

In-Vehicle Information Systems (IVIS) Consultation

**Autumn 2006
Questionnaire**

To:

**IVIS Consultation,
Frances Evans,
Department for Transport
2/04, Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street,
London,
SW1P 4DR**
tts.enquiries@dft.gsi.gov.uk

From :

Intellect and Ukspace
9 January 2007

Contact:

Jennifer Carlton, Senior Programme Manager, Intellect
T: 020 7331 2003, E: jennifer.carlton@intellectuk.org
Russell Square House, 10-12 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5EE
T +44 (0) 20 7331 2000, F +44 (0) 20 7331 2040
www.intellectuk.org

Paul Flanagan, Secretary General UKspace
T:+44(0) 845 329 9791, M:+44(0) 7879 667001, secgenukspace@71dm.freereserve.co.uk
PO Box 423, FLEET, Hants, GU51 9BD

A Your Personal Details01 **Name**

POC: Jennifer Carlton (Intellect) Paul Flanagan (Ukspace)

02 **Organisation**

Intellect and UKspace

03a **Type of Organisation** (please tick appropriate box)

Member of public	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manufacturer (Please specify type in 03b)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign group	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify in 03b)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

03b **Trade Association**

Intellect is the UK trade association for the IT, telecoms and electronics industries. Its members account for over 80% of these markets and include blue-chip multinationals as well as early stage technology companies. These industries together generate around 10% of UK GDP and 15% of UK trade. For more information go to www.intellectuk.org

UKspace (formally UKISC, the United Kingdom Industrial Space Committee) is the Trade Association of the British space industry. Founded in 1975, UKspace is sponsored jointly by the Society of British Aerospace Companies (SBAC) and Intellect. UKspace represents over three-quarters of the UK space industry by both turnover and people employed.

04a **Address**

Intellect, Russell Square House, 10-12 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5EE
 UKspace, PO Box 423, FLEET, Hants, GU51 9BD

04b **Postcode**

05 **Telephone Number**

Intellect: Switch board: 020 7331 2000; Direct Dial: +44 (0) 20 7331 2003
 UKspace: T: +44(0) 845 329 9791, M: +44(0) 7879 667001

06 **Fax Number**

07 **Email Address**

jennifer.carlton@intellectuk.org secgenukpace@71dm.freeserve.co.uk

B Questions Relating to Chapter 3 of the Consultation Paper

08 **Have you used a route guidance device?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

09 **To what extent are you concerned about the driver distraction potential of route guidance devices?** (please tick appropriate box)

Very concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slightly concerned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Not concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

10 **To what extent are you concerned about the mapping and routeing issues associated with route guidance devices?** (please tick appropriate box)

Very concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concerned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Slightly concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not concerned	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

11a **What in your opinion is the best way to tackle driver distraction and/or routeing concerns?** (please tick all appropriate boxes)

Regulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Central Government Guidance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Industry code of practice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Manufacturer self-testing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify in 04b, and continue onto a separate sheet if necessary)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12b These are two very separate issues:
Routeing - Dependant on mapping, algorithms and ancillary data used. Current Licensing is not sufficient to tackle the problem or exploit the opportunity of better traffic management.
Driver Distraction - International\ European standardisation is critical in successfully and safely implementing combating driver distraction and so minimum standards must come from regulation.
“Other” It should be noted that commercial market forces will continual to influence poor performance of routing or distracting technologies. Inadequate systems will not be able to compete and will be naturally removed form the market.

13a **Are you happy with the level of communication between Local Authorities/Traffic Managers and mapping companies?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

13b **Please explain your answer, and continue onto a separate sheet if necessary.**

DfT holds valuable traffic management data and Local Authorities have knowledge (and responsibility) for local congestion problems. Mapping companies and those who exploit their products often do not have the capability to effectively deal with all local authorities in detail, nor do they exploit the DfT database of average traffic speeds.
 Most public issues and stories relating to errors or issues in SatNav system generally impact local routes rather than national ones. As such Local Authorities should be considered as a “new user” of routeing systems and so need to get involved in order to express their needs. The commercial market cannot be expected to alleviate local traffic issues independently.

14 **What could be done to improve communications?**

International Format Standards already exist for traffic data; distribution of data is the key. Static devices now dominate the market so regular updating of road information (if not complete mapping) by the user is essential.
 A standardised means of automated communication would be of mutual benefit and a good example of e-government in action. This would allow local authorities to provide details of black spots, identified rat runs that should be discouraged and temporary roadworks to a central authority. Central Government actions and leadership will be needed to make this work. The current adhoc local govt and private company relationship is not effective. These issues relate to mapping concerns that do not need to be managed in real time. Local traffic issues are also impacted by road closure or road works. This requires a second means of near real time communication to cover local traffic conditions.

15 **Should the onus be on Local Authorities to inform mapping companies of changes to local traffic networks, or on mapping companies actively to seek out this information? (please tick the appropriate box)**

Local Authorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping companies	<input type="checkbox"/>
Both	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

16 **Should the onus be on Local Authorities to liaise with mapping companies on local traffic network management issues, or on mapping companies actively to seek out this information? (please tick the appropriate box)**

Local Authorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping companies	<input type="checkbox"/>
Both	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

17 **Should Local Authorities charge for their provision of roads information?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>There are clear arguments both for and against charging. Real-time roads information already has an exploited commercial value. However Local Authorities, and their residents, are more likely to benefit than the users of routeing guidance. Visiting traffic, including HGVs, are more likely to be using routeing guidance so input from the LA can ensure they are directed onto the most suitable route. This will invariably benefit local residents as much, if not more than, the routeing user. Information is only of use if it is accurate and updated, this is more likely to happen if there is a financial contract in place. However, this does not mean there should be an automatic revenue approach as this can be counterproductive. There is clear justification for this to be self-financing – operators will pay for better quality information and the service should not be a burden on the Local Authority. A cost-neutral approach should therefore be considered. For this to work some centralised public control is needed to agree and enforce standards and rates.</p> <p>It should also be considered that any future road tolling system will require, and therefore fund, similar types of information. If this is considered in the context of reducing congestion the same information will also be required for effective traffic management.</p>	

18 **Do you consider the use, by heavy vehicles, of route guidance devices to be...?** (please tick appropriate box)

Significant benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Slight benefit	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither a benefit nor a problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slight problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significant problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

19a **What are the major barriers to the development of heavy-vehicle-customised route guidance?** (please tick the appropriate boxes)

Cost	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of heavy vehicle route information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Formatting of heavy vehicle information	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify in 19b)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

19b Route guidance has been dominated by the mass market but exploitation by HGV is inevitable. However the relatively small size of the HGV market makes collection of dedicated road information costly.
 There are also some potential patent issues relating to the idea of HGV routeing around low bridges

19c **How can these barriers be overcome?**

The additional cost of collecting dedicated HGV mapping data is a cost the vehicle operators may not support under open market conditions, they will continue to use the cheaper mass market units unless there is some commercial benefit for them with HGV specific routeing. In this case regulation could be used to enforce the use of a suitable "routeing data class" specific to HGV use.

Low bridge information is already available, but dedicated classification of roads, or identification of unsuitable roads, is best compiled at a local level under some form of separate regulation or standard.

20 **Do you consider that there are any groups of road users who pose a particular problem in terms of routeing? Please describe below and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

Most issues relate to vehicle size or weight. Routeing can be filtered by the use of specific vehicle parameters, such as weight, width, length or towed loads. However this needs dedicated information on individual roads and some standard of suitability.

This is not restricted to HGVs, private vehicles towing caravans or trailers are a clear example of such an issue.

Emergency Response vehicles also require a different standard of routeing. This may require different priorities and the provision of additional information.

Finally Dangerous Goods carriers might also benefit for a specific routeing, avoiding tunnels or sensitive areas. This could be further enforced by specific regulation.

C Questions Relating to Chapter 4 of the Consultation Paper

21 **Does your organisation provide dynamic route guidance services?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No, None of our current members do	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

22 **Does your organisation provide information which feeds into, or is capable of being fed into, dynamic route guidance systems?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

23 **Does your organisation have a licence from the DfT?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA

24a **Do you think DfT should have a role in examining the safety and routing of route guidance devices on the UK market?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

24b **Please explain your choice below and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

Efficient and appropriate use of the UK's roads is essential to solving congestion, road maintenance and environmental issues.
 Route guidance systems are already commonplace and their use will significantly increase. DfT should be increasing their participation in this technology and have a defining role in its effective and safe use.
 Please see accompanying paper

25 **Should static and dynamic systems be subject to the same level of scrutiny in terms of HMI safety and routing?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a need for a level playing field and so the same level of scrutiny must be the case. New technologies are now available and the market is dominated by primarily static devices. The successful development of this technology will require a move toward the dynamic data approach (as seen by live updates of static devices). Different assessment categories will become blurred and could prevent new technologies entering the market.	

26a **Is the current licensing system fit for purpose?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

26b **Please give the principle reason for your answer below.**

Already the market has shifted toward static devices. The focus should be on maintaining a standard of improved and intelligent routeing throughout the age of life of these static devices if regulation is to be effective and fair on the current market.

27a **Would you prefer a self-compliance scheme to the current licensing regime? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

27b **If yes, which of the following do you believe are appropriate to form the basis of such a scheme? (please tick appropriate boxes)**

European Statement of Principles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
TRL Routeing Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify in 27c)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

27c The proposed solution probably requires a complex approach.
Self-compliance will not work alone and will require some regulation.
Market forces for the majority of users will in itself enforce the selected standard.
However, a regulation to enforce the use of specific standards may be needed in certain conditions, such as for commercial users or HGV operators.

28 **Are you aware of the European Statement of Principles on the design of Human Machine Interaction? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

29a **If your organisation manufactures in-vehicle devices, does it subscribe to the contents of the European Statement of Principles on Human Machine Interaction safety? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

29b **Are there any areas with which you or your organisation disagree? If so, please describe below and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

--

30 **Are you aware of the Department for Transport's *Framework for Routeing: Assessment of Dynamic Route Guidance systems*? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

31a **If your organisation manufactures in-vehicle devices, does it subscribe to the contents of DfT's *Framework for Routeing: Assessment of Dynamic Route Guidance Systems*? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

31b **Are there any areas with which you or your organisation disagree? If so, please describe below and continue on a separate sheet if necessary..**

--

32a **Do you foresee any need to maintain legislation concerning use of roadside infrastructure? (please tick appropriate box)**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

32b **Please explain your answer, and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

<p>More information required, there are a number of separate issues relating to roadside infrastructure.</p> <p>Part of the original purpose for legislation was to simplify communication with local authorities. This relationship is key to effective collection and exchange of information. Any Legislation should therefore support a wider concept of communication and not be limited to specific roadside infrastructure.</p>
--

33a **Which of the options presented in Chapter 4.2 of the Consultation Paper would you favour?** (please tick appropriate box)

Option 1 (<i>Do nothing - leave the legislation and the licensing regime as it stands</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option 2 (<i>Extend the licensing regime to cover all static and dynamic devices</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option 3 (<i>Fully deregulate; completely remove the licensing regime</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option 4 (<i>Partially deregulate; remove the licensing regime except for systems requiring use of the roadside infrastructure, and introduce non-regulatory mechanisms to encourage self-regulation.</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

33b **Please explain your answer, and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

We believe the existing scheme can be dropped with the possible exception of some residual roadside infrastructure support but regulation is still required. All new regulation needs to be in line with the market and the distinction between static and dynamic devices removed as far as possible.

Most “static” devices have some means of being updated and this should be encouraged as dynamic traffic management is the key to both the success of this technology but also the more efficient usage of the UK road network

New regulations should:

- i) Encourage the accurate and regular updating of “static” devices.
- ii) Enforce the use of suitable “routing data classes” for HGV and other users
- iii) Standardise and simplify exchange of local mapping and traffic information.
- iv) Engage and aid Local Authorities to provide local traffic information
- v) Encourage new entrants into the market to provide supporting dynamic data e.g. “floating vehicle data” for surveillance of traffic conditions.

DfT and local authorities could provide additional road network and average traffic flow data; centralised govt management is needed to successfully implement this.

Please see accompanying paper for further information.

34 **Should DfT incentivise self-compliance to Good Practice criteria?** (please tick appropriate box)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

35a **Which of the suggested incentives would you favour?** (please tick appropriate box)

No incentive needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Published list of self-complying organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logo for self-complying organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>
Star-rating of all route guidance systems on the market	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other method (please describe in 11b).	<input type="checkbox"/>

35b **Please explain your choice below, and continue on a separate sheet if necessary..**

All issues with route guidance cannot be met by regulation.
An approach similar to Euro NCAP may be appropriate with standards managed and products reviewed by industry, motoring and consumer organisations; with a consumer orientated approach but backed by government.

36 **Do you have any further comments? If so, please describe below, and continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

1) Public Image

There are a number Government policies dependant on SatNav in areas such as taxation, enforcement and offender tracking.

Public goodwill and support for "SatNav" is essential for the success of these policies and the wider industry.

The current generic name of SatNav for in vehicle routeing is causing confusion between GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite Systems) and mapping data or usage.

Anything that can be done to protect that image in the long term will be good for both government policy and industry.

2) Role of Central Government

SatNav and automated route guidance are new technologies that will continue to grow.

To date legislation has in part assisted in the growth of this technology. This may now be dated or inappropriate but Government should maintain a role in the development of this sector as it brings mutual beneficial to central and local government and the road user.

Route guidance can have impacts on congestion, taxation and environmental concerns and should not be ignored.

3) Local authority participation.

The original legislation on roadside infrastructure was to simplify the relationship with local authorities. Although the current legislation is not suitable the concept is correct and local authorities should be encouraged to improve their participation though central government intervention, guidance and assistance.

4) Future Road Pricing

As already stated there is a public image issue relating to SatNav and future plans for national road pricing. Active Government participation and input into the use of in-vehicle information systems, especially routeing and traffic alerts, can aid in the success of road pricing to reduce traffic congestion by making the most efficient use of our road network.

Ineffective car navigation, be it GNSS based or otherwise, will always have an adverse effect on an automated road pricing scheme.