EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

Directorate C - Innovative & sustainable mobility
C.3 - Intelligent transport systems

* * * * * * * *

1ST EXPERT MEETING - 15 APRIL 2013

Preparation of a delegated act

TOWARDS SPECIFICATIONS FOR PRIORITY ACTION (B) 'THE PROVISION OF EU-WIDE REAL-TIME TRAFFIC INFORMATION SERVICES'

Meeting minutes – final

Meeting: **15 April 2013**, **10.00 – 16.00**
Berlaymont, **room Walter Hallstein** (1st Floor)

Objective: Kick-off of the drafting of specifications for priority action (b):
- Presentation of key outcome of preparative work realised;
- Stock taking of *comments and viewpoints of experts* from Member States and European Parliament;
- Discussion on the *key elements to be retained* in the specifications.

Agenda: **enclosed in Annex 1**

Chairman: *Mr. Pawel Stelmaszczyk, Head of Unit, DG MOVE C3, Intelligent Transport Systems*

Participants: *See detailed attendance list enclosed in Annex 2*

Meeting minutes:

0. Welcome, agenda and *tour de table*

The Chairman welcomed the representative from the European Parliament and 35 experts representing 17 Member States plus Switzerland and Norway;

The Chairman recalled the subject of the meeting and informed that
- relevant information on studies to be presented had been made available upfront the meeting, allowing experts to get familiar with main outcome of latest studies realised;
- final reports of any study realised and info related to the workshops organised as part of the implementation of the ITS Action plan/ the ITS Directive is published on DG MOVE's 'Transport and Mobility' website[1];

The proposed agenda was accepted without remarks.

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/its/studies/its_en.htm

Following a short 'tour de table' and in light of the presentation of main outcome of preparatory studies realised, it was reiterated that experts should take advantage of the presence of the authors to ask clarification when needed.

1. Context of the priority action on "Real-time traffic information services"

DG MOVE elaborated on the policy framework, the objectives of the ITS Directive and the concept of specifications to be adopted as delegated acts, and notably on the scope of priority action and the connected elements - as identified in Annex I of the ITS Directive.

There were no direct observations or comments.

2. Accurate data for digital maps – findings and progress so far

Rapp Trans NL presented the main outcome and recommendations from the study concluded at the end of 2011 on the 'Availability of Public Data for Digital Maps'[2] (action 1.3 of the ITS Action Plan).

The (*ERTICO) coordinator* of the iMobility Forum's Digital Maps Working Group *(*DMWGp coordinator) elaborated on follow-up of recommendations and progress achieved so far by the Working Group building on the outcome of the ROSATTE project (FP 7 project, establishing procedures enhancing the accuracy and timely updating of digital maps).

Key messages from the iMobility's Digital Maps Working Group:

- it is proposed to establish a TN-ITS 'development & deployment platform' (Transport Network relative to ITS - related data and technical specifications for digital maps) - in light of a proposed alignment of the *ROSATTE specifications* with the INSPIRE technical and organisational framework,
- there is a clear win-win on safety-related elements to be addressed (accurate provision of information to result in safer & less disturbed traffic, enhancing transport effectiveness and adding to comfort and user satisfaction).

It was indicated that the Commission analyses a potential connection between on-going work on the specifications for the current priority action in the area of digital maps and the technical and organisational INSPIRE framework, specifically to have technical elements defined in coherence with agreed INSPIRE specifications and to re- use the existing (INSPIRE) organisational framework for facilitating collection/ validation, access to and re-use of safety-related, geo-referenced road characteristics & attributes.

Observations and comments:

One Member State confirmed the need to have safety-related data, and speed indications in particular, collected and shared, but questioned the need to have it all embedded in digital maps in light of development of co-operative systems. It remarked that current updating processes of digital maps take too much time and also questioned the appropriateness of the INSPIRE framework. This Member State also indicated that a network-wide approach would be required and explained that it also would be necessary to e.g. encode and standardize the additional information to be enclosed in speed limit undersigns, as these specify the applicability of the speed limit itself (e.g. in case of rain, dependant on time of day, etc.);

One Member State was concerned about the lack of an appropriate business case to justify costs, and indicated some data might need to remain confidential to some stakeholders;

The DMWGp coordinator indicated development of cooperative systems to call for additional and even more accurate data (e.g. existence of slopes, traffic lights, black spots, etc.);

[2] http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/its/studies/doc/2011_12-availability-public-data-digital-maps.pdf

DG MOVE recognized the establishment of an TN-ITS platform to be an important step forward; also remarked road users would be keen on accurate and complete speed information whereas speed limits in principle are set by public authorities (so these should be well-known);

DG MOVE invited MSs to liaise with the DMWGp, study the proposal for TN-ITS and, potentially, to consider joining the initiative;

One Member State expressed its support to data sharing, however requested also to consider privately collected data and obligations for the private sector;

Two Member States requested to clarify scope and extent, notably public vs. privately owned data.

Both the DMWGp coordinator and Rapp Trans NL stressed the need for synergies between public & private partners, and the need to come to an overall complete and accurate image of the network;

DG MOVE clarified that Delegated Acts would apply to both public and private entities and highlighted the apparent willingness of private map makers to contribute and get involved – at reasonable cost; apparently the key question seems to be to get organized and agree on procedures;

It was clarified that action (c) more or less relates to a sub-set of what is to be tackled under action (b), whereas the specifications for (c) call for the set-up of 'national central nodes' where info would be made available – that not necessarily require the realisation of (national) data warehouses;

DG MOVE requested to have observations raised and discussed in the DMWGp, bringing together mapmakers, authorities and some providers.

3. Availability and access to Road data, Traffic regulations and traffic management plans

Rapp Trans UK presented main outcome of a preparative study concluded early 2013 on the availability and re-use of road data, traffic regulations and circulation plans;

Key elements: Enhanced co-operation is beneficial for all; suggestion to further develop DATEX II to streamline and harmonise information provision; an overall framework and sound conflict resolution however remain crucial.

Observations and comments:

One Member State remarked that scope and stakeholders involved are quite different for road data and traffic data, whereas the study suggests everything could be handled in a ‘single format fits all’ approach. Also the border line between INSPIRE and DATEX II-based approaches should be made very clear;

DG MOVE commented that conclusions seem to have been based on a handful of successful initiatives, but that indeed significant additional (development) work would be required;

One Member State remarked important differences in road vs. traffic data – also from an institutional perspective; data categories should be clearly defined and so should the objectives for action (b);

DG MOVE and the DMWGp coordinator commented that synergies with the DMWGp’s TN-ITS approach should be clarified, whereas any overlap should be avoided.

4. Findings and recommendations with regard to Liability aspects of ITS applications and services

DG MOVE presented main outcome and recommendations emerging from a 'Study regarding liability aspects of ITS applications and services' (action 5.2 of the ITS Action Plan) that was concluded at the end of 2012.

Observations and comments:

One Member State requested confirmation that where 'cooperative systems' had been identified as the most sensitive area, each stakeholder is expected to deal with particular liability-related issues in the part of the service chain he is covering. This Member State also asked if and what kind of legislation would be required.

DG MOVE responded that the principle was indeed that each stakeholder of a system should be responsible of the part under its design and/or control. Such principle has been applied for instance in the case of 112 eCall, and written both in eCall standards and specifications for PSAPs.

5. Feed-back and discussion on key elements (and level of detail) to be retained

As there were no specific comments or observations raised, DG MOVE presented 15 issues for discussion that had been identified and where European action might be envisaged.

1) Availability of road data (geometry, characteristics/ attributes, regulations…)

Two Member States requested to clarify 'availability' and 'capacity';

One Member State indicated basic road data for all public roads and all regulations incl. updates are published in standardised electronic format; more detailed info (road curves etc) is considered not to be relevant for public authorities, but could be of interest for private providers;

Two Member States requested confirmation on the scope – applicable only to core or comprehensive TEN-T?

> it was clarified that the issue is under investigation and needs to be confirmed;

DG MOVE indicated that a potential approach could be to start with the core TEN-T network and to gradually extend the scope.

One Member State remarked duplication with INSPIRE requirements needs to be avoided, e.g. geometry, whereas 'capacity' might be handled as (real-time) 'information'. Is there an intention to force private parties to share their data? This Member State also remarked that Public bodies have invested a lot in traffic modelling and that from an economical perspective emerging results cannot be given for free or without conditions for re-use to any Service Provider (SP) or actor requesting this;

> DG MOVE remarked 'making available' isn't necessarily implying 'for free' whereas also rules for the re-use of data obtained might be required;

One Member State remarked that public and private road operators own datasets of road network inventory (i.e. geometry characteristics, static and electronic traffic signs, maximum permissible height in tunnels and overpasses, road weather information stations, etc.) mainly for maintenance purposes; it also asked if traffic lights in tunnels are to be included?

One Member State indicated some road data is already to be collected, in full compliance with national rules. This notably is the case for the motorway network (there is a contractual obligation for the motorways under concession) and also remarked one has to pay attention to budgetary restrictions, which are limiting room for (additional) manoeuvres;
One Member State remarked the lower level roads are regionally/ locally managed, therefore it will be difficult to collect/ manage/ publish related data. Provision of details on traffic lights notably relates to local networks, whereas most traffic lights on motorways are situated in tunnel sections.

Some Member States requested to focus on the TEN-T for which lots of data (including regulations) already are available using a single access point; it would be a big challenge to collect data on the lower level roads, even speed data;

One Member State indicated that it would be in favour of a common architecture/ a single set of specifications and systems – for both state roads and those managed by regional and local authorities; therefore supports a step by step approach but stresses a holistic view is needed;
a more detailed definition of content types would be required to better understand costs involved. Who will do the work of precise definition? The European Standardisation Organisations?

> DG MOVE confirmed the idea is to define a single set of (scalable, extendible) rules and specifications, and in parallel to look for a step-by-step implementation. Key is to agree on what we want to achieve;

Two Member States agreed with this proposal (step-by-step), and would like to include a time plan 'distinguishing immediate requirements and longer-term aspirations';

Another Member State confirmed the relevance of a flexible, standardised approach – in line with the overall objective: need to define what, when and why, and by whom;

Two Member States informed that private road operators were an issue when it comes to collecting data (contracts are signed, and do not allow for additional costs as potentially incurred by the specifications). Specification might also cause additional costs for the road managers whereas financial resources needed for such purpose are hardly predictable at the moment. Additionally, any inspection system would have to be clear, simple and non-costly;
Two Member States also stressed the specifications should not apply to projects already implemented and should not lead to additional costs.
DG MOVE announced an additional small survey would be launched to better capture what is available where, as well as what processes and (organisational) frameworks effectively are in place;

2) availability and access to (semi-) dynamic traffic data

Some Member States indicated data are available (in the National Data Warehouses), though quality is an issue; need to involve the 'owners' – e.g. when private actors do road works, they should provide information on (expected) impact. Therefore the service chains and responsibilities involved need to be defined;

> DG MOVE confirmed specifications should tackle all kind of issues, to overall come to a better result;

One Member State signalled to have many systems in place, including cross-border types; backward compatibility is an issue and that it may oppose costly new solutions; but it agrees with the coverage of the TEN-T and reminded that for urban areas, urban ITS guidelines have now been published;

> DG MOVE indicated that to guarantee 100% backward compatibility with all (dispersed) systems currently in place might not be feasible. The objective is to overcome fragmentation and lack of interoperability, but the aim is to try to find consensus as much as possible;

One Member State recalled the need for an end-user perspective, i.e. quality of information (output) and not only quality of data (input); quality of dissemination is also important; the scope should go beyond public data only i.e. private data (incl. its quality) to be covered;

One Member State requested to quickly find consensus on terminology to be used

> DG MOVE agreed

One Member State indicated the legal requirements for road data are higher than for traffic

data and therefore this should be reflected in the specifications;

3) Access to (private) data

DG MOVE recalled the underlying double objectives: enhancing network management and provision of accurate information to the road user;

Two Member States confirmed to be interested in buying privately owned data, at a reasonable price – but would be reluctant on any obligation on this;

One Member State confirmed 'open data' policy is applied to publically-owned data, maintenance of road data however is difficult – therefore more competition between map makers should be encouraged;

One Member State reminded of the commercial aspects of buying data. The interests of data owners, and the investments they have made to generate data have to be safeguarded. Therefore the commercial relationship between road operators (who own and collect data) and, where appropriate, external service providers has to be taken into account.

What about publicly owned (collected) data?

One Member State would be in favour of a common license; in case additional costs are involved to deliver specific sets of data the extra-cost should be recovered

Two Member States indicated one should be careful with market intervention; if costs are to be covered, these should be market-conform. Therefore it has adopted the 'market place' approach – parties agree themselves on the price to be paid;

One Member State added that road data as part of INSPIRE are available for free, and so is the traffic data on publicly owned (state-owned) roads.
When it comes to speed data: one Member State experienced many difficulties to set up a (single) integrated data base, but it has remarked the private sector seems to have solved the issue on its own.
It also asked the question if common specifications would generate different market responses across the EU?

4) Conditions for Re-use of data

One Member State indicated cities are reluctant on making raw data available, if so these should be used (by SP) in line with traffic management 'rules' and measures in force – what cannot be solved by a single contract;

One Member State suggested creating open pools of data, accessible to all parties without too much contracting burden. This could be achieved by having both public and private data providers feeding an agreed minimum data set into a common open data pool. Combining data from different sources enables identification of critical data and having data sets complemented, therefore helps to enhance overall quality

One Member State remarked private data, e.g. resulting from probes (Floating Car Data) are becoming more and more important, and wondered how one could optimally deal with the issue (i.e. are they accurate enough? Common purchasing rules?...) It put forward the question if this issue would be covered by the current priority action?

One Member State indicated making available data from public or private sources needs to be approached from different perspectives; If transparency (= *enabling stakeholders to* be informed on *who owns what set of data* and/or *what data would be available for a particular part of the road network*) could be achieved, this already would be a major step forward;

One Member State signalled a national law, forcing municipalities to update data in favour of (services delivered by) private actors and vice-versa

One Member State indicated to make data available both under 'open data' policy, where re-use of data would be excluded, and as part of (bilateral) contracts that can include agreed conditions relevant for the re-use on e.g. continuity, quality etc.;

5) Traffic management measures and

6) Consistency of information (using all dissemination/ communication channels)

One Member State stated that it was not systematically disseminating such info as one is not convinced of the added value, but there is a pilot on-going in Amsterdam and depending on the outcome it might change its position;

One Member State indicated that when (major) Traffic Management Plans (TMP) are available, their use should be compulsory;

One Member State commented on an on-going pilot where a public authority and a private service provider co-operate on TMPs to enhance traffic fluidity. In case of big events co-operation is effective, and probably as well for improving safety-related traffic info; however, in principle there is an inherent conflict of interest: individual vs. collective benefits, whereas it is better if not too many road-users effectively follow diversion advices. Analysis is still in progress, but an intermediate suggestion would be that making TMP compulsory is not desirable

One Member State recalled that latency in delivering traffic management info to the users is an issue; TMPs are less dynamic whereas (messages on) VMS can be disseminated (via additional channels) more rapidly.

7) Data formats & exchange mechanisms, and

8) Location referencing

One Member State indicated to have national standards in place (for location of data); DATEX or INSPIRE would not be sufficient – e.g. with regard to intermodal information or bus stops;

One Member State expressed support for a common intermodal approach;

One Member State expressed its support for the use of DATEX II for data exchange between traffic centres; however it seems less suitable for Business to Business (B2B)/ private partners.
Location referencing: private actors should decide themselves; an issue might be that today the use of Open LR (re: patented by TeleAtlas/TomTom) is granted, but that this might change at any time – this could cause problems if such information is well embedded in service chains…

One Member State indicated to have assessed Open LR, and concluded it is quite acceptable, therefore no need 'to start' with AGORA C (re: which is implicating license fees);

Two Member States argued the problem is solved if GIS-referenced data is exchanged; on the fly referencing may well build on Open LR, but why not stick to existing TMC Location tables?

One Member State requested to be informed on existing standards, and pros and cons;

> DG MOVE indicated quite some material to be available in the final report of the 'Supportive Study on priority action (c)' concluded in January 2013;

One Member State stressed to stick to standardised solutions as this is fundamental for Public-Private co-operation;

One Member State expressed a wish to use only royalty-free standards.

9) Technology/ Dissemination channels

Two Member States expressed their reluctance on framing innovation, in particular with regard to fast evolving technology;

10) Organisational frameworks

Two Member States estimated this to be a core element as Public Authorities may provide the info but also depend on private SPs to have the information effectively delivered > one needs to agree how information can be timely disseminated to the end-user, spurring review of service chains and public-private co-operation. A platform to discuss would be required;

One Member State called for harmonized methods and business models; issues include Public-Private co-operation, shared investments, re-use of data…
It would be interesting to elaborate on *what* works and *why* it is working.

11) Minimum service required?

No direct reactions

12) Quality

One Member State agreed on the importance of quality, but would be in favour of combining top-down guidance (' what is required for effective balancing of the networks, i.e. the role of traffic info vs traffic management …') and a bottom-up approach leading to normative criteria - which might take 3 years;
Quality cannot be enforced top-down; EasyWay has made a proposal to tackle the issue (new work plan);

> DG MOVE indicated it would be good to establish at least consensus on terminology, on indicators etc…

One Member State stressed the need for 'a minimum service level', however acknowledging differentiated levels might be required for different data sets or services; first needs may relate to agreements on common standards and how to comply with these;

One Member State reminded customer feed-back is crucial, and should steer processes;

One Member State reminded quality requirements will have an impact on costs;

One Member State questioned how to measure quality or to valorise data; also sees added value in harmonized terminology, methods, organisational framework…

13) Certification - of systems/ services/ providers

One Member State indicated it is impossible to have all services 'certified' as a combination of methods and costs; however expects vehicle-based services most likely to become subject to certification, through certification of equipment;

One Member State indicated conformity testing is a first step;

Two Member States referred to TISA achievements in the field and would agree on voluntary certification, but also signalled costs involved, and that resources have to be foreseen in the service chain. If it becomes too expensive, it simply will not happen and even may hamper further development;

One Member State suggested to concentrate on the end-products (= services) as done in the specifications for action (c);

One Member State confirmed private sector often is in favour of 'formal' certification by Road Authorities – as it is positive for branding & therefore is driving revenue; the Government has put in place measures facilitating self-assessment / compliance checks.

14) Road network classification

DG MOVE referred to the work realised by the EasyWay project in this field that could

provide a good basis;

Ireland remarked network classification can be critical; one currently is adapting the national referencing system;

15) Best practices

Data collection/ organisational frameworks/ quality assurance/ service delivery… as support parallel to the legislation itself.

> no particular comments or observations.

16) More?

One Member State stated that it has reservations against the use of the INSPIRE framework for the adoption of specifications as this is considered to be out of scope of the INSPIRE Directive's mandate.

Indeed, INSPIRE deals with the setting up of a European GIS infrastructure whereas issues to be covered under action (b) of the ITS Directive rather would relate to 'routable transportation graphs' - clearly beyond the scope of INSPIRE.

> EC stated to be reluctant on re-inventing the whell or to create something completely different; also would be keen on building on existing shared principles (terminology, procedures…) and processes;

> one Member State agreed on a need for synergies, but insisted on keeping 'governance' under the ITS Directive;

One Member State requested an analysis on the relation between action (b) and (c), as similar discussions seem to occur;

> DG MOVE confirmed (c) to be a subset of action (b), and that redoing work should be avoided; agreements made during discussions on (c) will be respected but might have to be broadened;

One Member State would be in favour of starting discussion on quality – even if this item might be hard to tackle; the approach towards the elaboration of service requirements applicable to private concessionaires can serve as a model i.e. start with the definition of a common glossary, then define requirement types, service levels and performance indicators; and reminded as well data owned by private concessionaires are in principle not public;

One Member State indicated that due to a complex internal organisation involving many institutions it would be in favour of receiving documents / topics to be discussed upfront a next meeting, in order to enable upfront consultation, discussion and preparation;

One Member State requested early warning on dates of next meetings/ events;

> DG MOVE confirmed that a survey and stakeholder workshop are under preparation; dates of workshop and a next meeting will be confirmed in due time.

17) Parallel actions to promote R&D, standards, pilots

Member States were asked to send their comments by email.

6. Conclusion and way forward

The Chairman summarized the main outcomes of the meeting

- experts have been informed on state of art, and findings & key outcome of preparatory work undertaken;

- priority action (b) is quite broad and touches on many issues that seem relevant in light of effective and cost-efficient Europe-wide provision of traffic information services;

- it is recognised that action (b) might imply (extra) costs, but there will also be funding opportunities under the CEF/TEN-T budget;

- some difficulties have been raised, but without any straightforward objections;

DG MOVE will consolidate the observations made and outcome of discussions; all documents and presentations will be made available on a dedicated web-space on CIRCABC.

Next meeting of the current group of Member States experts would take place during or just after summer, with the aim to discuss a first draft of the specifications.

Annex 1

Expert meeting 15 Apr 2013 on priority action (b):

Agenda:

10.00	Welcome and 'Tour de table'	Pawel Stelmaszczyk (DG MOVE)
10.25	1. Context & State of art / specifications for priority action (b)	Eric Kenis (DG MOVE)
10.50	2. Accurate data for digital maps / Findings & progress so far	T. van de Ven (Rapp NL) M. Flament (iMobility /Digital maps Working Grp)
11.15	Questions & Answers	
11.40	3. Provision of road data & traffic regulations / Study findings & recommendations	Nabil Abou-Rahme (Rapp Trans UK)
12.05	4. Liability aspects of ITS applications and services / Study findings & recommendations	Gilles Carabin (DG MOVE)
12.25	Questions & Answers	
14.00	**Feed-back from Experts**	All
14.45	Discussion on key elements to be retained in the specifications for priority action (b)	Moderated by DG MOVE
15.30	Conclusions and the way forward	Pawel Stelmaszczyk (DG MOVE)
16.00	End of meeting	

Participants Expert Meeting 15 Apr 2013 / priority action (b) **Annex 2**

Country
AT
BE
CH
CZ
DE
EL
ES
FI
FR
IE
IT
LT
LV
NL
NO
PL
PT
RO
SE
UK
EC