



Brussels, 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008

**Nomadic Device Forum**  
**ERTICO Office, Avenue Louise, 326, 1050 Brussels**  
**4th September 2008, 10.00 – 17.00 h**

**Minutes**

**Edited by: ICCS, ACEA, MEDION, ERTICO, EC, VTEC**

**Date: 18/09/2008**

**Version: 0.5**

**Participants List**

No	Name	Company	Initials
1	Wolfgang Reinhardt	ACEA	WR
2	Mark Jendrzok	Medion	MJ
3	Wolfgang Hoefs	EC	WH
4	Angelos Amditis	ICCS	AA
5	Katia Pagle	ICCS	KP
6	Peter Christ	ERTICO	PC
7	Frida Jonsson	Volvo Technology	FJ
8	Henning Wiefelspuetz	Garmin	HW
9	Jochen Katzer	Navigon	JK
10	Theo Kamalski	TomTom	TK
11	Johan Grill	ADAC	JG
12	Pedro Valero Mora	UV	PVM
13	Andreas Weimper	Harman/Becker	AW
14	Chuck Spaur	VP Architecture	CS
15	Lutz Eckstein	BMW	LE
16	Christian Rousseau	Renault	CR
17	Stephan Armagni	Medion	StA
18	Rudolf Gerlach	TUV	RG
19	Uwe Toppel	VDA	UT

## **Contents**

<b>PARTICIPANTS LIST .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. WELCOME, OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING AND TOUR DE TABLE (CHAIRS) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. IMPLEMENTATION OF ESOP, WOLFGANG HOEFS, EC .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. REPORT FROM IFA 2008, MARK JENDRZOK, MEDION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. DISCUSSION ON THE MOU, WOLFGANG REINHARDT, ACEA .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. LIST ON COOPERATION ITEMS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>ROUND TABLE MODERATED BY WOLFGANG REINHARDT, ACEA AND MARK JENDRZOK, MEDION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. SUMMARY, WOLFGANG REINHARDT, ACEA .....</b>	<b>11</b>

## **1. Welcome, Objectives of the meeting and tour de table (Chairs)**

The invited participants' registrations took place within the expected time frame.

Mr. Wolfgang Reinhardt (ACEA) welcomed the participants to the kick off of the European Nomadic Devices Forum (NDF) as an eSafety WG. Special thanks were given to EC, ERTICO and ICCS for their continuous support of the NDF and their active participation. A "Tour de Table" followed this.

WR set the agenda of the meeting.

- Introductory remarks from the European Commission (W. Hoefs) concerning the implementation of the ESoP, the signing of a MoU and the political expectations
- De-Briefing on the IFA 2008 exhibition on commercial electronics that took place in Berlin (Mark Jendrzok, Medion)
- Discussion on the MoU draft between OEMs and ND manufacturers
- Discussion on the cooperation between OEMs and ND manufacturers on safe nomadic devices integration.

The Forum unanimously approved the agenda.

The objectives of this meeting was to find a common understanding of the respective positions and to agree on potential solutions to both sign the ESoP and to find a way to vest cooperate between vehicle and Nomadic Device manufacturers.

The full details of the event are uploaded in the relevant section of the eSafety web site:[http://www.esafetysupport.org/en/esafety\\_activities/esafety\\_working\\_groups/nomadic\\_device\\_forum.htm](http://www.esafetysupport.org/en/esafety_activities/esafety_working_groups/nomadic_device_forum.htm), where the final minutes and the presentations of the workshop can also be found.

## **2. Implementation of ESoP, Wolfgang Hoefs, EC**

WH presented the evolution of ESoP on HMI.

The 1st Commission Recommendation on safe HMI was issued on 21 December 1999. It was initiated on request of a high level expert group from Member States in 1995/1996, directly appointed by the European Commission.

A report on the need for updating & expanding of the first principles that were included in this 1<sup>st</sup> recommendation was published in July 2001. While ACEA supported the EC recommendation on behalf of its members through a letter to the Commission only a very few Member States took actions to implement the recommendations in their respective markets. With the start of the eSafety program a new eSafety Working Group on HMI was formed to revise the first ESoP and to explicitly add nomadic devices integration issues and requirements to the work of the group. The group delivered a final report with updated recommendations in 2005. Moreover, an experts group was established to draft the 2006 update of the ESoP. Both AIDE IP and HUMANIST NoE European projects supported this work.

The Commission Recommendation of 22 December 2006 was published on 6th February 2007 (refer to: OJ L 32/2007). Comparing to the previous recommendation it addresses both mobile and integrated in-vehicle information and communication systems but not yet Advanced Drivers Assistance Systems (ADAS).

A revision of this recommendation was performed on 26 May 2008 and was published on 12 August 2008 (refer to: OJ L 216/2008). This revision was performed after a request by ACEA and it includes a clarification on visual displays' mounting installation principle (in Installation Principle IV) excluding such type M1 vehicles from the "30 degree rule", which are "derived" from N1 vehicles.

LE commented that the same group of experts that drafted the 1st version of ESoP wrote the revision and he noted that the nomadic devices forum is autonomous and its connection with the vehicle might not be essential.

AA asked WH on the next steps envisioned by the Commission.

WH commented that this is to be decided after October, when feedback from the Member States is received. The feedback from the Member States will also clarify if there are more items to be discussed and considered in a new revision of the ESoP.

CR: What about the evaluation of integrated systems?

WH: this is not part of the current recommendation and might be included in the next revision. EC sees implementation of the ESoP

Remark from the editor: integrated systems are part of the ESoP and will be evaluated for conformity with the ESoP in the same way as nomadic devices. Even though the degree of conformity is much higher there is still room for improvements.

### **3. Report from IFA 2008, Mark Jendrzok, MEDION**

Mark Jendrzok reported on IFA 2008 exhibition, which took place in Berlin, Germany on August 29 – September 3, 2008. The IFA exhibition is a world-leading exhibition for consumer electronics and takes place every year. The exhibition showed that new technology is coming up. Now it is possible to have better communication via SIM card towards two directions. There is a very good potential to use these devices in the near future to enhance safety as well (it is expected that eCall will be integrated in the near future on the nomadic device).

Moreover, MJ noted that TV is also coming to the ND. In some markets it is already provided. The emerging distraction issues that this development may cause should be considered by the NDF. Another issue that the NDF should address is the distraction and narrowing of the driver's field of view imposed by new devices with very large screens (7"). This "field of view" is clearly regulated. On the other hand smart phones with relatively small screens and tiny figures also cause an increasing distraction potential. Therefore, guidelines are needed on what information should be allowed on different screen sizes.

WH complementing the report on IFA 2008 by communicating that there is a black box already in the market, which is able to take pictures of the scenes before and after a potential accident (reference: Fahrerassistenzsysteme, FAS 100).

In general the progress shown at the IFA is immense and underlined the potential but also the risk of nomadic devices.

#### **4. Discussion on the MoU, Wolfgang Reinhardt, ACEA**

Wolfgang Reinhardt from ACEA reported on the view of the vehicle manufacturers' regarding the Memorandum of Understanding for the European Statement of Principle (ESoP) on human machine interface for safe and efficient in-vehicle information and communication systems. The proposal of the vehicle manufacturers is to decouple the ESoP part from the cooperation part. The reasoning behind this proposal is outlined in the following:

ESoP has resulted in a EU recommendation. The recommendation details what has to be done in order to avoid distraction and promotes the safe use of nomadic devices in the vehicle environment. As each group is responsible for development of products, which meet the ESoP requirements without being able to influence the development work of the other party, there is no need for jointly signing a volunteer agreement. Therefore, each group or company (either automotive or nomadic or contributing partner) may send a letter to the EC expressing its willingness to fulfill the ESoP requirements. ACEA has decided to do so for the group of European vehicle manufacturers organized under ACEA. The NDM could either send a letter individually or jointly.

ACEA does not see a factual necessity to couple both ESoP and cooperation on safe integration. According to the production cycles and lead times of the OEMs it would take many years before a standardized mechanical safe interface in the dashboard (I-Tafel) could be offered, delaying the ESoP implementation even further.

WR explained again the background of the NDF, which was set up in 2003 as a voluntary cooperation and discussion platform for OEMs and NDM to discuss potential cooperation on eye level. The new NDF was initially a success but participation became less over time and attendance especially from NDM was low. The December 2007 meeting at ACEA premises on invitation by the European Commission tried successfully to relaunch the NDF and agreed – among other things – on an action item to draft a MoU to facilitate the signing of a voluntary agreement between the two groups, OEMs and NDM. This MoU, therefore, incorporated among others a volunteer agreement on the adoption of ESoP and aims at the promotion of (safe) integration issues and cooperation between the 2 industries (nomadic device manufacturers and vehicle manufacturers). As ESoP and business cooperation are two different subjects the automotive industry proposes to decouple these two things.

Mr. Gerlach from TUEV Rheinland reported on the outcome of a meeting on nomadic device integration in Germany (Cologne) with representatives from OEMs, NDM and other stakeholders.

He mentioned that it would not be a problem for the NDM to fulfill the EECE-R21 and 72/60/EWG in the near future.

The following changes can be done by the NDM alone:

- Radiuses larger than 3,5 mm
- Energy absorption
- Holder meets Slide test 20g/30ms
- 72/245/EWG electromagnetic compatibility

- 17 December, 1998 decision on user manuals
- Council directive from 29 June 1992

The problems are the high testing cost for each vehicle

- Interaction with airbag- NDM require information on airbag installment
- Field of view – NDM require information where a nomadic device could be legally installed safely on the windscreen. OEMs will check if information are available at all

Proposal Gerlach:

- Acceptance of negative influence on field of view; LE: can only be temporary as legal requirements are for all.
- Standardization of a mechanical interface analogue to ISO-FIX. Work should start right away to develop an ISO-FIX for nomadic devices. ISO-FIX is voluntary, there are also child seats, which are safe without ISO-FIX (same as GARMIN integration with BMW)

An open discussion among the participants followed on the aforementioned issues.

JK noted that this would mean that each vehicle manufacturer would proceed on his own and would deal with any joint emerging issues related to nomadic device integration with a specific nomadic device manufacturer on an individual basis. In turn this would mean that we would not reach a standardized or commonly accepted solution.

LE commented that we should not mix the functionality with the HMI, which is different for each vehicle manufacturer (OEM specific). Therefore, the functionality should lie on the nomadic device manufacturer side.

TK commented that we should increase the efficiency of the meetings. We need to define what we want to do, how to do it, the level of cooperation, interest, content of the cooperation and if we really do need standards. TK also said that the CE4A initiative works alone without offering the possibility to nomadic device manufacturers to interact.

WH added that it is not straightforward that the 2 items, ESoP and cooperation for safe integration, can be decoupled. ESoP itself promotes a holistic view. HMI and integration functionalities cannot be separated easily.

LE argued against by saying that the ESoP discusses human capabilities and this can be separated from functionalities and other technical issues.

JG brought the example of ISO-FIX. Both the vehicle and the car child seat developers agreed on the standard of ISO-FIX. Decoupling seems to be holding back things. The vehicle manufacturers do not consider the requirements of the users when saying that the nomadic device- that is compliant with a certain type of vehicle - is specific and cannot be used in a different vehicle.

LE commented that the ISO-FIX is not a standard for the automotive industry and that there are also other existing solutions that are safe as well. This means that ISO-FIX as preliminary set-up is an option the customer can select or not.

MJ asked the audience on what are the measures for the statement that “the non ISO-FIX solutions are safe”.

LE replied that there are certifications processes for the different options that are offered in the market.

JK added that fulfilling the ESoP does not lie in the hands of the nomadic device manufacturers alone. For example, how would it be possible for a ND manufacturer to plug a ND safely in the vehicle? The windshield has to have “holes”. Moreover, today’s practice shows that the user will in any case bring or integrate the nomadic device in the vehicle because there is no relevant legislation that forbids him to do so. Consequently, keeping it like that there is no possibility for a controlled safer integration / installation in the vehicle, because customer choices will probably not be compliant with the ESoP.

WH added again that there should be a holistic view on these issues. He commented that he is happy that the NDF exists on a voluntarily basis. If it is not on a volunteer basis then we should have to rethink if it is needed at all.

AA commented that one of the reasons that we gathered in the NDF is to find solutions on the safe integration of ND within vehicles and by doing so avoiding unnecessary legislation. However, it is essential to take into account the vehicle manufacturers’, the nomadic device manufacturers’ and the users’ needs. The continuance of this collaboration in the NDF is very important.

LE questioned to which extend is it needed to collaborate in order to implement the ESoP?

WH cited a statement that is found in the ESoP:

“The European vehicle manufacturing and supply industries, which design and/or provide and/or fit in-vehicle information and communication systems, whether original equipment providers or after sales system providers, including importers and nomadic devices suppliers, should comply with the attached updated European Statement of Principles and should enter into a voluntary agreement on this matter within a period of nine months from the publication of this Recommendation”.

RG presented an integration proposal developed for a client together with the results of a crash test of the system. The presentation is available online at the eSafety website. He commented that there is not a real problem in implementing the European Recommendations.

Coming back to the proposal to decouple ESoP and Safe integration cooperation WR discussed the need for a time frame. It is necessary to set a deadline for handing over compliance letters from both the vehicle manufacturers and nomadic device manufacturers to the European Commission. This should take place until the end of 2008. The commitment from the automotive industry can start on its own, ACEA will propose a letter to be approved by the ACEA Joint Committee in November the latest. The nomad device suppliers can also draft an individual or a joint letter. It is up to them to decide. Furthermore, they can start developing a standard interface (NAVI-FIX) of their own, if this is considered essential. In this case, each OEM would have the possibility to comply (or not) with the standard (like ISO-FIX. There are two alternatives:

1. No need to keep the NDF alive and both the automotive and the nomadic devices industries work on their own. The chairs will have to report to the eSafety Steering group that the NDF completed its work and that there is no need to continue its work.
2. Maintain the NDF alive under the umbrella of eSafety, create NDF sub-workgroups for special issues and maintain the dialogue between ND and vehicle manufacturers.

WR suggested that the second option is the preferred as a constructive dialogue needs to be maintained. The participants agreed to that.

CR commented that the vehicle industry is trying to maintain the collaboration between the two industries for a set of issues, so as to improve safety of installation. However, it is not possible to state that it will be possible to come up with one solution for every nomadic device. We can, however, try to find the best solution for each case.

LE added that a first step could be the identification of the emerging mechanical issues. A second step could be the handling of the data flow issues (connection of the ND with the vehicle). The second step also involves liability issues, which we should take care of.

WR commented that the current MoU foresees cooperation between the industries. Now we have to discuss how to do it best.

WH asked why this work couldn't be finalized under a MoU?

CR commented that the most important issue is to find the content of the MoU and then check if it can be signed. In addition CR mentioned that the automotive industry is willing to comply with the ESoP and sent a letter to confirm its support. What has to be done now is to agree on a roadmap towards the implementation of the ESoP. In order to apply the ESoP recommendation also for nomadic devices in the vehicle environment in some cases the cooperation between the vehicle manufacturers and the nomadic device manufacturers is needed.

TK commented that there might not be a common voice coming from the vehicle manufacturers, as the representation during the meeting is not high. TK added that during this meeting only RENAULT and BMW are here, but if other vehicle manufacturer were here we might hear different opinions.

WR answered that ACEA represents 100% of the European vehicle manufacturers and is present at this discussion. The important question is if we agree at this table to decouple the ESoP from the integration issue and if we need a MoU at the end of the day.

WH stated that the chairs of the NDF should report the progress of the NDF during the next eSafety Steering group meeting. Should it be reported that the NDF had its last meeting today since one of the major working items (according to the ToR) seems to fail to be fulfilled?

LE stated that the automotive industry is not in favor of a shut down solution. We do not want to go on on an individual basis but it has to be clear that it will not be possible for the NDF to propose one standard with which all vehicles should comply with.

WH commented that if a revision of the way to work inside the NDF is needed (meaning a revision of the ToR) then this should be brought up. The ESoP implementation roadmap should also be set.

The following actions/decisions have been taken:

**Action 1:** The Steering Committee of the Nomadic Devices Forum should implement the agreed changes in the current ToR before the next eSafety Steering Group meeting (responsible: SC of the NDF).

Comments:

MJ commented that the goal of the Forum might not be to find a common standard but rather the goal could be to find a clustered solution.

LE commented that a common solution should not be a goal as it might not be applicable for all vehicles.

**Action 2:** Identify the common activities and issues related to integration and cooperation. Creation of a roadmap to cooperate on all aforementioned items (responsible: chairs of the NDF, SC of the NDF).

The status of the achievements should be reported on regular basis.

**Action 3:** Automotive industry prepares and signs a letter on the compliance with the ESoP and sends this letter to EC by the end of 2008.

**Action 4:** Nomadic devices industry prepares and signs a joint letter on the compliance with the ESoP and sends this letter to EC by the end of 2008.

Each ND manufacturer should sign the ND letter individually as an association (like ACEA for the vehicle manufacturers) does not exist in Europe. The letter of the ND manufacturers should list the items where compliance is already reached, a timetable for those which will be fulfilled short-term and a list of items where a cooperation between the ND and the vehicle manufacturers is required to fulfill the ESoP

**Decision:** This set of letters replaces the discussion on a volunteer agreement (MoU) between the ND and the vehicle manufacturers for the compliance with the ESoP.

WH reminded the Forum that on September 30 the European Commission will meet with the Member States to discuss progress on the ESoP voluntary agreement and receive comments and reaction from the Member States on the ESoP Recommendation and

**JK proposed to organize a workshop to discuss the foundation of an association for the European Nomadic Device manufacturers (NDMA) in Brussels to better coordinate their work and interests.**

PC stated that concerning setting up this association ERTICO might offer support to discuss organizational issues.

**Action 5:** MJ and TK will invite the NDM to a meeting in October regarding the set up of a ND Manufacturers Association in Brussels.

In addition, the possibility of renaming the NDF to “Navigators Forum” was also discussed. This proposal was not approved, as the forum should be open to other nomadic device manufacturers in the infotainment area also. While the current focus of the forum could be on navigators other systems – when mature enough – could be added and handled in respective separate working groups. Towards that, subgroups can be initiated, to deal with specific issues. Each sub-group would gather experts from the specific sector. Necessary decisions will then be taken by this group (e.g. for the navigators sub-group the decisions will be taken by the navigator developers).

**Action 6:** Concerning cooperation between OEMs and NDM and the related work it needs to be discussed if some kind of written agreement is needed. Group agreed that at least the word MoU should no longer be used. The chairs, together with the Steering Group, will prepare a proposal to be discussed at the next meeting in November (25.11.2008)

### **3. List on cooperation items (Draft)**

#### **Round table moderated by Wolfgang Reinhardt, ACEA and Mark Jendrzok, MEDION**

A possible list of cooperation items between the nomadic device and the vehicle manufacturers was discussed:

- Driver Information (Driver is not well informed about safe installation and safety possibilities in the vehicle due to insufficient documentation)
  - Proposal: Add in user manual a page to show where airbags are located and identify legally required field of view
- Mechanical integration / improve passive safety
  - Insufficient knowledge on viewing distances (=> character sizes)
- Electrical integration
  - Avoid loose wiring (antennas, power)
- Information exchange
  - Vehicle speed in order to switch off TV while driving
  - Rain sensor for correct speed limit display
  - Day or night (own light sensor)
  - Fuel level
  - Mute car audio for navigation instructions
  - HiFi Audio streaming
  - Steering wheel remote control
  - Airbag signal for safety functions (eCall)
  - GSM to access floating car data

**Action 7:** Circulation of the preliminary list of cooperation items to the forum for comments (responsible: ICCS).

**Action 8:** Each group is requested to complete and detail the list and provide feedback to chairs with copy to all the NDF participants before the next meeting. (Responsible: all NDF members, ICCS).

The next meeting will take place on November 25 in Brussels.

#### **4. Summary, Wolfgang Reinhardt, ACEA**

WR summarizes the discussions and list of actions that have been agreed during the NDF WS:

- The ESOP has been decoupled from the MoU
  - Each group (OEM and NDM) will write a separate letter to the Commission to confirm compliance with the ESOP, latest by end of 2008.
  - The NDM will decide if they will send individual letters or agree on one common letter. This letter will include a list of those principles they are already compliant with, the principles including timing they can work on themselves and those where they need support from the OEMs.
  - The Commission will discuss with the Member States on 30. September and agree either to approve this proposal as being compliant with their request for a voluntary agreement or not and take necessary steps
  - Concerning cooperation between the OEMs and NDM it was agreed that there is no real need for a MoU.
  - Furthermore, (a) NDM continue to discuss potential cooperation on a company level with OEMs and try to enter individual cooperation agreements, (b) the Nomadic Device Forum continues to exist with revised TOR. New Terms of Reference have to be approved by one of the next eSafety Steering Group meetings.
  - If it shows that some kind of written confirmation (not an MoU) to work together is needed that will then be discussed in the next NDF.
  - Furthermore, the NDMs will discuss to set up a NDM Association in Brussels to better coordinate their work and represent their interests in an appropriate way.
  - NDM mentioned that as access to CE4A was difficult and not "on the same eye level" they might start to develop a standard of their own ("NAVI-FIX"). The 6 companies represented cover about 90% of the ND market in Europe.
  - For an effective work in the NDF the NDM will provide a list with action items where cooperation is essential or value added. The NDF will then set up sub-groups to deal with each issue, identify the roadblocks and discuss and agree (when possible) on possible solutions including roadmap and timing and business case issues (as long as legally possible). No Commission involvement needed for this activity.
  - The sub groups will report back to the NDF, which reports to the eSafety Forum.
  - In case, work can be expanded to other areas like smart phones, MP3 Players, etc. the NDF will set up separate sub workgroups when sufficient participation is ensured and not mix the work up with the activities in the NAVIGATION Sub-Group.
  - Next meeting of the NDF 25 November 2008 in Brussels
  -
- 
- We have decoupled the ESoP from the integration issues.
  - Each group (OEM and NDM) will write an independent letter to the Commission to confirm compliance with the ESOP.
  -

## List of Actions

No	Who	Action	To whom	Status
1	SC	The Steering Committee of the Nomadic Devices Forum should check (and implement the changes) if the current ToR has to be modified, before the next e Safety Steering Group meeting	All NDF members	
2	WR, MJ, SC	Identify the common activities and issues related to integration and cooperation / creation of roadmaps for the implementation of the cooperation on all aforementioned identified items.	All NDF members	
3	OEMs	Automotive industry prepares and signs a letter on the compliance with the ESoP and sends this letter to EC by the end of 2008.	EC	
4	NDM	Nomadic devices industry prepares and signs a letter on the compliance with the ESoP and sends this letter to EC by the end of 2008.	EC	
5	WR, MJ	Finalize the next NDF meeting date (25 November 2008 at ERTICO)	All NDF members	Done
5a	MJ, TK	Invite to a meeting the ND manufacturers in October regarding the set up of a ND manufacturers Association in Brussels.	ND manufacturers	
6	WR, MJ, SG	Discuss how MoU can be reformulated and renamed to reflect the need for cooperation	To be discussed at next meeting	
7	ICCS	Circulation of the list on cooperation items to the forum for comments	All NDF members	
8	All NDF members	Comment on the aforementioned list and send it back to ICCS for consolidation before the next NDF meeting	ICCS	