

Action Plan for the deployment of ITS in Europe

-- Stakeholder perspectives and priorities --

John Miles
Ankerbold International Ltd



7th European Congress & Exhibition on ITS
Geneva, Switzerland



Who was interviewed?

- Member State ITS policy teams
- Government ITS development agency
- City authority ITS manager
- Tolled motorway company
- 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



Quotes

- “ITS should be user/usage driven, not technology driven.”
- “The big picture priorities are safety (road fatalities), efficiency (congestion, reliability) and environment (carbon emissions).”
- “Need clear statements about which ITS applications are needed as policy instruments.”



Views on barriers to ITS deployment

- 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



Views on Action Plan components

Available instruments:

- 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



Theme A: Studies, field trials and demonstrations

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
- Trials etc. are seen as 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



Theme B: Technical harmonisation

- Possibilities are:
 - “Official” standards (and industry-accepted standards)
 - European guidelines and functional specifications
 - “Soft” measures: evaluation and benchmarking
- eSafety applications
- Data exchange
- Route restrictions and traffic circulation plans
- Payment systems



Theme C: Coordination frameworks and forums

- “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
- Conclusion: “need a new group of people sitting round the EU table”
 - plus demonstrations, training and awareness-raising



Coordination proposals

- A European ITS Strategy Board
 - Mandated and politically supported
 - With “cascade” to national ITS Authorities
- 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 key stakeholders



Theme C: more proposals

- 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



Theme D: Financial support

Ideas for spending money

- Support for large-scale demonstrations and field trials
- Funds for cross-border ITS collaboration
- The development of an EU database of independent and unbiased evaluation of ITS field trials
- Preparation and promulgation of best practice guidelines
 - (How to implement ITS? What precautions to take?)
- Subsidising high-profile EU concertation and consensus-building activities
- Underwriting trials requiring public-private collaboration (reduction of investment risk)
- Promote other financial incentives (e.g. differential pricing)



Theme E: Legislation

Views on where EU regulation might be justified:

“Consumer-led” ITS

- Regulate for:
 - consumer protection
 - equipment certification
 - regulation of liability for OEMs and service providers
 - payment protection
 - discharge of public service obligations
- ...and (maybe) to make the market happen!

“Mandated” ITS

- Required for reasons of public policy
- e.g. to meet safety, transport & traffic management or environmental goals
- Examples:
 - demand management
 - advanced vehicle safety systems
 - cooperative systems
 - enforcement systems
 - co-modality



Final thoughts

- “Need to focus on the outcomes, not the technology.”
 - how to move everyone in the city?
 - how to help the elderly maintain mobility?
 - how to maintain just-in-time goods deliveries and make servicing premises more reliable?
 - how to achieve social inclusion?



Conclusion: be pragmatic

- “Harmonise the basics, but don’t insist on solutions that are absolutely identical in every country. The basic idea may be the same in each Member State but the systems may not be identical.”
- “It would be disappointing if the proposed ITS action plan did not take a long-term view (10, 15, 20 years). [For example] big sums of money could be saved if the time horizon was clearer for new in-vehicle systems which could replace conventional signs.”



Action Plan for the deployment of ITS in Europe

Stakeholder perspectives and priorities

-- Thank you for your attention --

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

