



European Committee for Standardization
Comité Européen de Normalisation
Europäisches Komitee für Normung



TC 278 Road Transport and Traffic Telematics

N1996

Title : Minutes of a meeting of WG 15, Brussels, 2007-11-20
Source : WG 15
Date : 2008-03-07
Status : For information
Note :

n1996 Minutes of a meeting of WG 15, Brussels 2007-11-20.doc

Secretariat: **Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)**

Mr. J.A. Dijkstra
Vlinderweg 6
P.O. box 5059
2600 GB Delft
The Netherlands

Telephone : +31 15 2 690 127
Telefax : +31 15 2 690 242
Telex : 38144 nni nl
Internet : jelte.dijkstra@nen.nl
WWW : <http://www.nen.nl/cen278>



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

Minutes of meeting of CEN TC278 WG15 Brussels Tuesday 20th November 2007

The 5th meeting of CEN TC278 WG15.

ACEA/EUCAR Avenue des Nerviens 85 B-1040 Bruxelles
MEETING: CEN TC278 WG15 Tuesday 20th November 2007

1. Welcome and Role Call, Introductions (10.00 AM)

NAME	Country	Organization	eMail	Telephone
B Williams (Chair) (BW)	UK	CSI	bw@2-csi.com	+44 1422 883 882
John Archer (JA)	UK	Airbiquity	jarcher@airbiquity.com	
Egil Bovim (EB)	Norway	KOKOM	Egil.bovim@kokom.no	+47 55 38 99 32
Stephan Cayet (SC)	France	PSA	stephan.cayet@mpsacom	+33 1 57 59 01 57
Natalino Curci	Italy	UNINFO/ Autostrada	n.curci@polidream.it	
E.Davila Gonzalez (EDG)	EU	EC DG INFSO	Emilio.davila-gonzalez@ ec.europa.eu	+32 2 296 2188
Remi Demerle (RD)	France	Wavecom	Remi.demerle@wavecom.com	
Michael Fichte (MF)	Germany	Volkswagen		
Bernard Flury-Herard (BFH)	France	France Ministry of sustainable Development	bernard.flury- herard@equipement.gouv.fr	
T.Form (TF)	Germany	Volkswagen	thomas.form@tu-bs.de	
Stella Kist (SK)	Germany	ATX Europe		
Henri van de Kraats (HK)	Belgium	IMA	h.vandekraats@imabenelux.com	
Raimer Krumrein (RK)	Germany	Daimler Chrysler	Rainer.krumrein@daimlerchrysler.com	
Pierre Lecointe (PL)	France	PSA	pierre.lecointe@mpsacom	+33 1 57 59 83 68
R.Lindholm (RL)	Belgium	Airbiquity	rlindholm@airbiquity.com	+32385769802
Benoit Mazeau (BM)	France	France Ministry of Interior	benoit.mazeau@interieur.gouv.fr	+33 1 56 04 76 03
Constantantinos Photiou	Cyprus	Cyprus National Security Authority	cphotiou@mod.gov.cy	
Markus Putze (MP)	Germany	Audi AG	Markus.putze@audi.de	
A. Raison (AR)	France	AFNOR	a.raison@ima.fr	
Javier Roca	Spain	UVEG		
Joachim Scholten (JS)	Germany	BMW	Joachim.scholten@bmw.de	
Andrea Srocynski (AS)	Germany	ATX Europe	asrocynski@atxeu.com	



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

Monica Shettino (MS)	Belgium	ERTICO	m.schettino@mail.ertico.com	
Sabine Spell (SS)	Germany	Volkswagen	Sabine.spell@volswagen.de	
Wolfgang Reinhart (WR)	Belgium	ACEA	wr@acea.be	
Thomas Starek (TS)	Czech Rep	Telematix Services	starek@telematix.cz	
Martin Wiecker (MW)	Germany	Ford	mwiecker@ford.com	

The attendees introduced themselves.

Business cards, where provided are scanned and attached to the back of these minutes

The hosts, ACEA, were thanked for providing facilities for the meeting.

2. Membership of CEN TC278 WG15.

Delegates were reminded that they must have their name put forward as an expert to WG15 in order to regularly participate in this group.

3. Minutes of last meeting and approval

The minutes were agreed as presented and previously circulated (v2).

4. Matters Arising/Action Points

it was noted that all but one action item had been completed.

ACTION #2-0003 : BW to provide Emilio Davila Gonzalez (EC-ICT for Transport) with ISO TC204 working documents and link to Convenor of the working group (AVI ??) To Do AVI

5. w15-0044 WI00278220 Operational Requirements for eCall 071020 Version 1.doc

The convenor stimulated a debate about what comprised eCall and the principal users. It was agreed that eCall was an automatic service connecting a vehicle in distress to a PSAP, and therefore the 'users' were the occupants of the vehicle and the PSAPS. It was important to be very clear about these issues if the development of documents was not to be confused by different objectives

There was a long debate about the role of third party service providers. EDG pointed out that any service provider could be nominated a PSAP by the responsible public authority in a country.

It was agreed that both the "pan European eCall" and "third party eCall Support" had the same objective- to get assistance to occupants of vehicles in distress. However Third party services may include additional functions such as call filtering. Then EDG asserted that other emergency service support was not "eCall" in the sense the European Commission gave to this term while promoting the European initiative. "Pan European eCall". This vocabulary precision was accepted. There was an issue



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

about the use of 112/e112, and the fact that third party services may use a different number. It was agreed that a link between a vehicle and a third party service provider did not constitute an eCall, but an eCall automatically routed to a PSAP and the establishment of a direct voice channel between vehicle occupants and PSAPs might constitute an eCall, but in other circumstances may not. BFH proposed the definition of a "Car Rescue Service" but this was not accepted by the meeting which pointed out that such enhanced definitions were outside of the scope of eCall, and being done by others.

However, it was agreed that there were two scenarios and that the current OR draft dealt only with 'pan-European eCall'.

It was proposed by the Chairman that there should perhaps be a separate work item "Third Party eCall Support", defining the operating requirements and intrinsic procedures and QoS. He invited those interested to create the new work item at 4pm. He reminded delegates that 5 member country support would be needed (but not necessarily at this meeting). There was considerable support by delegates for this new work item. Task force of BW, BFH, EDG to prepare new work item proposal, circulate to group for 14 day review and then submit to TC278. BFH appointed as editor for the new work item. All encouraged to circulate the draft once agreed to other potentially interested parties and to encourage their participation.

In response to a challenge, the Convenor stated that the WG has two work items, but is open to proposals from any member for new work items, and if supported by 5 member countries, can open and submit new work items for ratification by TC278.

It was agreed that the MSD was applicable to both scenarios.

The meeting then discussed, debated and developed the working draft of "Pan European eCall Operating Requirements (See doc wg15-047).

Particularly there was the removal of "Significant Accident", extensions and improvements to Terms and Definitions, removal of items that duplicated 15722.

BW apologised to the full editing group that while it had been the intention to develop the document, share it with the full editing group, then with the WG, because of the delays leading to the cancellation of the October meeting and a very late document, the middle step had not been possible. He reiterated that once the issues of principal had been settled, the editing groups task to make the document smooth to read, accurate and unambiguous remained an important stage of the development. In the interim, the version agreed at the meeting would be issued to all, but he looked especially to the editing group for comments on the detail of this text.

When MS/EDG/BW had developed the first working draft, there were a number of issues that were considered crucial for eCall. Some of these were quantified values, but there was not quantified assessment of the requirement. ETSI MSG have recently issued a liaison statement outlining their progress towards the communications means for pan European eCall. Three possible technical solutions – SMS, In Band Modem and CTM had been evaluated. None could meet the time/data volume requirements in the requirements documents in their possession. A further variation on the CTM was being developed but would take until next summer before it could be finalised. The chair had been informally asked if there was any flexibility in the operating requirements. In producing the draft these values were highlighted and in working through the draft these issues were dealt with as recorded below. The issues came into two groups- internal and external

Internal



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

Requirement : *The automotive manufacturer/equipment supplier shall make best reasonable efforts to ensure that the in-vehicle equipment is reasonably protected from the effects of collision and shall be able to operate without reliance on the vehicle power supply for a period of at least **eight** minutes*

In the preparation of the draft this had been reduced from 20 minutes to 8 minutes. But what was the appropriate requirement? No rationale was available. What was the minimum that had to be specified?

MP (Audi) argued that in 95% of accidents power was not lost so the voice channel could be supported indefinitely. In the small residual 5% it was not practicable to provide an independent battery because of the high cost of such batteries and the maintenance implications. TF (Volkswagen) supported saying that in a system that VW deployed in the late 1990's the principal cause of system failure was battery related. EB explained that from the point of view of the PSAP most of the necessary voice communication could often be provide in 1.5 -2 minutes. But in some cases conversation with the vehicle occupant was a vital part of treatment prior to the rescue services arriving. This could continue for several minutes at least. This was particularly important where the only occupant able to talk was a child or where some initial simple emergency steps could be taken.

BFH Argued that the ability to send the MSD and support a voice channel post loss of power was essential. He believed that examining the statistics would find that there was a strong correlation between serious accidents, where eCall was most needed, and loss of power. In total statistic it might only be 5% of all accidents, but it was the 5% where eCall was most needed. He explained that also, in many cases, especially where the battery was at the front of the car, power loss was often near immediate. Some vehicle manufacturers also had a policy to cut power in the event of accident to minimise risk to rescue teams. MP again argued that is was an impractical cost and maintenance requirement. RK (Daimler) supported. EDG asked for the statistical analysis from Audi so the issues could be clarified. MP explained that the figures would only be appropriate for Audi models so could not be extrapolated, and was very model dependent, with models where the battery was close to the front of the car most likely to suffer power loss, while larger vehicles where the battery was in the boot of the vehicle experienced almost no power loss. BW quizzed how the MSD could be sent if there was no power. MP argued that this could be done by techniques such as capacitors. SC (PSA) pointed out that it took many seconds to establish a connection before an MSD could be sent so he doubted that any technology other than battery could provide this. The battery need not be expensive, but could not support endless voice channel. He suggested that there should be a flag sent in the event the voice channel was being supported on emergency battery power. SS (Volkswagen) again raised the cost issue, and when pressed SC estimated that emergency battery cost is less than 7% of the total in-vehicle equipment cost for eCall and can be easily maintained by being replaced in routine service at 5 year intervals without great cost imposition to vehicle owner. When challenged that this was OK for top end range add on equipment, but not for a low cost solution, SC replied that even bottom end range vehicles would be equipped with this type of solution by 2010, and cost was manageable, so long as it was understood that the amount of time that voice communications could be supported was limited. Audi, VW and Daimler Chrysler remained unconvinced.

It was agreed to separate post crash requirements to

- a) sending the MSD in all circumstances, but without specifying time or technology.
- b) that vehicle manufacturers would make best reasonable efforts to establish a voice channel post crash, without specifying time or method.

The second internal value examined was :

Requirement: *Depression/toggling of the manual initiation button for a period of not less than **three** seconds shall initiate the 'eCall', and An 'eCall' shall be terminated if the "112/SOS" button is depressed/toggled for a period of more than one second.*



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

This was felt to be too technology specific, and in any event was largely avoided by removing MSD specification elements of the document to 15722, and was to be replaced by a general statement saying that it could be effected by suitable means, without specifying the time.

Values with External impact

BW explained that by far the most urgent issues were those that affected MSG. In the letter referred to above, MSG had stated that the 3 solutions that they had examined could not transfer 140 bytes in 4 seconds.

Requirement : *Assuming the availability of a suitable wireless communications network, a complete 'eCall' transmission including the transmission of the MSD, shall be completed within four seconds.*

Although there was not time to work through all of the OR document in the day, the convenor raised the issue of the justifying why 4 seconds was a critical time? Why was 6 or 3 or 10 seconds not appropriate? He asked EB to explain the PSAPs real requirement. EB explained that it was not an issue of critical time. It needed to be quick- i.e. just a few seconds, but the exact number of seconds was not generally important. He thought that the 4 seconds had probably come from a UK and/or Netherlands requirement for a PSAP to answer a received call within 4 seconds of it starting to ring as part of a QoS requirement for manual response. It was agreed by the meeting that there was probably some flexibility but the UK/Dutch would have to be involved in a final solution. The convenor pointed out that the 4 seconds could still be related to when the PSAP received the call rather than the MSD transmission. However see below.

Requirement : *MSD Length as defined in 24722 is 144 bytes.*

The second issue was the length of the MSD. The Convenor made it very clear that we were not going to re-open the MSD and its sequence or semantic values. However, the length of 144 bytes, he believed originated from an earlier potential solution that where eCall was were advised by MSG that the message could not be longer than 144 bytes (in respect of the solution that they were then examining).

The MSD actually utilised 71 bytes, including XML delimiters. The rest was reserved for expansion, and there was a way to truncate the sent message to only where there were actual values. BW recognised the need for expansion space, but questioned whether we really needed 70 bytes of extension space. Perhaps 10 or possibly 20 bytes would be perfectly adequate. This was the MSD, not the FSD. If the amount of data was causing MSG a problem, maybe it could be reduced without losing any of the MSD, and without giving up all expansion possibilities.

BW also raised a second issue. The MSD was defined as semantically expressed in integer and string values – i.e. effectively represented in ASCII 8 bit encoding. The PSAP did not need to understand the ASCII encoding only the human readable representation. If the MSD were encoded in Binary or BCD- binary coded decimal, it would be similarly re-presented in HR form by the software to the PSAP. He did not claim to be an expert on BCD or binary encoding, but believed that the transmitted length could probably be halved. All agreed that so long as this did not change semantic values of the MSD nor sequencing, this should be studied further. The convenor invited all to submit to their computer data experts for suggestions as the best way to do this.

BW suggested that we should share this debate with MSG, but several delegates felt that when MSG was in the middle of making an evaluation based on the current 4 second/144 byte requirement, it could set the work back to give them new values at this stage. There was no agreement so it was decided to defer this issue until the next meeting when values achievable by different encoding would be better known, but in the meantime the Convenor would seek clarification of the issues under examination by



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

MSG at the moment and the critical issues as part of his normal informal liaison with the Chair of ETSI MSG.

The debate then ran out of time.

6. Assignment of Tasks

ACTION #5-0001 : BW, BFL,EDG to prepare new work item proposal "Third Party eCall Support: operating requirements"

ACTION #5-0002 : ALL : Those interested in joining the editing team for the new work item to email the Convenor to register their interest.

ACTION #5-0003 : BW : To circulate agreed NP proposal to WG for 14 day comment

ACTION #5-0004 : ALL : Submit any comments within 14 days

ACTION #5-0005 : BW : To submit final version to CEN TC278 Secretariat for TC approval

ACTION #5-0006 : MS/RW to revise and change title of OR working Draft to "Pan European eCall: operating requirements".

ACTION #5-0007 : MS to revise and circulate OR working Draft.

ACTION #5-0008 : ALL : To study draft and submit comments on revisions to date by Mid January.

ACTION #5-0008 : ALL : To submit MSD to their computer coding experts to find suggestions for more efficient encoding, and to submit suggestions to Convenor by 7th January

7. eCall AOB

There was no time for this item

8. eSafety AOB

There was no time for this work item

9. Date of Next Meeting

Notice that the next meeting would be delayed has already been given because of the closure date of the 15722 ballot.

The next meeting has to run a "Comment Resolution Meeting" for 15722, and to continue the progress on the OR draft.

In respect of development of the OR, the convenor did not want to reopen and redebate the issues agreed today, but left the door open if any major errors or new facts came to light re these issues. Text that had not achieved consensus would be highlighted in red in the next version of the OR draft. We had marked the draft at the point we had reached and would intend to debate only issues still



CEN TC278 (ITS) WG15 eSafety

Convenor: R.K.Williams. International Messaging Centre: Tel/Fax/Voicemail: 44 1422 883 882
CSI, 1 Brearley Hall, Halifax HX2 6HS, England UK : E-Mail: bw@2-csi.com

highlighted in red, and those past the point that we had reached- this included the contentious issue of nomadic devices, and the issue of 4 seconds and the data compaction achievable with the MSD.

It was therefore agreed that the meeting would be scheduled for 2 days (as many members had a problem stretching to three days.)

The 'third party support for eCall' work item would probably not have time for debate at the next meeting, but the editing group might choose to meet separately to start off development of the first working draft, and it would be the main subject of the following meeting.

Brussels, Paris, Munich and Norway were offered as venue, but it was decided that it was the wrong time of the year for Norway. In a loose show of hands, Brussels was the first choice of most. EDG was asked if he could find a venue. In the event that he cannot, Paris would be the fallback

Date of the meeting 5/6 February 2008, commencing 10 am on 5th. Probably working to 6/6.30 pm on 6th and finishing at 5 pm on the 6th

10. Closure of meeting

The meeting close shortly before 17.30.

If you wish to make any new proposals for WG15 work, please send to Bob Williams
bw@2-csi.com