

# **Minutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group**

at CLEPA, Blvd Brand Whitlock 87, Brussels  
Meeting room 3 on Thursday, 14 February 2008 10:00-15:40

## **1 Welcome**

All participants introduced themselves, especially the newcomers Theo Kamalski Tomtom and David Graullera LISITT.

## **2 Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

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

The minutes of the meeting of 13 November were approved.

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

Mäurer presented the conclusions of the chairs on the workshop and award ceremony in general and also an overview of results and discussion on their utilisation. We need a regular monitoring of the deployment of the eSafety systems. Other key aspects are willingness to pay and the awareness of the customers.

There was a problem with the American input and the Japanese input was a bit skewed. The media coverage was not at all on the level expected. Knibb pointed out that we should learn from the media professionals like UK Press International (in charge of Stuttgart Engine Awards) and perhaps also utilise them. Reinhardt and Mäurer wished to have a well-known name to present the awards. Reinhardt also emphasised the need to plan all well in advance and to remind the media at intervals. Hagleitner proposed to use the European Parliament, but Ferreira and Reinhardt pointed out some practical limitations. Kamalski told of bad experience from the past if we do not present anything new.

## **5 Workshop and Award Ceremony in 2008**

Reinhardt discussed what to cover: ideas were ITS Action Plan, eCall reporting, nomadic devices, clean mobility, measuring the progress, benefits. The keynote speaker was a success at the last workshop. Perhaps in the next workshop, marketing could be the topic of the keynote presentation the next time.

Hagleitner wished for some cars in display having different kinds of eSafety equipment on board.

Kulmala, Mäurer, Reinhardt, Breuer, Knibb, someone from eSafetySupport and Hedlund volunteerer, perhaps also the someone from European Commission Jääskeläinen?

Concerning the awards, Kulmala pointed out the need to be more transparent in the award process such as in the categories (lifetime award, "public sector", "private sector") and to be out more early. The nomination of the Award Committee should be done by the eSafety Forum's Steering Group as the award covers the whole domain and not just the eSafety Implementation Working Group's domain.

## **6 Latest developments in eSafety and EC**

The eSafety Forum RTD WG had produced its recommendations concerning the Strategic Research Agenda for ICT for Intelligent Mobility, concerning especially the FP7 calls of 2009 and 2010. Ferreira told of the problems of sharing the ICT programme "Challenge" with another Directorate (Environment). Clean mobility is very important but many are still not convinced that intelligent vehicle solutions could also reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The International Cooperation WG has been re-launched with new chairs of Eric Sampson UK and Bart van Arem. Jacob told of the problems of the WG in the past with one-sidedness of the WG with Europe disseminating information whereas the USA, Canada, China, Japan etc. just were listening. Reinhardt remarked that all regions tend to have their own information sharing platforms, and the question is how to get these platforms to work together on one or a few selected topics perhaps once a year. Jacob found this a good idea, but it should be organised by the different platforms in succession.

Blervaque gave a report from Steering Group 30 January 2008. A proposal on an eSafetySupport study on HMI and nomadic devices, but this will be decided upon soon. There was a discussion on the current Nomadic Devices Forum becoming an eSafety Forum WG on Nomadic Devices. The question of ESoP would be one topic on the WG's agenda. The development of the nomadic device gateway and the liaison with the German action on the same topic is also a key issue. The next eSafety Forum plenary

Kulmala reported on the EC ITS Action Plan's current status based on his information. The member state consultation will occur on 22 February..

## **7 eSafety Deployment Study**

Mäurer introduced the study of the Technical University of Munich briefly. Hallström pointed out that there is a problem with input from many countries missing. Reinhardt emphasised the need to concentrate on the most beneficial systems. Knibb also mentioned problems in the study with incompleteness, confusion of new fleet with whole fleet, and the lack of sample size making it impossible to assess the reliability of the data. It could be good if the group could ask questions from them by a presentation of the authors in the WG. Hagleitner also pointed out some errors in the report like Obstacle and Collision Warning having the market introduction eight years later than what happened in reality and the missing sample sizes. The impacts should also be addressed. Breuer had also wished for a report which the WG could endorse, and the current one has too many errors to endorse.

Hallström regarded the report good in pointing out the differences in the level of deployment between the different countries. Mäurer stated that, for example, the Swedish measures to speed up ESC deployment as reported at the 2007 workshop were a good example to others. Hallström remarked that these measures were taken due to comprehensive accident study.

Reinhardt remarked that the price information was missing in the report and could have been included as the prices have a clear correlation to volume of penetration. Hagleitner stated that there is wide variety of the prices, for instance ACC costing between 600 and 2 200 €. Scholten wished for the objectives of the study to be circulated.

Knibb pointed out the figures in Figure 59 - how reliable are the maps? Is it really for the whole vehicle fleet as claimed or just the new vehicles? Hagleitner wished for the clear distinction of embedded, aftermarket and nomadic deployment of the systems.

According to Reinhardt, the share of business fleet of the registrations should be considered as well as the age distributions of the respondents as well as the population. Young people are more prepared to make a change and to take new systems in use.

**All WG members should send in the detailed comments to Mäurer and Kulmala by 29 February.**

Kulmala and Mäurer brought up the idea of using the eSafety Observers' network to validate and update the report's results, which was seconded by Knibb. Bolte was promoting to make a new study on deployment status in 2009.

## **8 New eCall approach**

Reinhardt presented a new 10 step approach in order to promote the deployment of eCall. The presentation is enclosed with the minutes. This approach is based on the conviction that eCall can only work when it is understood and supported by those who work with emergencies in their daily work. He listed a number of roadblocks impeding the deployment of eCall. Each MS signing the MoU should nominate a national eCall coordinator and establish a national eCall deployment platform. UK and France should be brought back in line with the European concept, even Belgium. To have eCall at one single date requires a directive and the availability of the appropriate infrastructure in all 27 member states.

The steps were the following:

- 1) Develop evaluation criteria of emergency services in each country
- 2) Investigate the status in different countries
- 3) Define a feasible vision on how the pan-European eCall service network
- 4) National platforms led by national eCall coordinator
- 5) Form regional clusters of adjacent countries to work together and to share best practice
- 6) Clusters only consist of countries having signed the MoU (proposed leaders in bold)
  - North - **Finland**, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden
  - Central - **Netherlands**, AU, CZ, DE, HU, LU, NL, SL, CH
  - South - **Spain**, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Cyprus
- 7) Set up regional eCall roll-out platforms under the cluster leader
- 8) Each level will develop its national/regional/European roll-out plan
- 9) Foundation of European eCall roll-out platform including the cluster leaders, key stakeholders, EC, etc.
- 10) This platform will replace the eCall Driving Group

This is challenging structure, but according to Reinhardt needs to be done to break out from the deadlock caused by the current non-signers of the MoU. 11 different types of stakeholders need to be involved in all levels. Currently, the eSafety Forum's Steering Group members have been asked to comment. The Steering Group members had after the first presentation of the idea been a bit surprised but many had accepted the idea basically. Reinhardt has not contacted the national champions yet, and Hallström regarded this a key point as these countries would need to take up many new responsibilities.

Bolte asked about the stand of the vehicle industry of whether the system would be offered as standard equipment or standard option. According to Reinhardt, the deployment will start with new type approved vehicles but the standard equipment question has not yet been finally settled. Regulation is not considered as a threat. When asked about any TomTom plans, Kamalski stated that their deployment cycle is only 6 months and that they will take up the decision to deploy when the time of infrastructure deployment has been definitely set. Kamalski also questioned whether countries with major safety problems would set eCall as a priority if more efficient measures also require investments.

## **9 Flexible UWB SRR Allocation**

Rollman gave a presentation of the status of the Ultra Wide Band Short Range Radar. The local resolution is only 2 cm whereas that for narrow band radar is ca 1 meter. The SARA group has also worked a lot on other technologies for instance in maintaining the frequency allocation for automotive applications. An example of such defensive actions was for the the 76-77 GHz band used for ACC but which was also being requested by radioastronomy applications.

There is no unified consensus of using UWB SRR among the automotive users, but SARA represents a significant sector of the automotive industry and has invested substantial effort and funding to implement a now growing global market. Worldwide >50 countries have approved 24 GHz UWB SRR. In Europe, regulation since January 2005. In Japan, a UWB study group and a regulation expected by 2009.

The European band 22-26.625 GHz until 30 June 2013, car park penetration limited to 7% and with automatic deactivation. Canada and USA 22-29 GHz with no restrictions, and Japan 22-26.625 GHz (expected only limited) and 24-29GHz. In Europe the 77-81 GHz has been allocated, not in other regions.

German Kokon project developed first 79 GHz SRR prototype, with final report expected April 2008.

First cars are on the road: Mercedes S-Class since 2005, BMW 5-series since 1/2007 and Mazda since fall 2007 (U.S. market only). GM and Chrysler planning introduction in near future. European car makers such as Audi, VW and Jaguar use narrow band SRR due to regulatory time and volume limitations for 24 GHz UWB SRR. The deadline of 2013 is really causing severe problems. Market penetration will grow but far below 7% in Europe, in north America the expected penetration is around 20% in 2020.

Radar works also in adverse weather, and brings high accuracy. It is essential to have no time, location or volume limitations or otherwise there will be clear problems. It is possible to guard the "passive services" and concentrate in the band 24.25-29 GHz.

Reinhardt asked about why the time restriction to 2013. Ferreira told that at that time there were some projects like DENSE TRAFFIC developing affordable 77-79 GHz UWB SRR sensors, but unfortunately lower cost sensors could not be produced. The radio astronomers were worried that a large number of equipped cars would be close to their stations measuring the water condensation point at a frequency around 24 GHz. Ferreira also reminded that a revision point in 2009 was set to check whether the temporary regulations would be modified somehow. Reinhardt also proposed that this issue of opening the decision and issue again should be taken up at the eSafety Steering Group, but Rollmann told that the SARA group would like to reflect on this.

## **10 Nomadic/aftermarket system issues, integration and market penetration**

Theo Kamalski gave presentation on PNDs (Personal Navigation Devices) and safety. He described the TNO study involving also Delta Lloyd and AON insurance companies and Athlon car lease company. The study indicated that navigation systems decrease accidents by ca 10%, reduce stress, reduce number of stops, reduce workload, kilometres driven by 16% and travel time by 18% i.e. increase road safety. Kamalski also regarded positive the possibility to position the PND for optimum readability, use of the familiar device everywhere one goes, and reliable traffic information.

Kamalski showed an example for the Netherlands in 2008. Population 17 million, navigation sales 1.15 million, car sales 500 000, embedded navigation sales (15%) 75 000; this means that PND market is 1.075 million and market growth from 2007 is 38%.

Kamalski indicated that the mounting on the windscreen is safe as verified with research and with no reports from the customers to the contrary. Safety lock for indicating connection to a specific car. RTTI implementations in HD Traffic already in Netherlands, 2008 also UK and Germany, 2009 France. Position accuracy of ca 100 m for end of queue etc. Part of the information comes from TomTom users via FCD. The coverage of the RTTI is therefore much larger than that of e.g. TMC only restricted to main road network.

Other eSafety achievements: all products also have Speed Alert. Map Share is available for getting better maps for the new TomToms with the help of user feedback and corrections. Interface between PNDs and head units in the vehicles is under development. According to Kamalski, also ability to support ADAS functionalities exists.

In the future, continuous static and also dynamic speed warning, and also eCall is a possibility. Other potential applications requiring partnerships include local danger warning, extended FCD, dynamic traffic management, adaptive headlights.

Vincent invited TomTom to liaise with the new project ROSATTE just beginning and looking at speed limit information in digital maps.

Kompfner told about the Nomadic Device Forum which was initiated by the AIDE project, which is now ending. The original issues of the nomadic device was on safety. The ADAC film indicates the problems of nomadic devices during crashes. The purpose has been to extend the ESoP to also nomadic devices. Usability, design and installation are among the issues to be tackled. Some nomadic device manufacturers are better than others in guiding the users on the fixing and using these devices. Kamalski has already taking the ESoP into consideration.

According to Kompfner, the other main area of interest has been how to integrate the nomadic devices in the car. It is clear that the customers want portable devices and they wish to have an interoperable (dimensions, interface) docking to the vehicle. The development is now accelerating, BMW has taken some first steps. The last dimension is on the business framework. The case of in-built navigation systems is totally different from the portable systems. The new portable devices must fit into the agreed upon slot, when that is fixed.

According to Kompfner, the new working group on nomadic devices will become the platform for solving the nomadic device issues in the future. Mäurer mentioned that we must also take the nomadic devices in consideration in the implementation road maps.

## **11 Strategy for continuation 2009-**

The expansion and extension of road maps with regard to the time frame (from 2010 to 2020) and thereby also probably new systems have been discussed at the eSafety Forum Plenary in Versailles last September according to Kulmala. Knibb also proposed that we should look at whether the priority systems should be updated. Scholten reminded that our priority systems are in the market and there is no point of looking at research systems. Mäurer pointed out that we need to monitor the safety-beneficial systems that are already existing or soon expected to be in the market, and try to focus on the key priority systems. Bolte highlighted the Field Operational Tests which give robust real evidence instead of mere guesswork.

Kompfner asked whether this working group could also look at other main objective than safety such as clean mobility. Mäurer considered this as a good proposal worth discussing later in more detail. Hagleitner expects that the Field Operational Tests will also shed light on this.

Kompfner took also up cooperative applications, which will very likely be in the market in the near future at least in the form of some applications based on vehicle to vehicle communications.

Scholten wished that the working group should so far concentrate in solving the remaining issues in the current road maps. Hagleitner pointed out that the road maps should be made more market oriented as they are now quite technology oriented. Mäurer supported this. Kamalski emphasised a market penetration strategy to be the basis of the implementation road maps, with three to four scenarios. Ferreira hoped for discussion on new strategies for this. Bolte stated that in order to accomplish such we need a common vision for all stakeholders.

Blervaque took up the road map activities also elsewhere, and we decided to c

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

The next meeting was agreed to be held on 15 July 2008 at the CLEPA offices.

## **13 Any other business**

eIMPACT workshop is held in Utrecht on 26 February 2008.

Bolte announced that this was his last meeting in the WG as he is retiring.

## **14 End of meeting**

Mäurer ended the meeting at 15:40.