

eSafety RTTI WG	Recommendations Oct. 2005 - Draft Review 2006 -	Document 0605-02v4	Page 1/2
		Author H. Friedrichs	Date 26/07/2006

No		Comments
1 To R3	common implementation strategy for the extension of RTTI services, working to European standards, covering both inter-urban and urban areas;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Action WG: draft an implementation strategy - (JB) One concrete action here would be for each member state to say whether urban areas and motorways are both provided TMC and, where not, make a timed plan to do so. Other non-TMC methods could be substituted e.g. in cities if a different approach has already been planned or made. - (AS) OK it is a good first step - (HF) need of an EC recommendation?
2	support the TMC-Forum to promote the safety-related features of the Traffic Message Channel;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) This happens already – Good to reiterate that they should continue to support TMC. - (TK) I wonder whether a special mentioning of the TMC Forum is needed. The TMC Forum will not be able to promote any feature of TMC in a member state without an enormous budget. So, my proposal is to say "support any idealistic promotion of the safety-related features..." - (HF) necessary action of MS or stakeholders?
3	take steps to ensure roaming and inter-operability of RTTI services across the EU;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) A key recommendation – introduction of commercial TMC services with restricted access makes this increasingly important. Basic technical mechanism exists but how much is it used? - (AS) Roaming agreements exist between commercial operators (needed by car manufacturers) - (HF) need for monitoring? Who will do?
4	make existing public data available for the provision of RTTI services. Safety relevant data be freely available;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) An excellent aim. But, differing responsibilities for and attitudes towards data ownership in different contexts, plus differing legislations, may make this difficult. For example, in the UK this is all handled by ITIS and Trafficmaster so there is very little truly 'public' data as such. How to make a workable target from this aim would be a good work item. - (TK) One real motive for RTTI is also the maintenance of infrastructure. May I suggest to add this ("Safety relevant and infrastructure maintaining data...") - (AS) The quality of Safety relevant data must be guaranteed by the supplier (public or private !)
5	request that traffic management centres operate to European standards such as TMC-encoding of the data;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) Again, somehow need to make a more concrete action from this - (AS) OK, some private operators (with the approval of car manufacturers) are now giving a good example of effective European cooperation
6	agree, on the basis of national RTTI strategies and the Commission's Recommendation on TTI services, with the private service providers on the minimum quality for public (free of extra charge) services;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) Difficult for them to quantify the required minimum quality – is there any way we can help define this? - (AS) We try to develop with a private operator some tools to estimate the quality of the service - (HF) Existing "definitions of quality" available – or study / expertise needed?

eSafety RTTI WG	Recommendations Oct. 2005 - Draft Review 2006 -	Document 0605-02v4	Page 2/2
		Author H. Friedrichs	Date 26/07/2006

7	publish clear guidelines for the private sector on the conditions for establishing private data collection networks for commercial services;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) Is it possible for this to be also applicable where these data collection networks have already been set up? Needs to be for full impact. Could also roll into single recommendation with item 6? - (HF) provision of data is an inherent task of the infrastructure operator, details could be left to regional co-operations of public and private partners ?
8	require reluctant FM-broadcasters to carry an RDS/TMC service for public or private users so that 80% or more of all journey drivers can have access to a relevant RTTI service by the year 2010 or earlier;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) These statistics would be difficult to measure. They may be good headlines though, in which case we could perhaps have a work item to develop SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timed) objectives to fit 'beneath' them at a working level. - (AS) It is more realistic to say : about 90% of the territory has to be covered by the FM transmitters - (HF) to be integrated into the country road maps ?
9	require the authorities to ensure that frequency spectrum and broadcast capacity will be made available in the near future for advanced digital broadcast traffic information services via DAB, DRM, DVB-T, and eventually, satellite-DAB;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) This may need to be changed due to differing (and not always clear) digital broadcast plans per country. Perhaps it is possible to make a recommendation that allows countries to be flexible with digital broadcasting but asks for some suitable provision in whatever technology is selected, whenever it is introduced. - (HF) basic traffic needs of frequencies (broadcast, C2X) should be recommended to MS
10	support the development of future advanced services which become possible by DAB, DVB-T, satellite broadcasting, 3G, WLAN, and others;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) Can be bearer-agnostic here too. - (TK) I would suggest to phrase "support the development of future advanced services and technologies which become possible by DAB, DVB-T, satellite broadcasting, 3G, WLAN, and others. All efforts should support the idea of harmonized, compatible, pan-European delivery and reception of information." - (HF) to be implemented into the road map
11	take a position regarding these recommendations of the RTTI WG through their Transport Ministers;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) For me this is the key – that Transport Ministers offices are aware of the recommendations and either actively support them or feed back any parts which are difficult for them to support. - (HF) conferences during the German EU-Presidency ?
12	the Council of the Transport Ministers of the European Union should make a decision on this subject at one of their next meetings."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (JB) A mechanism? Can we identify a specific planned meeting and try to get this into the agenda? - (HF) same as (11)