

Minutes from the 15th Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group

at the Dekra office, Avenue de Cortenbergh 52 on Wednesday,
17 January 2007 at 10:00 - 14:20

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.

The new members were:

- Antonio Lucas from the University of Valencia, representing DGT Spain.
- Anders Holt from Norwegian Public Roads Administration

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.

4 14 November 2006 Workshop on "Implementation Road Map for Dynamic Traffic Management – Vehicle Systems co-operation"

We went through the conclusions of the workshop listed below. The discussion is marked in *italics*.

- Agreement on and standardisation of common interfaces and protocols for v2i and i2v is now crucial for deployment of cooperative systems

No new group, but the eSafety Forum SG will send a letter to CEN highlighting the key issues and places in standardisation. The ITSSG body chaired by Cathy Jenkins and coordinating the standardisation related to ITS should take care of the issues. An overview on the various groups

- A standard "connector" in the vehicle is required to enable many beneficial services. The system needs to be simple but smart and enable an increase in services and application through a flexible and modular open platform. The system has to be sustainable in a way that customers changing their short living consumer electronic devices to a new system will still be able to use the new one in the same vehicle. This means common standards and protocols (e.g. Bluetooth) but most importantly agreement on who will pay for it and how can the deployment be accelerated?

The automobile industry does not wish to have a connector enabling all kinds of uses, but the nomadic devices will anyhow come to the vehicles i.e. a compromise is needed

- Further work needs to be undertaken for interoperable and seamless communication

The Commission is aiming towards one single Pan-European architecture for the communications. Currently CALM and Car2Car have provided their own solutions. A task force was set up on a meeting on 27 November 2006 involving COMeSafety, CVIS, Safespot etc. The use of an IPv6 backbone is the key issue in the work of the task force.

- Work on common and open system architectures need to be continued following the example of KAREN, FRAME etc.
- The use of existing technologies is essential to speed up deployment, even if the technologies might be proprietary
- As the penetration of Electronic Fee Collection (EFC) systems is expected to increase strongly, actions should be commenced to enable the utilisation of their technologies (positioning, communications with secure monetary transactions, are be utilised for other purposes

In Germany, the use of TollCollect system is currently not allowed for a political discussion, but this could change in the future. Privacy is a big barrier for the other systems. In Japan, the use of the EFC infrastructure has been successful. Jääskeläinen pointed out that the eCall case has shown that many stakeholders are willing to utilise the eCall produced information and we have to be careful.

- Quality levels need to be established and monitored for data required by the eSafety systems and services as well as the information infrastructure behind the services.

The TEMPO programme of DG-TREN has produced tentative quality level recommendations for data quality on the TERN. Service providers are very concerned about the quality. This is especially a key issue for the RTTI WG, but also concerns other WGs. Quality of data but also of services is important for reasons of competition.

- Much more emphasis needs to be put on user centred design i.e. on making the systems work on a relevant manner from the user perspective to gain user acceptance and willingness to pay
- Special efforts should be undertaken to establish fair sharing of the benefits from the eSafety systems to those bearing the investments and costs. The impacts of the current insurance incentives for ESC need to be studied carefully.

The Commission aims to take up the discussion again this year concerning both tax and insurance incentives. Insurance companies seem to have very contradictory policies. The different policies in different countries may lead to market distortions.

- The solid business cases for FCD building on existing fleet management systems should be utilised for other possible cases. It is also advisable in order to reduce the high communication costs to pay more attention to having more intelligence in the vehicles so that FCD related results can be calculated in the vehicle rather than in a server.

These discussions should be added to the Implementation Road Maps WG report. It may be possible that the communication costs do not play such a key role due to wide implementation of the flat rate for communications. The RTTI WG will recommend that safety relevant traffic information submitted point-to-multipoint is provided free of charge. That WG is defining what is safety- and what is comfort-related information.

- The Field Operation Tests as planned for the 7th Framework Programme (FP7) should be used to evaluate the benefits and acceptance of the systems for the end users as well as to increase the user and political awareness of the eSafety systems.

FOTs are being supported by the European Commission in their 1st and 2nd calls..

- The stakeholders aiming to promote the deployment of eSafety should make much better use of the Article 29 Group dealing with all issues of data protection and privacy

This is relevant for the Security WG but also for other WGs.

- In order to provide the vehicle systems safeguards from outside disturbance due to "cracking" or viruses as well as owner or driver manipulation, the eSecurity Working Group should start its work as soon as possible taking into consideration to work already carried out on the national level. In addition, some of the specific FP7 R&D efforts on security should be concentrated in the vehicle service domain.

The WG has been now started and the 1st meeting is scheduled for March and will take care of these matters.

- The proposal to solve liability issues with the code of practice approach as developed by the RESPONSE 3 project should be studied for infrastructure based systems such as dynamic traffic management, too.

The RESPONSE 3 results are now available and the Commission is producing its own working report.

- Actions should be commenced to ensure that the annual vehicle inspections can also check for any manipulation of in-vehicle eSafety systems.

In Germany actions are being carried out this year to investigate issues related to the eSafety type systems as a first step in this direction. The Commission has initiated a study on performance testing. NHTSA has also initiated actions in the domain.

- The European Commission is hoped to act as an active moderator concerning regulation so that regulation can be used in the cases, where it is clearly needed
- The possible legal funding restrictions still existing for ITS investments in the European countries should be eliminated as soon as possible.

Up to the national governments to solve.

In the general discussion, Jääskeläinen wished for clear targets for traffic management concerning efficiency environment. Radia and Reinhardt pointed out that we should agree on the indicators for these. A target for CO₂ is possible in the future, but this target should be allocated to different sectors and stakeholders. The WG on ICT for Clean Mobility (chaired by Reinhardt) will concentrate on these issues. Reinhardt and Holt highlighted that it is essential to know, where we are now, in order to estimate what we can achieve. Mäurer reminded the current statistics on fuel consumption etc. will provide good estimates of CO₂ emissions.

Lucas highlighted the results of the IMPROVER report stressing for clearer road markings, which have naturally relevance for also eSafety systems such as lane departure warning. Many studies and actions deal with similar issues but perhaps unaware of all other actions.

It is clear with the increase of embedded and co-operative systems that all stakeholders must enter in the dialogue on how to participate in solving the common problems. Radia stressed that innovative funding plans are required, reminding of the example of the use of LEDs in traffic signals.

5 Workshop 2007

Mäurer stated that this year the focus should be on vehicle based systems as in 2006 the emphasis was on infrastructure related systems. The workshop should perhaps be timed to October-November 2007. As a tentative date, again the 14th of November 07 agreed.

Bolte highlighted the problem of costs and poor willingness to pay, and the use of the same technologies for many systems. It would be nice to know where we are now, and what does the future shows.

Kulmala stated that the workshop could be used to get a good picture of the deployment in the European countries. Carrotta reminded that the survey could be carried out as an eSafetySupport study, if the Steering Group would approve of it.

Radia preferred to look at where we are now compared to two years ago, what is happening with the integrated approach as proposed by GST, and which required infrastructure has been implemented. He also proposed to submit a short summary of the DG TREN supported groups studying the implementation issues.

Jääskeläinen stated that the national eSafety Observers are the best contact points in the different countries.

Kulmala stated that also the IVS Promotion and Deployment Benchmarking study's results should be included.

Scholten and Mäurer highlighted that also other studies and actions dealing with implementation of eSafety systems. Blervaque mentioned that the Eurobarometer study is also such a study.

Spell highlighted the business case as an interesting topic for a workshop.

Jääskeläinen liked the idea of having an Implementation Workshop. Even if we do not have the figures now, we should think on how to get the figures. Blervaque pointed out that at least the existing figures on how many models have the system available. Spell pointed out that manufacturers will not give penetration data as that is a competitive issue.

Jääskeläinen wished the elmpact would be invited also.

Carrotta and Mäurer wondered whether the V model could be used in looking at the implementation issues and status.

Scholten questioned the demand for such a workshop as he had difficulties in identifying the audience of such a workshop. Breuer also shared the scepticism of the workshop as there are no new things to discuss.

Jääskeläinen emphasised that eSafety is all about deployment and the workshop would be very useful. He assured that the Commission is not going to use any low penetration rates as a basis for regulation in this phase.

Blervaque thought that FOTs have a link to the deployment, and hence a link to the workshop is also to those. That is why the time of the workshop is very good.

Friedrichs wished that the workshop would also result in concrete actions e.g. via formation of a task force.

Reinhardt wondered whether the Cars21 recommendations on the integrated safety approach could be contributed to by this Working Group. Radia felt that it is still unclear what will happen with Cars21 recommendations, but also here the workshop would be useful.

Mäurer, Carrotta, Bolte and Kulmala volunteered for work in a smaller group preparing the workshop; the responsible person from / for ACEA or an OEM will be pointed out within the next week, after internal consultation by ACEA Members.

6 Updates of the roadmaps

Friedrichs gave a presentation on the RTTI WG's approach and ideas on a road map utilising the RTTI V model description in the Road Maps report. The presentation is enclosed.

There is an agreement on safety relevant information in all member states. Jääskeläinen wished that efficiency relevant information would also be agreed upon. Friedrichs stated that is to follow in the next phase.

Jääskeläinen noted that the last recommendation some years ago is still valid and nothing much has really happened. Mäurer commented also on the slow development in the area of digital maps. Blervaque noted that now there are developments with digital maps involving also key industrial players. Radia stated that the key issue is to make things happen in whole Europe. Bolte was not agreeing that nothing has been happening as he could list a number of things accomplished in Germany alone.

Kulmala asked Friedrichs to review the Implementation Road Maps WG report's RTTI part and the deployment indicators for the eventual survey.

7 Articles and dissemination of Final Report from 2005

The Commission will produce a Working Paper on the basis of the WG report.

The Working Group has now accepted the article. Kulmala asked Carrotta about the eSafetySupport dissemination channels.

The article should be at least to be put in the web site, and to utilise it in the awareness building campaigns. Specific targeting would be necessary to place such a article appropriately.

8 Monitoring of roadmap deployment

So far, five responses have been obtained on the basis of distribution of survey at the eSafetySupport regional meetings and the Commission letter.

We try to formulate a project for eSafetySupport on monitoring the priority system deployment in the European countries. Mäurer and Kulmala will formulate a study proposal and send it for comments to the WG members.

9 Promotion of eSafety systems

Kulmala presented the EC benchmarking study. Radia highlighted value added service providers as a key stakeholder.

Jääskeläinen told of the eSafety system performance testing study, which will be finalized around July 07.

10 Next meetings, date and place

Next meeting is to be held on Tuesday, 22 May 2007 in Brussels.

Workshop will be tentatively held on Wednesday, 14 November 2007 in Brussels

11 Any other business

No other business.

12 End of meeting

The meeting was ended at 14:20.