



MEETING NOTES
EGEA Working Group 10
Creation of a European Vehicle Test Equipment Network

19th November 2013 (9h00-16h30)

EGEA Offices (c/o FIGIEFA)

**Boulevard de la Woluwe, 42
BE – 1200 Brussels**

Participants:

AFIBA/Vteq	Ivan Campos Aviles
AICA/Bosch	Marco Le Brun
AICA/Texa	Samuele Zoia
ASA/ASA-network	Peter Rehberg
ASA/Bosch	Ramon Amirpour
ASA/Loco-Soft	Wolfgang Börsch
ASA/Maha	Antonio Multari
AVL DiTest	Martin Kammerhofer
FMA/TAE	Christophe de Langhe
GEA/Hella	Pete Bradley
GIEG/Actia	Tony Malaterre
GIEG/Capelec	Georges Petelet
RAI/TEN	Mark de Goede
STM/Automex	Rafal Grzeszczyk
Attending from 10.00 to 11.30:	
UNISYS	Marie van de Poele

1. Opening and welcome

On behalf of EGEA, the Chairman of Working Group 10, Marco Le Brun welcomed all participants to this fifth Working Group 10 meeting.

The meeting agenda was approved with the following changes:

- Point “10.1 Budget plan for 2014” was added to the agenda;
- Some “key questions” from Tony Malaterre will be discussed under point “7. Feedbacks on business model and alternative proposals”.

2. Election of a minute taker

Georges Petelet was elected to take the meeting minutes.

3. Approval of the minutes of the last Working Group 10 meeting held on 8th October in Brussels

With no further remarks, the minutes of the last WG10 meeting held on 8th October 2013 in Brussels were unanimously approved.

4. Review of the UNISYS questionnaire and WG10 feedback

Unisys sent a new version of the questionnaire yesterday evening. A new “part 0” was added.

How WG10 feedback was included:

- Test equipment manufacturers are still not listed as stakeholders.
- Other remarks are partly taken in consideration.
- Terminology is improved (e.g. “nuisance”)
- Time for responses is increased to 3 weeks.

Other comments:

- WG10 is offering to review the recipient list and to help find the right people.
- PTI centers and equipment manufacturers should be listed as stakeholders.
- ABS, EBS, Airbag, etc. could be grouped in one topic (ECSS).

5. 10.00-11.30: Meeting with UNISYS

The revised questionnaire was discussed.

Part 0 aims at identifying the target, due to the fact that each Member State is differently organized. It will be used to determine the recipient list for parts 1 and 2 that will be sent out after receiving the response to part 0.

The European Commission is supposed to make an introduction to the questionnaire.

1st target country is Netherlands (next week). After their answer, the questionnaire will be reframed if necessary.

Visits to the MS are scheduled for 1st quarter next year.

Unisys will contact the vehicle manufacturers through ACEA.

WG10 points out that test equipment manufacturers should be included as stakeholders and need access to the VIP for development and testing of their PTI solutions. Unisys agrees on this point and therefore also EGEA will receive and answer the questionnaire. Being part officially of the consultation will help our work on a communication standard and asking for funding later on, and will add emphasis on the fact that we need data for testing.

The architecture of the PTI and VIP network was discussed. WG10 showed a typical PTI network architecture diagram. Unisys showed a diagram from a document on impact assessment of the roadworthiness package that constitutes the base for the VIP architecture. The document will be distributed to WG10 (see “EGEA WG10 5th meeting.pdf” and Figure 2 at page 29 of “RoadWorthinessPackage_impact_assessment_en_swd2012_0206en01_51.pdf” attached).

As we will need access to the relevant technical information for testing ECSS, WG10 asked Unisys to list all the 24 safety relevant systems, or at least those that must be mandatorily tested in PTI. Tony Malaterre will send the ECSS list to Unisys.

Unisys will send the questionnaire files without protection, for easier comparison with the previous versions and for adding comments directly in the documents (see “MOVE-VIP-QST-001-VIP Preliminary questionnaire_Part0_v1.0_unp.docx”, “MOVE-VIP-QST-001-VIP Preliminary

questionnaire_Part1_v1 00_unp.docx” and “MOVE-VIP-QST-001-VIP Preliminary questionnaire_Part2_v1 00_unp.docx” attached).

6. Review of use cases

The updated document on use cases was reviewed; changes are marked in red (see “UseCasesEgeaWG10 V8.doc” attached).

- Use cases on ASM and Lug down test are only examples of “Generic Live Data Streaming”, so they were removed
- WG10 decided that “End of life” and “Audit trail” are not in the scope, so these use cases were removed
- Some use cases should be reworded, removing unnecessary details, in order to show more clearly how they impact on the definition and requirements of the Vehicle Test Equipment Network
- We want to cover the communication among test equipment
- We want to cover the communication to the VIP
- We want to cover the communication to the National PTI result database
- Do we want to cover the connection to the National Vehicle Register? Using a standardized “connector”?
- Initially the connectors will be defined, later the details (“pins” of those connectors).
- Actors and stakeholders should be better defined

Missing use cases to be added:

- Audit on equipment & SW version & calibration (related to quality management of the test centre)
- Camera and brake tester (event triggering, asking the camera to take the picture at the right time)
- More workshop use cases (e.g. connection to DMS)
- Offline PTI (e.g. Mobile PTI)
- Password and user identification.

Georges Petelet will do a first cleanup of the questionnaire. A small working group consisting of Martin Kammerhofer (leader), Georges Petelet and Antonio Multari will then meet by conference call and during the pre-meeting for review and further work on the document. *Note: after the meeting Pete Bradley volunteered to join the small working group on use cases.*

7. Feedbacks on business model and alternative proposals

A presentation from the French members was shown to the group, proposing a concept based on WEB services (see “EGEA WG 10_ European workshop_PTII_Exchange.pdf” attached).

Tony Malaterre presented a list of key questions that should be answered before defining a business model:

- *Who is providing what? E.g. which supplier is providing which part of the system? For example, only test equipment or PTI application*
- *What is the functionality provided by the Asanet Network Manager? What are the functionalities done by the PTI application which is Asanet Network Manager relevant?*
- *What is the level of abstraction provided:*
 - *The API*
 - *The software component.*
- *Who is paying for what?*

Ramon Amirpour explained the main features of the network manager:

- Off-line management (storage of information when components are off-line)

- Zero-configuration network: avoids configuring the webserver (plug & play). Automatic recognition of what equipment and services are available
- Assigned priorities for some web services (recommended settings)
- Mechanism to build an automatic request and query system

The network manager is much more important for small workshops where an IT manager is usually not available.

PROs and CONs of various solutions for the Network Manager (NM) were discussed; the following table contains some initial ideas from the group and need to be elaborated further and agreed upon.

	Single source NM	Multiple source NM	No NM
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simpler equipment validation (test with only one solution) • Proven, reliable implementation • Responsibility of Connector Application developer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free choice of different solutions • Local solution possible • Easier troubleshooting and debugging • ?? Clearer responsibility of Connector Application developer (if Connector application is from some source as the equipment software and/or PTI application) 	TBD
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one owner / maintainer • Support, hotline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifications need to be very detailed (including conformance test) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Configuration of web server is needed • No plug and play • No prioritization • No broadcast • No off / online management

8. Technical specifications

The interfaces and requirements for each box in the architecture diagram need to be identified.

A small working group consisting of Marco Le Brun (leader), Samuele Zoia, Tony Malaterre, Ramon Amirpour and Peter Rehberg will meet by conference call and during the pre-meeting for review and further work on the network requirements (see document "Vehicle Test Equipment Network V3.xlsx").

9. WG10 budget plan for 2014

Pete Bradley reported that in the last EGEA Board meeting it was decided that the WGs will be more project oriented. EGEA will provide service for day to day meeting management, but any additional participation of experts and other external services have to be included in a budget plan and the WG chairman will have to seek funding. The point "10.1 Budget plan for 2014" is added to the agenda.

An initial list of items was proposed by the group for inclusion in the WG10 2014 budget sheet:

- Legal advice
- External technical services
- Promotion, marketing
- Development of tools (validation, etc.)

10. Date and place of next meetings

- Martin Kammerhofer will organize a conference call of the small WG on use cases (Kammerhofer, Petelet, Multari, Bradley)
- Marco Le Brun will organize a conference call of the small WG on requirements (Le Brun, Zoia, Malaterre, Amirpour)
- 6th meeting: Brussels, 16th January 2014, 9:00-16:30 – pre-meeting on 15th, 13:00-17:30

11. Thank you and closure

The Chairman thanked all participants for an active and productive meeting.

* * *

Georges Petelet
WG10 Member

Marco Le Brun
WG10 Chairman