



eSafety WG-HMI meeting : 2009/1
EC Commission, Building BU 33
Brussels, 28 January 2009

Introduction

This was the first 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 45 persons.

Background and Terms of Reference

Following brief introductions from each person present, Wolfgang Hoefs (EC) presented the background and recent history of the European Statement of Principles (ESoP) including the 30 September meeting with Member States which asked for the eSafety WG-HMI to form a view concerning update of the ESoP.

He noted also the ITS Action plan adopted in December 2008 which has amongst its 24 proposed actions “Development of a regulatory framework on a safe on-board human-machine-interface and the integration of nomadic devices, building on the European Statement of Principles ...”

The previously distributed Terms of Reference (draft 06.01.09) of the group were discussed. No specific changes to existing text were proposed but it was agreed that the objectives should specifically include three additional points concerning the desirability and practicality of including specific verification methods and criteria, identifying any outstanding issues of liability and considering the role of driver training.

Initial Statements and Discussion

In a free-flowing exchange, the meeting collected experiences with the current version of the ESoP and discussed issues of scope and content.

Some new technology, such as head-up displays and voice activated controls are currently excluded from the ESoP scope due to limited scientific knowledge and development experience. It was agreed that these could now be considered for inclusion but this depends on state-of-the-art development and care must be taken not to preclude innovation.

It was noted that motorcycles are currently excluded from the ESoP and questions are whether anything in the ESoP disadvantages motorcyclists (e.g. restrictions of

the field of view as a result of inappropriate positioning of in-vehicle displays), and whether the ESoP can and should be extended to include the two-wheeled vehicle category.

It was noted that the ESoP refers to dashboard fixing whereas many devices are now fixed to the windscreen. A round-table review of approaches and legislation concerning this issue in Member States revealed a diversity of approaches but there was consensus that a European approach should be sought. The EC may launch a study to report on MS legislation concerning Nomadic Devices during 2009. Several participants were also active in the Nomadic Devices eSafety Working Group where safe and secure fixing was a topic of study. The group is also working towards voluntary agreements to respect the ESoP so some stability in the ESoP was requested even if periodic updates are necessary.

A key issue to emerge was the need for verification procedures and clear pass/fail criteria. It was agreed that ideally this should be simple yet valid and reliable. Options discussed ranged from checklists and expert judgment to laboratory testing and tests with driving simulators. No consensus emerged concerning whether or how this might be achieved.

Misuse by drivers was briefly discussed. Examples provided included defeating interlocks to prevent TV while driving and downloading internet material not intended by system providers. Links to driver training and the Recommendations on Safe Use were also made.

Concerning international harmonization, the approaches of ESoP, the US Alliance and the Japanese JAMA were briefly presented. It was agreed that a unified approach should be sought, possibly through the eSafety International WG or the vehicle regulations group WP29's ITS working group of the UNECE.

Expert Teams and Next Actions

During the afternoon, a series of Expert Teams were established, each with a Champion. These Expert Teams were grouped around some thematic key areas identified as a result of the discussion during the morning session (see blue boxes in Annex 2, page 5). It was decided to start with work on these general issues and then focus on the different technical parts of the ESoP in a second step.

It is the objective of each Expert Team to review the current version of the ESoP under a certain aspect (e.g. scope) in-depth and identify needs for revision. It is important to note, that at this stage no concrete revisions are requested but that the Expert Teams should conclude if revisions are needed, or not. These



conclusions should be substantiated by the state-of-the-art in science and technology and recent experiences with the current version of the ESoP. The main task of the respective Champions is coordinate discussion and flow of information within the Expert Team and to briefly present a common view at the next WG HMI meeting.

The following Expert Teams with volunteers among the participants were established during the afternoon session:

- **Scope** (Champion: Ana Paul, CTAG, Spain). This will consider the range of technology currently covered by the ESoP and, bearing in mind the state of knowledge, the prospects for broadening the scope. Example technologies for consideration include head-up displays, voice-activated controls, driver warnings and driver assistance systems.
- **Vehicle Categories** (Champion: Aline Delhaye, FEMA, Belgium). This will consider particularly the perspective of motorcyclists and two-wheeled vehicles. Is there anything in the ESoP which does not fully take account of the needs of motorcyclists; is it practical/desirable to extend the ESoP to include the two-wheeled vehicle category? Also, there may be additional considerations concerning heavy trucks that are not fully included in the current ESoP.
- **Safe Fixing** (Champion: Theo Kamalski, TomTom, Germany). This will not duplicate work but review that being carried out by the eSafety Working Group on Nomadic Devices.
- **Verification and Criteria** (Champion: Marika Hoedemaeker, TNO, The Netherlands, Petr Bouchner, CTU Prague, Czech Republic, and, Katia Pagle, ICCS, Greece). This will consider the desirability, implications and practicality of developing more specific pass/fail criteria for the ESoP and ways to assist designers and others to identify whether or not a specific system is in accord with the ESoP. The co-Champions will consider if the work should be further divided.
- **Misuse and Manipulation** (Champion: Christhard Gelau, BASt). This will consider both design and use aspects of misuse and manipulation and will also liaise with the eSafety working group on Security.
- **Liability** (postponed: Team not yet established)



- **International Harmonization** (Champion: Wojciech Przybilsky, Motor Transport Institute, Poland). This will investigate the practicality and mechanisms for working with JAMA in Japan and the Alliance in the US (and possibly others) to work towards a more global approach rather than a regional one.
- **Driver Training** (Champion: Mirko Novak, CTU Prague, Czech Republic). This will consider the need and mechanisms for better informing and training drivers as to their responsibilities for safe use. The work will be relevant to the Recommendations for Safe Use and to the misuse and manipulation efforts also.

Full lists of membership of the Expert Teams are attached as Annex 2.

For the next meetings of the WG HMI the following dates were fixed: April 16 2009, June 30 2009 and September 08 2009. If no other information is given the meeting place will be in Brussels.

Annexes

- Annex 1: Presentation by Wolfgang Hoefs
- Annex 2: Presentation on WG HMI provided by Alan Stevens
- Annex 3: Lists of Expert Team membership