



* * * * *

2^{N D} EXPERT MEETING - 10 OCTOBER 2013
Preparation of a delegated act

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

Meeting minutes

- Meeting:** 10 October 2013, 10.00 – 16.00
200, rue de la Loi, Brussels, Berlaymont Building, room Jean Rey
- Objectives:** Progress the preparatory work for the drafting of specifications for priority action (b):
- Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting
 - Presentation and discussion of draft vision document from the Commission services
 - Discussion on the possible scope of the future specifications
 - Introduction to the Cost-Benefit analysis
 - Provide overview of recent developments in the field of floating car data
- Agenda:** *enclosed in Annex 1*
- Chairman:** *Ms. Claire Depre, Head of Unit, DG MOVE C3, Intelligent Transport Systems*
- Participants:** *See attendance list enclosed in Annex 2*

Meeting minutes:

0. Welcome and introduction

The Chairman welcomed the experts representing 16 EU Member States plus Norway.

The Chairman recalled the objectives of the meeting and informed the participants that the agenda of the meeting will include the following:

- adoption of the final minutes of the first expert meeting held on 15 April 2013 for which the draft final minutes had been circulated prior to the meeting;
- a draft vision document on the provision of EU-wide real time traffic information will be presented by the Commission services and meeting participants will be invited to provide feedback on this document, in particular, on the problem definition, on the targeted users of the foreseen services and on the proposed objectives. Participants were also informed that based on the comments received, a revised version of the draft vision document would be

discussed in a forthcoming meeting with the members of the ITS Committee and the ITS Advisory Group;

- a detailed discussion is foreseen on the possible scope of the future specifications;
- the consultants in charge of a preparatory study will introduce the proposed approach to the Cost-Benefit analysis including the baseline scenario and the possible policy options.
- the Chairman also announced that the Commission will launch before the end of the year an on-line public consultation on the subject of the provision of EU-wide real-time traffic information services.

The proposed agenda of the meeting was accepted without remarks by the participants.

1. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the 15 April 2013 expert meeting was adopted without remarks.

2. Presentation and discussion of draft vision document

The chairman introduced the draft vision document and explained to the participants that the intention of the Commission services with the present meeting was to go through systematically the whole document with the experts.

Objectives

The Chairman pointed out that as for the objectives of the Commission services concerning the EU-wide provision of RTTI, in the draft vision document these were specified as follows:

- To make already existing services available to more users through increasing interoperability
- To facilitate the use of real-time traffic data by road operators and traffic managers to enable them to better manage road infrastructure
- To provide road users with accurate EU-wide real-time traffic information services (in combination with travel information services)
- To get the quality of real-time traffic information services right

The chairman emphasised that it was considered important that car drivers are provided with more alternatives both before and during the trip than simply road alternatives. Car drivers have to be able to choose between other transport modes, and that information necessary to enable them to make informed decisions has to be provided also in real time. There is eventually clearly a link with integrated multimodal journey planners that are attractive also for car drivers, providing for example real time information regarding parking spaces in Park and Ride (P+R) facilities or about parking spaces near public transport stops.

A Member State pointed out that a lot of relevant information is already out there in the public domain but people should be better informed where to obtain the available information from.

Several Member States pointed out that co-operation between private and public service providers was needed for the provision of RTTI services.

A Member State commented that increasing logistics efficiency should be added as a specific objective of providing RTTI and that user satisfaction should also be used as a measure of benefits.

Another Member State confirmed that the reduction of harmful emissions from transport was an important goal and agreed that providing parking information could help reduce CO2 emissions from road transport in urban areas as it would reduce the average time of cruising for parking and the traffic congestions because of this traffic. However, the physical availability of good P+R facilities was also important.

Some Member States asked for clarification on what exactly was meant by interoperability.

A Member State pointed out that on the private side interoperable services already existed in the field of RTTI but the quality of services was very different across countries and reminded that it would not be appropriate to attempt to define quality as part of this current exercise.

A Member State opined that as part of the specifications it cannot be mandated that new services are launched or existing services are extended and it also cannot be mandated that a single RTTI service should be established.

In reply to the questions and comments received, DG MOVE confirmed that the term "interoperability" in the document was used as it was defined in the ITS Directive and that the term "existing services" was meant to include all the different sources of RTTI information that was currently available to end-users.

Geographical scope

In terms of the geographical scope of specifications, two Member States proposed that the specifications should only cover the TEN-T. If the scope was to include roads beyond the TEN-T, then all the local authorities responsible for local roads would have to be involved in the exercise which would be extremely difficult to achieve.

Three Member States proposed that while the minimum scope should be the TEN-T and this could be enlarged on a voluntary basis by Member States but this decision should be left to individual Member States.

Four Member States added that as recurring congestion was mostly a problem in urban areas that is where RTTI services could deliver the biggest benefits. Therefore it would be useful to widen the scope to include metropolitan areas on a voluntary basis.

One Member State proposed the TEN-T plus all other motorways as the scope for the specifications.

One Member State expressed a preference for specifications that would evolve over time so that additional roads can be added.

Some Member States reminded that in any case currently there was no data available for the secondary road network to provide RTTI services.

One Member State also reminded the scope that had been already agreed for priority action 'c' on road safety critical information was the TEN-T and that it would be pragmatic to stick to the same scope for the current priority action as well.

DG MOVE agreed that a staged implementation starting with the TEN-T and then gradually moving to other roads and urban areas could be a pragmatic approach adding that the strategic road network of large cities could perhaps still be included in the first phase.

Scope in terms of the content of real-time traffic information services

Several Member States noted that the provision of parking information would be considered as valuable by road users.

Another Member State was of the opinion that a narrow definition of the scope for priority action 'b' on RTTI does not include parking.

One Member State pointed that RTTI should focus on services reaching the driver in the car and therefore pre-trip data should be left to the scope of priority action 'a' (multimodal travel info services).

One Member State reminded that static and dynamic data should be treated differently and not mixed.

One Member State asked if car-pooling services should be included in the scope while another Member State added that public transport users (for example riders of interurban bus services) can also have an interest in RTTI services.

One Member State commented that the focus needed to be on the problems that needed to be tackled first. In its opinion this was road works and congestion where consistent information needed to be provided.

Another Member State added the travel times and routing advice is the most important information that users want.

A question was raised regarding the meaning of 'real-time'. Does it refer to the current state of the network or a predicted future state of the network (which could be more relevant for users).

One Member State reminded that the scope for the specifications in terms of content was already defined in the annex of the ITS Directive.

Reflecting on the comments made regarding the value of including parking information in the scope of RTTI services, DG MOVE defended the idea of providing parking data as it would reduce traffic cruising for parking spaces in urban areas and would therefore have a positive impact on congestion. As regards the inclusion of car sharing services, DG MOVE was of the opinion that at this stage that this would probably go too far.

DG MOVE also confirmed that as part of the specifications there will be no obligation to deploy services. Deployment obligations would have to be proposed and agreed separately as part of a possible follow-up initiative.

Governance and quality

One Member State informed that it has made a strategic decision that the public sector will provide data instead of providing services. Discussions had taken place with private service providers before this decision was made. It added that the actual quality level of the service was considered less important as long as the quality level of the service provided was known to users. This Member State considered that the way to go for the specifications was to agree on how to define quality and not to try to agree on minimum quality levels.

One Member State reminded that the missing governance framework was the biggest problem explaining that the biggest challenge was how to bring all the necessary actors together and how to establish a contractual framework for the use of data.

One Member State pointed out that as for travel time data, road operators can deliver this information if they invest into the infrastructure but this information could also be bought from

the private sector or obtained from connected vehicles. The public sector would therefore have to co-operate with the private sector.

One Member State confirmed that the biggest problems currently associated with the provision of RTTI were not technical issues but organisational and legal aspects represented the greatest challenges.

One Member State considered it important to have common criteria agreed against which quality can be measured. It agreed that to mandate a certain level of quality would be a step too far at this stage.

One Member State reported problems with exchanging data between the public and private sectors. In this particular Member State the data from the public sector is delivered free of charge and there is also a distinction made between the so-called essential public services and commercial services.

One Member State considered the branding of the content of services important and added that this issue needs to be regulated so that users know from what source the information comes from. This Member State asked to make it mandatory to have the source of information published as a means of quality assurance.

Another Member State considered that this would potentially contradict the open data policies and it did not consider it realistic to regulate this issue in this way.

Two Member States stated that public authorities were responsible for the traffic flow and therefore they would like private information service providers to pass on official routing advice to road users.

Reflecting on the comments received, DG MOVE remarked that the road safety critical essential components of RTTI services are already defined in priority action 'c'.

Wrapping-up the discussion on the draft vision document, the Chairman thanked participants for the comments that they have provided on the content of the document and confirmed that the Commission services will produce a revised draft on the basis of these comments and clarifications.

3. The possible scope of the future specifications

The Chairman informed participants that in this part of the meeting the discussion will focus on the scope of the future specifications in terms of types of data and operating procedures.

Data types

As for the data types to be covered by the specifications, several Member States suggested that road works, road closures and serious congestion exceeding some pre-defined level (e.g. more than 15-20 minutes' delay) and speed limits should be included in data.

One Member State added the importance of other information that is currently displayed on Variable Message Signs (VMS), for example ban on trucks overtaking, weather data that goes beyond safety critical.

One Member State reminded the need to ensure consistency with action 'c' as regards road works.

Some Member States added that road works typically have an impact on travel time and as users are mostly interested in travel time, road works data should be included. Furthermore data on dynamic speed limits should also be processed.

One Member State added that there should be as well an obligation for contractors to publish in real time when the work actually starts and ends.

One Member State indicated that variable speed limits should be included and also Traffic Management Plans (TMP).

One Member State indicated a concern whether the proposed format for TMPs is followed by traffic authorities.

Some Member States expressed a preference for creating an obligation for TMPs to be followed by all service providers.

One Member State was concerned that if the actual content of TMPs was released to private parties, there would be a potential for abusing the information if some service providers used the information to provide advantage to their own users at the expense of other users.

One Member State argued that it should not be compulsory for private service providers to follow TMPs as road authorities do not always know which routing advice would serve the users' interests best.

DG MOVE stated that including future road works could be very useful, especially as road works are almost always accompanied by a modification of applicable speed limits.

Procedures

As for the sharing of data, one Member State was concerned about putting an obligation on the public sector to share the data that it invested in to obtain with private service providers that will in the end charge end users for this data.

One Member State indicated that sharing data generated by the public sector with the private sector was not considered a problem and added that public authorities purchased data from the private sector if it was considered attractive to plug the gaps in the data collected by public authorities. Additionally, it was important to recognise that end of queue congestion data had commercial value and was core to the business models of private service providers.

Another Member State added that it was important not to destroy the current dynamically developing market for services provided or to hinder innovation. The public sector already needs to provide information under the INSPIRE framework anyway. At the same time for infrastructure management purposes data collected by the private sector could be shared with the road operators. A balanced agreement between public and private sector must therefore be achieved respecting the fine line between a functioning market and a fair and efficient market.

In conclusion, the Chairman stated that the outlines of a common approach emerged from the discussion as far as the geographical scope and the scope of services and the data types to be included were concerned but added that there was certainly further work to be done before the actual working procedures for the specifications can be agreed.

4. Introduction to the Cost-Benefit analysis

The consultants working for the Commission services presented the proposed approach to the development of options for the Cost-Benefit analysis of the specifications. In addition to

the baseline scenario (the "do nothing" option), 10 different scenarios will be analysed whereby the scenario variables will include different options regarding the establishment of a governance framework, the introduction of common rules for the re-use of data, geographical coverage, data content and specifications on electronic data publication. As for the estimation of costs and benefits, it was noted that the analysis will fundamentally compare the cost of improving access to RTTI against the benefits of reduced congestion.

The amount of congestion reduction will depend on the geographical area and network for which such information is made available, the types of data provided and information derived from it and the number of users effectively informed.

As the benefit of reduced accidents is already captured under priority action "c", this impact will be excluded from the current analysis.

Some Member States emphasised the importance of balancing the costs and the benefits, because the scenario promising the most benefits is expected to be costly to implement and therefore the balance of costs and benefits was crucial.

Some Member States indicated that congestion costs mostly occur in urban areas. So it will be important to examine how much of the congestion problems can be tackled if the scope is limited to only TEN-T roads. They also asked for clarity about the congestion costs, the definition used for congestion and their source of information.

DG MOVE informed participants that the results of the Cost-Benefit analysis will be available before the next expert meeting that is planned to take place during Q1 2014.

DG MOVE also confirmed that the comments of Member State experts will be addressed during the preparation of the CBA.

4. Recent developments in the field of probe data

A presentation was delivered by the representatives of the iMobility Forum working group for information only.

Following the presentation, one Member State stated that they had concerns about availability of probe data to infrastructure managers and road operators due to an apparent lack of co-operation by automobile manufacturers to share this data.

The representatives of the iMobility Forum working group considered that there was a willingness to share probe data with road authorities and they encouraged public authorities to actively contribute to this work by participating in the activities of the iMobility Forum working group.

One Member State suggested that probe data might have the potential to cover blind spots in the network for which no data is available from other, traditional data sources.

The Chairman thanked the representatives of the iMobility Forum for the presentation and also thanked the Member States for their comments and concluded that for the provision of RTTI services it was important to continue to follow the developments in the field of probe data given the contribution that it could make to data collection.

5. Meeting wrap-up and conclusions

The chairman thanked the experts for their active participation in the meeting and for provided comments during the discussion. It was noted that the outlines of a possible common approach were emerging from the contributions as far as the geographical scope of the specifications, the timing of their implementation, the content of the services and the

functioning of the specifications were concerned and that the remaining questions will be addressed during the next meetings of the expert group that are planned to take place in Q1 and Q2 of 2014.

EXPERT MEETING

- 10.00 **Welcome and Introduction**
from the Commission services
- 10.10 **Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting**
Adoption of the minutes of the 15 April 2013 expert meeting
- 10.30 **Presentation and discussion of draft vision document**
The Commission services will present its draft vision document on the provision of EU-wide real time traffic information services.
Participants will be invited to provide feedback on the draft document, in particular on the problem definition, on the targeted users and on the proposed objectives.
- 13:30 **Discussion on the possible scope of the future specifications**
Building on the discussion of the draft vision document, participants will be invited to give their views on the following issues:
 - 1) Governance framework for the implementation and operation of the future specifications
 - 2) Rules on the collection, publishing, sharing and dissemination of data
 - 3) Geographical coverage (e.g. core or comprehensive TEN-T, secondary road network, urban roads)
 - 4) Data types to be included (e.g. static road data, information on road works and road closures, parking data, speed data, traffic management plans, dynamic traffic data, floating car data)
- 14:45 **Introduction to the Cost-Benefit Analysis**
Presentation of the baseline scenario and envisaged policy options by Rapp Trans, the consultants working for the Commission services on the cost-benefit analysis of the future specifications.
Participants will be invited to express their views on the suggested approach.
- 15:15 **Recent developments in the field of floating car data**
Presentation from the Co-chairmen of the Probe Data Working Group of iMobility Forum
- 15:45 **Conclusions**
Conclusions of the meeting and next steps

List of participants

Annex 2

AT
BE
CZ
DE
DK
EL
ES
FR
IE
NL
NO
PL
PT
RO
SE
SK
UK
EC