3GPP TSG SA Meeting #28 **SP-050372**
Quebec, Canada, 6 - 7 June 2005

Title:	**Revised Draft report of the eCall Kick Off Meeting of ETSI MSG (Sophia Antipolis, France 3 - 4 May 2004)**
Document for:	**Comments**
Source:	**ETSI Technical Officer**

César Gutiérrez Miguélez
ETSI Mobile Competence Center
cesar.gutierrez@etsi.org

Contents

1 Opening of the Meeting

Francois Courau, chairman of ETSI TC MSG, opened the meeting at 9:15 on Tuesday 3rd . He introduced himself and welcomed the participants to Sophia Antipolis.

M-05-018 Draft agenda Kick off meeting for the eCall activity (MSG Chairman)
The agenda was approved without comments

2 Reminder for IPR declaration

The chairman reminded the delegates of the obligation of ETSI members to declare any IPR they might be aware of and related to the work of the committee, and kindly asked to take the necessary actions.

> The attention of the members of this Technical Body is drawn to the fact that ETSI Members have the obligation under clause 4.1 of the ETSI IPR Policy, Annex 6 of the Rules of Procedure, to inform ETSI of Essential IPRs they become aware of. This section covers the obligation to notify its own IPRs but also other companies' IPRs.
>
> The members take note that they are hereby invited:
> - to investigate in their company whether their company does own IPRs which are, or are likely to become Essential in respect of the work of the Technical Body,
> - to notify to the Chairman or to the ETSI Director-General all potential IPRs that their company may own, by means of the IPR Information Statement and the Licensing Declaration forms that they can obtain from the ETSI Technical Officer or http://www.etsi.org/legal/IPR_database/IPRforms-V4.doc."
>
> Members are encouraged to make general IPR undertakings/declarations that they will make licenses available for all their IPRs under FRAND terms and conditions related to a specific standardization area and then, as soon as feasible, provide (or refine) detailed disclosures.

3 Discussion on preliminary Requirements

M-05-019 Letter from the Commission to ETSI The implementation of the pan-European in-vehicle emergency call (eCall): need for standards (ETSI secretariat)
M-05-020 eCall Memorandum of Understanding (ETSI secretariat)
These documents are presented for background information

M-05-030 eCall The Pan-European In-Vehicle Emergency Call (DG InfoSoc)
Emilio Davila (DG InfoSoc) presented this document
This contribution introduces the background of the eCall project and the eSafety initiative, the socio-economic benefits and the costs analysis.
Niels Andersen (Qualcomm) asked for the evolution path and how is here considered that GSM is evolving to UMTS, and whether the system will have to operate over both GSM and UMTS networks. Emilio explained that it is an issue to solve on the standardization phase. To Niels Andersen, the assumption for the terminals should be that they are dual mode. The chairman observed that whatever ends up being specified, it should be an application capable of working regardless of the transport network that lies underneath.

M-05-028 Realisation of eCall (eCall DG)

Michael Nielsen (eCall Driving Group) presented this document
This presentation introduces the basic principles for the eCall as agreed by the eSafety Forum (pan-European, Minimum Set of Data…). The objective of the work in ETSI/3GPP, to the understanding of eCall Driving Group, is also clarified:"ETSI standardisation should only aim at the simplest/most efficient (cost and time) way of conveying MSD to PSAP"

Michael clarified that the satellite positioning should be understood as the positioning found by the in-vehicle GPS and not provided by the AGPS functionality of the cellular network; the in-vehicle GPS will be running continuously. Niels Andersen (Qualcomm) asked for the privacy issue of having a tracking box active all the time, but this should be viewed as different from current GPS functionality.
For the eCall DG, it is clear that there are no requirements from the cellular network on terms of positioning, the network will only have to convey the positioning information, and this is found in the vehicle from GPS or Galileo.

Ian Harris (RIM) noted that the biggest issues with the eCall service as being presented are commercial rather than technical or standards-related. Michael reminded that there is a lot of activity in the non-technical grounds. It is clear that there are both a cost and a benefit of the service, and unfortunately today there is no model for those that have to bear the cost to get a benefit. However, these commercial issues shouldn't interfere with the standardization process.

John Meredith (ETSI Secretariat) reminded that the standards in ETSI and 3GPP are written by technical people from the member companies. If these companies see no commercial gain on engaging in the specification process, the specifications will not be written. ETSI has received the request from the Commission to produce the specifications, but it is only to ETSI members to do the work.

Ian Harris (RIM) noted that pure GPS positioning is not always the best solution for the needs of the emergency services providers. For example the case of a highway, were knowing the sense of the road makes a big difference although the geographical separation may be less than 1 m. Bob Williams (ERM TG37) argued that the scope of the work in ETSI is not to discuss on the positioning accuracy, or on better ways to provide this positioning, it is simply to transmit a set of data, coming from the vehicle, to the PSAP.

A first requirement that seems agreed is that ETSI should only specify a way to transport a certain number of bytes from the vehicle to the PSAP.

It was agreed that there is no need for the operator to send assistance data to help the in-vehicle GPS do the fix.

There was discussion on how to transmit the UUS, if used, to the PSAP. It was highlighted that the call may not go directly from the mobile operator network to the PSAP, but in some countries may have to travel through a fixed operator network. Even if it is taken as an assumption that the mobile operators upgrade their network to support UUS, it cannot however be assumed that the fixed operators will do. In this discussion, Niels Andersen asked if part of the regulatory effort would be that the cellular network will need to connect directly to the PSAP, which would simplify the standardization. Emilio Davila (DG InfoSoc) clarified that this cannot be taken as an assumption.

Niels Andersen raised the issue of what is meant by European-wide. It might imply that the terminal will have to be dual mode, GSM/UMTS. Regarding the DTMF solution, he noted that there is not 100% probability that a DTMF passes through all the networks on Europe.

After the discussions, the user requirement for ETSI/3GPP seemed clearer: to send a fixed data block, of more or less 140 bytes, from the vehicle to the PSAP which needs to be acknowledged. The delivery time should be less than X. It is not necessary that the voice call is active during the transmission of the data.

There was some debate on what would be required from PSAP operators, noting that there are about 500 PSAPs in Europe with various degrees of implementation of the current E112. From the eCall DG perspective, the solution standardized in ETSI should be implemented in the PSAPs at some point. As a requirement for MSG, it should be ensured that the eCall voice call gets to the PSAP as a normal E112 even if the PSAP hasn't upgraded to eCall. But if the PSAP is not eCall compatible, the acknowledgment mentioned above will not be delivered by the application layer. Having this in mind, there is a requirement for an acknowledgement from the transport instead of the application.

It is also agreed that there is a need for a return channel to confirm that the data has been received. However, if the PSAP hasn't upgraded to eCall yet, it will not be able to provide a response (positive or negative) Having this in mind, the requirement is to have the acknowledgement from the transport instead of the application in the PSAP.
Niels Andersen noted that it would not be necessary to standardize this acknowledgement if the solution is based on UUS, since the SS7 signalling would provide ACK, or error message if the link is broken.

M-05-027 Clarification regarding ETSI Standardization of eCall (eCall Driving Group/ ETSI Secretariat)

The document contains views and agreements in eCall DG on a list of open points identified in ETSI Secretariat as needing clarification before starting the standardization work.
The questions and answers were reviewed during the meeting as follows:

Note: The responses from eCall Driving Group quoted below have been edited from doc M-05-027.

1) Is it agreed that the eCall service will be provided over Public Land Mobile Networks or are other underlying networks still under consideration (TETRA, IEEE 802.x, satellite)?
eCall Driving Group: The members of the eCall Driving Group has agreed that only the GSM network should be used

The meeting agreed that eCall will be based on Mobile networks, GSM or UMTS

2) Is the eCall service based on a mobile terminal onboard the vehicle or it is also envisaged that the driver's mobile terminal could be used as the communications device (connected to the car via Bluetooth for example)?
eCall DG: is recommending that the in-vehicle system is a pre-fitted onboard system but is still discussing options of how to potentially make use of nomadic devices.

The meeting agreed to take as a working assumption that terminals would be pre-fitted onboard

3) Is it envisaged that vehicle units will be compulsory fit? If so, the characteristics of what has to be fitted will need to be defined. If so under what legislative base? If under the Automotive Framework Directive, it is old approach, technical requirements directly in the legislation, compulsory third-party testing... If not, will there be a regulatory requirement that vehicle units will support the features for access to emergence services? If so, the route is via the R&TTE Directive, a Commission Decision to invoke article 3.3e, and a mandate for a Harmonised Standard
eCall DG: At the moment there is no indication that the eCall system will be made mandatory with legislation behind it. The European Commission's opinion is that eCall shall be implemented on a volunteer basis just like the implementation of airbags

At this point, it is not clear whether there would be a Harmonised Standard. However, it is not an issue that impacts the specification process in ETSI

4) Will the terminals onboard have a SIM, not have a SIM, or are both scenarios to be considered?
eCall DG: No agreement yet, open point to be discussed in the standardization phase.

It was highlighted that the requirement of a pan European service means that the system should be based on SIM calls, since there are a number of countries already where SIM-less emergency call is not allowed. There seems to be a trend towards not. For 3GPP to have the correct picture of the requirements, this is a point that needs to be clarified. As an example, SIM-less calls will put out of the debate the use of gprs and most likely require an in-band solution.

Niels Andersen raised the issue of the physical conditions that the SIM will have to support in the car, like temperature and vibration. It was clarified that these issues had already been studied extensively in the car industry, even crash tests have been performed.

The issue of the implementation of the SIM concept, which in the case of normal GSM translates into the integrated circuit called UICC, was briefly discussed. The SIM functionality could be implemented in a standard plastic card with an UICC, or in another circuit.

There was some debate on the business case and the commercial reasons for mandating or not mandating the SIM. However, for the scope of the meeting here, one of the main requirements of the system is pan European applicability. Since there is a number of countries today that not allow for SIM-less emergency calls, the only way to ensure pan European service is to require the SIM.

David Barnes (DTI) explained that emergency calls without a SIM are now disabled in the U.K. upon request of the PSAP operators, who received too many false alarms.

As a way forward, it was proposed to take as a working assumption that the SIM will be used but do not discard the possibility of SIM-less calls. This approach however is not optimal, because support or not of SIM-less calls is one of the most important parameters to be accounted for in 3GPP when studying the different technical solutions. It must be noted, for example, that a SIM-less mobile is not allowed to set up a GPRS connection.

Philippe Lanney (Wavecom) noted that an option could be to modify the set up message for the emergency call for the eCall case, so that even if normal emergency calls cannot be placed without a SIM, the eCall type of emergency call would pass.

As a preliminary conclusion, it is agreed to pass to 3GPP the working assumption that the calls will be SIM based, and the eCall Driving Group will contact all the interested parties in order to confirm, as soon as possible, if the assumption is correct or calls without a SIM should be supported as well (see section 5 of this report for the conclusion on the SIM issue)

5) According to the eSafety Forum conclusions on February 2005 and to the letter from the EC received by ETSI, the necessary standards should be ready for December 2005. Should meeting this deadline be considered the fundamental criterion for the standardization work and choices?
eCall DG: The standardisation by ETSI is a key milestone in the overall action plan agreed at the eSafety Forum's High-level meeting. Any delay in the work done by ETSI will have a direct negative impact on the action plan and thus on the deployment of eCall throughout Europe.

Michael Nielsen highlighted that delays in the standardization would affect the work plan of other parties involved in the development. He noted, for example, that cars to be put in the market in 2009 will be designed next year. These parties will need to be informed as soon as it is detected that the milestones are shifted

The meeting agreed to set Dec 2009~~9~~5 as a goal, although it was accepted that there could be a slight delay due to the late starting time.

6) Will support of eCall be required from all GSM mobile operators of the 25 member states? What would be the requirement for operators with UMTS-only networks or CDMA networks? Is this required throughout the lifetime of the vehicle? Will network operators be expected to support "old" terminals installed in "old" vehicles, and if so for how long?
eCall DG: The issue is that currently the only close to full coverage mobile network is GSM, and currently it does not seem to change before deployment target of 2009. However, it is agreed that a migration plan from 2G-network to 3G-network needs to be developed.

It was agreed that the service should be provided over GSM and UMTS networks, and in order to cope with the evolution of GSM, dual mode terminals (GSM/GPRS and UMTS) should be used. There will be no requirements for cdma2000 networks as they are not meeting the same target as already deployed GSM/UMTS network.

7) September 2009 has been mentioned as the date of introduction of eCall equipped vehicles. Should this be considered the expected date for start of "commercial" operation of the service?
eCall DG: Agreed by the eCall Driving Group and the eCall Driving Group believes that this start date of the commercial operation of enriched information through service providers is not of relevance for the discussion in ETSI

Bob Williams (ERM TG37 chairman) rejected that the commercial operation (with the intervention of a Service Provider) is not of relevance for ETSI. It may not be relevant for the discussion here in MSG, but it is of relevance for the work in ETSI. From an ETSI perspective the incentive for work to be done is based on the fact that involved parties see clear incentive for them to deploy the resulting solution.

On the issue of the second data channel to the Service Provider, Niels Andersen asked why the two data set are not sent together; this two channels could be not standardized on a single go. Michael clarified that the link to the SP is subject to the commercial agreement between the car manufacturer, the user, the service provider or any other entity involved, depending on the business model. It is out of scope today to standardize that part of the service that, anyway, can be set up with a proprietary system. Furthermore, the data set to be exchanged with the SP is not yet defined.

8) Will eCall terminals be based on the minimum common GSM air interface (GSM Phase 2), or more advanced air interfaces are preferred (GPRS, UMTS)? Is the assumption that all eCall-equipped vehicles will have the same air interface?
eCall DG: It should anyway be guarantee that voice and minimum data reach the same workstation/operator at the PSAP without extra investment and complexity and even more important that the transport protocol selected for standardisation by ETSI is already implemented on a Pan-European level today. This is an issue to be solved in the standardization phase in ETSI

On the issue of the Frequency utilisation, Qualcomm provided document M-05-031, ERO INFORMATION DOCUMENTonGSM Frequency Utilisation within Europe, as background information.

In order to cope with the evolution of the mobile networks in Europe, dual mode terminals will be required. It is hence agreed that terminals will have to support GSM/GPRS & UMTS air interfaces.

9) Three proposals for the system have been made available to ETSI or ETSI committees so far, DTMF based, UUS based and USSD based. What is the status of these proposals in the eCall DG? Are they possible alternatives or is any of them endorsed or approved by eCall DG already?
eCall DG: This is an issue to be solved in the standardization phase in ETSI.
The proposals above, and the airbiquity solution presented at this meeting, should be considered as possible solutions, no technology is agreed at this point in time.
It is clarified that the DTMF has been proposed in Finland by the finnish companies working on eCall. The government hasn't mandated it, but believes that DTMF is a solution that ensures pan-european service. Finland would accept a different solution if the conclusion in the standardization bodies is not DTMF.
Companies having presented proposals are asked to come to 3GPP and raise their technical solution there. It will be up to 3GPP to decide which technology best serves the requirements.

The situation on the fixed side was raised again, as it seems that nothing can be expected from the PSAPs or the fixed line operators. However, for solutions like the UUS, upgrades on both are will be required. Niels Andersen argued that there is little point in devising a solution to work on the mobile network if nothing can be ensured from the fixed side.

10) The DTMF and USS proposals are based on a data communication from the terminal to the PSAP that is transparent to the mobile network, i.e. no network node has to process the data being transferred in any way other than to relay it towards the PSAP. Alternatively, it can be envisaged also that the terminal communicates with a network node, i. e. the operator's location server, who will use existing 3GPP/OMA protocols to convey the information to the PSAP. Has eCall DG taken a decision on what approach should be taken? If not, is there a preference?
eCall DG: this is an issue to be solved in the standardization phase in ETSI

The meeting agreed that this discussion is to be held in 3GPP, no solution can be precluded at this time.

11) What is the relation of the eCall service with the existing pan European emergency service E112, which according to the Commission Recommendation should also provide location? Should the location information produced by the vehicle in the eCall service be sent to the PSAP independently of the E112 location?
eCall DG: Both locations have to be sent to the PSAP. The mobile network operator is responsible for adding the E112 location information based on their best effort principle and within the MSD a precise location for the vehicle is available as the in-vehicle system include satellite-positioning capability. In this case the PSAP operator will receive two location information and normally the E112 location information provided by the telecom operators will act as a backup location in case that the MSD do not include the satellite based information.

The meeting agreed with the eCall DG view, location information from E112 is independent from eCall

12) Should the likelihood of an eCall delivery be 100 % or there is a failure ratio?
eCall DG: This has not been decided yet, but the reliability needs to be very high. However, there is always a failure ratio due to e.g. lack of mobile communication coverage and to “normal” lack of mobile services
The chairman reminded that emergency calls can be blocked by the network. This is for the case of disaster that would collapse the PSAP or the network itself, then only certain UE classes would be allowed to place a call.

13) Is there any back up service foreseen?

eCall DG: The existing E112 is foreseen as the backup in the case of failure of transmitting the MDS and successful establishment of the voice channel.

No comments in the meeting, eCall DG view was accepted.

14) Is eCall intended to be a subscription service?
eCall DG: The eCall System will be free of subscription, this it is not relevant for the discussion in ETSI. The issue is linked to SIM discussion, and mobile operators should be contacted before taking as an assumption that the service is free.

The group didn't reach an agreement on this point.

Points 15) to 18) relate to the Service Provider, which is agreed out of the scope of the work in MSG and 3GPP at this point.

19) Should ETSI standardization aim at the simplest way of conveying the Minimum Set of Data from the terminal to the PSAP or should the architecture be able to cope with future extensions, like an extended set of data?
20) If the second, what are the characteristics of the potential extensions? An extended data set, images, a stream of data?
eCall DG: ETSI standardisation should only aim at the simplest/most efficient (cost and time) way of conveying MSD to PSAP and ETSI should not at this moment of time take into account any additional features

The group agreed that only the transfer of the MSD is in the scope.

21) Does eCall delivery time depend on the amount of information to be sent?
eCall DG: The delivery of voice and data to the PSAP will be a stationary amount of data (MSD), which has to be delivered as fast as possible. More concretely the IVS should minimise the delay between sending the MSD and the initiation/opening of the voice call (performance criteria for this to be agreed with hardware manufacturers but less than 2 seconds is desirable). The MSD shall be available for the PSAP operator within an average of 4 seconds from sending the MSD from the IVS.

It is agreed that the response of eCall DG gives an indication on the acceptable delay, but it is better expressed as follows: "The MSD shall be available for the PSAP operator within an maximum of 4 seconds from sending the MSD from the IVS"

22) User cases
eCall DG provides a list of cases relevant for the standardization, with a detailed description and the sequence of exchanges. The cases are the following:

A) Automatic eCall where the only data is minimum set of data, no subscription to SP, the driver is able to speak.
B) Automatic eCall where the only data is minimum set of data, no subscription to SP and silent call.
C) Manual eCall where the only data is minimum set of data, no subscription to SP, driver is able to speak
D) Manual eCall where the only data is minimum set of data, no subscription to SP, silent call
E) Unit malfunction leading to false call

The group agreed to forward the user cases and sequence overviews, as background information, to 3GPP

M-05-029 Clarification of eCall requirements (ETSI EMTEL)

Ian Harris (EMTEL vice chairman) introduced this LS
EMTEL recognise that MSG is in charge of identifying the requirements of eCall within ETSI, and recommends that the solution has a minimum impact on standardisation activities as well as on technical enhancements/improvements on existing networks. EMTEL also reminds that no technical solution should be precluded at this point in time.

Ian asked that EMTEL is kept informed of the progress, since the group deals with other aspects of emergency communications and in order to avoid divergences.

It was asked also if the groups in copy of this LS will be kept informed also. Since the work will most likely take place in 3GPP, the 3GPP groups will be informed directly. As a general approach to disseminate the agreements of the meeting, it was preferred to circulate this meeting report to the relevant groups.

M-05-021 eCall Discussion Paper (Ministry of Transport and Communications Finland)
M-05-022 Status Report of eCall in Finland (Ministry of Transport and Communications Finland)
Anu Lamberg (Ministry of Transport and Communications Finland) presented these documents
The finnish administration departed from the following principles:
1. Vehicle to PSAP communications are implemented using existing communications technologies, networks and standards
2. Service centre to PSAP messaging is secure and, at the same time, enables free EU-wide competition of service centre business
3. EU-wide interoperability of terminals is ensured by creating an EU-level terminal certification procedure
4. EU member states agree on a rapid EU-wide interoperable implementation of eCall at PSAPs
5. eCall terminal will be made mandatory on all vehicles in a rapid schedule

And in order to reach these goals, the Finnish administration believes that DTMF is the best solution.

It is noted that the MDS used in the Finnish trial is only 19 bytes long, compared with the 140 required by eCall DG.

M-05-026 eCall Initiative (Airbiquity)
Kamyar Moinzadeh (Airbiquity) presented this document
Airbiquity introduces its software modem that allows for in-band transfer of data through any of the codecs used today in mobile networks. Airbiquity technology has been chosen by the North American OnStar system, which provides a functionality similar to eCall.
Kamyar clarified that the code has been tested with the Adaptative Multi Rate codec. The chairman observed that the bitrate of the AMR changes with the conditions of the radio, and asked what would be the impact of these changes in the modem. Kamyar clarified that the modem will adapt with the codec, and when the codec goes to lower bitrates, it will also slow down its data rate and add more correction.

The meeting concluded on a set of high level requirements and agreed to send them to 3GPP. See section 5 below for the final version of the requirements.

4 Organization of the work

M-05-024 Introduction to ETSI & 3GPP. Organization, working procedures, legal considerations (ETSI secretariat)
Cesar Gutierrez (technical officer) presented this document
The chairman further clarified that consensus is required in 3GPP to approve a new Work Item (in addition to 4 supporting members), whereas in ETSI it is enough to have the 4 supporting companies

M-05-023 MSG Work Item on eCall: WI Sheet and Draft ES (ETSI secretariat)
John Meredith (ETSI Secretariat) presented these documents
The WI Sheet and a preliminary draft for the ES were distributed in MSG mailing list on 15/2/2005.
The need for an ETSI deliverable, on the view of the discussions held, is to be reassessed. In John's view, an ETSI TS would be beneficial as a way of recollect a list of 3GPP specifications required for the eCall and could be used as a reference by the Commissions to what is needed for the system.
Another argument for having an ETSI document is that the work may involve also modifications to fixed line specifications under control of TISPAN. And since MSG has been appointed as the coordination point for the ETSI groups involved, it seems logic to have it produced in this group.

There was also some debate on what type of ETSI deliverable would be more appropriate. It was noted that EMTEL had gone through a similar discussion for their requirements documents, concluding to have a TS. Motorola and TMobile preferred to go for a TS instead of an ES, not seeing the need to involve the whole ETSI membership, and will also imply additional delay.

Since the work will take place in 3GPP, and the main intention of the ETSI deliverable is to recollect the 3GPP specifications need to implement the system, it was preferred to wait until the work in 3GPP is more advanced before starting the ETSI Work Item. Also, the fourth supporting company couldn't be found during the meeting, hence approval cannot take place now.

Concerning the future meetings, and once that it has been accepted that 3GPP will take care of the technical work, there is only a need for follow up meetings within ETSI. It is agreed that MSG will have an Ad Hoc meeting in October (tentatively scheduled for 10 – 11 October, location to be decided). Such meeting will have the same characteristics of this Kick off, i.e. open to non members and coordination point for the eCall activity in ETSI.

5 Agreed requirements and output to 3GPP

M-05-032 Draft LS to 3GPP (Chairman)
Francois Courau (MSG Chairman) presented this LS
The intention of the LS is to provide 3GPP the requirements agreed in the meeting. The LS was edited on line and a revision in provided in M-05-033.

It was suggested to copy TISPAN and EMTEL. Since this meeting is a joint Ad Hoc for all ETSI groups involved, this was not found necessary. TISPAN will be liaised by 3GPP, given that impact to fixed line specifications is to be expected, although this will only happen at a later stage.

Later in the meeting the eCall DG confirmed that calls with out a SIM will not need to be supported. But together with this confirmantion, a new requirement was presented: it shall be possible to place the call through a terminal not pre-fitted in the vehicle, the driver's personal terminal for example. The car and the terminal would be connected with Bluetooth.

This new requirement raised objections, as the capability of the Bluetooth radio link for what the eCall needs to be checked.
It is noted that this requirements would pose additional constraints for the choice of a solution in 3GPP, since it will have to be ensured that any normal user terminal can be used, and not simply a new, eCall-specific model of terminal.
Also, it may happen that the car links to any Bluetooth capable phone in the surroundings of the car, hence using somebody else's phone. In any case, this would mean that the system relies on a standard that is not under the control of 3GPP or ETSI.

As a way forward, and given that this requirement was presented late during the meeting and could not be discussed extensively, it will not be added to the LS but it will be mentioned as an open point when the LS is presented in 3GPP.

The actual size of the MDS was discussed, it was not clear whether it was 20 bytes, 140 bytes or something in between. It seems that these figures are based on the capabilities of the solutions that have been presented so far (DTMF, USS) and not necessarily coming from the requirements of the users. Michael Nielsen (eCall DG) agreed to provide the figure concluded by the studies in eMerge by Wednesday 11th.

The LS in M-05-033 will be edited to confirm that calls without SIM will not need to be supported, and to introduce the number of bytes in the MSD to be provided by Michael. The final version that will be sent to 3GPP will also be made available as M-05-035.

The requirements are finally agreed as follows:

The requirement is to send a fixed data block (MSD, Minimum Set of Data), of more or less [XX bytes], from the vehicle to the PSAP, at the same time that the emergency call is placed. The data needs to be acknowledged, hence there shall be return channel. It is not necessary that the voice call is active during the transmission of the data, the MSD shall be available for the PSAP operator within a maximum of 4 seconds from sending the MSD from the IVS.
The acknowledgement shall be done at the transport layers and not the application layers, so that the system is compatible with a PSAP that has not yet implemented the eCall functionality.
The terminal shall be dual mode GSM/GPRS and UMTS (WCDMA) in order to ensure full European coverage during the lifetime of the car.
The solution shall seek minimal impact on all nodes involved in the transfer of information, that is, in the mobile network and the fixed network possibly used between the mobile network and the PSAP node.
3GPP should aim at finishing the specification by December 2005.
The solution shall work on all European GSM/3G networks (pan European solution, full roaming capability)

SIM/USIM shall be present owing to the fact that the SIM/USIM presence is already mandatory is several EU countries for Emergency Calls.

Additional Clarification
The source of the information in the MSD will be the vehicle, the content and the method for obtaining this information is outside of the scope of this study. The mobile network will simply provide means of transferring the data. Other aspects of Emergency calls are not expected to be modified.

To achieve the requirement, no technical solution is precluded or recommended.

---

6 Any other Business

M-05-034 ICT innovation and Architecture Standardisation: a new approach to provide integrated and interoperable ITS services (UNINFO)

Natalino Curci (UNINFO) presented this document.

7 Close of the meeting

The chairman closed the meeting at 13:00. He thanked the participants for their work and remarked that the meeting has successfully achieved its goal of getting together the interested parties, agreeing on a set of requirements, and starting the standardization process.

Annex A: List of Documents

All meeting documents can be found at:
http://portal.etsi.org/docbox/msg/MSG/MSG_eCall_kickoff/

Document	Title	Source
M-05-018	Draft agenda Kick off meeting for the eCall activity	MSG Chairman
M-05-019	Letter from the Commission to ETSI The implementation of the pan-European in-vehicle emergency call (eCall): need for standards	ETSI secretariat
M-05-020	eCall Memorandum of Understanding	ETSI secretariat
M-05-021	eCall Discussion Paper	Ministry of Transport and Communications Finland
M-05-022	Status Report of eCall in Finland	Ministry of Transport and Communications Finland
M-05-023	MSG Work Item on eCall: WI Sheet and Draft ES	ETSI secretariat
M-05-024	Introduction to ETSI & 3GPP. Organization, working procedures, legal considerations	ETSI secretariat
M-05-025	3GPP SA1 Work Item Description Sheet: Transferring of emergency Call data (S1-050536)	ETSI secretariat
M-05-026	eCall Initiative	Airbiquity
M-05-027	Clarification regarding ETSI Standardization of eCall	eCall Driving Group/ ETSI Secretariat
M-05-028	Realisation of eCall	ERTICO
M-05-029	Clarification of eCall requirements	ETSI EMTEL
M-05-030	eCall The Pan-European In-Vehicle Emergency Call	DG InfoSoc
M-05-031	ERO INFORMATION DOCUMENTonGSM Frequency Utilisation within Europe Updated: March 2004	Qualcomm
M-05-032	Draft LS to 3GPP	Chairman
M-05-033	Revised LS to 3GPP	MSG
M-05-034	ICT innovation and Architecture Standardisation: a new approach to provide integrated and interoperable ITS services	UNINFO
M-05-035	Final version of the LS to 3GPP	MSG

Annex B: List of participants

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Email
Andersen	Niels Peter Skov	QUALCOMM EUROPE S.A.R.L.	npa@qualcomm.com
Barnes	David	DTI - Department of Trade and Industry	david@barnesdavid.com
Björkman	Johan	T-Trac AB/ SIS TK 255	johan.bjorkman@t-trac.se
Büchter	Martin	T-Mobile International AG	martin.buechter@t-mobile.de
Butscheidt	Holger	BUNDESMINISTERIUM FUR WIRTSCHAFT	holger.butscheidt@regtp.de
Callmer	Peter	Telefon AB LM Ericsson	peter.callmer@ericsson.com
CAYET	Stephan	PSA PEUGEOT CITROËN	stephan.cayet@MPSA.com
Courau	François	ALCATEL S.A.	francois.courau@alcatel.fr
Craik	Gavin	ETSI Secretariat	gavin.craik@etsi.org
Curci	Natalino	UNINFO/Autostrade per l'Italia SpA	n.curci@polidream.it
Davila Gonzalez	Emilio	European Commission	emilio.davila-gonzalez@cec.eu.int
DE HAAN	Hans	ITO	
de Montravel	Charles	ALCATEL S.A.	charles.de_montravel@alcatel.com
DIAZ	ALEJANDRA	TELEFONICA MOVILES	diaz_a4@tsm.es
Dietz	Ulrich	VODAFONE Group Plc	ulrich.dietz@vodafone.com
Dijkstra	Jelte	CEN - Comité Européen de Normalisation	jelte.dijkstra@nen.nl
Doig	Ian	MOTOROLA S.A.S	ian.doig@motorola.com
Friis	Jørgen	ETSI Secretariat	jorgen.friis@etsi.org
Gutierrez Miguelez	Cesar	ETSI Secretariat	cesar.gutierrez@etsi.org
Harris	Ian	Research In Motion Limited	iharris@rim.com
Hong	Leon	Airbiquity Incorporated	lhong@airbiquity.com
Howell	Andrew	MOTOROLA Ltd	andrew.howell@motorola.com
Julien	Christian	ETSI Secretariat	christian.julien@etsi.org
Krappel	Alfred	MOTOROLA GmbH	alfred.krappel@motorola.com
Kymalainen	Kimmo	ETSI Secretariat	kimmo.kymalainen@etsi.org
Lamberg	Anu	Ministry of Transport and Communications	anu.lamberg@mintc.fi
Lanney	Philippe	WAVECOM SA	philippe.lanney@wavecom.com
Latvala	Ari	EC - European Commission	ari.latvala@cec.eu.int
Leijon	Mattias	Wirelesscar	mattias.leijon@wirelesscar.com
Lilja	Martin	Autoliv Electronics Europe	martin.lilja@autoliv.com
Lindholm	Rasmus	ERTICO SC	r.lindholm@mail.ertico.com
MARTIN	Francis	Bureau de Normalisation Automobile	francis.martin@bn-auto.com
Meredith	John M	ETSI Secretariat	john.meredith@etsi.org
MINAEV	Igor	ETSI Secretariat	igor.minaev@etsi.org
Moinzadeh	Kamyar	Airbiquity Incorporated	kmoinzadeh@airbiquity.com
Mulligan	Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org
NIELSEN	Michael	ERTICO Intelligent Transports Systems Europe	m.nielsen@mail.ertico.com
Raviglione	Cesare	UNINFO / ISMB	raviglione@ismb.it
Rihet	Chantal	ETSI Secretariat	chantal.rihet@etsi.org
Robinson	Rhys	TruePosition Inc.	rrobinson@TruePosition.com
Rosagaray	Dalia	7 LAYERS AG	Dalia.Rosagaray@7layers.de
Sampson	Nick	ORANGE SA	nick.sampson@orange.co.uk
Sharpe	Michael	ETSI Secretariat	michael.sharpe@etsi.org
Wählen	Reinhard	MOTOROLA GmbH	reinhard.waehlen@motorola.com
Weinstock	Richard	YGOMI LLC	weinstock@ygomi,com
Williams	Bob	Low Power Radio Association (LPRA)	BW_CSI@compuserve.com
Wolfien	Gerhard	telmacon GmbH	g.wolfien@telmacon.com
Zijlstra	Guus	ITO	guus.zijlstra@isc.politie.nl
Zoicas	Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	adrian.zoicas@etsi.org