



## DIRECTIVE 2010/40/EU - EXPERT MEETING

### TOWARDS SPECIFICATIONS FOR PRIORITY ACTION (C)

### DATA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PROVISION, WHERE POSSIBLE, OF ROAD SAFETY RELATED MINIMUM UNIVERSAL TRAFFIC INFORMATION FREE OF CHARGE TO USERS

#### Summary Record of the Expert Meeting on 16 October 2012 TEN-T Executive Agency, Brussels

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

*Participants:* See attendance list in the Annex

#### 1. WELCOME AND TOUR DE TABLE

The Chairman welcomed the participants to this meeting with experts appointed by the Member States (MS) to follow the process of elaboration of specifications under Directive 2010/40/EU<sup>1</sup> ("ITS Directive").

The meeting was dedicated to the specifications for Priority Action (c) on **data and procedures for the provision, where possible, of road safety related minimum universal traffic information free of charge to users.**

The Chairman gave an overview of the Agenda. The objective of this meeting was to continue the discussion on the working document on the specifications for action c. An updated version of this document was circulated prior to the meeting. The discussion will re-open where it stopped at the end of last expert meeting, i.e. paragraph 5 on 'minimum quality requirements'.

The Chairman thanked the participants for their interest and dedication. He also thanked the experts whom provided comments in written format following the meeting on 26 September. These comments have been considered when updating the initial version of the working document on the specifications for action c. Some late comments will be further considered for next round of update. A summary table of all these comments providing the rationale behind the integration or not of these comments in the working document on specifications will be circulated to MS experts.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:207:0001:0013:EN:PDF>

These words of introduction were followed by a quick 'Tour de Table' where all participants briefly introduced themselves and the institution they were coming from.

## **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 26 SEPTEMBER 2012**

The Chairman thanked the experts for their feedbacks which have been integrated in the updated version of the Minutes of 26 September 2012 circulated prior to this meeting.

The additional comments made during this meeting will be further integrated and a final version of the Minutes of expert meeting held on 26 September 2012 will be re-circulated shortly.

The Experts agreed to the approval of these final Minutes.

## **3. CONTINUATION OF THE DISCUSSION ON THE SPECIFICATIONS FOR PRIORITY ACTION C**

The Chairman invited the experts to share their questions and comments, starting from paragraph 5 on 'minimum quality requirements'. The main elements of the discussion are summarised in the remainder of the document.

- **Quality, Conformity assessment & Reporting**

Quality requirements were too stringent as currently defined in the specifications. They were targets rather than minimum levels. Any quality criteria related to reality check cannot be monitored and controlled in practice today. Also automatic detection of events had to be distinguished from observation. Location accuracy was complex for moving target (e.g. ghost drivers) and constrained by technical limitations of the delivery channels e.g. RDS-TMC. The approach by operating environments (OEs) seemed relevant although over complicated. OEs can serve as guidance but do not have to be included in the specifications.

The specifications had to remain functional. Technical issues, including with respect to quality measurement and quality targets, needed further investigation at MS level. Also future development and innovations were likely to affect the service (e.g. think about what smartphone or cooperative systems can offer in the future).

MS shall further investigate quality targets for each criteria and safety event/condition and cluster of roads and delivery channels, and report back to the Commission on their respective levels of ambition depending on their respective capabilities. Common guidelines for doing so could be helpful.

European Standardisation Organisations (ESOs) shall be mandated to work on quality measurement standards. A common methodology would help setting the quality of the service and facilitate benchmark across MS.

Methods to measure quality according to quality targets linked to conformity assessment. Cost incurred by conformity assessment will much rely on the level of ambition for the service and the complexity of the assessment procedures chosen. Although a 'light' approach to conformity assessment was preferred (e.g. self-declaration), clarity on

processes and responsibilities was necessary (i.e. ascertain private parties' accountability) as well as consideration of the cost implication. In this respect Decision 768/2008/EC on conformity assessment procedures can serve as a reference.

Conformity assessment was the background to MS reporting to the Commission, which shall be regular enough, especially for new services for which feedback from the Commission will be helpful. Reporting should not be overburdening to MS. In this respect, aligning the different reporting periods of the ITS Directive might be a practical solution.

- **Coverage & Deployment**

The specifications will apply to new roads only if a SRTI service is to be provided along these roads. The new TEN-T guidelines will be voted at the European Parliament on 27 November 2012. Following the adoption of these new guidelines the specifications will apply to the comprehensive network.

Some roads were characterised by very low traffic and/or safety related events occurrence, therefore high level of equipment along such roads for the purpose of action c would not be necessary or realistic. And some safety-related events might in some instance not be detected or reported at all. The extent of coverage and therefore the associated costs of deployment of the service shall remain proportionate, knowing that different quality targets will drive different levels and costs of equipment.

A transition period allowing for fragmented deployment of the service was necessary e.g. start with equipping some parts of the network only. The gradation in deployment was accommodated by the ITS Directive: first binding specifications will be adopted, and then legislation might follow to mandate the deployment of the specifications. The entry into force of the specifications will propose a transition period which duration shall be informed by MS.

- **Data sharing & Consistency**

The single national point of access did not have to be a national database centrally managed by MS. A repository / catalogue / webpage known to users would be enough. The PSI Directive on the re-use of public sector information (Directive 2003/98/EC) can serve as a reference. In this context, reasonable cost for the public sector was limited to marginal cost of dissemination of information, whereas reasonable cost for private entities would be determined by the market price.

Private parties will have to share only the data proven to be necessary for generating the minimum information content of the service. This was a portion of their whole private dataset and this should not jeopardise their whole business. Public and private stakeholders have to contribute to road safety together and share the efforts in doing so.

Because rules / directives already exist with respect to privacy and data protection, the specifications for action c do not have to further specify these issues.

Consistency across delivery channels meant that SRTI disseminated via different delivery channels shall be non-contradictory in terms of content across these channels. It was

necessary to ensure the consistency between SRTI provided by private providers with SRTI provided by national authorities without hindering innovations. Also specifications should distinguish issues related to existing services with issues related to new services. The difficulty laid in monitoring, checking and enforcing this consistency.

- **Responsibilities**

Quality criteria were meant to address the quality of the service provided (i.e. end product). Good quality of the service relies on good quality of data collection, processing, exchange but this is not the scope of the specifications and shall be left under the responsibility of the various stakeholders along the value chain of SRTI.

Specifications were binding measures applicable to all parties. Road safety has a cost but this is a high priority / public concern. Both public and private parties shall contribute to it where and when technically feasible. And service providers will have to ensure that their service is accurate.

The different stakeholders participating to the provision of the service in compliance with the specifications shall be responsible (i.e. liable) for themselves.

Because rules / directives already exist with respect to liability, the specifications for action c do not have to further specify these issues.

#### **4 NEXT STEPS TOWARDS SPECIFICATIONS**

DG MOVE C3 thanked all participants for the positive discussion. Comments would be incorporated as agreed and outstanding questions would be clarified, in particular with regard to conformity assessment and interpretation of delegated acts under the ITS Directive.

DG MOVE C3 reminded participants that they can still send **written comments**.

The next meeting would be held on **30 October 2012**, from **10h45 to 17h00**, at the **TEN-T Executive Agency** (910 Chaussée de Wavre, Brussels).

The last meeting of the series has been planned for the 15 November (same location).

**Contact:** Julie Raffailac, Tel: +32 229-93664, [julie.raffailac@ec.europa.eu](mailto:julie.raffailac@ec.europa.eu)

## ATTENDANCE LIST

Expert Meeting: Data and procedures for the provision where possible of road safety related minimum universal traffic information free of charge to users

Date: **16 October 2012**, 10h30 – 16h45 - Venue: W910 00/41

Participants
Austria
Czech Republic
Cyprus
Germany
Denmark
Finland
France
Ireland
Lithuania
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Romania
Sweden
Spain
Switzerland
United Kingdom
European Commission