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

Seventh Meeting

Meeting on Finalisation of Guidelines

27 September 2012

Brussels

- Minutes of the Meeting -

Date: 30/10/2012
Version: 1.0
Author: Christian Egeler

1. WELCOME

Gzim Ocakoglu – European Commission, Team Leader, Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

Gzim Ocakoglu welcomes the participants to the 7th Meeting of the Urban ITS Expert Group.

The group members have no comments or additions to the proposed agenda, it is therefore adopted.

G. Ocakoglu recalls the workshop held on 15 May, after the 6th meeting of the Expert Group, during which much feedback on the three Guideline documents has been provided. He thanks the experts for all the work done in the last weeks.

The co-organisation of the workshop with ERTICO and EUROCITIES provided an opportunity to share resources, bundle efforts and spread knowledge about the Expert Group and its work. The experience has been positive, but there is still some room for improvement.

The focus of today's meeting is on the finalisation of the guidelines. G. Ocakoglu reminds that it is the last occasion to discuss the content in detail and to contribute to the guidelines.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM 6TH MEETING

Gzim Ocakoglu – European Commission, Team Leader, Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport

The minutes of the sixth meeting have been distributed to the experts for review by e-mail. No comments have been received, the minutes are adopted.

3. GUIDELINES – PRESENTATIONS FROM THE SUB-GROUPS

3.1. Multimodal Information

Chair and Reporter: Jean Coldefy – Greater Lyon Region

Jean Coldefy gives a short overview of the updated version of the Guidelines and of the main changes. He underlines that quality of data is very important for reliable multimodal information services. For the Expert Group, high quality of data is a requirement to have solid foundation for a positive business case.

J. Coldefy explains that a number of issues were clarified in the document (e.g. importance of real-time data, inclusion of new services into standardisation effort, social media). A section on social media has been added. While the technology is available, the use of social media is currently more a wish than a reality for travel information.

Discussion: Three main questions were discussed in the follow-up of the presentation

1. Recommendation on open data policy

One of the two remaining questions is "open data". The Expert Group thinks that public data should be available for free as long as it is used in line with the public transport policy.

Some Expert Group members express the opinion that the Group should think ahead and promote the 'open data approach'. The concern about the phrase that opening data access (and provision of private services) “has to be in line with the public policy” was raised. It is unclear whether it relates to European or local policy. The local policies can vary substantively and might not lead to a common pan-European seamless service. However, local and European policies should not be opposed in this respect and data should be made available under certain conditions. Cross-border experience shall not be different from national experience. Promotion of open data is also a part of other European policies.

There is also a convergence of Members States positions on the promotion of open data policy. The Guidelines should give impetus to foster this approach. There are a lot of applications developed in traffic information services, e.g. multimodal journey planners, but often their development is slowed down or stopped due to a lack of access to data.

J. Coldefy reminds that the aim is to build reliable and long lasting services. The first problem is the very existence of relevant data. Sometimes it has to be created and its quality has to be ensured. The user needs good information in order to take the best travel decision. People who develop services shall be able to earn on them, and thus be autonomous from public money. Users will only buy the service if its quality is good. It needs to have full coverage of modes and geographical area in order to be successful. Otherwise it will be very difficult to create sustainable service. Solutions that misuse data are not successful in the long run. The question of data quality is key, but once you open the access to data, you might lose control over its quality.

The Experts agree on open data policy, but they believe that it should include rules on the use of data. It is important to mention that multimodal information can influence the behaviour of passengers. For small networks it is not a problem if a lot of users make the same decisions based on travel information at the same time. For big networks such behaviour could be problematic. If 100’000 people decide to use the same mean of transport at the same time, it will not be possible. There is a need to define some rules: what services shall be provided with which data.

It is a question whether cities that opened the access to data have benefitted from it or not? Vienna, for instance, has an open data policy. The “A nach B” service in Vienna is better than information available by Google. But the Google service is worldwide and people use it even if it does not have the best data available. The goal is to provide customers with data about the best travel mode, for that reason Vienna offers the data as part of the infrastructure provision process.

In Denmark there have been a lot of discussions about open data. The idea is to make open platforms for data. There is a need to have some guidelines on how the market shall use the data.

In Lyon, opening of data contributed to decreasing the burden for administration, because now data is shared automatically and specific demands for data do not have to be processed.

There are both advantages and disadvantages of open data. Experts also ponder on the question of real-time information and whether it is enough. What is needed now is to foresee what will happen on the network in order to manage it well.

2. The availability of probe data

The second question that J. Coldefy submits for discussion is the question of availability of vehicles probes. He believes that it is not that easy to obtain them in the urban context, but they could be useful. However, a legal framework to do so is missing. More and more data (from connected vehicles) is collected by car manufacturers or navigation services providers. The public sector has no access to this data (but it would be useful for purposes of safety and security).

Tom-Tom is quoted as an example of a private service provider who started to work with cities. They work on the integration of real-time information too. Tom-Tom started working with local authorities, also because they are interested in receiving traffic data from them on the basis of exchange, i.e. the principle of giving and receiving data.

3. The provision of geographical graph

Another important detail that is mentioned in the guidelines is the question of geographical graphs to connect data, a joint graph of traffic situation seems suitable in order to better exchange data between institutions of the traffic sector. If you want to have a real-time connection of data of e.g. bus and street, you need a common network definition (graph). Different solutions are available, but they do not come together easily. In Frankfurt 4 or 5 maps exist, but it is still an unresolved issue how to combine them.

3.2. Traffic Management & Urban Logistics

Chair and Reporter: Steve Kearns– Transport for London

Steve Kearns explains the main changes that were made to the document following the feedback received at the workshop of 15th May. The aim is to show the added value of ITS in the domain of traffic management and how to deploy them successfully.

The issues raised at the workshop were the following:

1. The topic of urban logistics has been strengthened in the document, but it has been taken out from the title, because the document is still more focused on traffic management. A potential conflict between freight distribution and environment protection remains an issue. In general, traffic management measures shall improve the environmental situation but also guarantee the delivery of freight.
2. The references to V2V and V2I have been strengthened because these technologies can play a bigger role in ITS in the future.
3. Parking management: Vehicles searching for parking spaces add significantly to urban congestion. ITS can help to alleviate this problem if parking information is provided in real-time.
4. The link to standards has also been strengthened with references to UTMC and OCIT. An important issue is to avoid vendor lock-in situations.
5. It was pointed out that the Guideline is too focussed on delivering projects as policies are also important. The current version tries to balance policy and project references and emphasizes the link between them.
6. Although the Guideline has a more collective view, personally targeted information is very effective at influencing behaviour (e.g. Olympics experience).

7. When it comes to automation of traffic management systems, the group members agree that thanks to video analytics ITS can release human time to do more operational things than e.g. individual video surveillance.

Discussion:
The question is raised of how connected cars empower the individual to take decisions. The role of authorities is decreasing, because technology is taking power away from them. The references to V2I and V2V are perceived by some group members as potentially controversial, because V2V and V2I are not in power of highway managers, and they empower individuals more than authorities. The question is whether the guideline should focus on how the use of existing ITS helps local road managers to manage the network for travellers or also feature sections on future technologies.

It is concluded that cooperative systems play a role in communicating traffic information. Also, there is a need to bridge two ways of thinking: on the one hand that cooperative systems empower users and that some local authorities think that cars already do so much that there is no need for new infrastructure, and on the other hand that new infrastructure and ITS only attract more cars into the network. The overall conclusion is that the document should be aware of future technologies that are being developed, but in this case not to restrict itself only to V2V and V2I. One should also mention the potential of data generated by smart phones and localisation services, the same as of probe data. Some cities (e.g. Lyon) already consider using floating car data, but while it can have good results on motorways, its density in cities does not seems to be sufficient to replace roadside equipment. Trials led in Germany gave more optimistic results that probe data could be used for travel time predictions or even for controlling traffic lights.

Technology is evolving fast in that sector, but still needs a lot of research. It will probably not eliminate traditional sensors completely, but will lead to less sensors and a combination of roadside data and vehicle data. There is mutual consent that probe data will complement, but not substitute roadside sensors for now, but in future the bulk of data might be collected by the vehicles themselves. The question is whether V2V has real value for traffic management, or rather V2I enabling traffic managers to have access to more sources of data. Steve Kearns suggests redrafting the section 3.2.2 on future technologies and including reference to data collected by GPS and smart phones and probe data. It should also address the access to those data sources.

Parking management section would probably require some extension. It could be used as an illustration of horizontal interconnection of the three documents, as it would require good real-time information, traffic management and possibly also smart ticketing possibilities. Hence it could show the importance of ITS across these three domains.

Other traffic management tools could be mentioned, e.g. re-routing reversible lanes. Another suggestion is to strengthen the link between urban and interurban needs (regional and national level) in the chapter on co-operation.

3.3. Smart Ticketing

Chair and Reporter: Alexandre Blaquière – Tisséo

Alexandre Blaquière gives a short overview of the main changes in the document (integration of the comments from workshop in May).

The elements that still have to be decided are:

- the level of integration of business figures
- the question/need/format of an EC ticketing portal
- technical report status on co-issuance of cards
- further information on migration process and distribution channels

Discussion:
It is reiterated that one of the main benefits of deployment of smart ticketing schemes (in terms of time and financial resources) is the improvement of the transaction time, namely speed of boarding the bus.

When it comes to quoting specific figures and/or business models, it needs to be recalled that the guidelines are aimed at decision makers and shall not go into technical details. The three documents should also be coherent in the way they refer to specific examples; for this reason the collection of best practices is a separate document, a kind of addendum to the guidelines.

It was decided to keep the reference to the project “OV Chipcard in the Netherlands” in the document, because it clearly illustrates the main principle of the concept of smart ticketing: it allows having several tickets in the same basket (i.e. stored on the same support).

Concerning standardisation, A. Blaquière reminds that the problem is not that standards would be missing, but rather to have a clear vision first on what you want to do, and then choose standards to implement it. The implementation of smart ticketing is strongly dependent on the selected tariff concept and it is the main difficulty to have an integrated fare. John Berry illustrated this with the IFM project experience: it took eight months to solve the technical issues, but 4 years to solve the administrative problems.

4. GUIDELINES – NEXT STEPS

Gzim Ocakoglu – European Commission, Team Leader, Unit C.3 DG Mobility and Transport
Dorota Szeligowska – European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport, Unit C.3

The Guidelines should be finalised prior to the ITS World Congress in Vienna, because on 24th October there will be a special Urban mobility day, and it will start off with a panel presenting the work of the Expert Group, and the Guidelines in particular.

The intention is to have at least a press release when the final Guidelines will be adopted by the Expert Group. The Guidelines will then be freely available for everybody. Another possible option would be to adopt the Guidelines of the Expert Group as the Guidelines of the Commission. This opportunity is provided by the ITS Directive, but it needs the approval of the ITS Committee. Therefore the Guidelines could be presented to the ITS Committee, composed of Member States' experts. The next meeting of the Committee is planned for the 11th December 2012.

One question is if there are plans to update or revise the Guidelines from time to time. G. Ocakoglu answers that currently no decision has been taken on this point. The basics of the Guidelines should be quite stable, but nevertheless there will be a need to update these documents. A public consultation could be foreseen at some point to gather people's opinion.

Some experts believe that a real urban community on the European level is lacking. With the publication of the Guidelines such a group could be founded. One expert reminds that POLIS or Eurocities already exist, but the membership is not free of charge, thus some regions cannot allow themselves to participate.

The members of the Expert Group could also disseminate the Guidelines among their communities, provided they do it as members of the Group in their personal capacity. National ITS organisations shall also be informed about the guidelines, e.g. ITS UK that has a special group on urban issues. Associations who have nominated members of the Expert Group should also participate in the process of dissemination of the Guidelines.

5. STANDARDISATION NEEDS

Christian Egeler - Rapp Trans AG, external support

Christian Egeler gives a short overview of the report on possible standardisation needs (D5).

Feedback on the last meeting of CEN/TC 278 is provided. The Expert Group's report has not yet been circulated to the CEN/TC 278 members, but the draft recommendations have been presented. CEN/TC 278 welcomes the draft recommendations and would be willing to co-ordinate an urban pre-study if such a study is proposed. The next meeting of CEN/TC 278 is scheduled for 20-21 March 2013, and this document could be discussed there.

A presentation concerning possible pre-study in co-operation with CEN/TC 278 is given. It could include different WGs of CEN/TC 278 and be executed by several Project Teams which would include urban experts.

The experience of local standardisation organisms such as UTMC and OCA will surely enrich the report, especially concerning the questions of traffic management and interoperability between inter-urban and urban systems. It could be also valuable to mention the POSSE project.

C. Egeler will include some of the comments made during the meeting or provided in written form and will issue the version to members from UTMC and OCA for their further input. Chapter 3 shall be reinforced. The pre-study remains one of the recommendations.

The report on standardisation needs will also be public, but it will not receive the same level of endorsement as the Guidelines.

The sub-group leaders are asked to check the coherence concerning references to standardisation that are included in their respective Guideline and in the standardisation report.

6. BEST PRACTICES

Christian Egeler - Rapp Trans AG, external support

Christian Egeler gives a short overview of the current status of the Best Practices collection. The Best Practice collection was finalised in August 2012.

The Expert Group members confirm that sharing Best Practices is generally a good idea. Such exercise should be made as easy in format as possible.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The next steps are the following:

- 22nd October – ITS Conference in Vienna
- 22-26 October – ITS World Congress in Vienna, featuring a Special Session on Urban ITS Expert Group and its Guidelines on 24 October, in the morning.
- The last meeting of the Urban ITS Expert Group will be held in December 2012

APPENDIX

URBAN ITS EXPERT GROUP
FINAL AGENDA OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

9.30-10.00	*Registration and Coffee*
10.00	Welcome
10.05	Adoption of Minutes from 6th Meeting
10.10	**Guidelines**
	Presentation of the progress on draft Guidelines discussing comments received during and after the workshop on 15 May 2012, by sub-group leaders, followed by comments and questions from all group members
10.15 – 11.30	1. **Travel Information**, Jean Coldefy
11.30 – 12.45	2. **Traffic management and urban logistics**, Steve Kearns
12.45	Lunch Break
14.00 – 15.15	3. **Smart Ticketing**, Alexandre Blaquière
15.15	**Guidelines** – Next steps, discussion
15.45	Presentation of the deliverable on **Standardisation needs** and feedback from CEN meeting – Johan Hedin
16.15	Update concerning the collection of **best practices**
16.45	**Any other business**
17.00	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
FRANCO	Gino	Mizar / Swarco	ITS Industry	IT
HASELBERGER	Rainer	City of Vienna	Local Authorities	AT
HEDIN	Johan	Hybris Konsult	Standardisation bodies	SE
JENSEN	Helge	City of Oslo	Local Authorities	NO
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
VLEMMINGS	Tiffany	National Data Warehouse for Traffic information	National Authorities	NL

Excused

DIEGO BERNARDO	Enrique	EMT - Madrid Public Transport Authority	Public Transport Authority	SP
FIBY	Hans	Transport Association East Austria	Public Transport Authority	AT
IZDEBSKI	Piotr	ZTM Warsaw	Public Transport Authority	PL
TOMASSINI	Maurizio	ISIS - Rome	Consultancy	IT
VAN DEN ABEELE	Didier	Alstom Transport	ITS Industry	FR
WINNING	Ian	City of Cork	Local Authorities	IE

EXTERNAL SUPPORT

Name	First name	Organisation	Function
EGELER	Christian	Rapp Trans AG	External Support

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Name	First name	Organisation	Function
OCAKOGLU	Gzim	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	Team Leader *Chair of the meeting*
SZELIGOWSKA	Dorota	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	Project assistant *Secretary of Expert Group*
BERRY	John	European Commission, DG Mobility and Transport	
MERCIER-HANDYSIDE	Patrick	European Commission, DG Research	