

CIT/G101611/JMA

Geneva, 20 October 2011

IRU POSITION ON INTELLIGENT VEHICLE SYSTEMS

unanimously adopted by the IRU International Commission on Technical Affairs (CIT) on 6 September 2011 in Helsinki

Revised IRU Position on Intelligent Vehicle Systems.

I. ANALYSIS

Service applications for improving road safety are so-called Driver Assistance Systems consisting of e.g. advanced driving assistance systems (ADAS), Electronic Stability Control (ESC), Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC), Advanced Emergency Braking System (AEBS), Lane Departure Warning System (LDWS), eCall (emergency call) and road charging, fleet and supply chain management, electronic fee collection and pay as you drive insurance.

All relevant safety aspects proving that the application of those systems is not appropriate to the vehicles or classes of vehicles concerned should be taken into account.

II. IRU POSITION

The IRU is in favour of Intelligent Vehicle Systems for the road transport sector (e.g. advanced safety features) as long as they provide significant measurable *safety, environmental and economic benefits*.

For efficient and smart road transport operations, Intelligent Vehicle Systems:

- should be carefully analysed prior to any implementation in order to avoid any misinterpretation of the *real needs* of the market and *consequences* on the road transport industry as a whole;
- must be *standardised, harmonised and interoperable* (e.g. measurement methods and radio frequencies of TPMS should be harmonised to increase clarity and transparency for operators active internationally);
- should be used on a *voluntary* basis if they have not yet become mandatory;
- must be applied to the *right classes of vehicles* (e.g. some classes of M2, M3, N2 and N3, should be exempt from the obligation to install AEBS and LDWS);
- must be coupled with the *appropriate equipment* (e.g. AEBS needs radar equipment and proper detection areas and levelling by the vehicles rear air suspension) and *adequate infrastructure* (e.g. refilling stations for TPMS);
- should be *automatically turned off* in specific circumstances (city traffic conditions) and drivers should not decide when or how to switch these safety systems off;

IRU
P
O
S
I
T
I
O
N

- should be coupled with *appropriate* and *regular training*; and
- must not remove the *driver's responsibilities* (e.g. liability and reliability of the technology used should be included in the development process).

* * * * *