

5th eSafety Observers European Meeting

BRISA - Auto-estradas de Portugal S.A.

Quinta da Torre da Aguilha

Edifício Brisa

2785-599 São Domingos de Rana

Lisbon, Portugal

Thursday, 06 December 2007, 09:00 - 18:00

Friday, 07 December 2007, 09:00 - 14:00

Minutes

Day 1 - Thursday, 06 December

1. Opening Remarks - Welcome address to the Observers Meeting

Rui Camolino (BRISA) welcomed the participants to the meeting and for being present at BRISA. BRISA is today the largest motorway operator in Portugal, with a concession of 11 motorways and is a reference in the sector at the European level.

André Vits (European Commission, DG INFSO) briefed the Observers about the latest eSafety developments, including the various reports from eSafety Forum Working Groups and the new proposals on cooperative systems.

Vincent Blervaque (eSafety Support) thanked BRISA, the European Commission and eSafety Support for the organisation of this event.

2. High Level Remarks

Paulo Marques Augusto (Portuguese National Authority for Road Safety) gave an update on road safety in Portugal, noting that Portugal has made a lot of progress over the last 10 years in reducing road fatalities. In 1996 Portugal had the highest number of fatalities in the EU.

The Portuguese National Authority for Road Safety bases its work in three pillars: on infrastructure (extension of the motor way network and attention to road black spots), vehicles (new legal measures coming into force) and human behaviour (application of new rules such as the payment of traffic fines on the spot).

3. Session I - RTTI, Chair: Francisco Ferreira, European Commission

Alessandro Carrotta (eSafety Support) presented a status report of implementation of RTTI based on the questionnaires replied by the Observers present at the meeting.

Pierre Lereboullet (LOGMA SA) was of the opinion that the status report should include more specific levels to see what the implementation at local level is.

Fritz Bolte (BAST) was also of the opinion that this was a good exercise but a more detailed description is needed. For example:

- a description of the type of networks included,
 - quality level of traffic monitoring
 - accessibility of information (unencrypted or encrypted messages)
 - range of message contents (danger warnings, indication of delays, route recommendations,)
 - Description of Media for message dissemination (e.g. some 45–radio programmes - mainly public radio stations - for dissemination of unencrypted RDS-TMC messages, some 5-8 private radio programmes with encrypted RDS-TMC messages, ...
-
- Receiver units per country

Fritz Bolte (BAST) added (18/02/2008) a more comprehensive chapter on RTTI in order to give a better overview about the actual situation in Germany.

Real Time Traffic information (RTTI)

1. Free accessibility of safety-relevant Real Time Traffic Information

The importance of traffic information has been discussed in the frame of the eSafety Initiative and the recommendations given there. It is important to note that Real Time Traffic Information (RTTI) contributes heavily to traffic safety. In addition, road authorities consider RTTI as a valuable tool to achieve their own transport policy mandates such as enabling mobility of people and goods, accessibility of cities and regions, mitigation of environmental impacts of traffic etc. Traffic engineering has reached a considerable state of the art in many European countries, in conurbations and rural areas.

Traffic information is distributed by different means of communication such as traffic broadcast on analogue and digital channels, GSM channels and, of course, print media and television. Road authorities have installed a number of traffic management systems especially in urban areas and in rural areas with “traffic hot spots”. However, due to economic restrictions, it is not possible to cover all

major roads with dynamic traffic management systems. Therefore, the use of wireless communication media as mentioned above is a valuable complement to these other dedicated traffic management systems.

Traffic broadcasts on different media exceed the possibility of stationary dynamic installations in terms of availability, accessibility and flexibility. With variable message signs and variable direction signs only a limited amount of information items can be displayed to the driver on places where they are installed; principally wireless communication media do not need road side installations to communicate with drivers. (This, however, does not exclude to the necessity of installing sufficient and suitable traffic and environmental monitoring systems to gather up-to-date information and data).

In order to reach as many drivers concerned as possible it is necessary to enable access without “barriers”. “Barriers” might be

- encrypted information accessible only by subscription
- language barriers
- price barriers for the installation of suitable receivers in cars
- inability to use in-vehicle-receivers all over Europe.

In the past a number of traffic information services have been developed and operate on the market. Some of them distribute information “free of charge”, others distribute encrypted messages which are only accessible to subscribers which have either paid an “entrance fee” when purchasing their receiver systems, or others with annual fees or fees per message.

In principal, in all cases traffic messages as an output is paid by someone: by the state as a basic service to the citizens or by the citizens as a personal service.

Traffic information serve as tool to achieve traffic safety and to improve traffic flow and therefore should be offered free of charge to the end user as stated by the eSafety Conference of June 5-6, 2007. In some countries, a definition of safety relevance of information has already been agreed on by national platforms (e.g. Germany). Following the requests of the eSafety Conference that safety relevant information should be free of charge all over Europe, some international discussion is needed to identify which type of traffic information - at least - should be available free of charge all over Europe. This does not mean that other information should not be available free of charge but a minimum amount of safety relevant information should be identified all over Europe.

In recent lively discussions on international platforms between road authorities, commercial service providers, broadcasters and other stakeholders, the question of accessibility free of charge was tackled. Not all participants in these discussions have signalled their consensus; especially commercial providers feared that they would lose their revenues if this request was realised. However, this recommendation does not address commercial service providers, but member states and especially national road authorities which, in their turn, have to consider how they can provide safety relevant information to their citizens.

Commercial service providers might support this in different ways such as acting as content providers to public authorities (as paid services to the road authorities) or by distributing safety relevant information unencrypted and accessible to everyone, with re-compensation from public authorities. Other and more detailed private public partnership models need to be developed taking into account the contribution of each stakeholder in the information chain.

It is proposed to discuss the definition of safety relevance of traffic information in order to strive for consensus on a European level. In this discussion, the general mandates and objectives of transport policy should be taken into account; the value of synergy effects of conventional traffic management and freely accessible traffic information over different channels need be considered.

2. Language Barriers

As a result of increasing integration of Europe, the production of services and industrial goods is more and more distributed all over Europe. One of consequences is increasing cross border traffic of people and goods. This means that people with different mother languages are on the roads and possibly not understanding the language of the country where they are driving in. In order to enable access to traffic information to these drivers, it is necessary to use digitally encoded traffic information which can be decoded in the receivers in the desired language of the driver. Since ten years now, encoded traffic information has been distributed via RDS-TMC that traffic message channel of the Radio Data System. The deployment of RDS-TMC transmission various all over Europe; some countries have a full coverage of RDS-TMC services and others are still in the implementation face. It is a question of European dimension that RDS-TMC services should be available all over Europe. It can be foreseen that in the future other digital transmission channels such digital audio broad casting will be available; however, at least for the next decade, RDS-TMC is still needed.

3. The Roadmap towards the European deployment of RTTI

The Roadmap towards the European deployment of RTTI has been discussed at the eSafety RTTI Working Group. Based on their work, it was further discussed at the political level at the eSafety Conference in Berlin in June 2007. At this conference, the following needs were identified concerning the availability of services, user requirements, technological development, universal coverage, and universal accessibility:

1. Further improvement of quality and coverage;
2. Coverage not only of the main roads, but also of sizeable sections of the secondary network;
3. Digital data transmission of sufficient capacity by RDS-TMC and for secondary networks DAB and DRM, in order to facilitate automatic processing;



4. Safety related traffic information free of charge. The minimum scope of safety-related traffic information should be defined on a Europe-wide basis;
5. Commercial information services, catering to the individual needs of customers;
6. Legislation and arrangements by EU Member States for the free provision of safety-related traffic information within the framework of public-private partnerships;
7. Initiative and support by the EU member States for the allocation of reliable V2V and V2I radio frequencies;
8. Public-private partnerships for the exploitation of new information channels like vehicle generated data and data from congestion reporters and emergency calls, both for collective traffic management (by public providers) and individual services (by commercial providers).

A list of actions for all stakeholders results from these conclusions. National Road Authorities, from their mandate to enable mobility of people and goods and in acknowledgement of other actors' interests, should take the leadership. The motivation for National Road Authorities to be or to get involved are their transport policy mandates and the perspective to use the new ITS Technologies for better achieving their goals.

Pavel Prybil (ELTODO EG) reported that the Czech Republic has built a national TTI centre, but there is need for more complete information chain. Complete coverage exists in Czech Republic but the information volume is limited. The infrastructure is being built and soon more services will be available.

Antti Rainio inquired what kind of information the present countries have: do they have raw data on travel times? And can they obtain information about problems on the roads?

Paul Potters (ITS Netherlands) added that it is also needed to generate predictions not only obtain the traffic data.

Fritz Bolte (BAST) also mentioned that future planning, availability of internet support, and dissemination media are quite important. In order to work towards the requested joint European Implementation road map for improved and consistent RTTI in Europe, the intention of national actors and their way of co-operation should be questioned.

Pierre Lereboullet suggested discussing the content of the information. In his opinion the information is sometimes very poor, there is sometimes large coverage but the quality may not be good.

Antti Rainio inquired whose role is it to produce the data from the different countries. The information is often outdated. The Finnish road authorities are in a better position to give this kind of information. It should be defined how it should be done, who collects and who publishes it so that everyone can access the information.

Martin Boehm (Austria Tech) mentioned that the quality of the data is indeed important in order to know how sharp the time is, the positioning and how much time is needed to inform the driver (quality of distribution and content).

Paul Potters suggested coming up with better indicators and redo the questionnaire.

Francisco Ferreira mentioned the Berlin Conference conclusions and how these give a picture that allows seeing what the situation is in Europe. The remaining open issues are a good basis for collection of suggestions.

Pavel Prybil mentioned that the Czech Republic has a problem with electronic collection. They would like to standardize the process between travel information system and fee collection system.

Antti Rainio mentioned that there is need to have indicators and a harmonized way of collecting information. The impacts of real time traffic information should be evaluated. In order to raise awareness we need information at the European level. In addition focus should be put on multimodal services. In the future, navigation services should be able to offer to the users not only car navigation information but different information on how to get to a place and the time taken. Another issue is to have standard electronic vehicle identification which will permit the collection of data by the infrastructure.

Fritz Bolte raised the attention to the results and conclusions of the eSafety Conference in Berlin in June 2007. There should be a coordinated action to get consistent information all over Europe. Use the conclusions of the Berlin Conference as basis for further considerations to see what should be done. The open issues could then be fed to the eSafety WGs, CEDR, etc. (The conclusions are added to the minutes.)

Francisco Ferreira asked the new member states what was the situation of RTTI.

Alex Avgoustis (Ministry of Communications & Works Public Works Department) reported that Cyprus has just started an ITS plan looking for example on RTTI. The government is unsure of which way to go. Should they cooperate with the private sector? The government wants the information to be free for the user.

Dorin Dumistrescu (ITS Romania) reported that Romania wants to tackle the poor infrastructure. In terms of RTTI the government wants to analyse how to disseminate information to users. In a first phase it's important to send safety related information using these means.

Agnes Lindenbach (ITS Hungary Association) reported that Hungary has published a comprehensive Green Book and one of the priorities in its development is the travel information system. There is institutional background and support to this (Green Book, ITS strategy produced by the Connect project). In addition several EASYWAY several projects are in plan.

Robert Rijavec (University of Ljubljana, FGG-PTI) reported that Slovenia would like to conduct a campaign about real time travel information systems. The users are convinced very fast and the making of the business model is important. This is the first step for an architecture for such a system.

The observers concluded that:

- More common criteria are needed for the evaluation of implementation (state-of-the-art and further plans) of RTTI in all European countries.
- National activities on RTTI should be reported to eSafety Support highlighting the progress.
- Observers should elaborate a set of indicators on RTTI implementation.

4. Session II - Deployment, Chair: Francisco Ferreira, European Commission

Francisco Ferreira gave an introduction to the topic. The EC has been producing a lot of results in terms of R&D for eSafety Systems however the European Commission still has difficulty in seeing the systems deployed. The IRM WG has looked at these issues and has recently organised in cooperation with eSafety Support a Workshop on eSafety Deployment. The most recent European Commission Communication (adopted in September 2007 also approached aspects related to deployment. There was a set of actions related to eCall, ESC. The European Commission has also looked at cooperative systems, incentives and legislation.

Paul Potters remarked that creativity may be missing in combining different incentives. For example during the eSafety Deployment Workshop the SRA gave a presentation that underlined this need.

Fritz Bolte reported that the IRM WG discussed with the industry this issue and that the industry has said that it's up to the public administration to handle these



incentives. A major obstacle for better market penetration of ITS is the yet unsatisfactory integration of functionalities of systems. Example: GPS, electronic road maps, Wheel sensors etc. onboard the vehicles are used for a multitude of ITS applications. As long as the individual applications are considered / offered separately they will be very expensive. As soon as integrated solutions on standard platforms are offered they will certainly become cheaper. (Example: standardised communication platforms serving RDS-TMC, DAB/Tpe, GPS, GPRS, ...and connecting their data to individual ITS applications on standardised CPU platforms with standardise operating systems). In addition all partners should contribute to provide incentives, taking into account the gainings for their own businesses and interests. Another major point is that a full implementation should not be required before the individual car can make use of it: suitable and economically feasible business models and migration strategies for stepwise Implementation of systems are needed.

Antti Rainio added that Finland has realized that insurance companies have potential in this, and they should be asked: what kind of info they need regarding impact, so that they can shape their new products? Insurance companies may be interested in giving higher incentives but they need the data to evaluate impact.

Fritz Bolte was of the opinion that focus should be put on the systems that are most promising in terms of impacting the reduction of number of fatalities and then analyse which actor should act on each of the individual systems.

The discussion then continued on how awareness can play a role in deployment.

Antti Rainio reported that ITS Finland is cooperating with associations that produce materials for driving schools since this kind of material is lacking. Another tool could be to have neutral information on eSafety applications (eg Wikipedia).

Francisco Sanchez reported that the ChooseESC! campaign has had good results in targeting the decision makers and users. The events organised in Spain were successful. He added that it is Important that all stakeholders give the same message about the same system.

André Vits added that ChooseESC! campaign seems to be very powerful by having started with a pan-European event which has been replicated at national level.

Paul Potters suggested replicating the eSafety Forum at national level.

Fritz Bolte was of the opinion that the users should be more included in the events, campaigns that are being organised, e.g. the motor clubs have great potential to disseminate knowledge of systems among the users.

The Observers concluded that:

- All stakeholders should see their own possibilities to support the implementation of ITS.
- Joint “Round Tables” with all relevant stakeholders are needed to create a “Common shared vision” of Traffic and Mobility Management of the Future (e.g. 2015)
- These Round Tables are needed on European, national and local levels with different tasks.
- All stakeholders concerned should provide more incentives for the use of eSafety Systems.
- Current awareness campaigns like ChooseESC! are valuable towards the increase of awareness.

5. Presentation by Tiago Dias - Brisa, Centre for Operations’ Coordination

Day 2 - Friday, 07 December

6. Session III - Intelligent Infrastructure, Chair: Francisco Ferreira, European Commission

Francisco Ferreira gave an introduction to the topic. He suggested looking at the eSafety priority systems that were identified by the IRM WG. And see what is needed from the infrastructure to have these systems deployed and turn the infrastructure to become intelligent.

Fritz Bolte pointed out that a number of systems are based on infrastructure the availability of which cannot generally be guaranteed by Road authorities. (Example: up-to-date and certified data bases of static, temporary and dynamic road signalisation, high quality of road markings, etc.). This issue has been raised very often, but some stakeholders tend to ignore this. They should take care of imminent legal implications and study how these problems can be solved and which improvements are needed before some systems become operational.

Antti Rainio suggested looking at what else exists, other than intelligent infrastructure. The services could be separated: services are not the infrastructure.

Francisco Sanchez mentioned that it could be interesting to ask what are the objectives we want to achieve in intelligent infrastructure (such safety, efficiency, mobility).

Dorin Dumitrescu added that intelligent infrastructure could have two different meanings intelligent roads (roads and ICT infrastructure) or intelligent infrastructure with an ITS component supplementary for services. From the operational point of view the first meaning is more useful to promote ICT infrastructure.

Henrique Machado Jorge (CRP - Portuguese Road Centre) said that he didn't like the term "intelligent infrastructure" in itself and added that a business case is needed. The only available business case comes from the infrastructure's point of view. Many operators are not keen to invest anymore. Another area to work on could be for example to look at the services and think also of performance indicators.

Rui Camolino explained that operators usually have a contract with the state, to which they have obligations e.g. data gathering and provide some information to the users (minimum information on circulation) but this is changing as there is competition in the motorway environment and mobility. The competition between operators is resulting in provision of new services. So the infrastructure has to invest and give more services in comparison to other operators. If the operator wants to have more clients it should differentiate itself.

Francisco Ferreira asked the Observers: What should be considered as infrastructure?

Vincent Blervaque replied that what stakeholders want to achieve is technology operability and identify a minimum set of requirements to be applied at the EU level. He doesn't see how it could be open to all the systems. A minimum set should be identified.

Martin Boehm was of the opinion that the main characteristic of the intelligent infrastructure is the possibility to collect data and share data with others. That is the difference between the current infrastructure and the intelligent infrastructure. Collect data, process data and share the data.

Fritz Bolte reminded that the IRM WG recommendations identified vehicle autonomous systems, systems needing roadside infrastructure and so-called co-operative systems. Some infrastructure and subsystems can be used for more than one application (s.a.).

Antti Rainio added that another aspect important to the infrastructure is the time needed to reach safety. A new approach may result that if more infrastructure has to be built or included in cars it may take decades.

The Observers concluded that:

- Infrastructure improvements are needed in order to deploy eSafety Systems.
- Performance indicators should be identified in order to evaluate the service provided by the infrastructure.

7. Future of eSafety Observers: Discussion on next steps

Alessandro Carrotta presented the obstacles encountered during 2006-2007 in the management of the Observers Group, these included:

Observatory:

- Difficulty in finding an observer for some particular member states.
- Sometimes, difficulty in finding replacements for Observers who leave.
- Difficulty in obtaining reports from Observers on eSafety national activities e.g. eSafety Implementation Survey organised by IRM WG.

Meetings:

- Sometimes, no cooperation in organisation of an eSafety event.
- Sometimes, no cooperation to participate and report on eSafety during an eSafety Observers Meeting (and no cooperation in finding a replacement).
- Sometimes, no cooperation in finding participants to attend eSafety Observers Regional Meetings (resulting in no contribution towards dissemination).

Francisco Sanchez was of the opinion that not only eSafety Support is obtaining information from the Observers, it is also a way for the Observers to get a better picture of what is happening in Europe. The eSafety Forum Plenary meetings give an overview of the Working Groups while at the Observers meetings a broader picture is given.

Francisco Ferreira explained that the eSafety Forum Plenary Meetings have given overviews from member states but usually it's more the industry who reports at these events since there is still reluctance of member states to report.

Paul Potters reported that in the Netherlands it is the ITS National Association who is responsible for obtaining information from national organisations. He then

suggested that eSafety Support could give presentations at the meetings of the ITS National Network.

Francisco Sanchez said that since the eSafety Regional Observers Meeting that took place in Spain in 2006 (co-hosted by CTAG), many developments have occurred. The Spanish eSafety Forum now exists because the observers group met in Spain and the main actors behind the launch of ITS Portugal were also present at that meeting. In addition for him it would not matter if it's an organisation or specific person reporting in the Observers Group. In any case he feels that the Group should be professionalised.

Henrique Machado Jorge was of the opinion that it should be organisations not persons reporting in the eSafety Observers Group in order to give a sense of continuity. In addition other models could be tried since the meetings may not have had much impact. The local partners should attend to contribute to their knowledge.

Francisco Sanchez suggested having another European Observers Meeting in a year's time but it would be productive to know from the beginning of the year what topics they have to report on. That way they have one year to prepare. In the case of the last questionnaires sent by eSafety Support, one month was not enough to obtain all the information. The questionnaires should also be more concrete in order to have data that permits to compare the status of the different member states.

Henrique Machado Jorge was of the opinion that the comparison between member states is not worth doing, maybe a comparison of trans-border situations could be more fruitful as it permits to look at the benefits and what actions might have to be taken.

Paul Potters also suggested that the Observers could help to prepare the questionnaires in a more concrete way which would permit an easier comparison between neighbour countries.

Martin Bohm found for example that the questionnaires required doing a lot of interpretation. In the end the information is needed to permit a comparison between countries.

Antti Rainio recommended that the Observers should develop clear indicators, to develop a process. Even if the observers group does not continue, the process of obtaining information is implemented. He also added that he was worried about the follow up of the Nordic countries as they seem to not be participating as much. Perhaps Finland could join the next Observers Regional Meeting in Tallinn.

Dorin Dumitrescu suggested making more visible the transfer of knowledge and vision from the eSafety Forum to the local level. In addition it should be taken into account that every expert has a lot of meetings to attend and perhaps organising a local major eSafety event could bring more stakeholders together.

Francisco Sanchez proposed preparing a catalogue of good practices for deployment which could be promoted in the member states and could include specific recommendations not only covering the three areas covered at the present meeting.

Paul Potters mentioned that the indicators for the 28 recommendations are constructive however there is need for national indicators.

The Observers concluded:

- eSafety Support to inform the Observers in the beginning of the year which topics will be covered at the annual European Observers Meeting.
- The questionnaires sent to the Observers should be more concrete in order to allow comparisons between Member States.
- Clear indicators should be included in the above-mentioned questionnaires.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 13:00.

5th eSafety Observers European Meeting

BRISA - Auto-estradas de Portugal S.A.

Quinta da Torre da Aguilha

Edifício Brisa

2785-599 São Domingos de Rana

Lisbon, Portugal

Thursday, 06 December 2007, 09:00 - 18:00

Friday, 07 December 2007, 09:00 - 14:00

Final Agenda

Day 1 - Thursday, 06 December

- 8:30 - 9:00 Shuttle transfer from hotel to meeting venue
- 9:00 - 9:30 Registration and Coffee
- 9:30 - 9:40 **Opening Remarks**
Welcome address to the Observers Meeting
André Vits, European Commission
Vincent Blervaque, eSafety Support
Rui Camolino, BRISA
- 9:40 - 10:00 High Level Remarks
Paulo Marques Augusto, President of the National Authority for Road Safety
- Session I - RTTI**
Chair: *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission*
- 10.00 - 10.30 Introduction to the session - *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission*
RTTI Questionnaire Report - *Alessandro Carrotta, eSafety Support*
- 10.30 - 10.45 Coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00 Discussion with the eSafety Observers
- Mid-day break**
- 12:00 - 13:30 Lunch

**Session II - Deployment**Chairs: *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission**Vincent Blervaque, eSafety Support*

- 13.30 - 14.00 Introduction to the session - *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission*
Deployment Questionnaire Report- *Alessandro Carrotta, eSafety Support*
- 14.00 - 15.15 Discussion with the eSafety Observers
- 15.15 - 15.30 Coffee break

Technical Visit

- 15.30 - 18.00 Visit to the BRISA TMC

Social Event and dinner

- 18:00 - 19.30 Sightseeing at the coast
- 19.30 - 22.00 Dinner at Porto de Santa Maria
- 22.00 Transfer to the hotel

Day 2 - Friday, 07 December

- 8:30 - 9:00 Shuttle transfer from hotel to meeting venue

Session III - Intelligent Infrastructure (cooperative systems)Chairs: *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission**Vincent Blervaque, eSafety Support*

- 9.00 - 9.30 Introduction to the session - *Francisco Ferreira, European Commission*
Infrastructure Questionnaire Report - *Alessandro Carrotta, eSafety Support*
- 9.30 - 11.00 Discussion with the eSafety Observers
- 11.10 - 11.30 Coffee break

Conclusions

- 11.30 - 12.00 Wrap-up sessions
- 12.00 - 13.00 Future of eSafety Observers: Discussion on next steps
- 13.00 - 14.00 Lunch
- 14.00 Adjourn
- 14.15 Shuttle transfer from meeting venue to hotel

5th eSafety Observers European Meeting

BRISA - Auto-estradas de Portugal S.A.

Thursday, 06 December 2007, 09:00 - 18:00

Friday, 07 December 2007, 09:00 - 14:00

List of Participants

Last name	First name	Organisation	Country
Avgoustis	Alex	Ministry of Communications & Works Public Works Department	Cyprus
Blervaque	Vincent	eSafety Support	-
Böhm	Martin	Austria Tech	Austria
Bolte	Fritz	BAST	Germany
Camolino	Rui	BRISA	Portugal
Carrotta	Alessandro	eSafety Support	-
Cirilo Gimeno	Ramón	LISITT - University of Valencia	Spain
de Schaetzen	Magali	eSafety Support	-
Dumitrescu	Dorin	ITS Romania	Romania
Ferreira	Francisco	European Commission	-
Jacobs	René	Belgian Road Research Centre (BRRC)	Belgium
Lama	Aldis	Road Traffic Safety Directorate	Latvia
Lereboullet	Pierre	LOGMA SA	France
Lindenbach	Agnes	ITS Hungary Association	Hungary
Machado Jorge	H.	CRP - Portuguese Road Centre	Portugal
Marques Augusto	Paulo	Portuguese National Authority for Road Safety	Portugal
Morsink	Peter	SWOV	The Netherlands
Nemtanu	Florin	Politehnica University of Bucharest - Romanian eSafety Forum	Romania
Nigol	Margus	Stratum Ltd	Estonia
Potters	Paul	ITS Netherlands	The Netherlands
Pribyl	Pavel	ELTODO EG	Czech Republic
Rainio	Antti	ITS Finland	Finland
Rijavec	Robert	University of Ljubljana, FGG-PTI	Slovenia
Rodrigues	António	EP - Estradas de Portugal	Portugal
Sánchez	Francisco	CTAG	Spain
Silva	Irina	eSafety Support	-
Vits	André	European Commission	-

