

eSafety RTTI WG	Minutes Meeting #1: 19/07/2006	Document 0607-01	Page 1/4
		Author J.Burgess	Date 26/07/2006

1 Welcome, Apologies

Participants

Name	Initials	Email
Bolte, Fritz	FB	bolte@bast.de
Burgess, James	JB	j.burgess@mail.ertico.com
Eschke, Stephan	SE	stephan.eschke@de.bosch.com
Friedrichs, Heinz	HF	heinz.friedrichs@de.bosch.com
Kusche, Thomas	TK	thomas.kusche@wdr.de
Mikolaschek, Peter	PM	peter.mikolaschek@adac.de
Moutal, Valerie	VM	valerie.moutal@cec.eu.int
Reinhardt, Wolfgang	WR	wr@acea.be
Rudolph, Axel	AR	axel.rudolph@telekom.de
Sarignac, Alain	AS	alain.sarignac@renault.com
Schade, Hans-Joachim	HJS	hans-joachim.schade@siemens.com

Apologies

Dicke, Bernhard	BD	dicke@vda.de
Lux, Bernhard	BL	bernhard.lux@eric-info.com
Petersen, Gerhard	GP	gerhard.petersen@astra.admin.ch

Round-table introductions and outline of expectations from this re-started RTTI WG:

Expectations

- HF: Should prepare ground for European roll-out of TTI through Commission communications/recommendations during the next year
- PM: representing ERIC foundation (is VP). Agrees expectations HF – need to find some common recommendations for the Commission
- FB: in eSafety roadmap implementation WG too. Basis laid in former group; but now want to bring recommendations at European level
- WR: in eSafety roadmap implementation WG too. Not just infrastructure. Vehicles could contribute to services – data collection etc. RTTI seen as a ‘killer app’ and want not to overload this project with too many complicated future requirements – key is simple clear requirements and Europe-wide equal implementation. Re-starting gives an opportunity to really prepare for implementation. RTTI needs much less penetration to gather data successfully than e.g. vehicle-to vehicle cooperative communication
- AS: Wants to provide better TTI for customers
- HJS: RTTI already helped by providing European perspective. Priorities: quality, business plan – not too focused on technology. Siemens focuses on urban data – inclusion of this is one challenge for RTTI WG
- JB: Need to focus on generating simple, clear recommendations
- VM: to have services all around Europe as soon as possible to serve the citizens – want to achieve something concrete

eSafety RTTI WG	Minutes Meeting #1: 19/07/2006	Document 0607-01	Page 2/4
		Author J.Burgess	Date 26/07/2006

Timeframe

Timeframe influenced by German EU presidency first half 2007. Germany intends to focus on traffic through three conferences addressing:

- Street traffic
- Air traffic
- Water based traffic

Want to feed these RTTI activities into German conference and recommendations. Therefore have to present results latest second half November 2006, in such a form as to give confidence to give place in conference around June 2007 (with further tuning during first months 2007).

Therefore draft results late November 2006, final end January / February 2007, presentation latest June 2007.

Review of report to eSafety SG meeting #21

Proposed to improve information and awareness of RTTI relaunch.
Action: JB to advertise restart of WG through TMC Forum by end July

Definition of broad work topics.

2 Review of the Terms of Reference, including comments

Updated version included with minutes. Discussion notes:

- WR: Need to include mandate and objectives; what we want to achieve. Are original recommendations realistic?
- HF: Original RTTI objectives were to address each part of the service chain areas (and business models).
- PM: Original objectives such as 80% coverage etc are unrealistic for a timeframe of 2010. Recommendations could be e.g. to have all information which can be collected, made available in one place – then independent of different data collection possibilities per country. Also could define free and paid services
 - HJS: Should focus on aims and not minimum levels. Need to recognise that business models may be different for different markets.
 - FB: Should consider from point of view of user expectations and road authority expectations. Countries can deal with details themselves, but could define overall quality levels. Should define minimum set freely available data for all countries
 - HF: need to not dive too deep
 - AR: Last RTTI group drew a good picture of what people need. Doesn't though give a clear enough impression of what politicians should do in response. This should be our focus.
- HF: reviewed new proposed Terms of Reference and comments received
 - VM: EC already made some RTTI recommendations some time ago, might be useful to also review those

eSafety RTTI WG	Minutes Meeting #1: 19/07/2006	Document 0607-01	Page 3/4
		Author J.Burgess	Date 26/07/2006

- WR: Recommendations should go into some type of map/plan – existing recommendations are too much in parallel, should define order / sequence. Have to look not at business case (can be different from country to country) but at overall business model. Identifying costs etc is equally relevant to public and private providers – data collection costs, roaming agreements etc. Recommends this as a point 5 of Terms of Reference. Also, should try to agree mandate across member states first, before proposing results
 - VM: This is a nice idea but difficult in practice because member states cannot sign up to mandate without knowing fully what it is
 - AR: Let's identify the parts where business case etc are not clear – as these are the parts which companies would find difficult on their own and where Commission backing will be most useful
 - PM: definition of, and free provision of, what is regarded as safety-related information is critical for ToR
 - a. AR, HJS disagree
- HF: Options – ToR could be – frozen, updated today, or reworked more deeply → updated
 - Agreed to update today and use as basis for work

Action: "Further Actions drafting group": HF, VM, HJS, JB, FB to decide the format of the recommendations – a Communication, Recommendation or Industry Action? by next meeting (18 September)

Item 3 "Perspectives & Focus" – definition of safety-related information. Not include specifically in ToR here as too difficult to agree – different viewpoints. Point added to address safety relevance.

Item 4 "Road Map" – WR – how about longer-term 'ideal scenario'?

VM – need to concentrate on shorter-term recommendations for our output

AR – can define actions in context of a roadmap that extends further. → updated ToR

Item 5 "Further Actions" – VM – Proposal is to eSafety Forum and to Commission, on further actions. European position is to be supported by the eSafety Forum. All: timescale – first results to be included into German EU presidency workplan by November 2006. Also, the Commission plans to have a common workshop on digital maps and RTTI end 2006 / start 2007.

Result – Updated ToR with five main points. Agreed that working process must be based on consensus. Where consensus is not reached, should highlight in the recommendations that the area is important and member states / industry etc should address.

Agreed that draft minutes first circulated within group; agreed minutes then made available on eSafety Forum web site.

The group defined allocation of responsibilities for these ToR items. The people identified first need to define a work process and more detailed tasks / plan.

eSafety RTTI WG	Minutes Meeting #1: 19/07/2006	Document 0607-01	Page 4/4
		Author J.Burgess	Date 26/07/2006

3 Review of the Recommendations, including comments

Identified as task of "Recommendations Review drafting group" as defined against ToR.

4 Definition of the Work Plan, including tasks/schedule, drafting groups etc

All – please note actions in this section and refer to Terms of Reference for detail

Item 1 – none

Item 2 – Review of existing recommendations (lead JB)

- JB distribute list for review
- Individual review of recommendations and circulation by email in advance of:
 - Phone conference 8 August 9:30am to reach consensus.
Dial-in number +44870 22 333 44, PIN 090476
- JB distribute results to whole group

Item 3 – Criteria, perspectives etc (lead FB)

- Exchange of emails 24-28 July

Item 4 – Roadmap (lead HJS)

- Definition of starting point
- Phone conference 9:30am

Item 5 – Further actions (lead HF)

- Actions after next WG face to face meeting, input into eSafety Steering Group meeting 11th October

5 AOB, date/place of the next meeting

Reviewed 'perspectives of traffic information' mind map. To be kept in mind while drafting, and to potentially also offer as accompaniment / explanation to recommendations. ACTION – participants to propose any additions

Next meeting: Brussels, 10:30-16:30, Monday 18 September. JB has confirmed meeting room at ERTICO. Working groups to collaborate by email / phone conference in the meantime as defined above.

6 File List

- Draft Terms of Reference with comments: RTTI WG 20060719 recommendations after meeting.doc
- Previous Recommendations with comments: RTTI WG 20060719 recommendations after meeting.doc
- Mindmap PDF of Perspectives of Traffic Information: to include updated version from HF