working together with the Member States, the industry and other stakeholders:

- First, we are **acting as a facilitator**, as in the setting up of this eSafety Forum and its Working Groups.
- Secondly, we have a specific **responsibility in relation to our competencies** such as EU RTD, vehicle type-approval procedures, telecommunications regulation, and in addressing liability, standardisation and other obstacles in the introduction of Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems.

This is essentially the contents of the Commission Communication “Information and Communication Technologies for Intelligent Vehicles”, which I mentioned earlier.

Finally, about the goals of our meeting today, and the next necessary steps.

You will hear today **the first reports of the four Working Groups**, and in the afternoon we will discuss each topic in detail in the parallel sessions, which take the form of **interactive panel discussions**.

I know that the chairs of each of these Working Groups, and we in the Commission, remain highly interested in your comments and feedback. This is your opportunity to contribute to the way eSafety is taking shape.

Our next meeting will take place in Madrid on 17 November, on the occasion of the ITS World Congress. There we will continue on the four topics of today, and also discuss **the next four priorities**. I don't want to elaborate on this too much, as we will soon hear a proposal to this effect, but I would like to remind you of two key aspects which will feature on the agenda of our Madrid meeting:

1. One of the two basic tasks of our eSafety Forum, besides promoting the development and deployment of Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems, is **to monitor the progress in the implementation of all the 28 Recommendations** of the eSafety Working Group.

This means following up the progress of the eSafety initiative as a whole, and **of the actions of both the public and private partners**.

This monitoring exercise, which we try to establish as an observatory with benchmarks and which could be supported as a Specific Support Action in the IST Programme under FP6, is essential not only for assuring coherence of the actions by all partners, but also for increasing the public awareness and visibility of the whole eSafety initiative.

2. We propose the establishment of a Working Group for developing industrial and public sector Road Maps. By this we mean **Road Maps for "eSafety" deliverables and products**, and the corresponding public sector measures like investments in the infrastructure and removing possible obstacles for market introduction.

The need for Road Maps cannot be emphasised enough. I would say that **without a time table, there cannot be a commitment**. But it is clear that

there are commercial realities which have to be taken into account. A viable way forward could again be benchmarking this with a technology which is well known and close to the market, such as eCall.

Conclusions

Let me remind you once again of our objective which is to offer all European **road users a safer future through the use of ICTs**. I believe that by applying ICTs in developing Intelligent Integrated Road Safety Systems, by making them affordable and by promoting their demand and use there is a benefit for all: road users, European industry and, ultimately, the societies of an enlarged Europe.

Our challenge is to get actual systems deployed in sufficiently large scale in Europe in a medium term, so they can have an impact.

I would like to invite you to keep this objective in mind today, and throughout the next steps of the eSafety initiative.

In Madrid in November we should already have a much more clear picture on what can be done and when, and I propose that we revisit this issue then.

The success of the eSafety Initiative, its public image and continuation of support on political level depend on our capability to work together and find the solutions for safer mobility.

Thank you for your attention.