



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT
Directorate C - Innovative and sustainable mobility
C.3 - Intelligent transport systems (ITS)

EXPERT GROUP

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEMS FOR URBAN AREAS

Fifth Meeting
“Focus on Guidelines” session
07 February 2012
Brussels

- Minutes of the Meeting -

Date: 07/02/2012

Version: 1

Authors: Dorota Szeligowska / Julie Raffailac /
Christian Egeler



1. WELCOME

Pawel Stelmaszczyk– European Commission, Head of Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

P. Stelmaszczyk welcomes the participants to the 5th Meeting of the Urban ITS Expert Group. He thanks for all the work done, especially by the contributors of the guidelines.

He introduces Julie Raffailac, who joined the unit on 1 December 2011, and other members of the ITS unit present at the meeting: Eric Kenis and Dorota Szeligowska.

The focus of today's meeting is on the Guidelines and the progress achieved. The goal for today is:

1. Sub-group leaders will present the current status of the drafts
2. Discussion on each guideline
3. Work distribution for final drafting of guidelines
4. Update on the collection of best practices
5. Short reflection on how to proceed with standardisation deliverable

The group has no comments or additions to the proposed agenda, it is therefore agreed.

P. Stelmaszczyk reminds the Group members to sign the attendance list and provide the supporting documents for the reimbursement of travel costs within one month. The attendance list has to be signed and the official contact for administrative matters is Mrs Theresia Gruendl.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM 4TH MEETING

Pawel Stelmaszczyk– European Commission, Head of Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

The minutes of the fourth meeting have been distributed to the experts for review prior to the meeting.

No comments were provided. The minutes of the fourth meeting are approved.

3. GUIDELINES – PRESENTATIONS FROM SUB-GROUPS

Dorota Szeligowska – European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport

Few introductory remarks were offered before proceeding to the presentation of the current status of draft Guidelines. It was underscored that two sub-groups are more ahead in drafting their documents. All sub-groups can profit of today's meeting to collect more comments from all group members on their drafts. It would be advisable that the groups decide how to deal with the comments and allocate specific tasks to specific persons, in order to make the drafting process smoother. The length of the documents is as expected (they should try not to exceed 20 pages). Possibly the link to best practices, as illustration of Guidelines, could be enhanced.

The three sub-group leaders group are asked to present the current status of their group's guideline.

All presentations are accompanied by PowerPoint presentations that will be made available after the meeting on CIRCAB.

3.1. Traffic Management & Urban Logistics

Chair and Reporter: Steve Kearns – Transport for London

St. Kearns explains that in the beginning of the drafting process, there was some confusion concerning whom the document is aimed at. This has been clarified and the conclusion is that the document should address decision makers, persons without in-depth technical knowledge. This requires describing technical inputs in a non-technical language.

The document is less focused compared to the other two Guidelines, mainly because the topic to be covered is much wider.

St. Kearns thanks for the significant contributions he has received in the last days and elaborates on the group's progress so far:

The Civitas Policy Goals served as a starting point to the group's reflection (http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/docs1/CIVITAS_Initiative_Leaflet_EN.pdf). The current introduction will be replaced by the common introduction used in the other two guidelines (including a special paragraph introducing the topic of the group, i.e. traffic management and urban logistics).

In section III, that will inform the whole Guideline, definitions and application concepts are given to describe "Traffic Management and Urban Logistics". Local policy has greatest influence on how traffic is managed in urban areas.

It must be decided today if examples of applications are covered within the Guideline or if they are only in the Best practices collection.

The list of stakeholders in section IV is not yet definitive; and fine tuning is on-going.

In the recommendations section it is noted that public support is a critical factor for the successful realisation of traffic management projects. St. Kearns recalls that the London Congestion Charge had initially little public support, and only after its introduction it gathered political support. Procedures to get more public support must be developed.

Data quality is a key issue, especially as the access to traffic data has become easier in the last years.

Privacy is another major issue, but the legal situation might differ from country to country (e.g. tracking of data from mobile phones was used in a Bishopsgate trial (see minutes of the 4th Meeting) in London without informing users).

Other issues raised include:

- Need for acknowledgement of differing priorities whether local, regional, national and even international
- Role of standards / Harmonisation
- Role for subsidiarity
- Integration of urban logistics (not easy to be done)

Standardisation is good to achieve harmonised services and interoperability, but standards can also hinder innovation – and this must be avoided.

Discussion on most important issues, barriers and solutions:

A general comment was provided to all three Guidelines that they focus a bit too much on business models, which can be difficult to assess. Therefore, the Expert Group should avoid promotion of one or the other business model. More focus on organisational model in place or a recommended one would be welcome.

1. The structure and content of the document

- Urban logistics should be made more prominent throughout the document.
- Clear and specific recommendations to policy makers should be formulated.
- The message “ITS can support achieving your policy goals” should be a key message of the document. It would be advisable to showcase more specifically how ITS can add value in urban traffic management and urban logistics, preferably by highlighting more concrete examples and aspects related to the implementation of specific measures. Those examples shall be used with the aim to illustrate the Guideline, not in a detailed manner. The detailed description is included in the Best practices collection.
- The challenge of the document is to balance bold recommendations with the principles of subsidiarity in place and the focus on the promotion of ITS solutions.
- Urban areas cannot be seen as completely isolated, there is a need for cooperation with the (managers of) interurban networks and the interfaces in light of continuity of service.
- The role of ITS in support of traffic safety as well as their contribution to the policy goals of the White Paper on Transport (2011) was reminded.

2. Traffic Management

It was emphasised that Guidelines include two different definitions of Traffic Management. One is based on the present and on how ITS can support traffic management operations, the other one focuses on the future and on how ITS (and information it would enable to collect) could help to optimize traffic management. The need is to bring the two questions under one roof.

The question is whether traffic management should focus on restricting space for individual vehicles, for the benefit of public transport, for instance, as this would have an impact on urban logistics as well. Further attention should be given to solutions enhancing smooth traffic and optimising the existing infrastructure.

3. Examples of applications

The selected examples of applications are a bit too much UK-oriented. Some examples (i.e. Road Pricing) do not exist in other countries. Moreover Road Pricing is not a UK-wide, but a London project. It would be helpful to include more examples coming from other regions/countries. Road Pricing is one of possible traffic management solutions; but for sure it is not a solution to all problems. The main focus should be on showing the process of traffic management (data → information → management). If Road Pricing would be a good solution to attain some goals, as demonstrated in the UK, the benefits should be highlighted and the service should be promoted to other countries. Equally, if there are other good lessons to be learned from other countries/cities they could be mentioned. The document should demonstrate how ITS can support the policy goals, e.g. by reallocating space between different transport modes.

3.2. Multimodal Information

Chair and Reporter: Jean Coldefy – Greater Lyon Region

J. Coldefy gives a short summary of the current status of draft guideline of his sub-group. He recalls that the Guidelines are targeted at decision makers. Several comments have been received and were listed by the external support in an excel file. Some comments are too technical for the future audience of the Guidelines (decision makers without specific technical knowledge).

J. Coldefy states that the group conclusions at present are that multimodal information is ready to be deployed, and it concerns transport in urban areas, not only public transport (bike, car, freebike services, carsharing, carpooling, ...). The document is also addressing the topic of business models, but without singling out a specific one that would be promoted. Some people say that traffic information can be left to the private sector, but currently users are not willing to pay for traffic information. In the absence of autonomous private business model, there is a need for public intervention which should not be limited to provision of data only. The current estimate is that provision of reliable and up-to-date multimodal information could contribute to modal shift by a proportion of 4-5%. This is considerable. More studies should be led into the potential of modal shift thanks to information.

The policy of provision of public data (and open data is only a way to achieve this, and not the only one) should be reinforced. Public sector, which is vested with the defence of public interest, might be interested in controlling the data in order to support the public policy goals. Therefore the authorities want to provide the data under the condition to use it in line with the public policy goals, it can be achieved with 'urban multimodal datasets'.

Another issue is the lack of data and the quality of collected data (especially if collected by third parties). J. Coldefy mentions that for the group members, marketing (of MMI) is necessary. It could be complemented by leading urban surveys, in order to understand better users' needs and mobility requirements. The harmonisation and continuity of services between the different worlds (world of cars, world of public transport) and between different European cities needs also the support of the national and EU authorities.

The discussion touched upon a number of topics:

- It has been suggested to address in more details:
 - The organisational and/or institutional aspects (different players and their roles), especially as the approach is intermodal.
 - The topic of harmonisation and needed standards.
 - The question of user needs.
- Provision of information needs to be in line with the public policy goals. Public interest and user interest should be combined, and the provision of good quality multimodal information cannot be left to the private sector only, because it might not respond to public interest. The general interest is not necessarily a sum of individual interests, as we can see everyday with the use of the car in European cities.
- On the question of data, the debate concerned possible means of ensuring its good quality. On this point, it has been suggested that the user has to be a part of the quality check. Probably, there is a need for a clearer legal framework concerning the

access to data and its format. It has been mentioned that DG Information Society and Media is currently working on the revision of the PSI Directive (Public sector Information) and also on promoting an open data policy. For the expert group, this revision shall be targeted on goals not on means (like open data), and address consistency of transport policy with private services set up with public data.

- Possibly, social media (and networking) could support data quality, e.g. people could contribute to identifying hot spots quickly, but so far there is very little tangible experience on this matter, thus there will not be any special recommendation on that.

3.3. Smart Ticketing

Chair and Reporter: Alexandre Blaquière – Tisséo

A. Blaquière shortly presents the document elaborated by 3 group members with help from 3 external experts: John Verity, Sjeff Janssen and Gilles de Chantérac. For this group the target audience is clearly organisations in charge of decision making and deployment of ticketing systems.

Smart Ticketing shall deliver an electronic basket for several tickets. Smart tickets could be carried on different media: (belonging to more front-office category) smart cards, USB keys/dongles and/or NFC-enabled phones, but they could also rely only on the virtualisation of tickets (electronic tickets) or on secure identity presentation and back office processing (using contactless bank cards). The Guidelines document identifies different groups of stakeholders, and discusses the impact and benefits of smart ticketing. A set of recommendations is also provided.

The discussion of possible impact of smart ticketing could be extended.

Discussion:

The draft seems focused and on track. It has a predominant focus on public transport, while bike/car sharing services should also be covered.

- Long distance travel is quite different from urban mobility and they need different solutions. However, long-distance trips need to be better integrated with the last mile journeys. When it comes to ticketing, parking could be easily integrated (via near-field communication), but road tolling uses different technological solution (long distance communication), thus its integration can be more difficult. For this reason, it was decided to keep it out of the scope of these Guidelines, also because it is less linked to urban areas, than to motorways.
- The recommendations shall also take into account any possible future developments. There are choices to be made, in relation to the payment scheme and to the question of issuing the cards: whether PT operators should do it, or rely on the facilities provided by banks, for that matter. The end user probably does not really care about the type of card he is using, so long as it is one card and not an array of cards.
- From the transport operator's point of view, the need is to get people through the gates as quickly as possible, and the technology needs to provide this too.

Following the presentation and discussion on the three sets of guidelines, the subgroups split out to discuss further work and to agree on contributions and synthesis expected.

The sub-group on traffic management and urban logistics set a plan of revision of the Guidelines' chapters, starting from the Chapter 3, on definitions that will set orientations for further chapters.

The sub-group on smart ticketing agreed that it will wait for more detailed comments from the EC, and then the experts will proceed into revision of their specific chapters. The discussion also concerned the form of the Executive summary that needs to be concise and interesting, in order to catch the reader's attention from the beginning.

The subgroup on multimodal information has agreed to include institutional aspects into the Guidelines and to complement the section on standards (i.e. standards for new mobility services such as car-sharing, car-pooling, bike schemes). Some additions and/or refinements will be made across the document (e.g. marketing aspects, end users perspective, risks associated with low quality of data). The comments that were already provided will be sorted according to pre-defined criteria before subsequent amendments of the Guidelines are made. Similarly, the comments of today's meeting will be integrated.

4. GUIDELINES – NEXT STEPS

Dorota Szeligowska – European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport

The need of coherence between the three documents was underscored. The fact that some elements seem to be common for all three Guidelines could be highlighted e.g. issues on data collection, quality and use.

The final drafts shall be ready before Easter. It is important to keep this deadline, to enable a smooth finalisation of the documents and an organisation of a possible consultation/workshop in mid-2012.

There is no formal public consultation planned, but that there will be a possibility to collect reactions on the Guidelines as part of a workshop (Brussels, June) or potentially at a session of the ITS World Congress in Vienna in October 2012.

The last meeting of the Expert Group is foreseen for November.

The collected best practices should be analysed. If a specific project is mentioned in the Guidelines, it shall also be integrated in the Lessons learned collection. This check will be performed once all the drafts are at an advanced level.

A short discussion on the content of the Executive summary of Guidelines was held. Either it could take the form of a general summary of the document or it could focus on showcasing the recommendations.

The format of the publication of the Guidelines is not yet defined, and this will be decided at the end in discussion within the EC.

The relationship between the Urban ITS Expert Group and the newly established ITS Advisory Group had been discussed. It has been recalled that while the work of the Urban ITS Expert Group is related to the ITS Action Plan and its results might be presented to the ITS Advisory Group, the main role of the ITS Advisory Group is to advise the Commission on business and technical aspects of the deployment and use of ITS in the Union, notably when drafting specifications under the Directive 2010/40/EU. The question remains of how the specifications, which will be focused on more general level, will affect the local decision makers at their implementation level. It is recalled that the EC has neither the power nor the intention to impose anything on urban areas.

5. COLLECTION OF BEST PRACTICES/LESSONS LEARNED

Christian Egeler – Rapp Trans, external support

Ch. Egeler gives a short overview of how many Lessons learned have been collected and which are still missing. He explains that new projects are still welcome whatever the topic or the country of origin. Ultimately a good balance between topic and geography will be sought although this should not limit the collection exercise.

He reminds the Expert Group members that each project on the list is assigned to somebody: This person shall either make the contribution, organise the contribution (i.e. put Ch. Egeler in contact with a person who could realise the contribution) or tell Ch. Egeler to delete the project from the list because it is not representative enough. For each documented project it is important to have a contact person listed. It is recalled that R&D projects (unless demonstration) are out of the scope of the Best practices collection.

If somebody wants to have details of the projects currently collected, please contact Ch. Egeler. He will also deliver statistics on how many projects per country and topic have been collected. It is still an aim to have for each country represented in the Expert Group at least one project per topic. For now, it seems that the topics of traffic management and urban logistics are slightly underrepresented in Best practices. Also, there are not many examples of less successful projects, which could highly enrich the nature of 'Lessons learned'. Therefore Ch. Egeler asks the Experts to provide such 'bad' examples.

It is proposed to show in the Best practices an overview of projects for which an evaluation on socio-economic effects has been made. Other themes featured by the Best practices projects could be highlighted e.g. innovation, institutional aspects, business models.

In the end the projects will either be presented in a printed compilation (as done in the first part) or they will be made available in a web database, in which case, it could be investigated whether it would be possible/desirable to link it to the 2DECIDE project.

6. STANDARDISATION

Hanfried Albrecht – Albrecht Consult GmbH / OCA

H. Albrecht gives a short presentation on the ITS Standardisation Landscape 2012. He explains that there are two organisations that deal with harmonised Urban Traffic Management: OCA (DE) and UTMC (UK).

Both organisations are organised in a bottom up approach. Their focus is mainly on signal control applications, and now also on parking applications. There is a certain need for European Standardisation to take into account specific "Urban" issues (e.g. DATEX was designed for motorways and is now extended to cover parking and cooperative systems, but possibly the transposition of DATEX on the urban level would not be the best solution, because it focuses on event as an item, and it is not well adapted to the urban environment).

There is a need to bring the "Urban" view on a European level to ensure continuity of services. This requires an accompanying top down measure, perhaps in the form of a mandate from the EC to the European standardisation organisations provided that subsidiary

is respected. There is a need to bring together the motorway and urban world. There needs to be an integration path.

Experts agree that we could benefit from having ITS system architecture and interfaces standardised.

7. AOB - NEXT MEETING

Pawel Stelmaszczyk - European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport

The date of the next Urban ITS Expert Group meeting is not yet fixed. Either it will be held in June 2012 or after the summer holidays (it depends on the progress achieved on Guidelines, and possible organisation of a consultative workshop).

Concerning the report on standardisation needs (due in April 2012), it is a decision of the group if a report is needed and what would be its content. Currently, there seems to be little need for a special report. Maybe this can be a rather short document. Its table of content will depend on what are the needs.

Sub-groups shall identify whether they want to promote development of any specific standards.

APPENDIX

**U R B A N I T S E X P E R T G R O U P
F I N A L A G E N D A O F T H E F I F T H M E E T I N G**

| | |
|--------------|--|
| 9.30-10.00 | <i>Registration and Coffee</i> |
| 10.00 | Welcome |
| 10.05 | Adoption of Minutes from 4 th Meeting |
| 10.10 | Guidelines |
| | Presentation of draft Guidelines of each sub-group by its leader/rapporteur (max.15-20 minutes), followed by questions and comments from the entire group |
| 10.15 | 1. Travel Information , Jean Coldefy |
| 11.00 | 2. Traffic management and urban logistics , Steve Kearns |
| 11.45 | 3. Smart Ticketing , Alexandre Blaquièrè |
| 12.30 | <i>Sub-groups: distribution of work towards the finalisation of the draft Guidelines</i> |
| 13.00 | Lunch Break |
| 14.00 | Guidelines – Next steps, discussion |
| 15.00 | Update concerning the collection of best practices |
| 15.30 | Any other business: possible follow up of the discussion on eventual ITS standardisation needs and the suggestions for the deliverable on Standardisation needs , due in April 2012. |
| 16.00 | Closing of the Meeting |

ATTENDEES

URBAN EXPERT GROUP –MEMBERS

Present

| Name | First name | Organisation | Stakeholder group | |
|--------------|------------|--|---|----|
| ALBRECHT | Hanfried | Albrecht Consult GmbH / OCA | Consultancy / Nat ITS Association | DE |
| BEASLEY | Simon | Reading Borough Council / UDG | Local Authorities / Nat ITS Association | UK |
| BLAQUIERE | Alexandre | Tisseo - Toulouse Public Transport Authority | Public Transport Authority | FR |
| BROWN | Tony | Hampshire County Council | Local Authorities | UK |
| COLDEFY | Jean | Greater Lyon Region | Local Authorities | FR |
| ELIASSEN | Jarl | Trafikanten AS | Travel Information Provider | NO |
| FIBY | Hans | Transport Association East Austria | Public Transport Authority | AT |
| FRANCO | Gino | Mizar / Swarco | ITS Industry | IT |
| HASELBERGER | Rainer | City of Vienna | Local Authorities | AT |
| HEDIN | Johan | Hybris Konsult | Standardisation bodies | SE |
| KEARNS | Steve | Transport for London | Local Authorities | UK |
| LEFEBVRE | Olivier | STIF Ile-de-France | Public Transport Authority | FR |
| LEIHS | Dietrich | Kapsch TrafficCom | ITS Industry | AT |
| MEEUWISSEN | Marcel | City of Enschede | Local Authorities | NL |
| PLANATH | Susanne | Swedish Transport Administration | National Authority | SE |
| SPELL | Sabine | Volkswagen AG | Automotive Industry | DE |
| TØFTING | Svend | North Denmark Region | Local Authorities | DK |
| TYRINOPOULOS | Yannis | Hellenic Institute of Transport (HIT) | Research | GR |

Excused

| | | | | |
|----------------|----------|---|----------------------------|----|
| DIEGO BERNARDO | Enrique | EMT - Madrid Public Transport Authority | Public Transport Authority | SP |
| IZDEBSKI | Piotr | ZTM Warsaw | Public Transport Authority | PL |
| JENSEN | Helge | City of Oslo | Local Authorities | NO |
| TOMASSINI | Maurizio | ISIS - Rome | Consultancy | IT |
| VAN DEN ABEELE | Didier | Alstom Transport | ITS Industry | FR |
| VLEMMINGS | Tiffany | National Data Warehouse for Traffic information | National Authorities | NL |
| WINNING | Ian | City of Cork | Local Authorities | IE |

EXTERNAL EXPERTS

| Name | First name | Organisation | Function |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| DE CHANTERAC | Gilles | Interappli | |
| JENSSEN | Sjef | VDV | |

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

| Name | First name | Organisation | Function |
|--------------|-------------------|---|---|
| STELMASZCZYK | Pawel | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | Head of Unit <i>Chair of Expert Group</i> |
| SZELIGOWSKA | Dorota | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | Project assistant <i>Secretary of Expert Group</i> |
| RAFFAILLAC | Julie | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | |
| KENIS | Eric | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | |
| BORTHWICK | Bill | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | |
| GRUENDL | Theresia | European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport | |