Fifth *e*Safety Observers Regional Meeting

Connekt/ITS Netherlands

Kluyverweg 6, Delft, the Netherlands

Thursday, 31 May 2007 10:00 – 17:30
Friday, 1 June 2007 09:00 – 15:45

Meeting Minutes

31 May

Welcome & Introduction

Mr Paul Potters of Connekt/ITS Netherlands welcomed everyone to the meeting, which was organised on behalf of the Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management. It included the programme of presentations and information exchange, as well as two technical visits at the Dutch Test Centre for Traffic Systems and the 112 geo-referenced PSAP central at Rotterdam Harbour.

Mr Alessandro Carrotta of eSafety Support thanked everyone for coming and gave a special thank you to Connekt for its meeting organisation. He gave a brief explanation of the programme and explained the role of eSafety Support in providing follow-up and support for eSafety related meetings.

Mr Carotta also explained the role of the eSafety Observers, which is to keep track of national-level eSafety activities regarding technology and implementation. In 2006, Observers meetings took place at the regional level throughout Europe to involve national stakeholders in order to improve the information flow about eSafety activities.

1. Strategic overview of the eSafety initiative - Mr Francisco Ferreira, European Commission DG INFSO

In his presentation, Mr Francisco Ferreira of the European Commission provided a strategic overview of the eSafety initiative. He highlighted the latest news about eSafety and gave an overview of the Intelligent Car Initiative. He updated participants about the eCall and eCall MoU, and gave details about the proposals received in the first FP7 call. Mr Ferreira stressed the SME participation in FP7 and noted the changes in the cooperation programme. The idea is to get more SMEs to participate. Mr Ferreira also spoke about the need for further actions regarding awareness and dissemination, as well as the CIP Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme that runs in parallel with FP7.

Q&A

Mr Carrotta thanked Mr Ferreira and asked him to clarify what the lead markets were.

Mr Ferreira noted that the EC is looking for a study on lead markets, which are not commonly used in the EU. There is a need to see how lead markets can be used to push deployment, for example at the regional level. There is also the need to explore which domains could be used and supported through this mechanism. Often, the best technology does not have success, so ways to improve this must be examined.

Mr Gifford noted that from a UK perspective as a consumer, eCall is useful, especially when travelling in a rural foreign area. He asked whether the target date of deployment, September 2010, would have an effect on future fatality rates. Mr Ferreira replied that the future impact studies have already been done, with the 2010 target expected if deployment is realised. However, this target is temporary, because the real goal is zero fatalities, and activities won't stop in 2010 because the work is continuous. He pointed out studies which show that eCall reduces rescue times by 40%, which is important for the "Golden Hour" following an accident to treat and diminish injuries.

Mr Jan Malenstein (KLPD) referred to 2 Finnish eCall studies as well as a Cezch study which had significant results. He praised eCall's positive effects, including its effects on economic costs of accidents. Mr Ferreira noted that eCall is also very useful in urban areas. He encouraged the public sector to get involved and support new ways for improving deployment. He added that an expert meeting focusing on eCall will be organised in July.

2. eSafety priorities - Alessandro Carrotta, eSafety Support

In his presentation, Mr Carrotta discussed the latest developments of the eSafety Forum and its Working Groups. He gave examples of the objectives, activities and recommendations of each Group. He highlighted the recent activities of the eSafetyAware! communication platform as well as the eSafety accomplishments in 2006 and to date.

Q&A

Mr Ferreira noted that the RTD Working Group helps the EC to establish priorities.

Mr Cees de Wijs (LogicaCMG) stated that as Chairman of the ITS Netherlands Strategy Board and member of the ERTICO – ITS Europe Strategy Committee, the goal of the ITS community is to focus on climate change and the environment. The potential of ITS must look beyond the car, which in itself is too often the focus of discussion.

Mr Carrotta agreed with this statement, noting that the emphasis should not just centre on the car, but also on mobility.

Mr Ferreira interjected and stated that "car" is understood as mobility and there are limitations of ICT. The EC is addressing all areas, with the different DGs focusing on different areas (i.e DG Environment on environmental solutions, DG Enterprise on engine solutions, DG Information Society & Media on ICT solutions). The eSafety Forum Working Group on ICT for Clean Mobility has now started its work, and Mr Ferreira welcomed the participation and ideas in this WG.

Mr Carrotta pointed out that in the list of the eSafety priority systems, less than half of them are just car-based – and they also consider the infrastructure. Cooperative systems put everyone around the table, not just the industry.

Mr Malenstein referred to an article from the Dutch consumer association which gave an overview of cars with ESC, compared to cars exported to the developing countries. There is a big discrepancy, and this should also be addressed.

Mr Carrotta explained that he attended the ESC launch event in May in Rome, where it was shown that an ESC system costs 400-500 euros to install. This cost cannot influence the final price of a car in developed markets, but it still represents an important percentage of the price of car sold in developing countries. In this case, infrastructure is really the key issue in the developing world.

Mr Gifford noted that infrastructure should be compatible with the vehicles, which are most often bicycles, not Mercedes-Benzes!

Mr Ferreira noted that this was an important observation, and had participated in a conference in Australia addressing this issue. It is really a market problem, as the market must convince the users to buy. Car makers avoid putting ESC as standard, it is not just an issue of the developing countries! He stressed that the current ESC campaign is useful, especially if the US makes ESC mandatory.

Mr Gifford pointed out that ESC is useful in situations when a car pulls out, as illustrated in the Bosch video. Consumers are also concerned with children, bicyclists in the road. Car makers should be careful that ESC is used as a system for safety, not just performance!

Mr Ferreira remarked that these systems should not make the driver too confident! Awareness is extremely important. He noted that after ESC, eCall will be the next eSafetyAware! campaign. He also referred to figures showing that congestion costs the EU 2.1% of its GDP, and anything that is done to address congestion will have an environmental impact. We can indirectly gain from this, and the EC aims to work more in this area.

3. National Observers report on the eSafety Status: The Netherlands - Paul Potters, Connekt/ITS Netherlands

In his presentation, Mr Potters described the organisation of Connekt/ITS Netherlands, as well as the bottlenecks the Netherlands faces in terms of mobility. He outlined the Dutch safety policy and national traffic/transport plan. He noted his wish that eCall could be involved in all R&D projects in the Netherlands. He also gave more information about eCall efforts in the Netherlands, and its mission to

include it in hazardous goods transport for all sectors (truck/train/boat). In the Netherlands, all eCalls made from GSMs are centred in one place.

Q&A

Mr Malenstein noted that there is a 74% abuse to 112 for calls not requiring assistance.

Mr Ferreira asked if any progress had been made regarding the signing of the eCall MoU. Mr Potters replied that Ministries of Transport and Interior do not know who will sign, and Mr Ferreira remarked that often the issue is finding the "right person" to sign.

Mr Gifford asked if a pilot project on airbags in the car structure was planned or set to be launched. He noted that currently in the UK, the fire service must go to accident scenes because of precarious situations with air bags.

Mr Malenstein noted that FOCWA wants a standardised database of cars on Dutch roads, to help identify cars and allow the emergency services to use the VIN. He explained that Dutch PSAPs wanted to include the model year in the eCall MSD. The VIN can include this, but 40% of all VIN are withheld by the industry. The industry should address this!

Mr Bagislayici said that there is an ongoing pilot in which the supplier of data is given to the fire department. It is a Dutch solution using Dutch VIN, but it is not yet ready for the European level.

Mr Ferriera asked how hazardous goods are dealt within the eCall. Mr Malenstein replied that there are no fixed ideas and that in the pilot for hazardous goods, the MSD has been split. There is a need to expand the MSD for hazardous goods messages. He added that eCall will be present in all vehicles, so there is use potential! Mr Ferreira called on the need for standards.

Mr Potters remarked that this should also apply to other modes of transport and the Dutch want to expand this to all mobility areas.

Mr Morsink referred to an ISA pilot project in Noord-Brabant which took place in a school environment. There is a need for good digital maps with speed limits. Mr Ferreira pointed out that this could be a lead market.

Mr Carrotta encouraged everyone to share their info about best practices and pilots. He asked whether anything had been done regarding user awareness at the ministerial level. Mr Potters replied that not much had been done yet for eCall, but the ANWB (Royal Dutch Touring Club) had featured it in its magazine.

4. National Observers report on the eSafety Status: United Kingdom - Neal Skelton, ITS UK, United Kingdom

In his presentation, Mr Skelton provided a background of the UK road environment, including statistics. He explained that the car is the predominant mode of transport. He spoke about the role of ITS in the UK, driver issues surrounding ITS and an ESC study.

Q&A

Mr Potters noted that the national TIC in the Netherlands is public, but in the UK it is a public/private partnership and inquired about the role of the service providers in the UK. Mr Skelton explained that the authorities recognised their limitations to fully invest in such a service, and the private sector had been ready to make a commitment. It has been a successful model for the last 10 years.

Mr Skelton also mentioned that the difficulty is to ensure a transparent relationship as well as ensure that the end product is a good one.

Mr Gifford noted that using the hard shoulder between junctions has helped journey times, reduced crashes, speeds as well as emissions. Mr Potters pointed out that the use of the hard shoulder started because of CO2 emissions, but has also had an effect on safety.

Mr Morsink inquired whether the report on ESC would be published soon. Mr Skelton noted that the DfT will issue the public report. Mr Gifford informed that all DfT research reports are available on the DfT website, www.dft.gov.uk.

Mr Morsink added that since the UK and the Netherlands have similar statistics, it is easier for them to learn from the UK.

Mr Malenstein asked about eCall and the blue wave pilots. Mr Skelton replied that he knew of the Sussex Police's involvement in this, but had no other comments.

Mr Carrotta asked whether the data collection in the UK included any FCD. Mr Skelton replied that there is sophisticated traffic data in urban traffic management.

Mr Gifford commented that many studies have different cut-off points defining congestion.

Mr Carrotta asked if there were any best practices to share regarding freight transport.

Mr Potters replied that the Netherlands have WIM and other active systems. Mr Skelton referred to the UK SUSFR8 project which uses ITS technology to time freight deliveries by assigning them certain delivery windows.

5. Stakeholders presentations on national and ongoing activities - "PACTS activities", Robert Gifford, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety, UK

Mr Gifford noted that Sweden and the Netherlands are ahead of the UK in addressing road casualties. In the UK, deaths have dropped but injuries have not. The ETSC is running analyses of Member States based on 2010 targets, and the UK analysis was scheduled to be published 14 June.

Mr Gifford added that there is no room for complacency. He explained that PACTS is a small, non-profit association established 25 years ago with the aim of

protecting lives through road safety measures. It originally focused on seat belt use, and now has looked at research-based solutions using technology. PACTS gives independent advice to policymakers, and concentrates on 2 topics related to ITS:
1. policing road risk: how technology can help police, linking informational issues such as databases and also the use of alcolocks, seat belt interlocks and black boxes. A report is available on the PACTS website.
2. October 2007 analysis of post-2020 for reduction of casualties: Mr Gifford stressed that the UK government can do more, and should be informed that technology has a role to play. However, vehicles are complex and how people cope with this is an issue.

Q&A

Mr Malenstein referred to the PEPPER project, and asked how in-car systems can substitute for active enforcement. He suggested that it would be interesting for public authorities to look into this. He also noted that the occurrence of drunk driving is rising in every Member State, and that alcolocks could be a potential eSafety solution.

Mr Skelton added that the UK looked into driving while under the influence of drugs, and statistics show increases among young males ages 17-24 years that could suggest a lack of education on this issue. Mr Malenstein noted that the ESTHER project launched a FOT with real drivers that tested roadside equipment for drugs use. The results will be available in 2 years.

Mr Gifford noted that from 1997-2007, there was a 25% increase in DWI accidents in the UK. He asked whether we skipped a generation in educating about the risks of DWI, as there is a gap in road safety education in the UK. He also noted that there needs to be a balance between restriction and mobility, and asked how eSafety could help.

Mr Carrotta stated that eSafety is also looking at the education of young drivers and training activities at driving schools. The benefits of the eSafety technology are being studies, such as in the Safety TechnoPro project.

Mr de Wijs inquired whether there were any statistics or evidence on road charging and accidents. Mr Gifford said that a Transport for London analysis looked at this after road charging was introduced in central London, and there has been no increase in vulnerable road user injuries (more information on TfL website). The downside of the road charging has been the increase in cycling injuries/fatalities.

Mr Bagislayici inquired about the results of Norwich Union's black box pilot for its members. Mr Skelton said that there were as yet no results, but it has been a success. Mr Gifford added that the pilot was targeted at low-mileage drivers and the black box was activated when the emission was turned on. The monthly bill is itemised and lists the time/day. It's geared at drivers who travel less than 11,000 km, as higher mileage drivers will have more accidents. Mr Gifford noted that Norwich Union claims that it has reduced accidents among (a self-selected sample) users.

Mr Skelton advised to consult the VERONICA project's final report. The project used black boxes for a broad range of participants. The follow-up VERONICA2

project will look at taking the recommendations forward. Mr Malenstein added that VERONICA found that barriers are legal/institutional/policy-related.

Mr Gifford noted that the insurance industry has an interest in road safety.

Mr Morsink noted that a pilot project involving a "pay as you drive" scheme in the Netherlands was trying to be extended to small vans. This could be a business model, starting with high-risk groups.

Mr Carrotta noted that Europe is fragmented and issues such as privacy and liability are barriers to deployment. He added that enforcement measures are not high-priority for eSafety, reminding that the black box is not one of its 11 priority systems.

Mr Gifford stated that many of the eSafety systems are only available in high-end cars which are not used by young drivers. Questioning the long-term reliability of these systems, he noted that the car fleet renews itself every 10 years. He asked whether eSafety considers those (older) systems already installed in used cars.

Mr Carrotta answered that the aim of the eSafety efforts are to open the availability of these systems to all types of cars, thus reducing the global number of fatalities - not only those of the high-end car users. He mentioned that cooperative systems can give better results when all vehicles can benefit from V2V2 and V2I interactions.

Mr Ferreira noted that the eSafety Forum discusses that the vehicle market is global and fragmented. It is difficult to impose things on it.

Mr Malenstein stated that telematics equipment and cars have different lifecycles, and the discussion will continue. Mr Ferreira pointed out that infrastructure also has a different lifecycle and everything is difficult to combine.

Mr Skelton noted that until a system is needed in a given circumstance, it is difficult to know whether it works. Maintenance is also very important, and plug and play systems could be used as diagnostic tools.

1 June

1. Stakeholders presentations on national and ongoing activities - "ITS activities of Traffic Wales", Oliver Jarvis, Traffic Wales, UK

In his presentation, Mr Jarvis introduced Traffic Wales and its activities, explained how they are carried out, as well as discussed what Traffic Wales is doing to contribute to road safety.

Q&A

Ms van der Waard asked if Wales uses the motorists' info as floating car data. Mr Jarvis said it is used only for incidents or accidents. Mr Skelton added that information from motorists' calls is also used.

Mr Jarvis pointed out that Wales uses a free-of-charge traffic information SMS. It also has links to other websites for multimodal information.

Mr Malenstein asked whether Wales has any agreements for incident management. Mr Jarvis said that procedures are set for this.

2. Stakeholders presentations on national and ongoing activities - "Exploring eCall potentials", Jan Malenstein, KLPD

In his presentation, Mr Malenstein touched on the open discussion points around eCall and the bottlenecks for deployment – such as the need for a 100% fully operational system from day 1. He also offered suggestions for the future development of eCall and the Netherlands' foreseen FOT.

Q&A

Mr Jarvis asked if the Sussex eCall trial used public vehicles. Mr Malenstein noted that Sussex police cars were shown at the GST project demo event in February. He explained that the next steps are to look at the MSD and figure out how to send it to the national traffic management centre. In the Netherlands, it only has to be adapted for one centre.

Mr Skleton inquired whether the response times included delayed deployment of the vehicles. eCall can simplify the process and ensure that the "right" i.e first police, then fire service is sent.

Mr Malenstein noted that the eCall Driving Group PSAP Group worked out the functional requirements and performance indicators of eCall. There is still a need to enhance the data quality. New solutions are also required to help the emergency vehicles on their way to an accident forewarn the vehicles using the same route.

Mr Skelton noted that since cars are quieter, it might be more difficult for occupants to know that sirens are running.

Ms van der Waard asked what the VMS response time was. Mr Malenstein noted that GSM calls to 112 and the cooperation with the road operator and the police should undergo a cost benefit analysis. eCall could require less camera surveillance. Asking whether lots video screens really help, he noted that eCall could trigger a special camera. OJ agreed and stated that too many screens can create information overload.

Mr Malenstein announced that preparations have started for the adaptation of the 112 unit in the Netherlands.

Mr Haverkamp noted that emergency vehicles have been considered in a number of different projects. Namely, CVIS is looking at route guidance and the blue wave, while SAFESPOT is informing other users that a vehicle is approaching.

Mr Malenstein added that a standardised concept is desired.

3. Stakeholders presentations on national and ongoing activities - "eCall, only 100% counts", Marcel Konijn, LogicaCMG

In his presentation, Mr Konijn spoke about the Dutch vision concerning eCall, and gave an update on eCall progress in the Netherlands. He also highlighted experiences with early field tests at different types of intersections. He wrapped up the presentation with recommendations on what should be done next.

Q&A

Mr Potters asked if the ADAC field tests were available, noting that it would be interesting to exchange FOT results. Mr Konijn noted that all Member States should carry out independent FOTs.

Mr Malenstein reminded everyone of the fact that eCall does establish voice connection and a risk analysis is necessary.

Mr Carrotta reminded that aiming for 100% eCall effectiveness in all the situations is realistically impossible, without first learning from the actual test results. The trade-off is the race against time, but more time should be spent on implementation.

Mr Konijn noted that eCall implementation requires more than a 99% success rate, and Mr Malenstein interjected that the one occasion that eCall fails will be more than scrutinised by the press, among others.

Mr Carrotta referred to the ADAC test that implemented a two button solution for emergency calls and request of assistance calls, and Mr Konijn mentioned that having two buttons could create differences among Member States.

Mr Carrotta then provided his concluding remarks and along with Mr Potters, thanked the Observers for the presentations and discussions.