

Minutes from the 14th Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group

at the Dekra office, Avenue de Cortenbergh 52 on Wednesday, 5 July
10:00 - 16:00

1 Welcome

The chairs welcomed the participants, who have been listed in a separate excel file. Due to new participants, a short introduction round was carried out.

2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved. The workshop was moved earlier in the agenda.

3 Minutes of the previous meeting

We went through the minutes and the actions decided on at the meeting. The minutes were approved. Concerning the actions:

- Scholten could not get the conclusions for the VDA conference as these are not available in writing
- EC is not very positive towards publishing the WG report so another solution is required

4 Feedback and news from the eSafety Forum

The chairs distributed the conclusions from the Forum Plenary on 2-3 May in Brussels. Most discussion centered around Eurobarometer study and the new WG "ICT for Clean Mobility". The Eurobarometer study results have not been made public, but are expected to be published in September 2006.

Spell and Reinhardt emphasised that the WG on Clean Mobility should not do any work overlapping with current work carried out by the existing working groups dealing with environmental issues. Labudek wished that the Steering Group would make it clear the borderline against e.g. our WG – should we have had clean environment as one criteria in our evaluation. Pichl wished for a balance with the issues as it is clear that both environment and safety are pan-European issues. Reinhardt wondered whether the environmental issue is covering a hidden agenda, for instance for lowering speed limits and implementing ISA.

The chairs also told of the results from the Steering Group 4 July. The RTTI WG has been re-launched and we must monitor closely what is being done in the RTTI WG as it is one of the most mature

The eSafety communications platform has been set up with a first meeting at the end of June. Bittner told of the plans of the platform and of the occurrences at the meeting. Reinhardt was critical of the majority dominance in the User Outreach WG

and in formulating its final report. The car industry participants were emphasising RTTI as the first priority system to be promoted rather than ESP or eCall. ACEA is not actively participating in the WGs anymore as the other stakeholders are not actively doing their share in the deployment of eSafety and especially eCall. Labudek questioned the remark of Reinhardt that eCall is not existing as the system is being sold by various car manufacturers. Spell explained that the systems sold now are not the Pan-European eCall systems as specified by the eCall DG and the EC communication. Reinhardt remarked that nobody has forbidden the manufacturers to market their own systems perhaps integrated with a navigation unit etc. The needs of the citizens to get help in emergencies can not be given as the responsibility of the car manufacturers.

The European Commission is starting two studies based on tenders. One is looking at benchmarking of eSafety system promotion and deployment and the other on performance testing of eSafety systems.

5 14 November 2006 Workshop on “Implementation Road Map for Dynamic Traffic Management – Vehicle Systems co-operation”

The location of the workshop is the representation of Baden Württemberg in Brussels, thanks to the efforts of Erich Bittner.

Labudek questioned the topic of the workshop as dynamic traffic management is not the most important system in our ranking. Bolte explained that dynamic traffic management is currently developing fast thanks to the involvement of in-vehicle systems. Kulmala pointed out that the workshop involves two of the priority systems, extended Floating Car Data and Dynamic Traffic Management. Mäurer also stated that all the other systems are in the pipeline.

We talked about the possible speakers from TMC-Forum, BMW, SRA, Hessen, ASECAP, etc. We decided that the keynote speaker would be Professor Fritz Busch from the Technical University of Munich. The case presentations make the workshop oriented to practice, and the speakers should be selected with this in mind. The speakers should also represent all relevant stakeholders, many countries and all levels of traffic management (city, region, country).

Reinhardt pointed out that the keynote speaker should highlight the main challenges in the future rather than a possibly unrealistic vision. Bolte was certain that the vision will not be unrealistic.

Coverage of travel costs was also discussed. Silva will find out, whether the travel costs of the keynote speakers and possibly other speakers can be covered by eSafetySupport.

Kulmala and Bolte will compile a list of names of possible invitees from the traffic management circles. Scholten will send in the names from BMW and ask his colleagues to send in the names of the invitees from the car industry by Wednesday, 12 July. Silva told that eSafetySupport will draft an invitation letter for Kulmala and

Bolte to finalise. eSafetySupport will send out the invitation and also collect the names of the participants.

Timetable: 7 July – Silva to send invitation letter 1st draft to Kulmala & Bolte
10 July – Kulmala and Bolte to update and circulate
12 July – All to comment, Scholten, Kulmala and Bolte to provide list of invitees to Silva

6 Internet database on the safety impacts of eSafety systems

The database is now operational at www.esafety-effects-database.org. All were requested to send in studies on the effects of eSafety systems to Kulmala.

7 Articles and dissemination of Final Report from 2005

We had a discussion on incentives and whether they should be European wide or not. We decided to delete the sentence on European wide deployment.

Kulmala told that the eSafetySupport PR experts would edit the version for the ordinary reader. Labudek told that all the journals of European automobile clubs will cover eCall in a common article, which is the biggest single public consumer action in Europe.

We decided to send the article after finalisation to the Communication Platform for dissemination.

We discussed whether the users have use of the article oriented towards them. We concluded that this would be useful.

Again, a wish was expressed to have the Commission to officially publish our report.

8 Monitoring of roadmap deployment

So far, four responses have been obtained on the basis of distribution of survey at the eSafetySupport regional meetings. The regional meetings will go on very late into 2006 and possibly to 2007, and we must collect data quicker. At the Steering Group, the European Commission promised to send the survey to the respondents. first feedback. Kulmala will communicate on this with Jääskeläinen.

9 Promotion of eSafety systems

Kulmala and Mäurer told of the existing information on the EC benchmarking study and the Eurobarometer study.

10 Updates of the roadmaps

We discussed the concept of security covering issues such as terrorism, hurricanes, etc. A definition is needed. Reinhardt pointed out that we are mostly concerned privacy and hacking of systems. The data should be so secure as to ensure safe driving. Bolte reminded that safeguarding against manipulation of the driver itself is also security.

Kulmala showed the security input for the report. We decided to wait for the ToR of the Security WG.

11 Next meetings, date and place

Tentatively the meeting is to be held on Wednesday, 17 January 2007 in Brussels.

12 Any other business

Labudek pointed out that his interest is promoting the roll-out of the systems, which are most beneficial to safety. He is surprised that the ranking of systems within the 11 systems is in the order of their presentation in the tables as he had believed. He will check the report again to find out any contradiction in this respect.

Labudek was also against stating that eCall is non-existent. Spell stated that the problem is linguistic as Pan-European eCall is not existing but several eCall systems exist. Reinhardt said that there are different types of systems: 1) normal 112 from fixed vehicle, 2) E-112 from mobile systems and 3) emergency calls or messages to a service provider. The European eCall is based on 2) but also the channel 3) is to be considered in the Pan-European eCall. Labudek pointed out the messages of nonexistent eCall are very confusing and should not be given. Pichl pointed out the big advantage of European eCall of being language-independent.

13 End of meeting

The meeting was ended at 14:20.