

# Status of standardization and regulation with regards to GNSS in ITS

High Quality Positioning: a Key to Success for Autonomous Driving

Jesper Engdahl Deputy Head of Traffic Telematics RAPP R





### **Outline**

- Context
- Gap analysis
  - Approach
  - Findings
- Summary



2





IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

# Context

### GNSS users and integrators face 2 major challenges:

- estimate the expected performance of the service
- lack of common framework for defining and assessing GNSSpositioning performances







# Gap analysis

### Approach

- Inventory of relevant documents
- Gap analysis of the positioning aspects
- Synthesis and actions

Scope: 75 standards and 25 regulations in ITS (taximeters, DGT, EFC, eCall, Smart tachograph, C-ITS, ADAS, autonomous driving)

A few use cases and findings are highlighted in the following slides



COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020



4



# **Findings - Dangerous Goods Transport**

### Directive 2008/68/EC on inland DGT

- Regulation barely addresses positioning aspects
- References the "provisions" in ADR re "tracking tracing" for high-consequence dangerous goods

### Gaps

- Nothing about the positioning performance, not even for non-high consequence dangerous goods
- Nothing on geofencing of DGT on certain roads or areas
- Nothing on cross-border monitoring of DGT









5



# **Findings - Electronic Fee Collection**

- EFC used to achieve a variety of transport pricing policies
- Main technologies used in Europe
  - CEN dedicated short-range communication
  - Video-based charging
  - Autonomous GNSS-based systems
    - Section-/cordon-based charging —
    - Area-based charging



IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

![](_page_5_Picture_10.jpeg)

6

![](_page_6_Picture_0.jpeg)

# **Findings - Electronic Fee Collection**

- European electronic toll service (**EETS**) legislation in place
  - Separation of the Toll Charger and Service Provider (SP)
  - Positioning functionality and performance requirements (OBE + Proxy) responsibility of the SP
- Standards and recent procurements mirror the EETS legislation
  - E.g. ISO/TS 17444 on 'Charging performance metrics and examination framework'
    - E2E and intermediate metrics (e.g. toll declaration) but **not the positioning performance**
    - In line with the EETS legislation and to avoid duplication with 16803

![](_page_6_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_10.jpeg)

7

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

# **Findings - Electronic Fee Collection**

- A proposal for a recast of the EETS Directive and **Decision** launched in 2017-05
  - contain several significant changes but none regarding the handling of the positioning performance
- Gaps
  - no essential gap identified from the EETS-perspective
  - an open market for OBE requires that positioning performances are established; EN 16803 series is intended to bridge this gap

![](_page_7_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Findings - eCall

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

- The eCall system shall allow the "PSAP operator to identify the position and heading of the vehicle to a minimum degree of accuracy as defined in EN 15722 for the Minimum Set of Data (MSD) coordinates"
- "the receivers shall be compatible with the positioning services provided by satellite navigation systems including the Galileo and the EGNOS systems"

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020

![](_page_8_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Findings - eCall

- 6 main eCall standards
- Only EN 15722 on eCall minimum set of data deals with positioning performance: a flag in the MSD should be set to 'no confidence' when "there is less than 95% confidence that exact position is within a radius of ± 150 m of reported position"

### Gaps

- Regulation only referred to EN 15722
- EN 15722:
  - The meaning is not clear: the 95th percentile of the error distribution < 150 m?
  - No conformity assessment test case

![](_page_9_Picture_9.jpeg)

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme

![](_page_9_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

# **Findings - eCall**

#### New EU regulation (2017/79) on EC type-approval procedures for eCall in-vehicles systems, technical units and components

- Test procedures defined in Annex VI
  - The tests are based on constellation simulators
  - Perhaps not the ultimate solution but a big step forward in anticipation of 16803-2
- applies from 2018-03-31

![](_page_10_Picture_8.jpeg)

11

![](_page_10_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

- Increase safety and driving comfort, reduce emissions
- New services
  - Adaptive cruise control
  - Curve speeds assistance
  - Lane change assistance
  - Vision enhancements
  - Intersection collision avoidance .....
- New technologies competing concepts
- Legislation and liability difficult issues

![](_page_11_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_12.jpeg)

IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

![](_page_11_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

### What about vehicle positioning?

#### • vehicle positioning is not necessary for every service

- ABS, automatic lighting, rear view assistance...
- depends on the vehicle design (e.g. collision avoidance based on radar measuring the distance between the vehicles)

#### • but is part of the vehicle's system

- navigation based only on relative information is not sufficient to cover all the cases
- necessity to have an absolute position
  - calibration of sensors: odometer, accelerometer, gyros
  - image correlation
  - map matching (lidar)

![](_page_12_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Example: Curve speed warning systems (CSWS)

- Performance requirements and test procedures (ISO 11067)
- The test course shall be located in an open place so that the GNSS receiver of CSWS functions properly

![](_page_13_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### Gaps

- Positioning performance indicators are generally neglected or not verifiable

14

Test procedures do not reflect the real operational environment

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020

![](_page_13_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Example B: Longitudinal Collision Risk Warning (LCRW, ETSI TS 101 539-3:2013)

"In case position is used for longitudinal alignment estimation, the vehicle position accuracy shall be equal or less than one meter with a confidence level of 95 %"

### Gaps

- Metrics unit not exact / verifiable
- Test procedure not defined

![](_page_14_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

- On-going work "ISO/TS 21176 "PVT functionality in the ITS station"
- Prepared in cooperation between the ITS and the GNSS standardisation communities
- The need for and expectation on this new facility is growing among ITS stakeholders (Autonomous Driving...)
- A first draft is expected in the next weeks

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme

Horizon 2020

![](_page_15_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_9.jpeg)

16

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

#### Findings - Autonomous Driving **Evolution in Automated Driving** Fully A. (FAD)

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

17

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

### **Finding - Autonomous Driving Options for Absolute Localization**

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

18

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

# **Findings - Autonomous Driving**

- From level 0 (no automation) to level 5 (fully autonomous)
- Levels 0, 1, and 2 corresponds to ADAS
- Levels 3 and 5 are what most people recognize as autonomous driving
- NHTSA does currently not recommend to establish safety standards for self-driving vehicle technologies

### Gaps

 Legal, technological as well as human performance issues must be addressed in more depth before standards can be developed on a more solid basis

![](_page_18_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Summary

- GNSS-based positioning performances in ITS depend on the environment and are often overestimated
- Critical ITS applications require positioning performance indicators and examination framework
- Positioning QoS requirements are often neglected or not verifiable in current ITS regulations and standards
- Privacy protection considerations in current European regulations limit the use and societal benefits of positioning services
- Linking of GNSS-positioning and ITS experts starts to bear fruits. Room for strengthening the exchanges with the automotive industry and ITS legislators
- Standards are under development that can be used to underpin agreements between ITS stakeholders and to support ITS legislations

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

### THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION !

#### Jesper Engdahl (TF1 leader)

e-mail: jesper.engdahl@rapp.ch phone +41 58 595 78 53

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Ola Martin Lykkja (TF1 deputy leader)

e-mail: ola.lykkja@q-free.com phone +47 99 54 54 65

![](_page_20_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_8.jpeg)

21

COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020

![](_page_20_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_11.jpeg)