

Workshop 6 (W6): 2 November 2021

Session 1 (S1): 1400 UTC

Session 2 (S2): 2200 UTC

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W6S1	9:17:27	178	P2	[Slide 6] End-to-end certificates are needed.		Agreed, all rules should be signed by the translator and the disseminator
W6S1	9:20:27	179	P2	[Slide 7] What is an AV here?		We have changed this to "ADS-equipped vehicle"
W6S1	9:22:49	180	P2	ISO/SAE PAS 22736		Agreed, the formal standard will use formal terms and will have adequate review to ensure proper usage. This is a workshop that is likely to involve participants that are not familiar with "standards speak" and we need to accommodate the broader usage of terminology.
W6S1	9:25:50	181	P2	[Slide 8] Please avoid using AV.		We have changed this to "ADS-equipped vehicle"
W6S1	9:28:49	182	P2	[Slide 10] What is partial METR support"		As graphically depicted on the slide, it is where a METR system is able to provide some rules to a user for a particular location but not other rules. For example, it might provide speed limits but not more generic unposted rules, such as seat belt usage laws.

W6S1	9:29:29	183	P2	METR cannot be in force in this case.		As discussed on the call, as long as METR supports all rules within a category, it would be trustworthy and useful. To extend our example, as long as METR was able to report all speed limits for a location (e.g., default, route specific, and temporary, such as work zone) then the information can be considered trustworthy and used for a speed regulator function even if there is no information provided for seat belt usage (and METR makes clear that it does not provide rules related to seat belt usage)
W6S1	9:37:15	184	P2	[Slide 11] How can METR process managers [or central authorities] know there is no coverage in an area?		Agreed that the managers at central might not know about all communication coverage issues, but here we are talking about geographical coverage of the METR rules. The central managers should be aware of what geographical areas are covered by METR rules.
W6S1	9:54:23	185	P2	[Slide 14] METR should enable METR process managers to respect local laws.		Based on our conversations, we have concluded that METR should convey, as closely as possible, the laws as adopted by the jurisdictions. Ideally, the laws adopted by hierarchical agencies will not conflict and will provide clear rules of precedence - but we do not have control over these authorities and any conflicts that arise will need to be solved by the legal system.

W6S1	9:59:48	186	P2	METR must provide a complete and correct set of rules for the area.		Agreed that the rules provided by METR should be complete for a defined "domain" (e.g., geographic and functional scope) and accurately represent the laws that the jurisdictions have passed.
W6S1	10:04:40	187	P2	[What should user do when encountering physical infrastructure that conflicts with received electronic regulations?] Respect the law		The conversation concluded that METR should accurately convey rules as much as possible. When any conflict is discovered, they should be reported and it is left to the user/user system to determine the best real-time response. For example, if a speed limit sign goes missing the user/user system will have to determine if it is better to use the default speed limit or what it believes is the intended posted speed. METR should not define hard guidelines here as different jurisdictions might have different legal interpretations.
W6S1	10:11:45	188	P2	[Slide 15] Why is C-ITS outside the METR system?		This is a semantical debate as what is "C-ITS data"; we are now avoiding the use of this term and preferring "dynamic data" and we agree that dynamic data potentially includes information from the METR structure (i.e., established by a regulator and sent via a disseminator). We have changed the slide to read "Often originates from a source outside of the METR system".

W6S1	10:25:52	189	P2	[Slide 16] When in conflict, "push data always overrides" is ambiguous.		Agreed, revised statement to read: "Push data always takes precedence over pull data"
W6S1	10:26:46	190	P2	[Slide 17] Hybrid communications will be much more complex.		Understood that hybrid communications are discussed in several standards but we do not need to describe the full complexity of issues within METR. For the purposes of METR we are primarily focused on the latency issues and based on our discussions are changing the "short range wireless" and "cloud" terms to "low latency" and "high latency".
W6S1	10:32:43	191	P3	In Europe Hybrid is used for describing communication either using short range (Wi-Fi) or long range mobile based systems (3G/4G LTE/5G)		Agreed; we have revised our terms to "low latency" and "high latency" to emphasize the distinction that the ConOps needs to identify.
W6S1	10:42:09	192	P2	timestamps?		Low latency communication requirements occur when users need to be aware of information shortly after the information changes. For example, when a police officer closes a lane of traffic, the vehicle needs to be able to immediately become aware of the information; receipt of the notice 10 minutes later with an old timestamp does not fulfil the user need.

W6S1	10:43:18	193	P4	[Slide 18] is there a concept of location accuracy requirements - i.e. especially for parking restrictions - so the concept of METR needs to set a constraint with respect to location accuracy - - just a thought		METR will need to convey rules and the locations that they are associated with (e.g., the extents of a parking restriction, a.k.a. a geofence). From the ConOps perspective, we do not need to worry about the accuracy requirements in detail, just that they are provided. It will then be up to each vehicle to determine its location and match it against the received METR rule. Once we get into requirements definition, these issues will become more pertinent.
W6S1	10:44:43	194	P5	Why speed limit is considered short range" ? same for ad hoc on-scene/planned response mostly these use cases also are not clear to me" Speed limit may be assigned for predefined times and do not need low latency in general even when dynamically set variable speed limit should be assigned and kept for some time, not switched with high frequency	P2: Why can variable speed limits only be provided through short range"?"	The note at the bottom of the slide points out that we are not attempting to assign flows to specific types of communications; rather this slide is only attempting to depict types of patterns that might exist to see if we need to use particular terms. In other words, is there ever a need to send dynamic data over pull mechanisms. Does pull ever need to support low latency. The data types are examples to think about the different uses. Agreed that under some conditions a variable speed limit could be handled via a high latency pull system IF all users entering the variable speed limit section will have been informed of the new speed limit in a timely fashion.
W6S1	10:55:39	195	P2	Please look at CEN ISO/TS 17426 Contextual speeds		Thank you; We will review this standard

W6S2	17:39:55	196	P6	[Slide 15] Digital Commentary Driving - https://www.bsigroup.com/en-GB/about-bsi/media-centre/press-releases/2021-press-releases/june/digital-commentary-driving-the-new-safety-technique-that-can-help-put-automated-vehicles-on-our-roads/		Agreed that this is an interesting development for the operation and management of ADS-equipped vehicles, but it does not appear that it will have any impact on METR itself but we can mention this in the ConOps as a part of an operational scenario.
------	----------	-----	----	---	--	--