

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 1/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

1. Welcome, Apologies, Agenda

Participants

Name	Initials	Organisation	Email
Bartel, Georg	GB	Polizei NRW	
Bolte, Fritz	FB	BASt	bolte@bast.de
Burgess, James	JB	ERTICO	j.burgess@mail.ertico.com
Friedrichs, Heinz	HF	Bosch	heinz.friedrichs@de.bosch.com
Haddadi, Afsaneh	AH	T-Systems	afsaneh.haddadi@t-systems.com
Kamalski, Theo	TKa	Siemens	theo.kamalski@siemens.com
Kusche, Thomas	Tku	WDR	thomas.kusche@wdr.de
Mikolaschek, Peter	PM	ADAC	peter.mikolaschek@zentrale.adac.de
Moutal, Valerie	VM	DG INFISO	valerie.moutal@ec.europa.eu
Reinhardt, Wolfgang	WR	ACEA	wr@acea.be
Roca, Javier	JR	UVEG	javier.roca@uv.es
Rudolph, Axel	AR	T-Systems	axel.rudolph@telekom.de
Sarignac, Alain	AS	Renault	alain.sarignac@renault.com
Zubkowski, Günther	GZ	Polizei NRW	guenter.zubkowski@polizei.nrw.de

Apologies

Dicke, Bernhard	BD	VDA	dicke@vda.de
Eschke, Stephan	SE	Blaupunkt	stephan.eschke@de.bosch.com
Petersen, Gerhard	GP	Astra	gerhard.petersen@astra.admin.ch
Schade, Hans-Joachim	HJS	Siemens	hans-joachim.schade@siemens.com

Agenda approved.

2. Approval of the minutes of meeting #3, review of action points

Presentation to Plenary meeting

Complete.

Definition of safety-related information

Will be presented today by Polizei NRW.

Country status for annex

Complete by JB – reviewed in later agenda point

Roadmaps annex

Draft by JB – reviewed in later agenda point

Preparation of report draft into Commission format

Complete by JB and VM

Recommendations

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 2/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

FB comment item 3: rephrasing of 'free of charge' access to information – should be for all, not just for Public Authorities.

3. Presentations / review of contributions: Preparation of report draft into Commission Recommendation format

Public & Private Services

FB – concentrates too much on commercial services – should cover public sector in more detail.

FB – OK with this if we mention explicitly Public and Private RTTI services in the title. To highlight the joint focus on Public and Private services, add the phrase 'Public and Private' to the start of the Communication title. Becomes:

“COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION
Of (date)
On **Public and Private** Real-Time Traffic and Travel Information (RTTI)
Services for Safe and Efficient Road Traffic”

Extension of previous Communication, not replacement

VM - explained new format. New Recommendation will not be a replacement of the older (wider scope) Recommendation, but an extension of it. As it is nothing completely new, it allows to save some time regarding the adoption processing.

AH - Need to check if it is an extension that we do not contradict the original Communication. VM there is not contradiction; this offers a tighter scope and more detail in the specific area of RTTI.

HF proposes to make a comparison of the two Communications to check that there is no contradiction. **Action HF.**

Practical implementation of Recommendations

VM – would like to improve the links between the Recommendations and the Annex items, plus in Annex give more supporting information on how the Member States can practically implement the Recommendations. Examples: business model, best practices (still to be added).

TKa – need to explain how to practically implement the Recommendations – example of a country which is making restrictive usage requirements for location tables – how should this be addressed? This Recommendation should give a proposal for how to handle such situations, who is responsible for coordinating the resolution, who has the power to drive the adoption of best practices etc. The development of overall coordination for this area (as proposed for joint TMC Forum / TPEG Forum / mobile.info group) should be one of the Recommendations.

Need wording to add to Recommendation 1, something along the lines of “Should be supervised at the European level by an organisation incorporating interests ...; important for involvement of National bodies to participate; recommendations of this group should be followed” – **Action TKa with JB, AR** to look at how to incorporate this.

Background – Commission communication hierarchy:

- Communication – not mandatory
- Recommendation – not mandatory but MS (and Parliament and Council of Ministers) have to comment and if not agreeing highlight this and explain why
- Directive – becomes mandatory, much more work and time to create

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 3/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

HF asks if all are comfortable that set of Recommendations do indeed make clear Recommendations, and do not need to be renamed as Conclusions. Agreed.

WR proposes that there should be an **extra Recommendation, that the MSs should create a Memorandum of Understanding as a way to achieve these Recommendations..Action JB / HF to add to draft.**

Agreed – and preparation of this Memorandum of Understanding should be made as an input for the German Presidency event which would provide an opportunity for signing.

Statistics/claimed safety and cost effects

VM comment that we require footnotes for the figures quoted in the Whereas section, and remove 'more field studies are required' from Whereas part.

JB – clarification of the explanation of the figures required.

HF – the figures are from the eSafety Compendium (p.409?) – can clarify and footnote them from that information – **action JB**. Also FB will propose a clarification of text in this Whereas item.

WR - where the percentage figures do not look impressive, could quote actual figures – JB to check in Compendium.

FB comment – fourth Whereas point '...additional costs incurred could be offset by reduced costs for physical road development...' – is this realistic? HF sourced this from Swiss road telematics plan. FB doesn't think a reduction in physical road development requirements is realistic – consensus to **re-word** as '.. could positively complement physical road developments..'

Comments → new version of draft, to be distributed with minutes.

Recommendation 4 – Free availability of safety-related information

FB – comment on Recommendation 4 '...free of charge as far through the service chain as is under public control...' needs to be just free of charge

JB explained contentiousness of this point public vs. private.

VM explains this differs between MSs. Cannot outlaw private services for the safety information! E.g. that commercial services have to provide free information.

PM Safety related information should be free of charge for the end user

VM – we want consensus and possibility for all MS to support. As some MS have chosen commercial solution, cannot require them to support cost of free service. It is better if a service can be free of charge of the end user, but if the service can only be created with private involvement we cannot take away the possibility for these private companies to charge to support operation.

TKa – Difficulty of combining free and charged (open/encrypted) information in a service in current TMC technology.

AS – French policy is to provide information for free via radio, to VMS and to service operators. Service operators can use this information as part of a commercial offering. Very difficult to differentiate at the boundary of what is or isn't safety relevant information.

TKu – French example – collected by the Govt using public money and provided from the Govt to SPs to make business – not the best way to improve safety! As limits accessibility of information

AH – The problem is that the sentence is open to interpretation. Goal is to provide information to the end user free of charge. Someone has to pay – either government/public or private companies in the service chain.

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 4/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

GB – interest is that the end user gets the information free of charge as this is what has the safety impact. UK police strategy is to provide their information for free to other bodies to make the roads safer. Tried to define ‘safety related’ and will make a proposal later in this meeting.

AS Price of traffic info (less than 0.5% of price of terminal in French case) is built into terminal cost as standard, and there is no other charge to the user.

VM – this is potentially a never ending discussion. The text addresses a specific case for which it is more possible to reach consensus. As it is not possible to have consensus on information availability, we cannot make a broader recommendation than that.

AH – should clarify text whether control includes enforcement

WR – could add that MSs should follow the **long term objective** of making safety related information available to the end user for free

JB proposed to add that future technology developments should be made such that they enable the mixing of free and paid information in a service to the end user – agreed; consensus to add this to Recommendation – **action JB**

NRW police and ministry – Categorising events by risk and defining a minimum set of free traffic information
(presentation distributed minutes)

Background – GB is responsible for road enforcement for NRW police - Hazard prevention is main objective. Presentation agreed by TISPOL (association of traffic info system police) – working with EC and representing police forces of 25 MSs who discuss road safety best practice.

WR – Side note: any statistics on emissions / pollution vs congestion? No but ‘hot spots’ for particulates are found near some key congestion areas, and these are of course an indicator for emissions. These hot spots are controlled to restrict HGV / ‘dirty’ vehicle movement at certain times.

JB – asked for clarification of ‘Closest vs Core’ etc

- Closest is used to signify most significant / dangerous events level
- Core is used to signify second most significant / dangerous events level
- → (HF) need to simplify these categories / levels?

Don’t need to stick to the categories defined here; need to explain the levels more.

TKa – everything in TMC has a basic background in safety

AR – If TISPOL is NGO, how do they represent authorities? VM – advisory committee, like ACPO in UK. GB and ZG represent both German Ministry of Interior of NRW and the NRW Police

WR – what are the events which are not included in the minimum set?

GZ – e.g. normal roadworks but not fully explored / defined by this study.

TKa – are the definitions of slow traffic etc used here as in DATEX or TMC or different? GZ – different – independent definitions as used routinely in Germany.

VM – valuable input for business model as viewpoint of TISPOL. But WG’s final conclusion may need to be worded differently.

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 5/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

TKu – German national TMC platform identified need for categorisation of safety related traffic content and arranged this through this input from Wolfgang Blindenbacher in TISPOL, agreed it on national level.

PM – This was an official statement of Ministry of Interior of NRW, approved by Ministries of Interior of Germany. Agreed and approved by TISPOL. Agreed by all participants of German traffic information platform. Agreed and supported by European Automobile clubs.

Correction GB – clarification – in fact the presented Police consensus is still in process in TISPOL and therefore not final.

GB – The Police consider it a question of ethics and morality to provide safety information for all. Cannot intentionally exclude anyone.

HF – would be interesting to provide a counterpart list of core ‘non safety related’ information for commercial services to focus on. AR – there is nothing left! All included in this ‘safety-relevant’ definition.

TKa – are these categories internationally understood? Has anyone tried to go through TMC events and categorise them with this philosophy – do they all fit?

JB – These are all good input as reflection of these groups’ views. However clearly not consensus here to adopt these as our categories for a Recommendation.

HF – proposes to have input from Spain before further discussion. One way to represent these inputs would be to put both viewpoints into the Annex and make it clear that there is not consensus.

TKu – this is the core of the philosophy of our working group. Mustn’t avoid the definition of safety relevant data, and RTTI group not competent to make this decision. Police authorities as here are one of the competent bodies to determine this.

HF – Have agreed a set of recommendations. Have agreed that there should be Annexes to support these. Is this structure still valid? Or do we need to revisit the main document?!

TKu – we need a long term solution giving advice and a guideline.

VM – we are deviating from our objective. As well as safety we want to promote mobility and deployment of new telematics services. Do we want to expand our timescale and work as will be required to reach a full consensus on these information priorities, or are we happy to reflect that there are differing views in order to complete our Recommendation?

AR – this is a question of philosophy – there is no fixed answer other than that EVERYTHING is safety related. The real question is whether it is better to offer some information for money than no information for free.

HF – is it possible, if not to agree a cut-off level, to agree some common ground?

Further discussion, no agreement.

VM – our aim is to promote introduction of services, whether public or private. Must create environment in which more services can be created. We don’t necessarily have to decide ourselves all of the parameters.

JR presentation (Already distributed – request from JB if further copies required)

- Safety relevance of information depends on context, distance etc.
- e.g. closed road more safety significant ‘now, here’ than ‘nearby, tomorrow’.
- Separation of cause and effect information

HF – do we want to try to find a consensus over this information for recommendation 4, or just describe the situation and requirements as well as possible and recommend how to proceed?

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 6/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

Discussion around this and adding extra Recommendation 5 ‘..MS should cooperate..’ – see updated draft Communication

HF asks for further feedback on draft Communication by email following the meeting. We are not in the position now to define exactly the boundary of what is and isn't safety related / minimum set, but we can provide some perspectives of relative importance.

We will hold a public consultation (Internet – eSafetySupport web site)

- Need consensus document by first week January
- Text online by mid January, to mid/end February → integrate remarks and confirm
- Mid march – inter-service consultation for 3 weeks → integrate remarks
- End March – translation (1 month)

HF – how do we evaluate / incorporate divergent opinions received during public consultation? VM – in Annex – represent the differing views. In Recommendations – need consensus to change, or no change to be made.

JB – Everyone please read and feedback on roadmap drafts provided.

4. Business models / best practice / roadmaps

Not covered due to lack of time.

JB asks all to review roadmaps input and supply feedback by email.

Best practice – open action for DW (UK commercial service and ? (Germany or Spain? Public service) to provide.

5. Next Meeting

Thursday 22 February 2007 @ ERTICO – JB to book room.

6. File list

Updated report draft for feedback
Presentation from ZPD NRW (newer version)
Roadmaps input (JB) for feedback by all

7. Actions list

1.	Make a comparison of the two Communications to check that there is no contradiction	HF
2.	Propose wording to add to Recommendation 1, something along the lines of “Should be supervised at the European level by an organisation incorporating interests ...; important for involvement of National bodies to participate; recommendations of this group should be followed”	TKa, JB, AR

eSafety RTTI WG	Meeting Minutes Meeting #4: 1/12/2006	Document RTTI WG 20061201 Minutes Meeting #4.doc	Page 7/7
		Author J.Burgess	Date 12/12/2006

3.	Draft an additional Recommendation, that the MSs should create a Memorandum of Understanding as a way to achieve these Recommendations.	JB / HF
4.	Clarify 'effect' statistics with footnote	JB
5.	Draft an addition to the Recommendation on public access to information, that future technology developments should be made such that they enable the mixing of free and paid information in a service to the end user – agreed; consensus to add this to Recommendation	JB
6.	Feedback on roadmap drafts provided by JB	All