Main outcomes

3rd meeting of the GRSG informal group on Accident Emergency Call System (AECS)

Venue: Moscow, Kuznetsky most bld. 21/5
Chairman: Mr. Mr. Denis Zagarin (RUS) (zagarin@autorc.ru)
Secretariat: Mr. Olivier Fontaine (OICA) (ofontaine@oica.net)
Dates: Wednesday 26 February 2014 until Friday 28 February 2014,

1. General agreements in GRSG-AECS informal group

1.1. Status of UN regulations

– The informal group acknowledged that UN regulations imply interoperability and require mutual recognition
– Approval tests can only simulate the reality, i.e. cannot capture all real world situations

1.2. EMC

Background:
– simply referring to UN R10, or including all necessary requirements into the regulation
– not all UN R10 requirements are necessary for AECD/AECS

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group: reference to UN R10, plus additional relevant tests if necessary.

1.3. Climate resistance

Background:
– Need to ensure proper resistance to climate extremes in order to guarantee emission of e-call in all circumstances. Item of particular importance in RUS
– Resistance to climate usually not defined in other regulations, except UN R97, R116 and few others. Industry and J consider this as “over-regulation”.
– Resistance to climate currently well addressed by the market in the frame of product liability.

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group: item to be further discussed with proper justifications

1.4. Mechanical resistance

Background:
– Need to ensure proper resistance to mechanical aggressions in order to guarantee emission of e-call in all circumstances
– OICA concerned that the proposed requirements could be detrimental to safety as the manufacturers usually adapt the specifications to the vehicle.

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group: item to be further discussed with proper justifications
1.5. AECS triggering conditions (UN R94/R95 environment)

Background:
- Question on whether UN R94/95 are relevant for assessing AECD/AECS resistance to crash
  - Worst case configuration
  - AECD/AECS post-crash functionality assessment
- Proposal to perform a separate AECD sled test

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group:
- Verification (in minimum) of
  - generation of trigger signal during the UN R94/95 impacts,
  - audio capabilities and MSD transmission during crash test procedure.
- This can also be done via other measures

1.6. Navigation module requirements

Background:
- Question on whether the regulation should mandate GNSS for achieving accuracy in positioning (design restriction vs. technical necessity)
- European Commission keen that all AECD/AECS are Galileo compatible

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group: general requirements with no technology, and approval tests imposing GNSS.

2. Requests for guidance

2.1. Scope

Background: Conflict between restricted scope and wide scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Drawback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted scope:</strong></td>
<td>Limits the scope to the vehicles aimed by both UN R9495 for automatic AECD/AECS</td>
<td>In conflict with EU Directive (all M1/N1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoids liability concerns for vehicles not included in scopes of UN R94/95 (i.e. equipped with manual AECD/AECS).</td>
<td>Cannot capture vehicles equipped with only manual AECD/AECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mutual recognition of complying vehicles beyond the scope (must be approved nationally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wide scope:</strong></td>
<td>Aligned on EU Directive (all M1/N1)</td>
<td>Could provoke product liability issues as the scope would include vehicles not addressed by R94 (N1) and R95 (M1&gt;700mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captures a maximum of categories, Contracting Parties can introduce exemptions nationally.</td>
<td>Possible need for national exemptions for some vehicles mentioned above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request for guidance:
*Should the AECS UN regulation have a wide scope or a restricted scope?*
2.2. Communication with mobile phone networks

Background:
- AECD/AECS need mobile phone communication for sending MSD and establishing voice communication
- Mobile phone networks are currently not compatible worldwide
- Mobile phone technology evolves quickly
- Existing technology (Quad band) may provide basic performances almost anywhere, with maximum performance in one particularly aimed area

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group:

Possible solutions:
- Frequency requirements to be out of the AECS regulation, i.e. AECD/AECS shall fulfil the national requirements for what concerns the frequencies.
- General requirements not addressing the frequencies, test method proposing “relevant” frequencies.
- Quad band technology

Request for guidance:
How to achieve mutual recognition when the frequency requirements are regulated nationally and not compatible to each other?

2.3. Data transmission mechanism and MSD

Background:
- Need for clear definition of MSD,
- Need to address TPSs (Third Party Services) for supporting the J Helpnet and for guaranteeing e-call selection between the vehicle and the PSAP (about 80% of manual e-calls are false due to wrong trial, child manipulation, etc.)
- VIN, transmission process and protocols not harmonized worldwide

Status of discussions at GRSG-AECS informal group:
- UN regulation to limit the MSD to the mandatory part of CEN 15722 for the time being
- Agreed to bring space for TPSs in the regulation
- Mechanism of data transmission: no technology can support all Contracting Parties’ national provisions.

Possible solutions:
- Limiting the regulation to a list of data, and letting the transmission process and protocols to the national legislation
- Establishing one regulation per mechanism of data transmission
- Introducing different series of amendments in the regulation. (AEBS solution)
- Introducing different classes of type-approvals, with one definition of AECD/vehicle types by class of type approval.

Request for guidance:
How to achieve mutual recognition when the different mechanisms of data transmission are regulated nationally and not compatible to each other?