



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

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

* * * * *

4^{T H} EXPERT MEETING - 30 APRIL 2014
Preparation of a delegated act

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

Meeting minutes – final

Meeting: 30 April 2014, 10.00 – 16.00
Room 4B, Albert Borschette Conference Center, Rue Froissart 36, 1040 Brussels

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 a revised non-paper from the Commission services regarding the possible main parameters of the possible future specifications
- Presentation and discussion of the draft results of the cost-benefit analysis
- Presentation and discussion of the results of public consultation

Agenda: enclosed in Annex 1

Chairman: Ms. Claire Depre, Head of Unit, DG MOVE C3, Intelligent Transport Systems

Participants: See list of participating Member States and third countries in Annex 2

Meeting minutes:

0. Welcome and introduction

The Chairman welcomed the experts representing 17 EU Member States plus Switzerland and Norway.

The Chairman recalled the objectives of the meeting and informed the participants about the proposed meeting agenda consisting of the following items:

- the adoption of the final minutes of the previous expert meeting held on 27 February 2014 for which the draft final minutes had been circulated prior to the meeting;
- presentation and discussion of a revised non-paper and a discussion note circulated by the Commission services with a view to further discussing the main parameters of the future specifications;
- presentation and discussion of the results of the draft cost-benefit analysis;

- presentation and discussion of the results of the public consultation.

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

1. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting

The final minutes of the 27 February 2014 expert meeting were adopted without comments.

2. Presentation and discussion of revised non-paper concerning the possible main parameters of specifications

The chairman introduced the document to the participants explaining that the Commission services had integrated into the revised non-paper the comments received from the experts during the last expert meeting.

The attention of the experts was drawn in particular to the following developments:

- wording revised to make absolutely clear that the specifications would not create any obligation to collect any additional data;
- the concept and procedure of data updates clarified;
- the concept and operation of access point clarified;
- the requirements related to RTTI data clarified, in particular differentiating between requirements applicable to road authorities and operators and service providers.

One participant noted that while the definitions have been generally improved, their coherence with the other parts of the text should also be improved; the difference between the main data types was still not quite clear and additional clarification was needed on the requirements regarding traffic management plans.

Some participants indicated that there was a specific problem with the requirement to have static road data updated within one week after the physical implementation of any change to the road network.

One participant asked for further clarity on the roles and obligations of the private sector in the specifications.

One participant identified the issue of data types, service availability, the requirements arising from INSPIRE as topics for discussion.

One participant noted the need to acknowledge in the specifications that there was an existing market in RTTI services. He also suggested that instead of map producers and private service providers, the specifications should only apply to public actors.

One participant proposed to clarify the obligations upon Member States noting the potential problems in relation to Member States' constitutional law.

One participant expressed that the specifications should create no obligations for private sector service providers for how they relate to one another and if the intention was to make them share information with public authorities then this should be clearly stated.

One participant mentioned the issue of data ownership, in particular for floating car data, and quality standards as relevant topics.

Data update and data formats

The Chairman then proposed to first discuss the requirements for updating static road data, in particular the specific time frame of one week that is proposed.

One participant proposed to avoid specifying a time period and refer to "in a timely manner" instead.

One participant mentioned that the time period required for data updates depended on the types of data but considered that one week was not feasible for most authorities and most data types due to the strong separation of the different departments responsible for the different activities within the public administration. Achieving the one week time limit would not be possible without implementing completely new processes.

Another participant also agreed that the one week update would only be realistic for some of the data and proposed that wording such as "as soon as possible" or "timely" would be preferable.

Another participant stated that for his country the one week time limit would be challenging but manageable. He added that in addition it would also like to clarify if requirements would be proposed related to data availability (as per INSPIRE).

A participant proposed that authorities should retroactively publish the time delay between changing the road attribute and implementing the data update as a means to measure quality.

A participant noted that using the INSPIRE data model and web-service based infrastructure would be a good way to shorten the way to more interoperability. The use of INSPIRE should enable public authorities to use common infrastructure and data without investing into new IT infrastructure. However, he noted that traffic signs were not covered by INSPIRE. It also stated that the data models in both DATEX II and INSPIRE should be looked at (i.e. for selection of data attributes) before making a decision to create additional data models outside INSPIRE.

The Commission services noted that both the INSPIRE framework and DATEX II were still evolving and obviously it was not for the specifications to propose re-inventing INSPIRE. However, a recital could be added on this subject.

A participant noted that the TN-ITS initiative was looking at what should be added to INSPIRE. However, he noted that INSPIRE was a Directive developed with environment in mind therefore with a different purpose from ITS. Also he stressed that both INSPIRE and DATEX II should reflect the priorities and needs of the ITS Directive. Then he added that the issue of network coverage was relevant for deciding what was feasible within one week in terms of data updates.

A participant informed that there was an ongoing activity within the European ITS Platform (funded under TEN-T 2012 calls) that is expected to deliver relevant results on data quality by mid-2015.

The Chairman acknowledged the relevance of this work but noted that the timing would be difficult to align with the adoption of the specifications. The work of the EIP could be taken into account in the follow-up activities, following the adoption of the specifications.

A participant supported the idea of re-using existing standards and proposed to list the applicable standards in the specifications to avoid possible confusion as a too open interpretation could possibly be problematic.

The Commission services clarified that the use of DATEX II would be promoted in particular to avoid the use of proprietary data formats. However, if supported by the experts, a reference could also be made to TPEG, RDC-TMC and any other relevant standards.

A participant stated that DATEX II was the format for data exchange between entities while TPEG etc. were formats for delivery to end users.

Another participant was of the opinion that it should be sufficient just to refer to international standards in the specifications.

The Commission services concluded this point by clarifying that it would like to highlight in the specification the use of DATEX II in particular as it was the standard the development of which was specifically supported by the EU. As the draft specifications aim to create the right framework conditions enabling the provision of better services without trying to determine the content and format of those services, it was up to the service providers to decide on the best way to deliver services to end users. Therefore it would not be necessary to specify the relevant standards in the specifications (although they could be mentioned in a recital if that is considered desirable).

A participant supported the use of DATEX II as the focal point of data exchange between public authorities.

The role of public sector and private service providers

The Chairman invited experts to comment on the wording suggested.

A participant repeated the proposal to change the draft specification to make them concern only public authorities and map providers. He was in particular concerned about creating too large obligations for SMEs.

A participant proposed to consistently replace the wording "make available" throughout the text with an alternative wording that clarifies without doubt that there was no obligation or expectation for such transactions to be made free of charge. He also raised concerns on the lack of balance between the requirements placed upon public bodies as opposed to the requirements upon private sector.

The Chairman clarified that there was no intention to force any transactions of any sorts and that there was no "free of charge" requirement placed upon public authorities. This could be further clarified in a recital if needed.

A participant agreed with the proposed Commission approach but noted that in reality it was turning out to be rather difficult to commercially exploit RTTI data. He considered important, however, that there should be no obligation in the specifications for certain types of contracts to be used for the exchange and re-use of data. He also questioned who will be responsible for the validation of the data sourcing and responsibility vis à vis end users.

A participant did not consider it a positive development that according to the revised wording 12 private service providers would no longer be obliged to place information at the national access point regarding the services they provide. He believed that also private sector service providers should publish at least an overview about their private data sets at the national access point.

A participant proposed to make a statement somewhere in the specifications that would acknowledge that a functioning market already existed within the EU for the provision of RTTI services and that it was the intention to maintain and improve the functioning of that market.

Additionally, if the idea is to promote the use of the RTTI data of the private service providers by public authorities to improve traffic management and traffic flow, then this should be clearly stated. Nonetheless this would represent a huge amount of data that could clog up the access point. Provision of the metadata from the private service providers would be enough.

A participant opined that while it would consider positively having metadata on the datasets of private sector service providers at the national access point, he would hesitate to make

this an obligation. He explained that as a large part of the RTTI market existed due to the exclusiveness of the data, mandatory re-use of data could turn out to be problematic in this respect. Regarding floating car data, He wondered if OEMs would qualify as service providers. He noted that it would certainly be useful if some (but not all) of the floating car data would be available to traffic managers.

The Commission services clarified that the intention was to reflect on these issues in the recitals but it was not the expectation for these specifications to go into the details regarding the source of the data such as floating car data. It was also acknowledged that the intention behind the establishment of a national access point was to provide a single window through which to access the data (and associated metadata) needed to design information services. In this respect some data from private providers would be relevant too.

A participant noted that in his country an offer to the private sector service providers is discussed to provide information at the national access point especially for safety critical services, but this is not an obligation. He considered that such an approach could be proposed at the European level as well. He also raised the issue of the overburdening of assessment of compliance if all data from private service providers were to be provided through the national access point.

A participant noted that in his country they were currently considering establishing a system whereby private companies could have their services certified by a public body on a voluntary basis if service providers considered that this would be beneficial for the promotion of their services. The participant added that a number of service providers already expressed interest in such a voluntary certification possibility.

A participant noted that in his view the discussion was too much focussed on the private sector and instead we should be concentrating on the users and quality of the services provided. In reality to a large extent we are tip-toeing around large multinational companies over the activities of which we have no real influence of. He recommended a single set of core rules that will be applicable to both public and private stakeholders.

A participant noted that it considered that the few requirements applicable to private service providers in the text were reasonable.

A number of participants expressed their concerns and questions concerning the assessment of compliance. The Chairman noted that this would be an agenda item for the next expert meeting and the Commission services will make a proposal for a wording that would attempt to establish the right balance between costs and benefits, both for private actors and public authorities without putting law abiding operators at a competitive disadvantage.

A participant asked if broadcasting companies were considered service providers within the context of the specifications.

The Commission services acknowledge the issue of broadcasters.

Data classification

A participant noted that in most cases data about parking and public transport was not owned by road authorities. He enquired if there was a common European method available for the identification of accident black spots. In his country a method existed but the idea was to use the information to address the situation and remedy the problem as opposed to continue to warn the users about the black spots. He also noted that end user in any case would not know how to treat this information on lack spots and how to react to it.

Several participants agreed with the removal of accident black spots from the scope while one expert preferred to keep information regarding black spots within the scope.

A participant suggested carefully considering the re-use of public sector information for public transport services and wondered if the intention was to bring every parking operator within the scope of the specifications? He pointed out that a national parking database already existed in his country. It agreed, however, that the specifications should give also indications which direction future developments should go into but that the wording should be open and flexible at the same time.

A participant asked if "recommended alternative routes" referred to the official routing advice provided by public authorities or also to the advice of service providers to their users and asked to make a clear distinction between the two. He considered that "expected delays" and "estimated travel times" did not belong within the scope of real-time traffic data for these specifications but rather in the scope of real-time traffic information. He also stressed that data shall be well selected in order not to overburden traffic control centres.

A participant suggested the wording "estimated travel times" rather than "expected delays".

A participant expressed preference to keep information concerning public transport stops, public transport services, service disruptions and alternative routes and services in the scope.

A participant noted that the scope of the data may overlap with that of specifications "c" which should be avoided and that weather data should be added to the scope as it was very important for some countries.

The Chairman agreed with the need to clarify the scope of the present specifications versus existing and other planned specifications to establish legal clarity and recalled that this guiding principle had already been agreed upon in the previous Expert Group meeting. The Chairman also reminded of the importance of keeping parking information in the scope.

A participant questioned the need to include the information about the location of charging points for electric vehicles in the specifications as it considered it to belong to the category of Point of Interest information (such as the location of traditional petrol stations). Furthermore, if road user charges were in the scope, should tolled roads and the location of tolling stations not be also included in the scope of static road data? Another participant supported the inclusion of tolling gantries in the data scope.

A participant proposed to include the relevant information about tunnels and bridges in the scope of static road data. As for dynamic road data, lane information (e.g. lane closures) would be relevant and so would be the information on trucks ban overtaking.

A participant noted that all tunnels are assigned to a specific category under the ADR treaty and this information would be important to indicate. He agreed with the need to include adverse weather conditions in the scope and proposed to add information about service areas to static road data.

The Commission services noted the need to keep legal clarity also with reference to the existing specifications for safe and secure parking places. They also reminded the importance of keeping EV charging points in the scope as a means to contribute to promoting the use of electric vehicles.

A participant requested further clarification of what was included in "permanent physical road infrastructure characteristics" noting that road authorities in his country had a lot of data about the structure and maintenance status of the roads in non-standardised formats and that it would be very costly to convert this data into a standard data format without delivering

a lot of obvious benefits to service providers who do not need all this data for the provision of end user services. It also asked for clarification of the meaning of activation status of TMPs.

The Commission services agreed to focus on physical features to describe the roads, in particular the physical dimensions of the roads such as width, curves and gradients. The Chairman also stressed that what matters are the concrete traffic management measures of a TMP rather than the organisational steps of it.

Geographical scope

The Commission services launched a reflection on the possible progressive application of the specifications on the TEN-T core and comprehensive networks and in priority zones that could be defined by Member States.

A participant considered that the proposal to introduce the concept of priority zones to be decided by national authorities into the specifications was a good idea.

A participant emphasised the importance of urban areas for traffic congestion and reminded of the role of local authorities as urban road operators.

A participant considered that it would be a good solution to focus on the TEN-T with the possible addition of certain urban areas on the decision of Member States through their identification as priority zones. A participant asked for a clarification of what exactly were the urban nodes of the TEN-T.

The Commission services confirmed that it was the maps of the TEN-T guidelines that defined the network and zooming in on them at the main artery level (part of the comprehensive network) should be possible in TENTeC but usually the urban nodes were the ring roads and possibly some main city arteries.

A participant suggested that a specific reference could be made to "A" and "E" roads in the context of the priority zones as for practical legislative reasons this would make it easier for the national authorities to add the necessary roads outside the TEN-T to the scope.

A participant was of the view that the scope should be limited to TEN-T, preferably even excluding the urban nodes of the TEN-T but as a maximum including the urban nodes without any additional coverage of urban areas outside TEN-T.

The Chairman noted that according to the idea put forward for priority zones, Member States would not be under any obligation to define priority zones or to include any urban areas in priority zones. The concept of priority zones would give Member States flexibility to extend the application of the specifications to road sections outside the TEN-T if they considered it appropriate without creating any obligation for them to do so.

A participant warned that focusing on the TEN-T only would deepen even more the gap between the TEN-T and the other networks, and that this should be avoided.

Entry into force

A participant considered that anything longer than 3 years was irrelevant in the world of ITS.

A participant noted that as the ITS Directive was primarily focused on new services, the entry into force regarding existing services should not be specified.

The Chairman confirmed that in the view of the Commission service the ITS Directive also applied to existing services and the proposal has been prepared on this basis.

A participant considered that 12 months generally appeared to be too short a time for application to existing services but this would of course depend on the exact content of the specifications that will need to be implemented.

A participant considered that the 36 months implementation should be shortened to 24 months. A participant indicated that he could also agree to 24 months for priority zones whereas another participant asked for 48 months.

A participant noted that a shortening of the implementation period for priority zones would have a clear impact on what would be classified as priority zones. He agreed on the 12 month period for the establishment of the national access point and content provision.

A participant mentioned that this would not be a problem if it is possible for Member States to add priority zones at later stages as well.

The Commission services confirmed that this is the intention and that priority zones could be identified and added by Member States in a progressive manner. The priority zone concept does not oblige Member States, it only gives them flexibility.

A participant reminded the importance to continue discussing quality parameters as that would have an influence on the ability to meet implementation deadlines. The notion of quality needed to be added to the specifications to deliver real added value for end users.

The Commission service drew attention to the proposed recital on data quality and added that further provision could be added at a later stage once the ongoing research work on the definition of quality and the measurement of quality levels is completed.

A participant agreed that it was more important to establish a methodology for measuring data quality than to agree on setting quality standards. In this respect the approach followed under the INSPIRE Directive could be inspiring.

3. Presentation and discussion of the draft results of the cost-benefit analysis

A representative of Rapp Trans, from the consortium working on the background study for the Commission services, delivered a presentation about the results of the cost-benefit analysis. Please see the attachment for the presentation.

A participant warned not to mix the infrastructure / governance set up for the INSPIRE Directive on one hand and the ITS Directive on the other hand.

4. Presentation and discussion of the results of the public consultation

A representative of Rapp Trans, from the consortium working on the background study for the Commission services, delivered a presentation about the results of the on-line public consultation.

A participant noted in particular three aspects that the results of the public consultation seemed to confirm. Firstly, many respondents were concerned about the potential distraction of RTTI services for drivers. Secondly, while respondents generally agreed with the statement that the EU should take action to ensure the provision of EU-wide RTTI services, about 50% the respondents considered that the implementation of RTTI services should be left to market players to decide. Thirdly, respondents considered it less important for EU action to address the service provider to service provider interactions than addressing other possible measures addressing public authorities and interactions between public authorities and service providers.

5. Meeting wrap-up and conclusions

The chairman thanked the experts for their active participation in the meeting and for providing many useful comments during the discussion and reminded experts that they can

also send their comments in writing after the meeting. The discussion will continue during the next meeting of the expert group that is planned to take place on 28 May 2014. The focus of the next meeting will be on the assessment of compliance, the national access point, the definitions and the recitals.

E X P E R T M E E T I N G

- 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 27 February 2014 expert meeting.
- 10.20 **Presentation and discussion of revised non-paper from Commission services**
The Commission services present a revised non-paper discussing at a technical level the main parameters of the future specifications.
- 12.45 - 14:15 Lunch Break**
- 14:15 **Presentation and discussion of the findings of the draft final report prepared for the Commission services on the cost-benefit analysis of EU-wide RTTI services**
Presentation from RappTrans, from the consortium working on the background study for the Commission services, followed by a discussion.
- 15:15 **Presentation and discussion of the results of the public consultation on the provision of RTTI services**
Presentation from RappTrans, from the consortium working on the background study for the Commission services, followed by a discussion.
- 15:45 **Conclusions**
Conclusions of the meeting and next steps

List of Member States and third countries represented

Annex 2

Country
AT
BE
CH
CZ
DE
DK
EL
ES
FI
HR
IE
IT
LT
NL
NO
PL
RO
SE
UK