

# ***Minutes for the 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group***

at ERTICO, the Blue Tower, Avenue Louise 326, Brussels  
on Tuesday, 13 November 2007  
starting at 13:00 and ending at 17:00

## **1 Welcome**

The list of participants is indicated in a separate excel sheet.

## **2 Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

## **3 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes were approved.

## **4 14 November 2007 Workshop on “Deployment of eSafety systems”**

We went through the final programme and found it very satisfactory. According to the registrations, we can expect more than 80 participants i.e. more than double the participants a year ago at the previous workshop.

## **5 eSafety Deployment Study**

We went through the slides of the presentation of Professor Busch from TUM. The remarks made are listed below.

Hagleitner noted that the correct year of market introduction of Obstacle and Collision Warning should be 1999.

Labudek and others wondered about the ESC penetration figures in the table of slide 6 as the figure were falling.

Lucas pointed out that the Spanish ESC figures seem too high as their cars are mostly in the small categories, where the equipment rate is very low.

Reinhardt asked what new data has been collected in the study as the slides only show lots of old material. He wondered why he and his colleagues in ACEA have not been contacted so that not so many mistakes would have been made.

Knibb and many others thought that the figures for adaptive headlights must be too high. Maybe some problem in the consistent definition of the system. The definition in the report itself is appropriate though.

Reinhardt questioned why the motor way lengths are shown, but Kulmala thought this to indicate the potential coverage of dynamic traffic management systems.

Maes asked why lane keeping assistance is not among the priority systems. Kulmala responded that the list of priority systems can naturally be adapted. Knibb wished also speed adaptation to be a priority system.

Maes said that lane marking standards are probably needed in Europe referring to a request from Honda. Lane keeping is not only good for safety but also could be used to ensure more even wear of pavement.

Hallström regarded lane keeping also as important, whereas Hedlund reminded of the snow problem in northern Europe and in the mountainous regions preventing the visibility of the lane markings.

Maes remarked that this reminds of other cases where technology leads and others need to react such as the problems with the navigation systems guiding trucks through villages.

Lucas pointed out that a big problem in Spain and probably also other countries is electricity required by the roadside systems or rather the lack of it.

Reinhardt pointed out many mistakes in the eCall slide:

- timetable mistakes (2011 earliest possibility)
- not "all new vehicles" will be equipped but "new type-approved"
- not equipped but having eCall as a standard option
- aftermarket devices are possible
- systems are not always coupled with airbag
- Iceland has signed the MoU

Labudek questioned about the time table and other issues with eCall. Reinhardt explained that the delays are partly due to MoU signature delays but also to very long lasting standardisation activities. He also explained that the reason for "standard option" is the need of the industry to get those who benefit to also pay for it.

Maes commented that the press and media is giving the picture that all new vehicles are to be equipped from 2010 onwards. Now eCall as an option will compete with other systems such as ESC. Or metallic paint, Reinhardt pointed out.

Spell pointed out that accident prevention systems are being regarded as in more focus by the manufacturers but also eCall is important.

Hagleitner stated that according to surveys, people do not buy their vehicles for safety. Hallström did not agree but referred to the ESC example in Sweden. Knibb stated that the high ESC penetration is due to systematic "brainwashing" in Sweden.

Labudek detected that the correct wording in the FCD slides should be: X-FCD need not be in all vehicles.

Concerning RTTI, Scholten noted that France has free RDS-TMC only on motorways and Maes wondered about the Finnish commercial service, which Kulmala explained to be due to high broadcast prices requested from Finnish Road Administration. The

optional TMC category and its large size in navigation was not understood by Bolte nor Labudek.

Maes and Reinhardt wondered about the coverage of nomadic devices. The annual number of sales of nomadic mobile devices is today as high as the number of new vehicles. Mobile navigation is confused with mobile phones.

Maes pointed out that there is a problem with updating a navigation system. Bolte stated that it is perhaps cheaper to buy a new system than new maps. Hallström reminded that new maps may and need be uploaded quite frequently online via servers.

According to Lucas, the Spanish VMS figures are old and the current numbers are much higher.

Concerning speed alert, Blervaque noted that speed limit information listed refers to static speed limit information only. Many nomadic and navigation systems already offer speed limit information, but this is not mentioned. Bolte emphasised that for speed alert the updating problems with speed limit information should be highlighted.

Hallström asked about the industry plans concerning speed alert. Reinhardt and Scholten told that some cars have the system as GPS-based or driver-set.

Maes asked about EuroNCAP and speed limiters. Reinhardt told that the big problem is to assess the systems to other systems with same functionality. The active systems probably will receive extra points but a separate star in the ratings. An additional problem is the infrastructure support required by some of the systems

The group agreed that the observations made should be sent to professor Busch immediately after the meeting. Kulmala promised to do so.

## **6 Latest developments in eSafety**

The Working Group members had reflections on the second EC communication on Intelligent Car and especially the 15 actions listed. These are compiled below.

Action (2): eCall pilots 2008-2009, are to be carried out in the member states and not by them. These are waiting for the standardised solutions, especially the protocol.

Action (3): Labudek asked why ETSI and CEN have not finalised standardisation by now. Reinhardt explained this to be due to the slow process, and also the French SMS-proposal has delayed this.

Action (4): Kulmala noted that it is stated that eCall is in all new vehicles. So is the Commission wishing for more acceleration of deployment? Reinhardt stated that it means all new type-approved vehicles even here. Labudek stated that it must be easy to put an eCall black box in all new vehicles, and this requirement of type approval only delays the deployment. Scholten and Spell both confirmed that the production and design cycle requires a certain time and this is not a delay by purpose.

Maes noted that the mention in point 2.1.1 of a "full-scale roll-out of eCall" is in contradiction with the "standard option".

Hallström wondered why the digital maps and the attributes required of them by the intelligent vehicle systems are not mentioned? No answers could be given other than perhaps the focus just was on the issues selected. Hallström also pointed out that the aftermarket and nomadic systems are taking over also other functionalities than navigation, like the crash notification systems. Yet these are not properly addressed.

Kulmala asked whether we are happy with just eCall and ESC, or should other priority systems be included, should also co-operative systems be involved in our work. Scholten stated that we should first solve problems with eCall and ESC. Bolte wanted also RTTI to be included as it is also discussed in the communication. Blervaque wished that the EC should aim to remove the bottlenecks from the deployment of all the systems as identified by the IRM WG report. Reinhardt reminded that the IRM WG report was very concrete but the communication is mostly very generic.

According to Hallström, the EC should be consistent, and not forget earlier proposals e.g. concerning digital maps. Scholten pointed out that work is carried out by experts on all issues on digital maps as well. Maes told that the Commission is working towards defining priority European services, and very likely digital maps related issues will come up in the European ITS Road Map by the EC in mid-2008. The EC will fully utilise the results of the IRM WG in this process.

Labudek emphasised the idea of nomadic and aftermarket devices pushing into the markets and having extremely quick market penetration. Reinhardt mentioned that the problems with safe use and fixing of such devices should be first solved. Hallström remarked that the systems have their disadvantages but they are happening right now and should be considered. According to Reinhardt, the Nomadic Device Gateway in vehicles is being discussed. Lucas pointed out that a number of HMI issues need to be solved and this required integration with in-vehicle systems. Reinhardt mentioned that the ongoing C4A standardisation aims to the integration of nomadic devices with in-vehicle systems

A discussion on the input to the RTD WG concerning next FP7 calls followed. Kulmala had already emphasised for that WG the verification of benefits and business models. All should send their input by the end of the week to Blervaque.

A discussion on the expectations to International Cooperation WG also followed with no recommendations so far, but all should send their proposals to Kulmala.

## **7 Next meetings, date and place**

Concerning the next meeting, the following items to be discussed were identified:

- workshop in 2009 (possible topic: benefits of eSafety systems)
- nomadic/aftermarket system issues, integration and market penetration
- new priority systems
- new eCall strategy
- ITS Action Plan

- strategy for continuation if IRM WG

The next meeting will be held on 14 Feb 2008 at 10-17 at the CLEPA offices in Brussels.

## **8 Any other business**

The Safer Highways Conference is held on 12-14 February in Brussels. Knibb is organising a session on the conflicts of priorities in the afternoon of the 13th and he wished for contributions to that session. He will approach the members with a specific message on that.

A FESTA workshop on FOT methodologies on is staged on 11 December in Brussels.

## **9 End of meeting**

The meeting was ended at 17:00