

Minutes of the Meeting

Third Meeting of the eSafety Communications Working Group, Munich 06-April-06

Version 1.1, as of 05 July 2006, all feedback included

Participants:

Uwe Daniel, Bosch
Paul Kompfner, ERTICO
Peter Mann, Bundesnetzagentur
Rudolf Mietzner, Soft Lab
Elisabeth Uhlemann, Volvo
Peter Ludwig, Tri Consult
Dieter Seeberger, Daimler Chrysler
Tamas Szafko, Connexis

1. Welcome and introduction

Rudi Mietzner as host and Uwe Daniel as chair welcomed the participants. Rudi Mietzner presented the agenda for the day.

2. Rudi Mietzner showed a presentation from the Spectrum Requirements Workshop, held in Brussels 28.02.06. All presentations of this workshop are available on the [esafetysupport.org](http://www.esafetysupport.org/en/news/workshop_on_spectrum_requirements_for_road_safety.htm) website, see http://www.esafetysupport.org/en/news/workshop_on_spectrum_requirements_for_road_safety.htm

Rudi presented the COMeSafety project. Within the eSafety initiative the project will work on the following tasks, which are very much in line with the WG-C goals:

- Co-ordination and consolidation of research results and their implementation
- eSafety Forum support in case of Standardisation and Frequency Allocation
- Worldwide harmonization (Japan/US/Europe)
- Support Frequency allocation process

Consequently WG-C can integrate the results of the COMeSafety project to derive recommendations to the eSafety Forum and the commission.

Some feedback from participants of the above mentioned workshop regarding WG-C tasks were:

The term "Protected Spectrum" is not clearly defined, especially for the regulatory bodies of the MS it is unclear how to transform this proposal into regulations.

Next month in Geneva the Regional Radiocommunications Conference is held. Without clearly defined requirements in accepted terminology we are in quite a weak position to achieve our goal for a protected band.

Peter Mann, who also joined the workshop recommended to better concentrate on smart access technologies rather than just on frequency matters. Which technology requires what bandwidth to achieve which gain on safety? See below.

If an exclusive frequency will be granted, a „day one“ application has to make use of it within a relatively short period of time, otherwise the spectrum might be re-allocated. This means that i.e. field operational tests must be designed and planned alongside the spectrum and standards discussions.

Another unclear term was “predictive sharing conditions”. Dieter Seeberger mentioned an ECC document regarding this term, he will make that available to the WG-C.

From the discussion the task resulted that we will need to formulate the eSafety requests regarding spectrum issues using terms regulators are familiar with. A structure with well defined “baskets” could help as well: Which application goes where and needs what?

WG-C will have to collect all information from the various documents and projects and will prepare executive information which can be easily communicated to non expert or political audiences. For spectrum requirements we will need to translate applications into frequency requirements.

This means that the requirements of each application on bandwidth and quality of service must be specified. R. Mietzner and D. Seeberger agreed that this also has to be done within COMeSafety and the C2CC-Consortium. It was agreed that this should be a task to be finished until the next meeting in September to prepare at least a tentative requirements list based on applications for the WG-C mid term report.

3. Dieter Seeberger showed a presentation held in Brussels, 29.03.06. “There is ETSI and there is ECC” A chart explained “Preferred Spectrum SRDOC Part 1 and 2”. Conclusion: We will need good reasons why we need a 30 MHz, not a 10 MHz bandwidth. This can be answered after the results of the above mentioned task are available.

Rudi Mietzner introduced the DAIDALOS activities. Since this paper is for internal use only, Rudi Mietzner is not allowed to distribute it.

4. Lunch Break

5. The two Task Forces (TF) “Standardisation” (ST) and “Spectrum Requirements” (SR) worked in separate sessions. The findings were presented after the working sessions.

Paul Kompfner presented the findings of ST and Rudi Mietzner those of SR. All findings and to do´s are documented in the attached mind maps.

6. Time line for our WG-C working group activities: On 13.10.06 the annual “International Workshop on Vehicle Communications” will be held after ITS World Congress in London. This will be an ideal forum to discuss our proposals, especially because DG INFSO and COMeSafety are hosting the meeting. Therefore both TF are requested to make sure that a first draft is ready by end of September. (Peter Ludwig and Peter Mann will support both TF chairs to prepare and track the work plans).

7. The next WG-C meeting will be held in Brussels at ERTICO on 13.09.06. Paul Kompfner will be our host.