

**eSafety WG-HMI meeting : 2009/4
EC Commission, Centre Albert Broschette
Brussels, 8 September 2009**

Introduction

This was the fourth meeting of the re-convened Working Group on Human Machine Interaction. It was chaired by Dr Alan Stevens (Transport Research Laboratory, UK) and Dr Christhard Gelau (BASt, Ge) and attended by approximately 20 persons.

Opening

Alan Stevens opened the meeting and the draft notes of the 3rd WG-HMI meeting on 30th June 2009 were accepted. Wolfgang Hoefs (EC) welcomed participants. He mentioned some generally positive comments received on the work of the group.

AS explained that the main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the WG-HMI draft report, previously circulated by email on 4th August. He asked that comments should be made section by section but that word-by-word editing not would be attempted. There was a short intermission to ensure that all participants had a copy of the report.

Draft by sections

The overall length and structure of the document was accepted by the participants as appropriate. There were no comments on the "Introduction & Background" or on the "Method of Working".

3.1 Broad discussion issues

It was noted that one of the expected changes in coming years would be hybrid and electric vehicles which may have implications for HMI. It was suggested that previously identified editorial issues (footnote and translation) should be mentioned although WH also pointed out that this was in hand, anyway.

3.2 Scope

It was appreciated that the functional approach to defining scope would automatically include broader optical and vocal interfaces and it was agreed correct to point out that, whilst some design experience has been gained, there was limited maturity of some systems such that the ESoP may not be fully appropriate. To be positive, a recommendation was additionally proposed to study

the impact of devices such as voice input/output and HUD and to see if the ESoP would need development in the future.

There was discussion concerning terminology of information, advice and warnings. Whilst there was general agreement of what should be the focus of the ESoP, an exact definition was thought to be challenging. Christhard Gelau (CG) reminded the meeting that the primary aim of the report was to identify such challenges but not, necessarily, to solve them.

Concerning the suggested timescale for periodically re-visiting the ESoP, it was pointed out that the vehicle industry model timescale was around 5 years but that Nomadic Device (ND) manufacturers operated at less than one year. The formula “at least every three years” was thus considered a reasonable solution.

3.3 Vehicle categories

It was suggested that the second recommendation could be better worded by separating the motorcycle point (motorcycles being excluded from the ESoP) from the bus/coach point (these being included within the ESoP).

Stig Franzen noted that the expected timescale for the European Bus System of the Future (corrected title) was 2011 rather than 2010.

3.4 Verification and criteria

This is a key area that generated much discussion. The different perspectives of the automotive industry, the PND/ND industry and Traffic Safety authorities were again described.

Most discussion concerned Member States (MS) and the main point that needed to be stressed in the report was that national interpretations/criteria should be discouraged in favour of European solutions. It was pointed out that MS initiated the work of this group and would be reported to through the eSafety Forum, so some advice to them would be expected within the report.

The possibility of combining the last three recommendations of the section was discussed but, as the aspirations of different Stakeholder groups were so diverse, no “umbrella” recommendation could easily be formulated.

3.5 Safe fixing

After lunch Christhard Gelau (CG) assumed the Chair.

Discussion centred around the five options for safe fixing outlined by the Nomadic Devices group. It was clarified that the second option should refer to mounting

position rather than mounting instructions (which was considered too general). It was noted that option 5 (Navifix) is the “best” solution (minimising user fixing error, removing loose cables and allowing vehicle-specific elements) but required the longest timescale.

3.6 Manipulation and misuse

There were no substantial comments made on this section.

3.7 International harmonisation

There were no substantial comments made on this section.

3.8 Driver training

It was suggested that here might be an opportunity to re-enforce previous recommendations from the WG-HMI that Member States should strive to increase driver awareness of HMI issues and the consequences of excessive distraction.

4 Overall conclusions

There was discussion of what a “light update” would involve. WH clarified that the EC or MS were unlikely to sanction an update unless there were matters of substance involved; editorial issues would, of course, be included. Thus the suggestion was made that the recommendation concerning “light update” could be re-formulated to say that an update including matters of substance could be undertaken.

There remained the issue of what “short-term” and “longer-term” could mean and that this would also depend on the resources available for any update.

Next actions and meeting close

Meeting notes should be available within one week.

CG outlined a proposed future timetable as follows:

- Additional written comments by 16 September
- Revised draft from co-Chairs distributed by 25 September
- Comments on final draft by 2 October
- Document finalised to eSafety Steering Group by 9 October
- Presented at eSafety Forum 29 October

This was accepted by the group. WH explained that a meeting with MS is to be arranged by the Commission at the end of November/early December and future actions would depend on the view of the Member States.

There being no further planned meetings, CG closed the meeting by thanking the EC as meeting host and all the participants. WH also initiated a round of applause for the co-Chairs.