

## Main outcomes

### **3<sup>rd</sup> 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
  - o Worst case configuration
  - o 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
  - o generation of trigger signal during the UN R94/95 impacts,
  - o 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

	<b>Advantage</b>	<b>Drawback</b>
<b>Restricted scope:</b> M1 < 2.5 tons and lowest seat “R” point < 700 mm with regard to their automatic AECD/AECS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limits the scope to the vehicles aimed by both UN R94/95 for automatic AECD/AECS</li> <li>- Avoids liability concerns for vehicles not included in scopes of UN R94/95 (i.e. equipped with manual AECD/AECS).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In conflict with EU Directive (all M1/N1)</li> <li>- Cannot capture vehicles equipped with only manual AECD/AECS</li> <li>- No mutual recognition of complying vehicles beyond the scope (must be approved nationally)</li> </ul>
<b>Wide scope:</b> all M1/N1 vehicles with regard to their automatic or manual AECD/AECS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aligned on EU Directive (all M1/N1)</li> <li>- Captures a maximum of categories, Contracting Parties can introduce exemptions nationally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could provoke product liability issues as the scope would include vehicles not addressed by R94 (N1) and R95 (M1&gt;700mm)</li> <li>- Possible need for national exemptions for some vehicles mentioned above</li> </ul>

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?**

---