

ITS Action Plan

-- Report on stakeholder interviews --

Consultation Workshop
Brussels, 26 March 2008



Who was consulted?

- Government ITS development agency
- National Policy director for ITS
- City authority ITS manager
- Tolled motorway company
- Member State ITS policy team
- ITS-based information service provider
- Rep for heavy road transport industry
- OEM auto and truck research managers
- National Road Authorities directors (NRAs).
- Automotive electronic supply company



Stakeholder perspectives

What are the problem areas for ITS?

What action is needed?

What are the priorities?



Rationale

- Intelligent Transport Systems are a means to achieve an end result: no more, no less.
 - Using technology to improve mobility (people and goods)
 - Focus on services and utilities
 - The goal can be commercial or policy-directed
- Therefore the Action Plan should not be about I.T.S. for its own sake but about:
 - Safety (reducing road fatalities)
 - Efficiency (congestion, reliability, just-in-time, route choice, navigation, location-based added-value services)
 - Mobility planning (for people and freight)
 - Integrated transport (inter-modal interchange, co-modality)
 - Environment (reducing carbon emissions, managing pollution incidents)



Is there a problem?

What needs attention at EU level?



Barriers – policy context

- No clear mandate
 - ITS not seen as an instrument for delivering transport policy objectives
- No clear vision of how transport shall be organised in 10 or 20 years' time
- Low profile of ITS in the policy hierarchy at the local/regional level
- Not enough pressure yet (political, economic, social) to deploy ITS



Other barriers

- European and national programmes in ITS are often totally out of step (e.g. lorry charges)
- Mutual cooperation between actors is weak: especially public-public, public-private (and maybe also private-private).
 - Problems with organisational issues in the ITS delivery chain.
 - A history / national and proprietary silo solutions
 - Some signs of movement (digital maps, Euro-regional projects)
- Uncertainty over business models
 - Commercial case for eSafety, RTTI, eCall
 - Cost for carmakers, Telcos, other stakeholders not yet solved.
 - Too many risks; not enough hard cost-benefit data.



European coordination

- ITS does not engage the right people
 - too much in the hands of the researchers
 - Non-ITS professionals are not comfortable with it; Senior managers don't feel safe
 - Only slowly involving the commercial players
 - eSafety forum very productive but no strong policy follow-up
- Not enough appreciation amongst the Member States of the limitations and downside of developing ITS on a fragmented national basis rather than developing a common EU-wide approach.
 - Cross-border harmonisation of systems not a big political issue
- Conclusion: need awareness-raising and a new group of people sitting round the EU table.



What are the priority areas?

Core applications

Key action areas



Top priorities

- Real-time Traffic and Travel Information
- Freight information systems
- eCall
- Electronic toll collection and payment
- Traffic demand management
- Open in-vehicle telematics platform
- In addition:
 - Hazardous goods tracking
 - Cooperative systems
 - eSafety systems



Where is regulation justified?

- Consumer-driven (market-based) ITS systems and services
 - May still need equipment certification, regulation of liability, minimum service requirements
- Policy-driven applications and solutions which are not market-led may have to be mandated
 - Safety, traffic and environmental management
 - Advanced vehicle safety systems
 - Cooperative systems
 - Enforcement systems



What is the business case?

- Public infrastructure and utilities (citizen or customer-led) have to be justified
 - Impact assessment and cost-effectiveness
 - Affordability
 - Political acceptability
- Examples requiring public funds:
 - ITS for road space management and network operations
 - Urban mobility – transit priority, “green” modes, demand management, and environmental measures
 - Promotion of co-modality
- Hybrid (both public and private sectors have an interest)
 - Electronic payment for location based payment, fees and charges
 - RTTI (synergy with personal and freight mobility services)
 - Services for long-distance trucks and commercial vehicles



What should go in a European ITS Action Plan?

Proposed EU instruments



Available instruments

Possible actions:

- A. Studies, field trials and demonstrations
- B. Technical Harmonisation
 - B1. Standardisation
 - B2. Guidelines and specifications
 - B3. Evaluation and benchmarking
- C. Coordination frameworks and forums
- D. Financial support
- E. Legislation



Suggestions for Europe-wide coordination

- A strong forum with all stakeholders present
 - Public authorities and commercial actors
 - To promote public-private collaboration and consensus-building
 - “Round tables” to build consensus
 - Hierarchical – so that stakeholders nationally can follow and track developments
 - Promotion and endorsement of an ITS Vision and recommended practice
- Roads authorities and network operators
 - Small, dedicated task forces: city officials / TERN operators
 - Measures for safety, congestion and mobility management
 - Customer focus: services for travellers & road users
 - Inter-modal connections
 - European guidelines on deployment



Requests

- A European ITS Strategy Board
 - Mandated and politically supported
- A road-map for deployment of ITS
 - Promulgate ITS tools and best practices
 - Development of common systems performance requirements, functional specifications
 - A market-enabling architecture
- Concertation and strategic coordination of EU-level actors
- Awareness raising amongst stakeholders



Field trials and demonstrations

Why do stakeholders want them?

- To test the business models in “real life”
- To secure reliable data on costs, benefits and risks
- To understand and gain experience of ITS methods
- To demonstrate benefits for safety and congestion
 - Needs reliable, independent evaluation
- N.B. trials and demos are especially important for applications that have big social and economic benefits but are slow to market
 - Examples: eSafety applications (eCall); co-operative systems; co-modality



EU financial support

- Suggestions include:
 - Continuing EU support for RTD: research and technical development
 - Support for large-scale demonstrations and field trials
 - Funding for cross-border ITS collaboration
 - Funding for independent and unbiased evaluation of ITS field trials and full-scale deployment
 - Development and promulgation of best practice guidelines (How to do it? What precautions to take?)
 - Support for concertation and consensus-building activities
 - Underpin trials requiring public-private collaboration (reduction of investment risk)
 - Other financial incentives (e.g. differential pricing)



EU legislation / regulation

- Vehicles: mandate features with collective and community benefits if no market take-up:
 - Safety-related measures (next gen. tachograph)
 - Environment-friendly features (to address pollution, climate change targets)
 - Functional specifications for an open platform IVU
 - Liability issues
 - EC (or UN ECE) mandates will be needed
- Address market-enabling and cross-border issues
 - Location-based electronic payment
- Note: legislation and/or regulation will require a broad political consensus – may take time



“Soft” measures

- Voluntary agreements and codes of practice
 - Cities might enter into collaboration agreements to develop recommended practice on use of ITS to address issues of urban mobility
- Outreach and communications
 - Innovative / radical thinking to raise profile of ITS solutions to mobility problems
 - Political and public awareness
 - Best practices and education – professional capability
 - Development of European “ITS knowledge centres”
 - Sharing of experience and results obtained at national level



ITS Action Plan

-- Report on stakeholder interviews --

John Miles
Ankerbold International Ltd
jcm@ankerbold.co.uk

