

Minutes of the 20th Meeting of eSafety Forum Implementation Road Map Working Group

at CLEPA, Blvd Brand Whitlock 87, Brussels
Meeting room 3 on Wednesday 22 October 2008
starting at 10:00 (lunch 12:30) and ending around 15:00

1 Welcome

Introductions and apologies were made.

2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

3 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were approved.

4 Further Development of Implementation Road Maps

Mäurer noted that the report was finalised three years ago, and that our work is more focussed on the monitoring of the road map. Therefore, a monitoring report could be useful. He showed the monitoring report proposal compiled by Mäurer, Kulmala and Hedlund, sent around to the WG members on 30 September 2008.

Concerning blind spot monitoring, Reinhardt told that a study indicates that the system is not operating as well as it should due to lacking coverage of the blind spots. He also wondered about the other ADAS applications. Hagleitner point out traffic sign recognition, and that the obstacle and collision warning system should be divided into different systems. Reinhardt also questioned whether environmental systems such as eco-driving or eco-navigation should be included. Hagleitner stated that both the safety and environment benefits should be indicated. Blervaque hoped that the systems from other WGs should be considered.

Ferreira wondered whether navigation should be a vehicle-based system. Cooperative systems should perhaps be a third group of systems. Reinhardt pointed out that cooperative systems or their communications are future enablers. Kulmala pointed out that navigation system required information infrastructure as well as speed alert. Op de Beek stated that instead of vehicles, some nomadic systems can be carried by the user, i.e. instead of I2V/V2I we could have I2U/U2I systems. Mäurer pointed out that nomadic systems are expanding quickly.

Ferreira told that the Commission is now attempting to find a way, in which the public deliverables of the European research projects could be made available to the outside world and the general public. Perhaps a support action will be initiated on this. Mäurer told that the Safety-TechnoPro project website also includes a lot of information of eSafety, but nobody knows about the existence of it. Ferreira was also aware that the end of eSafetySupport in 2009 will mean problems as the very good web site of eSafetySupport will "die".

Concerning recommendations, Ferreira wished that the old 28 original eSafety recommendations should be reviewed at the Steering Group.

The structure of the report was found to be acceptable. Labudek hoped that the original structure of two types of systems should be used. Breuer could not foresee any vehicle

based cooperative systems to be on the market within the next five years. He could not even describe such a system today. He could not even see the worth of having such future, research systems in our report. Frans pointed out that V2I systems will be there much quicker than V2V.

Emergency braking was agreed to be on the list of priority systems. Navigation should be replaced by Dynamic navigation.

Reinhardt wished that also global developments and good examples should be considered. Blervaque mentioned that ERTICO

Concerning contributions, Breuer confirmed that he and Scholten could update the road maps for the existing vehicle based systems as well as for emergency braking. Reinhardt promised to tackle eCall, and the WG agreed to request Theo Kamalski from TomTom to take care of dynamic navigation. Patrascu and Labudek are to provide contribution to the chapter on Promotion of deployment.

5 5 November 2008 Workshop on “User Benefits Drive the Markets”

Mäurer presented the current agenda of the workshop. There was a lot of discussion on the interactive session.

6 Latest developments in eSafety and EC

Mäurer gave a report from the latest **Steering Group**, and showed the tentative agenda of the **10th Forum Plenary meeting**.

Kenis presented the current version of the **EU ITS Action Plan** reminding that this is not the final, which will be decided on the basis of the inter-service consultation ongoing right now. The Action Plan lists six primary action areas: 1) Optimised use of road, traffic and travel data; 2) Traffic management on European transport corridors and in conurbations; 3) Road safety and security; 4) Integration of vehicle in the transport system; 5) Data security and protection, and liability; and 6) European ITS concertation and coordination. A European ITS Committee and a European ITS Forum is proposed.

Reinhardt suspected that the ITS Forum will not be a big success, but Kenis explained that they attempt to engage the key experts into the body. Reinhardt regarded the current plans of the ITS Committee as a regulatory body and comodality to be possible critical issues, and the industry's role as very small in the plans. Kenis told that the low awareness of the key decision makers, and that is one reason behind the committee. To speed up the deployment in some well-defined special cases and topics, the mandate for regulations is proposed. One area could be eCall. The normal comitology processes will normally be utilised.

Reinhardt also wondered about the type approval for infrastructure. Frans remarked that today such type approval exists in Germany and the Netherlands, but not all over Europe. Reinhardt also remarked that the Action Plan is much delayed, and wondered about the timing. Kenis stated that the approval process will take its normal time.

Ferreira told about the first meeting of the **Intelligent Infrastructures Working Group**. The concept of Intelligent infrastructure had been discussed at length. A small group was set to define the concept. The emphasis is on cooperative systems. Op de Beek promised to send the definition to the WG members.

Op de Beek presented the **International Cooperation Working Group** and its links to IRM WG. He has taken over the chairmanship from Bart van Arem. The work should support

issues which benefit from discussions at "inter-continental" level. The work is carried out via contacts, workshops, expert meetings and fact finding visits/tours. They hope to do very close cooperation with the other WGs, and hope for a very practical approach. Mäurer wished for scoping activities. Kulmala hoped for good examples and best practices in the promotion and acceleration of the deployment of eSafety systems. Blervaque mentioned that ERTICO is managing project SIMBA and could also participate in such activities to get the information from those countries. ERTICO also has very good relationships with ITS Japan and ITS America.

Latest developments of the **eSecurity Working Group** were described by Mäurer. The issues with autonomous vehicle systems are more or less resolved. The systems communicating with the infrastructure have risks for interference, which need to be solved. Mäurer will attempt to invite Ruland or Kung (chairs of WG) to present the results at our next meeting.

Reinhardt told of the **eCall situation**. All of the three in-band modem systems passed the systems, with Qualcomm performing the best. The systems are licence free only with regard to the 112 option (minimum set of data), but the other services will be charged (the magnitude of the fee is not known). The ETSI meeting on 31.10. will confirm the decision, but the industry will find out before that about all costs from the three candidates. Reinhardt reminded that the automobile industry requires 3 years before putting the system in the vehicles as a standard option. Labudek asked about possible regulation of mandatory eCall. Ferreira stated that mandating eCall is only viewed as a possibility.

7 Current status of deployment of eSafety systems

Walter Hagleitner gave a presentation of the current status of eSafety deployment. One issue delaying deployment is the conservative attitude climate. Advanced brakes, headway sensors are among the key technologies. ESC and Brake Assist (BAS) are according to him the building blocks, with ACC the next enabling sensor step towards active safety. He had made figures showing the total safety effect of the active safety packaging for a number of car models. Active safety is increasing, and at the same time, the price of the systems is decreasing (e.g. for ACC from 2800 to 1800 euro in ca 10 years).

He also presented some trends in the car market, which are listed hereafter: Active safety systems become a sales argument, and comfort begins to be perceived. Insurance incentives are becoming a reality. EuroNCAP is working on an active safety rating. The trend is moving from warning towards assisting systems (from lane departure warning to lane keeping assistance, for instance). Video is offering video camera as a low-cost version of ADAS, like in the case of Opel. Lighting functions can promote the use of video camera. Functional extension is taking place towards autonomous braking.

Buying criteria are: styling/prestige, comfort/convenience, fun, economy, fashion/trend, handicap compensations, and passive/active safety. Comfort is becoming more important. Safety systems form the fastest growing component in car market, powertrain another major component with hybrid engines etc. The Japanese Automobile Manufacturers Association (JAMA) gives exact figures on its web site concerning the deployment of different systems in vehicles.

Hagleitner proposed that we highlight the key components Electronic brake control, headway sensors, video sensors, short-range UWB, communication, and CAN in the road maps. He also promised to send the presentation and the links to WG members.

Kulmala asked about the technology table in the WG report in view of the presentation. Breuer promised to check the table. Hagleitner hoped that the headway sensing would be just expressed in two categories: short- and long-range.

8 Prioritisation of eSafety systems in Field Operational Tests

Frans op de Beek from TNO told about the Dutch national FOT. The presentation is enclosed with the minutes.

The services are first assessed with regard to their effects, and then their feasibility/availability. The criteria for policy objectives were: accessibility/throughput, reliability/travel times, safety and environment. Those for deployment were planning/timing, technical feasibility, and realisation.

Floating car data, cooperative ACC (C-ACC), RTTI, multimodal travel information, and recommended speed profiles were at the top of the objectives list. The final list after considering also deployment issues were topped by FCD, priority lane allocation to other road users, eCall, RTTI, and "Belonitor" Pay-As-You-Drive.

They applied weighing factors and developed a policy decision support system, a multi-criteria assessment methodology.

Labudek found the system very interesting, but thought that industry was getting too much emphasis and users too little, also in the discussions of the working group. Mäurer liked the idea presented as that gave the possibility to view the priorities of all main stakeholder groups.

9 Any other business

Reinhardt told that the Clean and Efficient Mobility WG is publishing its final results at the Forum Plenary on 6 November 2008

Kenis reminded about the EasyWay programme, and to get information about the infrastructure related deployments also in the eSafety Forum and primarily to inform the EasyWay partners about the developments in the eSafety Forum. We agreed to push the road operator members in the WG.

10 Next meetings, date and place

The next meeting was decided to be on 10 February 2009 in CLEPA.

The next meeting should have a presentation of the Security WG, COMeSafety, results of the Vehicle Communications Workshop, the New York demonstration results, and the German national study on implementation issues. The monitoring report will be the main topic of the meeting, and a first draft

11 End of meeting

Mäurer ended the meeting at 14:30