



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



---

**TC 278 Road Transport and Traffic Telematics**

**N2204**

---

Title : Minutes of recent meetings of WG 15  
Source : Mr. Bob Williams (convenor WG 15)  
Date : 2009-09-08  
Status : For information  
Note :

---

n2204 Minutes of recent meetings of WG 15.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](mailto:jelte.dijkstra@nen.nl)  
WWW : <http://www.nen.nl/cen278>



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

# (Draft) Minutes meeting of CEN TC278 WG15 Brussels Monday 27th & Tuesday 28th April 2009

## The 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of CEN TC278 WG15, eSafety

**Location: Brussels**  
**eSafety Support Office, The Blue Tower, 2nd Floor, Avenue Louise 326**  
**B-1050 Brussels Belgium**

### 1. Housekeeping (10.30 AM)

The draft agenda was approved as the Agenda for the meeting,  
It had been agreed in advance that BSS would have the chance to present their proposals and this was also accepted onto the agenda.

Day one of the meeting was chaired by A.Mellett,

Day 2 of the meeting was chaired by the Convenor.

### 1.1 Welcome and Roll Call, Introductions

NAME	Country	Organization	eMail
B Williams (Chair) (BW)	UK	CSI	bw@2-csi.com
Jan Arfwidsson (JA)	Sweden	Wireless Car	jan.arfwidsson@wirelesscar.com
Jacques Anselem (JAn)	BE	Allianz	jacques.anselem@allianz.com
Jurgen Bartz (JB)	De	BSS	j.bartz@steiger-stiftung.de
Stephan Cayet (SC)	France	PSA	<a href="mailto:stephan.cayet@mpsa.com">stephan.cayet@mpsa.com</a>
Witold Cel (WC)	Poland	Starter SP. Z O.O.	witold.cel@starter24.pl
Bernfreid Coldewey (BC)	Germany	ADAC	Bernfried Coldewey@adec.de
E.Davila Gonzalez (EDG)	EU	EC DG INFSO	EDG.davila-gonzalez@ec.europa.eu
Thierry Delire (TD)	Belgium	Touring	Thierry.delire@touring.be
Bernard Flury-Herard (BFH)	France	France Ministry of sustainable Development	<a href="mailto:bernard.flury-herard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr">bernard.flury-herard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr</a>
Arnauld Lagua	France	IMA Benelux	h.vandekraats@imabenelux.com
Cristina Lumbreras	Spain	Madrid 112	clumbreras@madrid112.es
Andrew Mellett (AM)	Germany	BMW	Andrew.mellett@bmw.de
Monica Schettino	Belgium	ERTICO	m.schettino@mail.ertico.com
Paul Schlopsna (PS)	Germany	ATX Europe	pschlopsna@atxeu.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	SETRA/BNEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Gerard Segarra (GS)	France	Renault	Gerard.segarra@renault.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	MEEDDAT AT/SETRA/ONEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Thomas Starek (TS)	Czeck republic	Telematix	starek@telematix.cz
Octavian Tirla	Germany	Carmeq/VW	octavian.tirla@carmeq.com
John Watson (JW)	UK	Airbiquity	jwatson@airbiquity.com
Martin Wiecker (MW)	Germany	Ford	mwiecker@ford.com
David Williams (DW)	UK	Qualcomm	dwilliams@qualcomm.com

The Convenor attended day 1 by Skype, and Day 2 in person.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

Apologies were received from R Boesch, E.Bovim, J.van Hattem, B.Pringalle

### **1.2 Intellectual Property Rights**

The Chair explained the requirement to declare all relevant intellectual property, or risk being seen as not defending it, and he explained that anything discussed at the meeting was open and that any copyright on documents produced, or solutions developed during the meeting, belonged to CEN.

OPEN: BSS asked for some clarification regarding this point.

**ACTION: BRU 0904-001 : Convenor to write to BSS with CEN IPR policy and provide link into CENCS for any further enquiry**

BFH asked John Watson if there was any IPR associated with document TPS#6-07 and John Watson confirmed that there was no IPR issue and that the information could be used.

### **1.3 Membership of CEN TC278 WG15.**

The chair reminded attendees that to attend meetings and participate in the work of WG15 on a regular basis, a persons name must be submitted by their National Member body to the Secretary of CEN TC278 nominating them as an expert to participate in CEN TC278

### **1.4 Minutes of last meeting and approval**

The minutes of the previous meeting W15-0122, were accepted with the following amendments:

EDG asked that, following a request from French permanent representation, it be pointed out to the HLAP group that their delivery recognize that the PSAP may be

“a public authority or a private organisation recognised by the government and operated by or under the delegation of a public authority”.

as per the definition agreed within the EGEA group.

**ACTION BRU0904-002: BW: BW to take requirement to HLAP PT that their delivery recognises that the PSAP may be “a public authority or a private organisation recognised by the government and operated by or under the delegation of a public authority”.**

### **1.5 Matters Arising/Action Points**

**ACTION : BRU0809-007 : BW/MS/EDG to make arrangements for WG15 web repository..  
Awaiting renewal of eSafety Funding. NO CHANGE STILL OUTSTANDING**

**ACTION : BRU0812-003 : ALL : Q of S : ALL to consider what Q of S items might be relevant for a TS, and to supply ideas, and possibly some description to JA before End May 2009: J Anselem has now accepted leadership of this work item and will summarise to 2nd meeting 2009. None received to date. All members reminded To be discussed June 17/18 meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0812-004 : BW : Q of S: BW to summarise contributions and present to 2nd WG15 meeting in 2009 : J Anselem has now accepted leadership of this work item and will summarise to 2nd meeting 2009. None received to date. All members reminded.**

**ACTION : BRU0812-0008: ALL : Dialogue with PSAPs : ALL to liaise with the PSAP expert group in their own countries to discuss these issues. (Ongoing)s**



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

EDG stated that this issue had been mentioned at the eCall implementation platform, but that there had been no notable response, most likely as they are not aware of the contents of the work. EDG proposed that the TPS-OR document might be circulated to this group for further comment. The group agreed to consider wider publication of the document draft depending on progress after this WG-15 meeting.

It was noted that the next implementation platform meeting is not yet scheduled but is expected to be in September/October. Decision outstanding.

**ACTION : BRU0904-003: ALL: TPS-OR: WG15 to consider if and when to share TPS-OR draft with eCall PSAPs Expert Group.(Next meeting of the eCall Implementation Platform Sept/Oct 09)**

**ACTION : BRU0812-0013: JA : Third Party Services: JA to instigate the discussion within the editing group None received to date. All members reminded To be discussed June 17/18 meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0001: BW : TPSP OR: BW to submit document to WP29 for clearance (pointing out the privacy issue in 3 way conversations) once the doc finalised. Awaiting finalisation of TPSP OR**

EDG stated that the next steps with WP29 (not just for TPS-OR) were currently under discussion.

**ACTION : BRU0903-0002: BFH: TPSP OR: BFH to finalise the changes to the document (with support from editing group if required) and circulate to WG by 13th March . DONE Version 4.71 circulated. Convenor has pointed out that v4.71 does not include changes to Clause 11 that were agreed at last meeting. Revised doc circulated at meeting.**

See "TPS-eCall OR" section later in these minutes.

**ACTION : BRU0903-0003 BW : TPSP OR: BW to request plenary approval to send to TC Comment after April Meeting. DONE Status of work item promoted, Agreed to circulate for TC comment as soon as agreed within WG.**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0004: BW : 15722 MSD: BW to submit document to TC plenary for approval to publish as TS and send to CEN Enquiry. DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0005: BW: Pan European OR: BW to finalise the changes to the document (with support from editing group if required) and circulate to WG by 13th March . DONE Circulated. Doc finalised and circulated, both TS version and EN Draft version**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0006 BW : Pan European OR: BW to submit document to TC plenary for approval as a TS. (Progress to enquiry(EN) cannot occur until stable HLAP document available. DONE Convenor requested TS ballot and TC comment of draft EN (having explained that EN Enquiry could not be held prior to HLAP results. Sweden and Germany objected to request to approve as an adopted work item for progress to a Standard. However, Germany withdrew its objection when the situation and planned route ahead was explained. Passed resolution at meeting. However TC Secretary stated that the work item could not be both TS and Standard, and would only approve to go to TS. However, CEN Central secretariat subsequently overruled (W15-0141) TC Secretariat by reminding them that the doc type for PE OR had already been changed to work item for a Standard. The position about the TS ballot remains unclear and Convenor seeking clarification from TC Secretariat / CEN CS.**

Bob Williams was asked to clarify this last point on day 2. Has the document been submitted as TC or EN? (On Day 2 BW clarified the position as far as possible. See Action item list).

**ACTION : BRU0904-004: BW: PE-OR: BW to clarify position about TS ballot with CEN CS**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

Several participants commented that they were unable to open the meeting document bundles and/or that these were received very late.

The Convenor apologised for the lateness of the doc bundles, but the TPS-OR document, the principal subject for day 1 had not been received until the Friday before the meeting, so it was impossible to circulate beforehand. Post meeting document bundles had been sent in good time, and most of the other documents had also already been circulated, the only difference in the meeting bundles being the assignment or revision of a WG15 document number.

With respect to problems opening bundles, the Convenor apologised, his Mac has for some reason started adding a Mac folder when compressing (.zip) files, which both makes the bundle larger and seems to cause some peoples systems to have problems opening the bundles. He has put a system in place where all bundles are first sent to one of his Microsoft machines, and opened, and this had been done and no problem was experienced, so apart from the additional Mac file issue, he had thought the problem solved. Obviously it is not and he undertook to make further investigation to rectify the problem.

### **1.6 Progress towards Web repository**

No progress as yet.

### **1.7 Date of Next Meeting**

17/18 June 2009

20/21 July 2009

2/3 September 2009

24/25 November 2009

## **2. 00278244 Intelligent transport systems – eCall – Operating requirements for third party support (Session leader : B. Flury-Herard)**

### **2.1 BSS Presentation**

Juergen Bartz (BSS) made a presentation of the BSS systems, with the request that this system should be recognized within the WG15 standards.

This resulted in an active discussion, including the following highlights:

BFH commented that the BSS system may have many benefits ( for example in that it is not just focused on automotive applications) and should be encouraged, and no eCall system is perfect, but that because it does not fit either to the pan-European eCall nor to the current TPS-eCall definition, it should not prevent it to be incorporated into either of these standards.

EDG confirmed that it was clearly not a Pan-European eCall because the MSD is not sent directly to the PSAP using the relevant standards.

BSS felt that they had answered the questions which had been asked of them and were not sure what else was expected of them.

PSA felt that there was a high risk that the initial data routing from BSS would not match the voice routing of the 112 call determined by the mobile network's routing rules, and that this probable high occurrence of unmatched routing was unacceptable, even if as BSS pointed out the second PSAP still had the chance to see/retrieve the data for this call.

EDG asked whether PSAPs are willing to include the BSS platform and how the maintenance of the platform will be ensured.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

The BSS presentation included some new alternative scenarios for voice and data routing for discussion. The routing scheme “3” including a filtering 3<sup>rd</sup> party call centre was agreed to be a representation of TPS-eCall.

The routing scheme “4”, including a direct re-routing of the voice call but without an intermediate call centre, was felt by many to fall outside of the current TPS-eCall scope because it does not include a “filtering” feature.

It was suggested by BW that BSS should submit a written response comparing their proposals against the letter from EDG (of the Commission) containing 10 points about what could / could not call itself an eCall. EDG’s previous “what constitutes an eCall” rules, with the possibility to consider including this system into the JA “Third Party Services” work item.

**ACTION BRU0904-005 : BSS : BSS System : BSS to compare their system to the 10 points of what classifies a system as eCall, from EDG (of the Commission) in the autumn of last year and state how their system compares against each of these points.**

**ACTION : BRU 0904-006 : ALL : BSS System : Once the response is received, WG15 to decide which of the WG15 work items would be most appropriate for this work item**

### **2.2 TPS-OR**

BFH first informed the participants that , as agreed during the last meeting, a small editing group, including A. Mellet, J. Cayet, J. Arfwidsson, J. Amselem and BFH, had worked on the document. It had been circulated among that group and substantive comments were introduced by AM & BW. The group had worked further and agreed on proposing a version 4.71, (with modifications highlighted), to the plenary group.

BFH proposed to discuss this document, version 4.71, submitted to the Convenor for circulation on 23rd April and circulated to the WG on Friday morning (24th), titled 'Bob Williams revisions'. AM had pointed out by email that not all of his points were taken into account, and Bob Williams commented on Friday 24th to the WG that the requirements of the last WG meeting had not been made to S11/Annex in the proposed v4.71 and this was not acceptable as this was a requirement of the previous WG meeting, noting that despite his having proposed suitable text, the doc circulated under the title 'Bob Williams Revisions' did not in fact include most of those revisions.

BW revised 4.71 over the weekend to include the requirements from the minutes of the previous meeting and circulated 4.72 version on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> morning at 10:06. There was a somewhat heated discussion regarding which version of the document should be used as the basis for the discussion. BFH attempted to base the discussions on v4.71

Many felt that this v4.72 was too new as no-one had had the chance to see this version. BW pointed out that technically v4.71 had also been received too late, so either we considered v4.72, which incorporated v4.71, or both were ineligible, and that 4.71 clearly did not include the requirements made at the last WG meeting and minuted in the report of that meeting.

However, as an exception in order to make the practical visibility of the changes and also the additional comments at the same time, and because of the problems of the communication link to BW, it was agreed to use v4.72 as the basis for the review.

It was generally felt that documents and comments on circulated documents should be submitted and considered more in advance in future meetings.(WG15 operating procedures advise 7 or 7+ days before the meeting.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

(Day 1) The document was reviewed up until chapter 10.10 (although section 10.9 needs to be revisited after reviewing chapter 11).

The following key points were made:

In section 10.8, the deleted text referring to a timing of 90-180 seconds was reintroduced as agreed in the last meeting.

JW proposed to change the introduction text to "is characterized as" ...

The connection of a voice channel between the vehicle and the PSAP was clarified from "if required" to "if required by the PSAP".

Although many felt that the concept of splitting the TPSP into the dual roles of TPS-eCall responder and TPS-eCall notifier help make the document more precise, some felt that it made the document less readable for the first-time reader. The definitions were re-ordered to aid understanding and it was suggested that a diagram might be introduced later in the document to help explain the concepts.

Most of the modifications proposed from chapter 1 to 10 by the small editing group were accepted, some minor changes were accepted. These modifications can be reviewed in the file whose name is "w15-1052\_TPS\_eCall\_OR\_version\_4.72 mod session definitive.doc"

Regarding the scope, EDG stated that the way a manufacturer could opt for the kind of eCall service should not be included in a standard, as it is a political/commercial decision. EDG proposed an alternative text for the clause.

Carmeq (for VW) asked why recent vehicle location should be compulsory for TPS-eCall and not for Pan-European eCall. PSA/BFH said that this was partly concerning the responsibility of a TPSP to provide reliable information concerning the carriageway of the vehicle. It was suggested that Carmeq should suggest an alternative text to address both issues (optional recent locations but reliable information, including the clear responsibilities of each party).

**ACTION : BRU0904-007: Carmeq (VW): TPS-OR Re vehicle location : To propose an alternative text including the clear responsibilities of both parties (by May 22)**

AM commented that the use of the term "hands-free voice call" vs "voice call" is not consistent throughout the document. The editor should amend this (e.g. by using "hands-free voice call" throughout, or by use of an appropriate definition).

AM also felt that Section 9.6 was confusing. It was suggested to clearly split the following use-cases:

- Retries from the TPS-IVS for the Initial call build-up
- Call-back from the TPSP to the vehicle when receiving data without voice call (taking into account any TPS-IVS retry strategies)
- retries from the TPS-IVS when detecting a "dropped call"
- Call-back from the TPSP to the vehicle after detecting a "dropped call".

The editing group should propose a new text.

Similarly AM commented that section 10.7 was felt to be inconsistent and should be reworked accordingly.

BMW's change request "TPS#0409 CR BMW001 post crash.doc" was accepted, aligning the TPS-IVS post-crash requirements with those of the Pan-European IVS, and removing the explicit requirement for a vehicle-independent power supply. In addition, however, the recommendation was added that "Ideally it should be possible to maintain a voice communication for at least 8 minutes".

The document review was not completed on day 1 and deferred until the afternoon of day 2..



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

On Day 2 residual points on Clause 10 were considered, and some changes to text proposed.

Clause 11 was considered.

BW explained that at the last meeting it was agreed that there were two problems- a) the title implied there was a definition, and there was no eCall compliant definition, so the title was wrong, and the actual content was 'transitional arrangements, so should be called this in a separate section or annex. The last meeting instructed that this must be corrected. His revision had done this. BW had put them in an Annex. The meeting accepted this as the basis for the review by the WG.

The Convenor also made it clear that the WG, not he, had to make the decision as to whether the transitional arrangements were in an annex or a separate clause in the main body, the risk being that if they were in a separate clause in the main body, if comments at ballot said this was not eCall, we would have no choice but to delete the section, because it isn't eCall. So the better way to successfully retain the content, he suggested, was in an informative annex. The meeting agreed to let the transitional arrangements reside in an annex, at least for the moment, to be reviewed later in the process.

The link between TPSP and PSAP was discussed, including (although not in detail) BMW's Change proposal "TPS#0409 CR BMW002 TPSP-to-PSAP Data transmission.doc" and possible xml structures.

Change request " TPS#0409 CR BMW002 TPSP-to-PSAP Data transmission.doc" from BMW was discussed.

This document proposes many different possibilities that the participants found interesting and BMW was thanked for this input. It was agreed to take BMW's proposal for paragraph 11.3 inside the main text of chapter 11.

Concerning the data transmission protocols, it is agreed that these telematics proposals need further discussion. BFH pointed out that there exist other proposals from SP, JA agreed. This could be discussed either during next WG15, or an adhoc meeting on SP/PSAP link could be organised before and present clear proposals to WG15 plenary.

It was agreed that the core TPS-eCall editing group would work further on more detailed proposals for this part of the document (interface between TPSP and PSAP), with an aim of having more complete descriptions which could also be used as the basis for consultation with PSAP experts.

It was agreed that the objective would be to discuss the half dozen possibilities within the WG, propose a short list to the PSAPS of say 4, and ask them to select two of these methods (in addition to voice, and the automated pan European eCall method), - giving them no more than four different possible ways to receive the eCall data message.

**ACTION : BRU-0409-008 : TPS eCall Transitional. No of alternatives : AM to lead small discussion with interested parties to come up with short list of 4.**

### A4.2 List of relevant numbers

BW proposed that although this list was required, this current text was politically inappropriate, and may lead to the rejection of the proposals by PSAPs. BFH disagreed (because he felt that the PSAPs would welcome the TSPs interventions). BW stated that he felt that it had to be made clear what the benefit to PSAPs would be. He proposed that the document should recommend to change the text to something like:

"A central register is required to provide a list of responsible PSAPs together with key relevant information.

NOTE Such a register may be maintained by, for example, EC eSafety, or in an ISO 24978 compliant eSafety Data Registry, etc.

The registry metadata shall be designed in a form acceptable to PSAPs, and to enable PSAPs to receive



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

data in a form that they prefer  
(without the need for all PSAPs to agree on the same format)

Information Annex B provides an example of such metadata.

In order to ensure that the PSAPs receive the eCall data in the form they prefer, the relevant authorities shall obtain the preferences of their PSAPs and provide this data to the central registry.

The TPSP shall provide eCall data to the PSAP in their preferred form, as recorded in the central registry."

BW's objectives were understood, but consensus was not achieved at the meeting, (in part due to lack of time to more fully discuss the proposed text.

JA/BW to work together to propose the metadata content and wording for Annex B

**ACTION 0904-009 : JA/BW : Annex B Metadata for central registry: JA/BW to propose text :**

**ACTION 0904-010 : BFH: TPS-OR: To revise the document to incorporate the changes agreed at the meeting and to circulate by 19th May 09**

**ACTION 0904-011 : ALL : TPS-OR: To review the revised document and make any comments back to BFH by 29th May 09**

### **3. HLAP : eCall- High Level Application Protocols (Session leader : Bob Williams)**

#### **3.1 Introduction of Project Team**

The HLAP editing team introduced themselves:

Bob Williams, of CSI and Convenor of WG15.

Cristina Lumbreras, a representative from Madrid 112, involved in PSAP expert group and eCall implementation group.

David Williams from Qualcomm, involved with ETSI standardisation, and the team developing the In-band modem & WG15 member.

Jaques Anselem from Allianz/Mondial - leader of their telematics solutions & WG15 member.

Gerard Segarra, Renault - OEM - involved in their work towards pan-European eCall & WG15 member.

John Watson - Airbiquity - has been involved in the 3GPP eCall flag standardisation & WG15 member.

#### **3.2 PT programme/timetable**

The Commission were very keen to have this work completed quickly, and WG15 also need prompt result so that both Operating Requirements documents can progress. The HLAP team have therefore agreed to work intensively with the intent to achieve the following timetable

28th April	Agreement of Scope and Approach by WG
10th June	Interim Draft available to WG
18th June	Interim Draft approved by WG
10th July	Final Draft Available to WG/TC
3rd September	Final Draft Approved by WG
11th September	Final Draft Approved by TC

The PT may provide additional incomplete working drafts, and may invite the WG to an HLAP meeting after the comments to the interim draft are integrated.

#### **3.3 PT Skeleton Deliverable. Presentation and discussion**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

Comments were invited on the structure, introduction, and scope of the HLAB document. Also, concerning the scope (but not necessarily the detailed content) of the "conformance" section.

The meeting worked through the skeleton document. BW explained that agreement on the general description and scope was most important, followed by the general skeleton which described how the PT is approaching the task. The PT needed the WG's agreement to the general approach. It was far too early to comment on details of text in the skeleton, but the HLAB needed affirmation that it is approaching the work in an acceptable way.

When commenting on the document, these should be delivered as a separate Word document, with the relevant existing text and proposed text pasted into this document (and not as comments embedded into the master document as this gives version control problems).

BMW commented that there were new "political" statements in this introduction text. It was agreed to make the text compatible with other deliverables but also to significantly reduce the introduction text to key points.

It was agreed that the introduction would be significantly shortened, and largely by reference to the other Standards with description of what is defined in this document.

### **ACTION BRU0409-012 : BW/HLAP: HLAB Introduction, to be substantially revised and reduced**

BMW commented that the direct voice connection between PSAP and the occupants of the vehicle should say "if required by the PSAP" .

There was a discussion about the role of TPS-OR in the work HLAB PT.

BFH questioned whether TPS-eCall should be included in the HLAB document.

BW agreed that this something that needs to be decided.

JW stated that the priority needs to be Pan-European, and any reference to TPS-eCall should be clearly separated to aid understanding.

JA proposed to focus the HLAB for Pan-European (but not excluding TPS requirements from the draft) and subsequently to decide if Pan-European HLAB elements, or draft TPS HLAB requirements should be included into this or other documents. The PSAPs may want to see one document containing HLAB sequences for both systems.

EDG pointed out that incorporation of the TPS requirements should not delay the deliverable document. The document should ensure that there is no confusion between Pan-European and TPS requirements.

The scope should be reworded to make it clear that the HLAB document does NOT include any aspects of the vehicle-to-TPSP communication.

General Overview of the eCall transaction. The specified period for call-back will refer to the PE eCall Operating Standard.

BMW questioned the incorporation of conformity requirements for Pan-European OR requirements into the HLAB document, and suggested that it was not appropriate to have requirements in one standard (OR), but conformity to these same requirements in a separate document (HLAB).

EDG commented that the Universal Service Directive may be an appropriate reference

### **ACTION BRU0409-013 : BW/HLAP: HLAB USD, Universal Service Directive is mentioned in text so should be added to references**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

JW asked for clarification of the purpose behind the application layer acknowledgement, and to ensure that the technical solutions used to implement this are practicable.

BFH suggested that the reason for the application layer acknowledge is to know that the PSAP application - the PSAP operator has received the message and taken the appropriate action, and not just that the modem has received the MSD.

The key operation steps were discussed.

Call-flows. Step 10 is not clear enough. Step 12/13 are exceptions, not normal call flow. Step 6 application layer ACK; the purpose of the application layer ACK is an end-to-end acknowledgement, because the transport layer ACK is between modems. It may also be useful to store the MSD ACK in the vehicle (e.g. as a legal record). There is concern about the length of time that the audio would be muted to provide an application layer ACK. Steps 4/5 are within the scope of ETSI (although interactions with other components need to be described) and step 5 may be a subset of step 4.

BW: Within the HLAP team suggestions might be made for practical solutions to meet the overall "user" requirements, and how to react to those. If necessary, clarification may be asked from WG15.

Modem initiating sequence. The French PSAP (via BFH) asked for clarification whether the IVS or PSAP modem would generate the initial tone. Spanish PSAP thinks that the modem tones from the IVS could be useful for PSAP operator to know that the incoming call is an eCall, but this appears to be different to the opinion of the French PSAP. There was discussion of the merits of each side sending first, and the HLAP PT will consider it further and make recommendations. It is agreed that separate routing of calls using the eCall flag is a better solution. The eCall flag is mandatory in the UE (Rel-8) but optional in networks. However, Member States may decide to make it mandatory in networks in their countries if they so choose.

Participants were asked for further suggestions of error scenarios to be dealt with. A number were added.

Abnormal circumstances: Additional failure cases are the following - call dropped, GNSS failure, PSAP busy, multiple calls from a given car, repeat manual initiation, what happens if MSD is corrupted, what happens if can't switch to data mode, what happens if can't un-mute. Further error cases are welcomed as soon as possible if WG15 members can think of any.

Several OEMs expressed the view that the current Conformance testing text was unacceptable.

There was some concern that the current scope of testing is too broad (Clauses 2 and 10). In-field testing should not be included in HLAP. HLAP should not go down to bit level where such detail is contained elsewhere (e.g. MSD specification). There is a need for a method to demonstrate high level conformance, but that the HLAP should not attempt to prescribe or describe end-of- manufacture or in-life test calls. the comments were noted for further rework.

BMW commented that it was a bad idea to refer to specific bit and byte positions of the MSD in this document, as this may contradict with the MSD document, which is the place to define such things.

Step detail. Is 7.3.3.1 superfluous? Step 4 sequence is currently different to ETSI because the PSAP modem makes the first tone. In step 5 "transport layer" may really be "link layer". Is 7.10.4 re-routing of the voice and MSD? In step 7.16.13 more detail is required. Step 7.18 is already in the PE eCall Operating Standard.

BMW commented that the eCall flag (relevant for 7.4.2.1) is a more elegant solution for this and that

DW suggested that "link layer" is a better description, according to the OSI standard instead of "transport".  
- HLAP team will agree on the wording to use.

BMW pointed out that any repeat attempts should have Boundaries for how many and how long?



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

VW asked what was intended to be included in section 7.14? BW stated that the intention was to define the procedures to be used to implement the requirements from the Pan-European OR document.

BFH: Section 7.16.11 - BFH asked how the PSAP system should know that it had not received an MSD. this needs to be thought about.

**ACTION : BRU-0409-014 :HLAP How does PSAP know it has not received an MSD : HLAP to consider further and make explicit in document**

BMW suggested that sections 7.17 and 7.18 were covered in Pan-European OR and therefore were not required in this document.

BFH asked for clarification about the compatibility of in-band modem calls and non-equipped PSAPs.

EDG stated that it was a requirement that a normal 112 call should not be negatively influenced by the in-band modem solution.

CL had the opinion that it may be useful for the operator to hear these tones

BFH stated that it would be a problem for the French authorities if a non-equipped PSAP were to receive "beep beep" tones.

EDG mentioned that PSAPs operators could be trained to understand the meaning of the beeps. He also stated that Member States may implement the eCall flag to avoid such issues.

### **3.4 Open discussions and contributions to PT**

WG15 gave approval to HLAP PT approach to the HLAP deliverable, taking into account the above comments.

The interim HLAP Standard will be made available by the HLAP PT Leader to WG15 by 10 June 2009, and approval will be requested at the 17-18 meeting of WG15.

Drafts of the HLAP standard may be provided by the HLAP PT Leader to CEN TC278 WG15 at various stages. Comments are invited by WG15 members by making tracked changes to specific clauses of the HLAP standard.

It was agreed that the HLAP PT will focus on, and give priority to, PE eCall. The PT may later consider which aspects are relevant to TPS eCall. There may be an annex in the final HLAP standard on TPS eCall. The HLAP standard will specify nothing between the vehicle and TPS eCall service provider.

**ACTION : BRU-0409-015 :HLAP Points raised : HLAP to consider further and accommodate all of the points raised in this section of the minutes**

HLAP PT is reminded to take into consideration the numerous references in the PE eCall Operating Standard to future HLAP standard, and to ensure that all of the text dropped in Comment Resolution for PE-OR because it would be dealt with in HLAP, is in fact dealt with in HLAP.

**ACTION : BRU-0409-016 :HLAP Re PE OR comment resolution : HLAP to consider items deleted from PE OR on the basis that they will be dealt with in HLAP to ensure that these points are covered by HLAP**

### **4. Other Deliverables - update**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

There will not be time for significant discussions on these items which will be addressed in the June meeting.

### **4.1 CEN TS15722 (PREN Draft) eCall Minimum Set of Data**

Not discussed- other than as in open action items above

### **4.2 WI00278220 Pan European eCall- Operating Requirements**

Not discussed- other than as in open action items above

### **4.3 Quality of Service Requirements for eCall and Emergency Support Services**

Invitation for contributions made. See Open Action items

### **4.4 Intelligent transport systems – eSafety - Third Party Emergency Support Services**

Invitation for contributions made. See Open Action items

### **5. eCall AOB**

None

### **6. eSafety AOB**

None

### **7. Closure of meeting**

The meeting closed a little before 18.00

TC278/WG15-0151

## **OPEN ACTION ITEMS**

**ACTION : BRU0809-007 : BW/MS/EDG to make arrangements for WG15 web repository..  
Awaiting renewal of eSafety Funding. NO CHANGE STILL OUTSTANDING**

**ACTION : BRU0812-003 : ALL : Q of S : ALL to consider what Q of S items might be relevant for a TS, and to supply ideas, and possibly some description to JA before End May 2009: J Anselem has now accepted leadership of this work item and will summarise to 2nd meeting 2009. None received to date. All members reminded To be discussed June 17/18 meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0812-004 : BW : Q of S: BW to summarise contributions and present to 2nd WG15 meeting in 2009 : J Anselem has now accepted leadership of this work item and will summarise to 2nd meeting 2009. None received to date. All members reminded.**

**ACTION : BRU0812-0008: ALL : Dialogue with PSAPs : ALL to liaise with the PSAP expert group in their own countries to discuss these issues. (Ongoing)**

**ACTION : BRU0812-0013: JA : Third Party Services: JA to instigate the discussion within the editing group. None received to date. All members reminded To be discussed June 17/18 meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0001: BW : TPSP OR: BW to submit document to WP29 for clearance (pointing out the privacy issue in 3 way conversations) once the doc finalised. Awaiting finalisation of TPSP OR**

**ACTION : BRU 0904-001 : BW: Convenor to write to BSS with CEN IPR policy and provide link into**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

**CENCS for any further enquiry**

**ACTION : BRU0904-002: BW: BW to take requirement to HLAP PT that their delivery recognises that the PSAP may be “a public authority or a private organisation recognised by the government and operated by or under the delegation of a public authority”.**

**ACTION : BRU0904-003: ALL: TPS-OR: WG15 to consider if and when to share TPS-OR draft with eCall PSAPs Expert Group.(Next meeting eCall Implementation Platform Sep/Oct 09)**

**ACTION : BRU0904-004: BW: PE-OR: BW to clarify position about TS ballot with CEN CS**

**ACTION BRU0904-005: BSS : BSS System : BSS to compare their system to the 10 points of what classifies a system as eCall, from EDG (of the Commission) in the autumn of last year and state how their system compares against each of these points.**

**ACTION : BRU 0904-006: ALL : BSS System : Once the response is received, WG15 to decide which of the WG15 work items would be most appropriate for this work item**

**ACTION : BRU0904-007: Carmeq (VW): TPS-OR Re vehicle location : To propose an alternative text including the clear responsibilities of both parties**

**ACTION : BRU-0409-008 : TPS eCall Transitional. No of alternatives : AM to lead small discussion with interested parties to come up with short list of 4.**

**ACTION 0904-009 : JA/BW : Annex B Metadata for central registry: JA/BW to propose text**

**ACTION 0904-010 : BFH: TPS-OR: To revise the document to incorporate the changes agreed at the meeting and to circulate by 19th May 09**

**ACTION 0904-011 : ALL : TPS-OR: To review the revised document and make any comments back to BFH by 29th May 09**

**ACTION BRU0409-012 : BW/HLAP: HLAP Introduction, to be substantially revised and reduced**

**ACTION BRU0409-013 : BW/HLAP: HLAP USD, Universal Service Directive is mentioned in text so should be added to references**

**ACTION : BRU-0409-014 :HLAP How does PSAP know it has not received an MSD : HLAP to consider further and make explicit in document**

**ACTION : BRU-0409-015 :HLAP Points raised : HLAP to consider further and accommodate all of the points raised in this section of the minutes**

**ACTION : BRU-0409-016 :HLAP Re PE OR comment resolution : HLAP to consider items deleted from PE OR on the basis that they will be dealt with in HLAP to ensure that these points are covered by HLAP**



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

# (Draft) Minutes meeting of CEN TC278 WG15 Brussels Wednesday 17th & Thursday 18th June 2009

The 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of CEN TC278 WG15, eSafety

Location: Brussels

Day 1: BU29 0/027 European Commission, Ave de Beaulieu (see map)

Day 2: eSafety Support Office, The Blue Tower, 2nd Floor, Avenue Louise 326  
B-1050 Brussels Belgium

### 1. Housekeeping (10.30 AM)

The draft agenda was approved as the Agenda for the meeting,

#### 1.1 Welcome and Roll Call, Introductions

The Convenor welcomed Mr Robindhra Mangtani, of GSM Association, who was attending the meeting at the Convenors invitation to improve the link between WG15 and MNOs and to discuss MNO issues associated with the work of the HLAP.

NAME	Country	Organization	eMail
B Williams (Chair) (BW)	UK	CSI	bw@2-csi.com
Jacques Anselelm (JAN)	BE	Allianz	jacques.anselelm@allianz.com
Egil Bovim	Norway	KOKOM	Egil.bovim@kokom.no
Stephan Cayet (SC)	France	PSA	stephan.cayet@mpsa.com
Witold Cel (WC)	Poland	Starter SP. Z O.O.	witold.cel@starter24.pl
Bernfried Coldewey (BC)	Germany	ADAC	Bernfried.Coldewey@adec.de
Michael Fichte	Germany	VW	Michael.fichte@volkswagen.de
E.Davila Gonzalez (EDG)	EU	EC DG INFSO	EDG.davila-gonzalez@ec.europa.eu
Bernard Flury-Herard (BFH)	France	France Ministry of sustainable Development	bernard.flury-herard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Henri van de Kraats	B-NL	IMA Benelux	h.vandekraats@imabenelux.com
Cristina Lumbreras	Spain	Madrid 112	clumbreras@madrid112.es
Robindhra Mangtoni	UK	GSM Assn	rmangtoni@gsm.org
Andrew Mellett (AM)	Germany	BMW	Andrew.mellett@bmw.de
Bernard Pringalle	France	ANEC	b.pringalle@laposte.net
Alain Raison	France	IMA	Alain.raison@ima.eu
Monica Schettino	Belgium	ERTICO	m.schettino@mail.ertico.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	SETRA/BNEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Gerard Segarra (GS)	France	Renault	Gerard.segarra@renault.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	MEEDDAT AT/SETRA/ONEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Filip Sergeys	Belgium	NBN/HONDA	fillip.sergeys@honda-eu.com
Alice Valvodova	Belgium	GSM Association	avalvodova@gsm.org
Mark Vermeulen	France	PSAP	marc.vermeulen@interieur.gouv.fr
John Watson (JW)	UK	Airbiquity	jwatson@airbiquity.com
David Williams (DW)	UK	Qualcomm	dwilliams@qualcomm.com

**Apologies:** J.Arfdisen, A Ballatona, R.Boesch, T.Delire, J van Hattem, A.Kohn, P.Lecoite, P Schlopsna, T.Starek.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **1.2 Intellectual Property Rights**

The Convenor explained the requirement to declare all relevant intellectual property, or risk being seen as not defending it, and he explained that anything discussed at the meeting was open and that any copyright on documents produced, or solutions developed during the meeting, belonged to CEN.

### **1.3 Membership of CEN TC278 WG15**

The Convenor reminded attendees that to attend meetings and participate in the work of WG15 on a regular basis, a persons name must be submitted by their National Member body to the Secretary of CEN TC278 nominating them as an expert to participate in CEN TC278

### **1.4 Minutes of last meeting and approval**

Several comments had been received to the draft minutes, most had been accepted and incorporated and version 4 was issued on 23<sup>rd</sup> May. No further comment received.

Some comments to delete text were proposed by BFH. It was agreed to revisit these at the end of the meeting, but BFH had left by that time. The deletions were discussed in AOB, but the deletions could not be accepted because they were extracted from the notes of multiple delegates, therefore reflect debate at the meeting. Decisions and results are not affected by inclusion of these texts.

### **1.5 Matters Arising/Action Points :**

Other than HLAP / TSP progress deferred to September meeting

**ACTION : BRU0903-0002: BFH: TPSP OR: BFH to finalise the changes to the document (with support from editing group if required) and circulate to WG by 13th March : DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0903-0003 BW : TPSP OR: BW to request plenary approval to send to TC Comment after April Meeting : DONE: Can be done as soon as draft available :DONE**

### **1.6 Date of Next Meeting**

This was agreed initially as 20/21 July 2009 Paris, however, as it was possible to complete the TPS document it proved possible to shorten this to a meeting solely focussed on the final HLAP PT deliverable. This being the case the meeting was relocated to Brussels 20th July 2009.

(Subsequent to the meeting it was confirmed that the meeting location would be the CEN Conference centre in Brussels.

## **2. 00278244 Intelligent transport systems – eCall – Operating requirements for third party support (Session leader : B. Flury-Herard) Session 11.00am - 3.pm**

BFH had circulated v4.8 in May. The TPSP editing group had met in Munich the week before this meeting, and AM had presented the summary changes proposed at Munich, and the meeting worked through these.

See follow on - Section 4 below.

## **3. HLAP : eCall- High Level Application Protocols (Session leader :Bob Williams)**



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### Session 3pm -5.30 pm day 1, 9.00-12.00 (scheduled) day 2

3.1 Presentation of Interim Deliverable. (circulated circa 11 June, and enhanced doc 16<sup>th</sup> June)

BW presented the interim deliverable.

The MNO related issues highlighted in the Progress Report were discussed with Robindhra Mangtoni of GSM Association. Alice Valvodova of GSM Association attended on day 2.

The WG discussed the draft on a line by line basis.

### 3.2 Discussion/ revisions required/Action list

Many editorial/sp corrections were made live to the draft displayed on the screen during the meeting, and the following points were raised for further attention by the PT:

- a) Security. Defences against hacking/denial of service need to be covered.
- b) Reword 2 para to to exclude TPS
- c) 4.10 NOTE . Revisit note, and if needed, the wording. Revised
- d) above Fig 2 Text, text needs revising and chopping
- e) 7.1.3 BMW challenge 'from the user'
- f) 7.2.1 Is this consistent with PEOR
- g) 7.3.4 Note. Bracket missing
- h) 7.3.6 Reference to bits 6 & 7 is too specific just refer to the standard
- i) 7.3.7 example move the word 'emergency' to before 'call'
- j) 7.4.5 Remove '28 bit'
- k) 7.4.6 What is clause X ?
- l) 7.5.1 Cover situation where manual call is in progress and car crashes during call
- m) 7.5.1.1 When the IVS receives the app layer ACK should it be required to store it
- n) 7.5.1.3 Note needs to be formatted
- o) 7.6.2 Can PT improve wording and check consistency to PEOR
- p) 7.7.1 is (F) a requirement ? reconsider
- q) 7.13.6.2 What happens if resend is requested in this period
- r) 10.1 Clarify lifetime of the vehicle? Discuss also with EDG
- s) 10.1.1 Who makes this available ?
- t) 10.1.1 Availability of PSAP simulation ?
- u) 10.2 New eCall flag required
- v) Fig 13 change 'vehicle type approval' to 'vehicle validation conformance testing'
- w) Make it clear that throughout the doc that the frequency of conf tests is not specified only the subject/method when done
- x) Emilio : Who is responsible for full recognition in 27 member states
- y) Add 151.010 and 134.123 to both Refs (23 and 24) and add scopes to Annex B
- z) 10 Table. MSD App acknowledgement. Separate into 2 points
- aa) Throughout 10 'Test that'
- ab) Swap order of 10.2.2 and 10.2.3 and its equiv in HLAP below
- ac) 10. Combine RIVS2 and RIVS3
- ad) 10. Revisit 'HLAP' layer wording throughout 10
- ae) 10. + revisit 'what' what result is expected if needed after reversal of order
- af) 10. Check 'level' of tests
- ag) Repts and S10 Don't allow to deregister during an ongoing eCall
- ah) Repts Check termination is clear in requirements and that 10 is consistent with requirements
- aj) 10. 'once requested within system. Check consistency with PEOP 8.17.1
- ak) check terminating an ecall issues See 8.10.2 in PEOR (to S10 tests)



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

The WG agreed that the PT may act on behalf of the WG group to develop and effect any liaison statements required to achieve the objectives of the HLAP deliverable provided that any such documents are circulated to the WG with a minimum of 7 days notice for comment

**ACTION : BRU0906-001: PR: HLAP: Accommodate revisions**

**ACTION : BRU0906-002: PR: HLAP/BW: Circulate revised interim by 26/6**

**ACTION : BRU0906-003:PT1501: HLAP: PT to develop/prepare final deliverable for circulation by 11 July 2009**

**ACTION : BRU0906-004:ALL: HLAP: All to meet to agree final PT deliverable as a working draft for further development as a WG15 document at 20/21 July meeting**

### **3.3 Approval as INTERIM deliverable.**

WG15 acknowledge and accept the delivery of the INTERIM draft from PT1501 as a working draft of its intended deliverable ( a working draft for further development by WG15), which is expected to be completed and delivered in July 2009, subject to the expectation that the considerations and revisions proposed during the review at the WG15 meeting 17/18 June 2009 are addressed and accommodated. WG15 recognises the important contribution of this work and issues raised by the PT, and that the PT has fully fulfilled the goals of its task.. In accepting the document as an interim deliverable working draft document as a basis for further development within WG15, acceptance of the work of the PT does not imply agreement with all aspects of the proposed deliverable. WG15 acknowledge that the work of the HLAP includes issues which have to be further discussed and consensus achieved once the document becomes a working draft of WG15.

A second interim doc will be made available as soon as these issues are accommodated. Hopefully before 26 June.

If there are any further comments or suggestions for change these are requested by 7<sup>th</sup> July.

**ACTION : BRU0906-005: PR: WG15 ALL: HLAP: Any further proposals for revision (during HLAP PT phase) to PT by 7<sup>th</sup> July**

(Note: as after the finalisation of the work of the PT, the deliverable will become a working draft of WG15, there will be opportunity for further revision by the WG.)

### **4. Overflow session HLAP or TPS OR 13.00-16.00 Day 2**

BFH had worked overnight to make the revisions to the text to date.

VW presented their proposed revision to the text, which was accepted subject to minor amendment,

The meeting worked through the incorporation of the changes proposed at Munich editing meeting, and at this meeting using the document displayed on the screen.

There was active debate on a number of issues, and clarity of wording.

In respect of Conformance requirements, it was agreed that proposals from HLAP PT Section 8 will be considered and where appropriate incorporated/adapted in the next version in respect of the TPSP-PSAP link. In respect of issues regarding the TPSP-IVS link, it was recognized that as systems may vary considerably, precise conformance requirements would not be possible. It was agreed that for a later version, the IVS conformance aspects in the HLAP document in respect of Pan European systems would be considered to see if some could be abstracted to a high enough level to be specified as generic conformance requirements that would have to be met by conformance measures to be specified by implementers (but the tests not standardized).



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

An Annex B 'XML format for TSD' has been proposed and it is widely accepted that this will be provided in a later version.

See w15-0180 TPS-OR version 4.9 (to be circulated by 30/6/09)

**ACTION : BRU0906-006:AM : TPS OR : AM to provide XML Annex to BFH 26 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-007:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to finalise and circulate the document to WG15 by 30 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-008:ALL : TPS OR : To consider final document and provide any corrections/proposed revisions to BFH by 7 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-009:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to make final corrections and submit to Convenor by 10 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-010:BFH : TPS OR : Convenor to circulate to TC for comment immediately thereafter to TC and PSAPs.**

**ACTION : BRU0906-011:BFH : TPS OR : BW to request upgrade to full work item at September TC278 plenary**

### 5. eCall AOB

5.1 EDG commented for clarification that it is not the intention of the EC that countries have a choice to select between Pan European eCall and TPS eCall. It is the intention that all countries will support Pan European eCall via the 112 system. Countries will have a choice whether or not to additionally support TPS eCall.

BFH commented that this was not practicable because there was 0 cars and 0 countries operating the PE for the while, and no experience of PEOR.

BW commented that there was no experience of *any* form of eCall to date - PEOR or TPS OR, because it was not yet implemented and could not be until the eCall standardisation was substantially completed.

EDG stated that that the reason why we do not have any PEeCall in the market yet was because some stakeholders have several times tried to delay the standardisation process in the different standardisation Committees.

BFH expressed the clear opinion of 'France' that it considered it a 'nonsense' to consider supporting the paneuropean eCall presently:

- when the issues of ecall flag, of tones getting inside firemen's ears etc were still unsolved
- when the safety of putting modems on all firemen communication lines is questionable
- when there is no solution for a filtering center if 112 used, as long as the eCall flag is not implemented by all the MNOs

Responding to the question by EDG, Col. Vermeulen stated that France had the technical capability to implement eCall and the use of new technology as eCall is strongly encouraged by French authorities ; However ITEC/1389/2007 from the French authorities concerning the eCall project to the presidency and general secretariat of the council, France considers that the paneuropean ecall has major consequences, such as : the likelihood of saturation with non-emergency calls and the attendant risk of not responding to a genuine emergency, an obligation to equip all the emergency services with a proprietary system in order to answer the ecalls.

In order to solve these problems, it is recommended that a marker (an "eCall flag") should be added to the 112 number which would enable eCalls to be routed to centres other than the local emergency services. Presently France has no answer from the operators about their possibility to support the ecall flag.

EDG and JW responded that there was no requirement for any particular proprietary system as eCall was based on e112.



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

All agreed that it is strongly preferred that the eCall flag is implemented. BFH commented that it should not just be preferred, but should be required, and the Commission should enforce this. EDG commented that France could pass regulation to require this in France. At the present time these are decisions for National Governments. BFH reiterated that it should be a pan-European requirement.

BFH stated it may be possible to hack the PSAP modem / database.

JW responded that the GSM and 3G access network are secure, and that 3GPP TSG SA3 are responsible for the network security specifications e.g. TS21.133 and that a SIM card is required in order to establish an eCall.

BFH responded that the an attacker could generate many eCalls and block the PSAP. JW said that since eCalls are based on normal 112 emergency calls the risk would be no greater than at present i.e. a denial of service attack using automated 112 calls to a PSAP.

BFH said that in the case of eCall it was different because the PSAP modem would delay the call being routed to an operator. JW responded that the attacker would have no more than 2 seconds to send a valid INITIATION tone to the modem and then an MSD, if the MSD was error free the call would be routed to a PSAP operator very quickly, otherwise the call would be routed to an operator after the PSAP MSD reception timer expired (20 seconds).

BFH said that this was still a problem because it would cause a 20 second delay each time. JW acknowledged that a terrorists could set up a denial of service attack to disrupt the emergency services e.g. after a bomb attack, but that there were much easier ways of setting up an automated denial of service attack rather than buying hundreds of IVS modems with SIM cards. If a SIM card is not present the network will reject registration attempts and most countries in Europe will not allow a emergency call without a SIM. If a SIM is used then the calling terminal can be blacklisted on request from the PSAP.

It was agreed that a new reference be added to the HLAP specification:

[Ref.25] ETSI 121 133 Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS); 3G security; Security threats and requirements; (3GPP TS 21.133 version 4.1.0 Release 4)

### 5.2 Issues to be make EDG aware of

The need for availability of PSAP simulation was raised with EDG.

The issue of test requirements was made with EDG EU provision of test number.

The issue of a new eCall flag requirement was made with EDG.

The issue of who is responsible for full recognition in all 27 member states.

AM asked EDGas representative of the EU to clarify the required included service lifetime for an eCall system i.e. for how long after purchase / initial activation must the system be capable of performing an eCall, and for how long must this be possible without further customer subscription costs. This may have significant impacts, for example on system costs.

AM also requested EDG to clarify with MNO's and member states the issue that in order to bring a cost effective eCall system to EU citizens it is imperative that MNO's continue to support GSM networks with sufficient coverage and capacity long into the future. Please note that it is not only eCall systems which are effected by this issue, but also many other systems (e.g. remote meter reading systems).

Emilio agreed to address these issues and provide feedback as soon as possible.

5.3 BFH suggested deletions to prev meeting minutes. Was discussed. BFH had however left by the time of this discussion. Those present, considering that these texts were in the meeting notes of multiple persons, felt that they should remain in the minutes. Conclusions and decisions of the meeting are not affected.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

5.4 A memory stick containing all 2009 WG15 documents was made available for copy. EDG advised that we were still awaiting eSafety contract renewal before any action could be taken on the website. CEN has formally confirmed consent for WG15 to be a test website and agree to our previously circulated rules for operations,

5.5 DW pointed out that the HLAP required at least 2 changes to ETSI/3GPP Standards, for the revised AL-ACK, and in respect of communications link layer push/pull issues. He requested that , because these were technical comms specific issues, and were promulgated by the PT, the HLAP PT be delegated to prepare and submit these liaison statements to ETSI on behalf of WG15. The meeting agreed to this.

### **6. eSafety AOB**

None

### **7. Closure of meeting**

The meeting closed at 16.30pm



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION : BRU0906-001: PR: HLAP: Accommodate revisions**

**ACTION : BRU0906-002: PR: HLAP/BW: Circulate revised interim by 26/6**

**ACTION : BRU0906-003:PT1501: HLAP: PT to develop/prepare final deliverable for circulation by 11 July 2009**

**ACTION : BRU0906-004:ALL: HLAP: All to meet to agree final PT deliverable as a working draft for further development as a WG15 document at 20/21 July meeting**

**ACTION : BRU0906-005: PR: WG15 ALL: HLAP: Any further proposals for revision (during HLAP PT phase) to PT by 7<sup>th</sup> July**

**ACTION : BRU0906-006:AM : TPS OR : AM to provide XML Annex to BFH 26 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-007:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to finalise and circulate the document to WG15 by 30 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-008:ALL : TPS OR : To consider final document and provide any corrections/ proposed revisions to BFH by 7 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-009:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to make final corrections and submit to Convenor by 10 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-010:BFH : TPS OR : Convenor to circulate to TC for comment immediately thereafter to TC and PSAPs.**

**ACTION : BRU0906-011:BFH : TPS OR : BW to request upgrade to full work item at September TC278 plenary**

**TC278/WG15-0166**



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

# Revision 1 (Draft) Minutes of meeting of CEN TC278 WG15 BRUSSELS Monday 20th July 2009

## ATTENTION: Location revised to BRUSSELS

The 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of CEN TC278 WG15, eSafety

Location: CEN Conference Center, Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels, Brussels

### 1. Housekeeping (10.30 AM)

#### 1.1 Welcome and Roll Call, Introductions

The Convenor welcomed Mr Robindhra Mangtoni, and Philippe Melle of GSM Association, who was attending the meeting at the Convenors invitation to improve the link between WG15 and MNOs and to discuss MNO issues associated with the work of the HLAP.

attendees:

NAME	Country	Organization	eMail
B Williams (Chair) (BW)	UK	CSI PT1501	bw@2-csi.com
Jacques Anselelm (JAn)	BE	Allianz	jacques.anselelm@allianz.com
Stephan Cayet (SC)	France	PSA	stephan.cayet@mpsa.com
Bernard Flury-Herard (BFH)	France	France Ministry of sustainable Development	bernard.flury-herard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Pierre Lecointe	France	PSA PT1501	pierre.lecointe@mpsa.com
Cristina Lumbreras	Spain	Madrid 112 PT1501	clumbreras@madrid112.es
Robindhra Mangtoni	UK	GSM Assn	rmangtoni@gsm.org
Phillipe Melle	France	GSM Assn / SFR	phillipe.melle@sfr.com
Andrew Mellett (AM)	Germany	BMW	Andrew.mellett@bmw.de
Ricardo Rodriguez	Germany	VW (Subs Fichte)	ricardo.rodriguez@carhg.com
Paul Schlopsna (PS)	Belgium	ATX	pschlopsna@atx.eu.com
Gerard Segarra (GS)	France	Renault PT1501	Gerard.segarra@renault.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	MEEDDAT AT/SETRA/ONEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Mark Vermeulen	France	PSAP	marc.vermeulen@interieur.gouv.fr
John Watson (JW)	UK	Airbiquity PT1501	jwatson@airbiquity.com

**Apologies:** J.Arfdisen, A Ballatona, R.Boesch, E.Bovim, B.Coldewey, E.Davilla Gonzales, T.Delire, M.Fichte (substitute sent), J van Hattem, A.Kohn, B.Pringalle, P.Sergeys, T.Starek, D.Williams

The meeting wished David Williams and his wife a happy and succesful birth.

apologies:

#### 1.2 Intellectual Property Rights

The Convenor explained the requirement to declare all relevant intellectual property, or risk being seen as not defending it, and he explained that anything discussed at the meeting was open and that any copyright on documents produced, or solutions developed during the meeting, belonged to CEN.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **1.3 Membership of CEN TC278 WG15.**

The Convenor reminded attendees that to attend meetings and participate in the work of WG15 on a regular basis, a persons name must be submitted by their National Member body to the Secretary of CEN TC278 nominating them as an expert to participate in CEN TC278

### **1.4 Minutes of last meeting and approval**

Other than HLAP progress deferred to September meeting.

### **1.5 Matters Arising/Action Points :**

See 2 below. (Only HLAP issues dealt with. All other action points deferred to the September Meeting.)

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION : BRU0906-001: PR: HLAP: Accommodate revisions : DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-002: PR: HLAP/BW: Circulate revised interim by 26/6: DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-003:PT1501: HLAP: PT to develop/prepare final deliverable for circulation by 11 July 2009 : DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-004:ALL: HLAP: All to meet to agree final PT deliverable as a working draft for further development as a WG15 document at 20/21 July meeting : DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-005: PR: WG15 ALL: HLAP: Any further proposals for revision (during HLAP PT phase) to PT by 7<sup>th</sup> July : DONE**

### **1.6 Date of Next Meeting**

2/3 September 2009 Brussels

## **2. HLAP : eCall- High Level Application Protocols (Session leader :Bob Williams)**

The meeting discussed the most efficient manner to proceed, and decided that it would be most efficient to comment to improve the document at the same time it was conducting the review. The Convenor explained that in order to do this WG15 had first to accept that the PT had successfully completed its work, and adopt the deliverable as a working draft. After this approval, the document becomes a working document of WG15, and WG15 can then further develop/revise the draft.

The other alternative is for the PT to first explain its deliverable by reviewing it (but not revising it), then approving it, then going back to revise the document once it is adopted as a WG15 draft.

WG15 elects the first option.

WG15 accepts that the PT has completed its task and adopts the deliverable as a working draft of WG15. It thanks the PT for its work. For clarity, in accepting the deliverable, the WG accepts that the work of the PT is complete, however this does not in any way imply that the content of the document is approved, only that it is accepted as a working draft for further development within WG15. Further discussion on the content will be required within the WG prior to consensus being achieved within WG15, and this consensus was a prior step to the further progressing of the deliverable. Indeed the HLAP PT had highlighted several issues, particularly timers, that required further debate within WG15, before the document could be progressed. Other issues may be expected during the review, and after reviewing the document post-meeting.

### **3.1 Presentation of Final Deliverable.**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

The meeting spent the day working through the document clause by clause, and reached clause 7.5.2.2 by the end of the day, plus the timings in Annex A were reviewed. See HLAP 090720v1.

### **3.2 Discussion/ revisions required/Action list**

Upon request of WG15, the HLAP agreed that the draft as revised to end of the meeting 09/07/20 would become the final text of the HLAP PT deliverable. However, in the event, because of the complexity of some of the proposed changes to implement, it was decided to use the last circulated version of the PT deliverable (090719v3), as its final deliverable.

See HLAP 090720v1 (changes highlighted), plus 3.4 below

### **3.3 Approval as Final deliverable.**

Approved. See 3 above.

**ACTION : BRU0907-001: HLAP: BW to advise TC278 Secretary and Chairman that WG15 accepts that HLAP PT has successfully completed its task, has approved the deliverable to be accepted as a working draft of WG15, and recommends TC278 to accept the final PT deliverable. (And to note that WG15 will make best speed to make the final decisions required as a result of the work of the PT and to provide any further edits/improvements**

**ACTION : BRU0907-002: HLAP: BW: To request whatever action is needed to upgrade the work item so that it can be promptly balloted as a TS, and to note that it is the intention to subsequently develop the work item to a full EN.**

**ACTION : BRU0907-003: ALL : To review the HLAP PT deliverable and make any suggestions in respect of timings, or propose any improvements to the text BEFORE the September meeting.**

### **3.4 Development of the document**

The meeting spent the bulk of the day reviewing and proposing further enhancements and debating timings. The PT has proposed routines, several of which had timing defaults. Where these were not already defined in PEOR, the PT had proposed values. during the meeting of the full PT and the WG, the PT explained its rationale for values proposed, and the meeting debated the timings. The Convenor proposed, and it was agreed that, unless there was full and immediate consensus on a value, we would debate the appropriate value at this meeting, but would defer any decisions until the September WG15 meeting, to give time for delegates and their colleagues to give further decision to the issues, hopefully informed as a result of the discussions at this meeting.

3.4.1 The issue of countries where the MNO was allowed to 'lock' user to only its own network was discussed. The effect was that for example, a driver with a French or German SIM, having an accident in the UK, if his prime roaming network was not available, would default to another available network and the eCall would succeed. Whereas a user on a home (UK) network, if his home network is not available, the eCall, or for that matter any 112 call, would fail, because he was 'locked' into his home network with no possibility to roam.

3.4.2 Clause 6, Para 2 post Fig 3

Does Ref 4 (PEOR) specify/require the use of a SIM ??

3.4.3 Timings

Following a debate some next actions were agreed



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

- a) Give a NAME to each timer
- b) Present the timers in the sequence diagrams
- c) Make names consistent between tables/figures/body text and Annex a

J.Watson volunteered to take on this task

**ACTION : BRU0907-004: JW: HLAP Figures, diagrams body text and Annex A. : JW to give names to all timers and make the use consistent throughout the body text, diagrams and figures**

### **3.4.4 Textural improvements**

See HLAP Doc 090720v1 for changes agreed at the meeting.

#### **3.4.3 Automated Welcome Messages**

The issue concerning "Automated Welcome Messages", used by many emergency services in Europe was raised. It is necessary to detect and divert an eCall BEFORE this message commences. It is only possible to bypass the message by diverting based on the use of the eCall Flag. This is another reason to insist on the use of the eCall Flag. This needs to be pointed out to EC and the PSAP Implementation Group.

The convenor confirmed that decisions in this respect were political issues, not Standards issues. We could only identify the problem, and say that a system was only in compliance with the Standard if the eCall Flag was used, and propose fallback procedures for where it was not supported by an MNO. We can raise the issues with EC, but the political actions needed to be resolved by the EC/ GSMA / 3GPP, not WG15.

#### **4. eCall AOB**

None

#### **5. eSafety AOB**

None

#### **6. Closure of meeting**

The meeting closed circa 17.15.pm

TC278/WG15/Cn15-0182v1



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION : BRU0907-001: HLAP: BW to advise TC278 Secretary and Chairman that WG15 accepts that HLAP PT has successfully completed its task, has approved the deliverable to be accepted as a working draft of WG15, and recommends TC278 to accept the final PT deliverable. (And to note that WG15 will make best speed to make the final decisions required as a result of the work of the PT and to provide any further edits/improvements**

**ACTION : BRU0907-002: HLAP: BW: To request whatever action is needed to upgrade the work item so that it can be promptly balloted as a TS, and to note that it is the intention to subsequently develop the work item to a full EN.**

**ACTION : BRU0907-003: ALL : To review the HLAP PT deliverable and make any suggestions in respect of timings, or propose any improvements to the text BEFORE the September meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0907-004: JW: HLAP Figures, diagrams body text and Annex A. : JW to give names to all timers and make the use consistent throughout the body text, diagrams and figures**

*c/f from June meeting*

**ACTION : BRU0906-006:AM : TPS OR : AM to provide XML Annex to BFH 26 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-007:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to finalise and circulate the document to WG15 by 30 June 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-008:ALL : TPS OR : To consider final document and provide any corrections/ proposed revisions to BFH by 7 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-009:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to make final corrections and submit to Convenor by 10 July 09**

**ACTION : BRU0906-010:BFH : TPS OR : Convenor to circulate to TC for comment immediately thereafter to TC and PSAPs.**

**ACTION : BRU0906-011:BFH : TPS OR : BW to request upgrade to full work item at September TC278 plenary**



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

# (Draft) Minutes of meeting of CEN TC278 WG15 Brussels Wed 2 - Thur 3 September 2009

The 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of CEN TC278 WG15, eSafety

**Location: Brussels**  
**eSafety Support Office, The Blue Tower, 2nd Floor, Avenue Louise 326**  
**B-1050 Brussels Belgium**

### 1. Housekeeping (10.30 AM)

The agenda was adopted with 2 additions to AOB and 1.6 expanded to include the recent EC communication on eCall implementation.

#### 1.1 Welcome and Roll Call, Introductions

The Convenor welcomed delegates who introduced themselves to the meeting. He welcomed the new members.

NAME	Country	Organization	Email
B Williams (Chair) (BW)	UK	CSI	bw_csi@fastmail.fm
Jacques Anselelm (JAN)	BE	Allianz	jacques.anselelm@allianz.com
Reto Boesch	Switzerland	SARTE	Reto.boesch@0800technik.com
Egil Bovim	Norway	KOKOM	Egil.bovim@kokom.no
Stephan Cayet (SC)	France	PSA	stephan.cayet@mpsa.com
Witold Cel (WC)	Poland	Starter SP. Z O.O.	witold.cel@starter24.pl
C Cipriani	Germany	ATX Europe	ccipriane@atxeu.com
Bernfried Coldewey (BC)	Germany	ADAC	Bernfried.Coldewey@adec.de
Michael Fichte	Germany	VW	Michael.fichte@volkswagen.de
E.Davila Gonzalez (EDG)	EU	EC DG INFSO	emilio.davila-gonzalez@ec.europa.eu
Bernard Flury-Herard (BFH)	France	France Ministry of sustainable Development	bernard.flury-herard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Jan van Hatten	Netherlands	RWS	Jan.van.hattem@rws.nl
Henri van de Kraats	Belgium	IMA Benelux	h.vandekraats@imabenelux.com
Cristina Lumbreras	Spain	Madrid 112	clumbreras@madrid112.es
Philippe Melle	France	GSMA	Philippe.melle@sfr.com
Andrew Mellett (AM)	Germany	BMW	Andrew.mellett@bmw.de
Bernard Pringalle	France	ANEC	b.pringalle@laposte.net
Alain Raison	France	IMA	Alain.raison@ima.eu
Sven Rohl	Germany	Nobiscum	Sven.rohl@nobiscum.de
Davide de Sanctis	Italy	Octotelematics	Davide.desanctis@octotelematics.com
Paul Schlopsna	Germany	ATX Europe	pschlopsma@atxeu.com
Jean Seng (JS)	France	SETRA/BNEVT	jean.seng@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Filip Sergeys	Belgium	NBN/HONDA	fillip.sergeys@honda-eu.com
Mark Vermeulen	France	PSAP	marc.vermeulen@interieur.gouv.fr
John Watson (JW)	UK	Airbiquity	jwatson@airbiquity.com
David Williams (DW)	UK	Qualcomm	dwilliams@qualcomm.com

Apologies: G.Segarra

#### 1.2 Intellectual Property Rights



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

The Convenor explained the requirement to declare all relevant intellectual property, or risk being seen as not defending it, and he explained that anything discussed at the meeting was open and that any copyright on documents produced, or solutions developed during the meeting, belonged to CEN.

During the meeting questions were asked by BFH as to whether Airbiquity had applied for any patents in respect of the 'Push' mechanism put forward as the HLAP specification. JW assured the meeting that he had placed no applications for patents in this respect. He noted that the HLAP used commonly used telecomms procedures, he had no idea whether any of these used IPR of Airbiquity or any other company. He could only assure the meeting that neither he, nor anyone that he was aware of, had placed patent applications in respect of HLAP. He was not a patent lawyer and obviously could not comment concerning applications that he was not aware of. He provided the following statement

'I personally have not filed any new IPR in respect of eCall HLAP and we have met all our 3GPP, ETSI and CEN 'Essential IPR' declarations obligations. Our currently applicable patents are listed on the ETSI IPR database." I cannot speak for others in Airbiquity who may have, or be in the process, of filing patents in respect of eCall and telematic services. Companies are invited to speak to our legal department who will be happy deal with IPR licensing queries.'

He advised that the IPR of several companies, especially Qualcomm, was involved in the ETSI/3GPP modem specification.

The convenor pointed out that the need to declare patents had been made clear both at all WG15 meetings and at the start of the PT1501 work. Anything developed within the PT was open and therefore 'prior art' except in respect of CEN copyright on its deliverables. He noted also that Airbiquity had been very open in its declaration of patents to ETSI.

During the meeting, when the BC alternative solution to eCall message identification was discussed, BFH declared that the process proposed was the subject of a France Telecom/France MoT application for patent, but if granted would be made available for use in eCall without royalty.

### **1.3 Membership of CEN TC278 WG15**

The Convenor reminded attendees that to attend meetings and participate in the work of WG15 on a regular basis, a persons name must be submitted by their National Member body to the Secretary of CEN TC278 nominating them as an expert to participate in CEN TC278

### **1.4 Minutes of last meeting and approval**

The minutes were approved as circulated. EDG proposed a slight wording change to the previous minutes to more accurately reflect what he was reported to have said.

### **1.5 Matters Arising/Action Points**

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION : BRU0907-001: HLAP: BW to advise TC278 Secretary and Chairman that WG15 accepts that HLAP PT has successfully completed its task, has approved the deliverable to be accepted as a working draft of WG15, and recommends TC278 to accept the final PT deliverable. (And to note that WG15 will make best speed to make the final decisions required as a result of the work of the PT and to provide any further edits/improvements : DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0907-002: HLAP: BW: To request whatever action is needed to upgrade the work item so that it can be promptly balloted as a TS, and to note that it is the intention to subsequently develop the work item to a full EN.:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0907-003: ALL : To review the HLAP PT deliverable and make any suggestions in**



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

**respect of timings, or propose any improvements to the text BEFORE the September meeting.:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0907-004: JW: HLAP Figures, diagrams body text and Annex A. : JW to give names to all timers and make the use consistent throughout the body text, diagrams and figures:DONE**

**c/f from June meeting**

**ACTION : BRU0906-006:AM : TPS OR : AM to provide XML Annex to BFH 26 June 09:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-007:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to finalise and circulate the document to WG15 by 30 June 09:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-008:ALL : TPS OR : To consider final document and provide any corrections/ proposed revisions to BFH by 7 July 09:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-009:BFH : TPS OR : BFH to make final corrections and submit to Convenor by 10 July 09:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-010:BFH : TPS OR : Convenor to circulate to TC for comment immediately thereafter to TC and PSAPs.:DONE**

**ACTION : BRU0906-011:BFH : TPS OR : BW to request upgrade to full work item at September TC278 plenary:DONE**

EDG asked if the TPS draft could be circulated to PSAPs. The meeting agreed that this could/should happen now. BFH requested to circulate both TPS OR and current PE OR at same time.

**ACTION : BRU0909-001:BW : TPS OR/PE OR : BW to send latest copies of TPS OR and PEOR to EDG and ask that he circulates them to PSAPs for comment, as soon as meeting revisions were completed..**

### **1.6 Progress towards Web repository / EC Communication**

eSafety still in negotiation. No progress. IN the meantime BW has a large capacity memory stick dedicated to WG15 Docs which he will bring to every meeting and make available to WG15 members.

EDG presented the recent EC communication on eCall. He explained how finding may be available for pilots.

BW informed WG15 about the ISO article on eCall. He will circulate it as soon as it becomes available.

### **1.7 Date of Next Meeting**

24/25 November 2009.

## **2. 00278244 Intelligent transport systems – eCall – Operating requirements for third party support (Session leader : B. Flury-Herard)**

This document is currently out for TC comment.

A number of internal (to the WG) comments had been received and BFH led the group through these comments and the meeting found resolution to these comments, and revised the draft. One comment concerning prioritization and active safety systems, and generated significant debate. GS had introduced this text in a previous revision, but had presented his apologies for this meeting.

SC to contact GS and to jointly propose a new text.

The issue of how TPS's are accepted by PSAPs was raised and discussed. JvH raised the issue about a vehicle from one country where the TPS is accepted, driving in another country where that TPS is not accepted. SC explained how this might work. BFH pointed out that these were policy issues not



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

Standardisation issues.

"Supporting' to be changed to 'supported' throughout the document.

JVH raised the issue of matching the data to voice. There was a discussion but no particular conclusion.

**ACTION : BRU0909-002:SC : TPS OR: Prioritisation. SC to contact GS and to jointly propose a new text**

Subsequent to this discussion, during the revision of the HLAP work item, it was agreed that Section 8 of the HLAP would be transferred to the TPS OR deliverable as a new clause "High level application protocols for TPS eCall". Section 8 would be reduced to the figure and a reference to TPR OR.

The TPS OR editing group would then remove duplications where definitions were already included in the text of the TPS OR deliverable.

**ACTION : BRU0909-003:BFH : TPS OR: BFH to circulate next version by 21 Sept 09**

### 3. HLAP : eCall- High Level Application Protocols (Session leader :Bob Williams)

The meeting considered a modification request from DW/JW.

Section 7.5.5 says "if at any stage the PSAP application layer ACK with Block 2 = "2" is received at the IVS then the behaviour shall be as specified in clause 7.9. Call clear-down".

After receipt and acknowledgement of the MSD by the PSAP and when the telephone conversation has ended, it is easier for the PSAP to simply hang up rather than sending an AL clear-down message. When the PSAP hangs up, then the IVS UE knows what has happened because an SS7 ISUP REL message is sent back.

In section 7.5.5, the correct value should be "1" (not "2") because the MSD standard is going to be modified so that only values "0" and "1" are used.

In section 7.5.5 text is added such that the AL clear down message is used following receipt of the original MSD or new MSD, but following the telephone conversation the PSAP operator should hang up.

In section 7.9 it is clarified that the PSAP hangs up after the telephone conversation with the vehicle occupant.

The meeting considered the request, but decided that at the moment, the benefit and practicality of the change at the application level was unproven. DW/JW were invited to provide evidence of feasibility and benefit, but for the moment the change request was rejected.

The residual worth of the AL-ACK was again debated as its functionality had been reduced. However, this had already been discussed several times in the WG and PT and the need justified. BW would bundle and circulate all relevant docs and the issue would be introduced again as an agenda point for the next meeting.

**ACTION : BRU0909-004:BW : AL ACK: BW to bundle and circulate docs and introduce as an agenda item for next meeting.**

The meeting worked through the HLAP deliverable and proposed and made a number of revisions. BW noted that the last circulated version had fallen out of the template due to his being away from a Microsoft Office system during August. He would return the draft into the template. The new draft will incorporate the changes



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

agreed. Key changes include:

Consistent use of 'Most appropriate PSAP' (instead of 'responsible PSAP').

Fig 5 will be revised to state E112 (rather than e112)

Definitions will be added for :

Incident

Accident

Teleservice 12

As stated above, the text of Clause 8 will be transferred to TPS OR. The content of Clause 8 will be reduced to a new intro para, Fig 10 and a reference to TPS OR for TPS OR HLAPs.

The table of timing will introduce a new column to identify 'trigger point'.

**ACTION : BRU0909-005:JW : HLAP Anex table of timings: JW to bundle and circulate docs and introduce as an agenda item for next meeting.**

GS is requested to revise Figure C1 and to remove 'click to add text' from this and other figures in Clause 11. In C1 'Vehicle certification' to be changed to 'interoperability validation'.

**ACTION : BRU0909-006:GS : HLAP Anex: GS to revise fig C1 and remove 'click to add text' from all figures in the annex. Vehicle certification to be changed to 'interoperability validation'.**

Timing T2 was revised from 12 hours to 1 hour, with a request for EDG to take this proposal to the PSAPs to affirm or propose an alternate minimum reasonable time could be for T2. It was pointed out that as the vehicle battery would probably either be disconnected because of the accident or after the accident for safety reasons, there was no way that any small in-IVS battery or capacitors could maintain power for more than an hour, and even this was questioned as being impractical as a requirement. It was pointless, indeed counterproductive to specify something that would be impossible to deliver. In any event, the PSAP always had the opportunity to redial the vehicle, which could respond if it had sufficient energy supply to do so.

**ACTION : BRU0909-007:EDG : HLAP Min connect time if not disconnected: EDG to take minimum stay connected time proposals to PSAPs for comment.**

BFH explained the problem of the impact of the current proposals to France, and he suggested that this would be the case in several countries if the eCall Flag was not implemented, in the current organization of PSAPs, implementation would be impossible, so compliance would require a complete and expensive reorganization of PSAP structures in the country. This would prevent France from voting for or complying with the standard.

He agreed that, if the eCall Flag was implemented, the problem could be more easily managed.

For situations where the eCall flag was not supported by the MNO, he proposed the use of a 'beacon capability' table in the ETSI / 3GPP specification. He explained that the current ETSI standard already provided this, the cell values proposed were currently not used (reserved), and the system could be implemented without a change to the ETSI Standards.

JW pointed out that changes would be required to prevent other use of these cell values.

The BFH proposal was summarized in a Liaison Statement from SA4.

It was noted that SA4 states in its LS that it has not evaluated the proposal, as it is outside of its scope, so it does not anyway endorse the proposal.



**CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
 bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

The core of the proposal is in S2 of the LS:

**"The use of the BC of the Setup message to indicate an eCall modem**

**The emergency setup**

In order to establish an emergency call, the TE (IVS) sends an "emergency setup message" (different of the ordinary setup message) that is received by the MSC.

This emergency setup message is specified by 3GPP TS 24.008 V8.6. The information elements of this message are described hereafter.

Table 9.62/3GPP TS 24.008: EMERGENCY SETUP message content

Information element	Type/Reference	Presence	Format	Length
Call control protocol discriminator	Protocol discriminator 10.2	M	V	1/2
Transaction identifier	Transaction identifier 10.3.2	M	V	1/2
Emergency setup message type	Message type 10.4	M	V	1
Bearer capability	Bearer capability 10.5.4.5	O	T L V	3-11
Stream Identifier	Stream Identifier 10.5.4.28	O	T L V	3
Supported Codecs	Supported Codec List 10.5.4.32	O	T L V	5-n
Emergency category	Service category 10.5.4.33	O	T L V	3

**Weakness of the ecall flag**

The GPP TS22101 specifies that the emergency category should be used by IVS, which shall use the bits MieC (Manual Initiated eCall) and AieC (Automatic Initiated eCall) that is indicating that the emergency call is an eCall.

But this indicator **is not an end-to-end indicator**, as it is used at MSC level for the routing, and it is not carried by the fixed ISUP network to the PSAP access. Thus, the Q931 primary rate access of the PSAP don't receive this indicator inside the setup message.

Therefore, the PSAP presently receives some setup messages exactly identical, whether the call is an ecall or an ordinary e112 call.



## CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### Use of the BC capability

Another information element of the emergency set-up is the Bearer Capability (BC). This element is an end to end information, unchanged by the network, is 7 bytes long . The signification of the byte 6c of the BC is "modem type", according to the following table:

**Table 10.5.111/3GPP TS 24.008: Bearer capability information element**

Connection element (octet 6c)	
Bit	
<b>7 6</b>	
0 0	transparent
0 1	non transparent (RLP)
1 0	both, transparent preferred
1 1	both, non transparent preferred
The requesting end (e.g. the one sending the SETUP message) should use the 4 values depending on its capabilities to support the different modes. The answering party shall only use the codings 00 or 01, based on its own capabilities and the proposed choice if any. If both MS and network support both transparent and non transparent, priority should be given to the MS preference.	
Modem type (octet 6c)	
Bits	
<b>5 4 3 2 1</b>	
0 0 0 0 0	none
0 0 0 0 1	V.21 (note 1)
0 0 0 1 0	V.22 (note 1)
0 0 0 1 1	V.22 bis (note 1)
0 0 1 0 0	reserved: was allocated in earlier phases of the protocol
0 0 1 0 1	V.26 ter (note 1)
0 0 1 1 0	V.32
<b>0 0 1 1 1</b>	<b>modem for undefined interface</b>
0 1 0 0 0	autobauding type 1
All other values are reserved.	
Note 1: In A/Gb mode and GERAN lu mode only.	

*Different modems are indicated by this element. One particular value is "00111 modem for undefined interface".*

*It seems particularly convenient to use this value in order to indicate an eCall modem.*

*Once byte 6c of the BC information element has been set to 00111, the IVS sends the emergency setup message to the MSC.*

*The MSC generates an ISUP Setup message, including this BC information element unchanged. The PSAP with digital connectivity will receive this setup message, in general in the channel 16 of its Primary Rate Access (PRA).*

*Therefore, the routing of the incoming call towards an ecall modem is particularly easy. The PSAP's PBX or ACD will examine the content of the BC, and if its value is 0, it will route the call to an operator, and if its value is 7, then it will transfer the call to a modem equipped extension.*

*The only PSAP capability that is needed is the capability to read the BC element of the emergency setup messages.*



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### *3. Comparison of the in band/signalling channel methods for ecall calls recognition*

#### *General considerations*

*The use of BC capability is not exclusive of the use of in-band methods. The BC recognition method is an additional possibility, added to in-band push or pull methods.*

*The use of the BC in order to differentiate the ecalls from the ordinary calls does not need any modification in the mobile or in the fixed network. This method relies on the use of the existing network capabilities.*

#### *Advantages of the BC eCall recognition method*

*The use of the BC recognition for eCall is completely compatible with the existing PSAP working organisation. In particular, the BC recognition is fully compatible with the welcome/waiting messages installed on the 112 lines in some countries.*

*The use of the BC recognition method makes that the ecall implementation in the PSAP equipment has no impact on the "ordinary" 112 calls. In particular, it avoids the inconvenients such as the additional 2s delay for the ordinary calls.*

*It provides a method for automatic ecall recognition without any inconvenients, which is not the case when using an in-band recognition method.*

#### *Inconvenients of the BC recognition method*

*This method works only for a PSAP having a digital connectivity (PRA or ISDN 2B+D lines) with the fixed network. Although this is the case in all the large European countries, it may exist some very small PSAPs with analog lines.*

*This method needs an ACD or a PBX capable of reading the BC information element, inside the ISUP Setup message, and then to route the calls to the modem equipped extensions. As the BC normally enables to differentiate modems from other calls, this should be a feature easy for most ACD, but may be difficult for an ordinary PBX. It may require to change the PBX."*

There was an active discussion about the proposal contained in the LS and put forward by BFH.

BW asked for clarification of the meaning of the word "inconvenients" as it did not parse in English. It was explained as "disadvantages".

JW explained that he did not think that HLAP, should specify any one technical solution, this is done later when careful consideration has been given to all possible solutions, by people who are suitably qualified e.g. 3GPP CT1. The vast majority of the CEN WG15 delegates do not have the necessary network signalling knowledge, including BFH, to make any sort of technical judgement of the French BC proposal.

There may be several ways of doing this and, most importantly, the proposed France Telecom Bearer Capability method does not appear to work. He pointed out that in the discussion BFH had indicated that he conceded this and said that maybe they would have to use some other BC field i.e. not the unused modem field.

JW also explained that the mapping from TS24.008 (PLMN MAP) to ITU Rec Q.931 (ISDN DSS) is done in the MSC IWF, this means that IF they find a spare end to end BC bit then, in addition to all the PSAP PABXs, ALL MSCs will almost certainly have to be modified....!!!! .....Read TS29.007.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

JW pointed out that he looking at this some years ago when he wrote the original eCall MSD transmission study for Vodafone and GSMA and concluded that out-of-band signalling was full of interworking 'holes'.

BFH insisted that it was a workable solution. JC suggested that this was not an alternative to the eCall flag but should be accommodated as an additional method that could be used if the eCall flag was not supported by the MNOs in a particular country. BFH reiterated that it would provide France and he felt several other countries who would be in a similar position, a viable way to identify eCall without waiting for Issue 8 of the 3GPP standards to be adopted by MNOs. On being questioned, he confirmed that if the eCall flag was present, the problem did not exist, but MNOs were generally working to issue 4 or 5 of the 3GPP specifications, and would not be operating at issue 8 level for several years. So this problem was real and the BC offered a solution.

BW asked him to confirm that if BC was adopted as an additional method of identifying eCall, French problems with implementing eCall would be removed. BFH advised that it would not cure the problem but would reduce it to manageable proportions.

JW reiterated that the proposed solution was unproven and should not be introduced until it was proven and approved in ETSI. DW pointed out that the modifications to accommodate the application layer ACK and the 'push' were incorporated into the HLAP prior to finalisation in ETSI.

JW reiterated his concern that the proposals were unproven, there were possibly other alternatives, and he strongly objected to including any BC proposals being incorporated in eCall standards unless they had been first evaluated by ETSI.

BW proposed the conciliation that any addition would carry the preface caveat "If supported by a published ETSI Standard or TS, the following procedure may be used as an additional means of identifying an eCall" and within the text would make it explicitly clear that the method could not be used until an ETSI Standard or TS supporting and specifying it had been published.

The Convenor asked the meeting to clearly indicate support or not for the inclusion of this item, and requested response from those who had not been involved in the debate as well as those who had been active. The meeting clearly indicated support for the inclusion of an additional clause to accommodate the BC method of identification of an eCall, with the caveat described by the Convenor.

The meeting found itself in difficulty reviewing Clause 11 (conformance testing), in part because of the absence of GS who was the prime author for most of the text. AM felt that the test requirements should specify only the result of the test, and not the test methodology. It was important that tests were made at points that could be measured, preferably by simple means. The work in Clause 11 had done important work to identify the process stages that needed to be tested, but some of the specs involved internal mid-process points that it would be difficult if not impossible to reliably test. He argued that it was important to test results at the end of process stages at the point that there was something tangible to test. Much of the detail of the type of processes to be used provided important information for manufacturers, but he felt that this level of detail should not be written into this standard, which should concentrate on the expected results of such tests. AM agreed to work with GS to propose a revised text.

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-008:HLAP BC: To prepare an additional clause for BC recognition of eCall.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-009: HLAP BC: To integrate the new clause into the HLAP working draft with the caveats described**

**ACTION: ALL: BRU0909-010: HLAP BC: ALL to review the clause**

**ACTION: BW: BRU 0909-011: HLAP BC:BW to revise the draft to include the revisions made at the meeting and circulate to the WG by 21/9/09 (latest) for 14 day comment.**



**CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-012: HLAP BC ALL: to comment on the revised draft.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-013: HLAP BC: BW to prepare a response to the LS and circulate to group for 14 day comment.**

**ACTION : ALL: BRU 0909-014: HLAP BC : All to review response to LS**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-015: HLAP BC : BW to revise and submit to ETSI & 3GPP**

**ACTION : AM/GS: BRU0909-016:HLAP: AM to work with GS to propose revised text for Clause 11 if possible by 3/10/09**

Subsequent to the meeting BW circulated the following text to the WG for 7 day comment, prior to insertion into the deliverable.



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **7.12.5.2 Use of BC recognition of eCall**

*The preferred method to identify an eCall is the eCall flag.*

*The use of the method described in this subClause is only permitted in accordance with a published ETSI Standard or TS specifying its operation (which at the time of developing this Standard is not yet available) .*

*In order to be able to identify an eCall where the eCall flag is not supported by the MNO, the 'Bearer Capability' (BC) or other bits of the communication process, as specified for this purpose in an ETSI Standard or TS may be used, in accordance with procedures specified in such (yet to be developed) ETSI Standards or TS / 3GPP Specifications, to identify an eCall.*

*In the absence of ETSI Standards or TS / 3GPP specifications for such means of identification, this method shall not be used.*

*An explanation of a proposed possible methodology is described in Annex D.*

*NOTE: Annex D provides a proposed use of BC to identify an eCall. it is an informative example only. Any implementation of means other than the eCall flag to identify an eCall shall be strictly in accordance with published ETSI Standard(s) / TS.*

## **ANNEX D : Use of the BC capability to recognise eCall**

### **D.1 Context**

*The preferred method to identify an eCall is the eCall flag.*

*However, where an MNO is not operating to release 8 or above level of the ETSI/3GPP standards, this is not possible. In this case BC capability (or other similar data field) may potentially be used to identify an eCall.*

*This Annex summarises proposals made by 3GPP SA4 to ETSI/CEN TC278 WG15 in document 3GPP TSG-SA WG4 Meeting #55 S4-090777, as to how this might, subject to further study by 3GPP WG CT1, be achieved.*

*Any implementation will however have to comply to (yet to be developed) ETSI/3GPP Standards or TS, and can only be used in accordance with such ETSI / 3GPP Standards or TS, as specified in those documents when published, rather than in accordance with the explanation provided in this Annex, which is provided solely for general understanding of the proposals.*

### **D.2 Technical proposal made in S4-090777 .**

*Another information element of the emergency set-up is the Bearer Capability (BC). This element is an end to end information, unchanged by the network, is 7 bytes long .*

*The MSC generates an ISUP setup message, including this BC information element unchanged. The PSAP*



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

*with digital connectivity will receive this setup message, in general in the channel 16 of its 'Primary Rate Access' (PRA).*

*Therefore, the routing of the incoming call towards an eCall modem is particularly easy. The PSAP's PBX or ACD will examine the content of the BC, and if it identifies an eCall, then it will transfer the call to a modem equipped extension, otherwise, it will route the call to an operator.*

*The only PSAP capability that is needed is the capability to read the BC element of the emergency setup messages.*

### **D.3 Advantages of the BC eCall recognition method**

*The use of the BC recognition for eCall is completely compatible with the existing PSAP working organisation. In particular, the BC recognition is fully compatible with the welcome/waiting messages installed on the 112 lines in some countries.*

*The use of the BC recognition method makes that the eCall implementation in the PSAP equipment has no impact on the "ordinary" 112 calls. In particular, it avoids the disadvantages such as the additional 2s delay for the ordinary calls.*

*It allows routing the incoming eCalls to specifically equipped extensions, or specifically trained operators. This avoids the equip all the PSAP operator positions. It makes PSAP equipment less expensive.*

### **D.4 Disadvantages of the BC recognition method**

*This method works only for a PSAP having a digital connectivity (PRA or ISDN 2B+D lines) with the fixed network. Although this is the case in all the large European countries, it may exist some very small PSAPs with analogue lines.*

*This method needs an ACD or a PBX capable of reading the BC information element, inside the ISUP setup message, and then to route the calls to the modem equipped extensions. As the BC normally enables to differentiate modems from other calls, this should be a feature easy for most ACD, but may be difficult for an ordinary PBX. It may require to change the PBX.*

*This method may, depending upon the Bearer Capability (BC) information element (IE) used to indicate the presence of an eCall to the ACD or PBX, require modifications to the Mobile Switching Centre (MSC) Interworking Function software. This would be needed to provide correct mapping between the BC IE received from the IVS NAD and the ITU Rec. Q931 specified BC IE to be sent to the modified ACD/PBX. Details may be found in ETSI TS 129 007 "General requirements on interworking between the Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) and the Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) or Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN)".*

"

## **4. CEN TS15722 (PREN Draft) eCall Minimum Set of Data**

This document has been stable for some time, and is a published TS. However, because of the limitations of the ETSI modem, the means/method of sending the application level ACK and to some extent its content were proposed to be changed. The new draft makes these changes, and is now consistent with HLAP.

The meeting reviewed the document and requested that, as because of the limitations of the modem specification provided some of the specified data could not actually be sent over the link, the application ACK was simplified to only that which could be provided over the link, otherwise the IVS was being asked to



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

perform actions (eg generate a CRC and a message identifier) that could not be sent over the link. This was agreed, a new table prepared. However by this stage DW/JW were not available. BW/DW/JW to review for accuracy, then BW to revise the master.

**ACTION : DW/JW: BRU0909-017: 15722: DW/JW to study and comment on proposed new AL-ACK table.**

### **5. WI00278220 Pan European eCall- Operating Requirements**

A liaison had been received from SA4 in respect of the PUSH and PULL modes. See Doc w15-198. BW to respond indicating WG15's preference for PUSH mode.

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-018: PEOR PUSH: BW to prepare a response to the LS and circulate to group for 14 day comment.**

**ACTION : ALL: BRU 0909-019: PEOR PUSH : All to review response to LS**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-020: PEOR PUSH : BW to revise and submit to ETSI & 3GPP**

There was no time to review the PEOR for consistency with HLAP, and this would be done by email.

**ACTION : BW/JW/JA/MS: BRU 0909-021:PEOR : BW/JW/JA/MS and the Editor (MS) to check consistency of PEOR with HLAP and if necessary propose revisions**

### **6. Quality of Service Requirements for eCall and Emergency Support Services**

This agenda item was not reached during the meeting. Deferred to next meeting.

### **7. Intelligent transport systems – eSafety - Third Party Emergency Support Services**

This agenda item was not reached during the meeting. Deferred to next meeting.

### **8. Interest from SISTER project re CALM - Safety Application Message Formats for onboard and independent devices**

This agenda item was not reached during the meeting. Deferred to next meeting.

### **9. eCall AOB**

This agenda item was not reached during the meeting  
However BP had submitted a document concerning consistency

**Consistency of use of terms**  
**Consistency between documents**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-022: Consistency: BW to circulate BP document.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-023: Consistency: ALL to consider and comment by email**

The item to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

### **10. eSafety AOB**



**CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

None

**11. Closure of meeting**

The Meeting closed at about 17.00



## **CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

### **Summary of Action points**

**ACTION : BRU0909-001:BW : TPS OR/PE OR : BW to send latest copies of TPS OR and PEOR to EDG and ask that he circulates them to PSAPs for comment, as soon as meeting revisions were completed.**

**ACTION : BRU0909-002:SC : TPS OR: Prioritisation. SC to contact GS and to jointly propose a new text**

**ACTION : BRU0909-003:BFH : TPS OR: BFH to circulate next version by 21 Sept 09**

**ACTION : BRU0909-004:BW : AL ACK: BW to bundle and circulate docs and introduce as an agenda item for next meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0909-005:JW : HLAP Anex table of timings: JW to bundle and circulate docs and introduce as an agenda item for next meeting.**

**ACTION : BRU0909-006:GS : HLAP Anex: GS to revise fig C1 and remove 'click to add text' from all figures in the annex. Vehicle certification to be changed to 'interoperability validation'.**

**ACTION : BRU0909-007:EDG : HLAP Min connect time if not disconnected: EDG to take minimum stay connected time proposals to PSAPs for comment.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-008: HLAP BC: To prepare an additional clause for BC recognition of eCall.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-009: HLAP BC: To integrate the new clause into the HLAP working draft with the caveats described**

**ACTION: ALL: BRU0909-010: HLAP BC: ALL to review the clause**

**ACTION: BW: BRU 0909-011: HLAP BC:BW to revise the draft to include the revisions made at the meeting and circulate to the WG by 21/9/09 (latest) for 14 day comment.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-012: HLAP BC ALL: to comment on the revised draft.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-013: HLAP BC: BW to prepare a response to the LS and circulate to group for 14 day comment.**

**ACTION : ALL: BRU 0909-014: HLAP BC : All to review response to LS**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-015: HLAP BC : BW to revise and submit to ETSI & 3GPP**

**ACTION : AM/GS: BRU0909-016:HLAP: AM to work with GS to propose revised text for Clause 11 if possible by 3/10/09**

**ACTION : DW/JW: BRU0909-017: 15722: DW/JW to study and comment on proposed new AL-ACK table.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU0909-018: PEOR PUSH: BW to prepare a response to the LS and circulate to group for 14 day comment.**

**ACTION : ALL: BRU 0909-019: PEOR PUSH : All to review response to LS**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-020: PEOR PUSH : BW to revise and submit to ETSI & 3GPP**



**CEN TC278 WG15 eSafety**

Convenor : Bob Williams, CSI, 1 Brearley Hall Halifax HX2 6HS, UK  
bw\_csi@fastmail.fm

**ACTION : BW/JW/JA/MS: BRU 0909-021: PEOR : BW/JW/JA/MS and the Editor (MS) to check consistency of PEOR with HLAP and if necessary propose revisions**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-022: Consistency: BW to circulate BP document.**

**ACTION : BW: BRU 0909-023: Consistency: ALL to consider and comment by email**

TC278/WG15/Cn15-0201