



BSI Standards Publication

Electronic fee collection - Charging performance

Part 2: Examination Framework

National foreword

This Published Document is the UK implementation of CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2017. It is identical to ISO/TS 17444-2:2017. It supersedes PD CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2013, which is withdrawn.

The UK participation in its preparation was entrusted to Technical Committee EPL/278, Intelligent transport systems.

A list of organizations represented on this committee can be obtained on request to its secretary.

This publication does not purport to include all the necessary provisions of a contract. Users are responsible for its correct application.

© The British Standards Institution 2018
Published by BSI Standards Limited 2018

ISBN 978 0 580 97816 6

ICS 35.240.60; 03.220.20

Compliance with a British Standard cannot confer immunity from legal obligations.

This Published Document was published under the authority of the Standards Policy and Strategy Committee on 28 February 2018.

Amendments/corrigenda issued since publication

Date	Text affected
------	---------------

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION
SPÉCIFICATION TECHNIQUE
TECHNISCHE SPEZIFIKATION

CEN ISO/TS 17444-2

November 2017

ICS 03.220.20; 35.240.60

Supersedes CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2013

English Version

**Electronic fee collection - Charging performance - Part 2:
Examination framework (ISO/TS 17444-2:2017)**

Perception du télépéage - Performance d'imputation -
Partie 2: Cadre d'examen (ISO/TS 17444-2:2017)

Elektronische Gebührenehebung -
Abbuchungsdurchführung - Teil 2:
Rahmenbedingungen für Prüfungen (ISO/TS 17444-
2:2017)

This Technical Specification (CEN/TS) was approved by CEN on 27 August 2017 for provisional application.

The period of validity of this CEN/TS is limited initially to three years. After two years all members of CEN will be requested to submit their comments, particularly on the question whether the CEN/TS can be converted into a European Standard.

CEN members are required to announce the existence of this CEN/TS in the same way as for an EN and to make the CEN/TS available promptly at national level in an appropriate form. It is permissible to keep conflicting national standards in force (in parallel to the CEN/TS) until the final decision about the possible conversion of the CEN/TS into an EN is reached.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels

European foreword

This document (CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2017) has been prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 204 “Intelligent transport systems” in collaboration with Technical Committee CEN/TC 278 “Intelligent transport systems” the secretariat of which is held by NEN.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

This document supersedes CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2013.

According to the CEN-CENELEC Internal Regulations, the national standards organizations of the following countries are bound to announce this Technical Specification: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Endorsement notice

The text of ISO/TS 17444-2:2017 has been approved by CEN as CEN ISO/TS 17444-2:2017 without any modification.

Contents

	Page
Foreword	vi
Introduction	vii
1 Scope	1
2 Normative references	1
3 Terms and definitions	2
4 Symbols and abbreviated terms	6
5 Examination Framework	7
5.1 General.....	7
5.2 Method for defining a Specific Examination Framework.....	8
5.2.1 General.....	8
5.2.2 Selection of metrics to be evaluated.....	9
5.2.3 Definition of environmental conditions and associated performance requirements.....	9
5.2.4 Determination of Required Sample Sizes.....	9
5.2.5 Selection of methods for generating Charging Input and Reference Data.....	10
5.2.6 Determination of Test Routes/Subset of Charging Network for generating representative trips.....	10
5.2.7 Documentation of the Specific Examination Framework.....	10
5.3 Sources of data.....	10
5.4 Methods of generating charging input.....	13
5.4.1 General.....	13
5.4.2 Predefined routes (identifier: “PVR”).....	14
5.4.3 Reference System (used in combination with identifiers: “PVR” and “UVR”).....	15
5.4.4 Simulated OBE/FE (identifier: “SO”).....	16
5.4.5 Dedicated OBE Testing (identifier: “DO”).....	17
5.5 Applicability of metrics scheme types.....	17
5.6 Charging Metric Selection Tables.....	22
5.6.1 General.....	22
5.6.2 DSRC Discrete.....	22
5.6.3 Autonomous Discrete.....	23
5.6.4 Autonomous Continuous.....	24
6 Examination Tests	26
6.1 Common (and DSRC Discrete) Examination Tests.....	26
6.1.1 General.....	26
6.1.2 ET-CM-E2E-1 E2E — Correct Charging Rate.....	26
6.1.3 ET-CM-E2E-2 E2E — Overcharging Rate.....	27
6.1.4 ET-CM-E2E-3 E2E — Undercharging Rate.....	27
6.1.5 ET-CM-E2E-4 E2E — Late Charging Rate.....	28
6.1.6 ET-CM-UA-1 UA — Correct Charging Rate.....	29
6.1.7 ET-CM-UA-2 UA — Overcharging Rate.....	29
6.1.8 ET-CM-UA-3 UA — Undercharging Rate.....	30
6.1.9 ET-CM-UA-4 UA — Accurate application of Payments and Refunds.....	31
6.1.10 ET-CM-UA-5 UA — Accurate Personalisation of OBUs.....	31
6.1.11 ET-CM-PC-1 PC — Correct Charging Rate.....	32
6.1.12 ET-CM-PC-2 PC — Overcharging Rate.....	32
6.1.13 ET-CM-PC-3 PC — Undercharging Rate.....	33
6.1.14 ET-CM-PC-4 PC — Latency — TC.....	34
6.1.15 ET-CM-PC-5 PC — Late Payment Claims Rate.....	34
6.1.16 ET-CM-PC-6 PC — Rejected Payment Claim Rate.....	35
6.1.17 ET-CM-BD-1 BD — Correct Charging Rate.....	35
6.1.18 ET-CM-BD-2 BD — Overcharging Rate.....	36
6.1.19 ET-CM-BD-3 BD — Undercharging Rate.....	37

6.1.20	ET-CM-BD-4 BD — Incorrect Charging Rate	37
6.1.21	ET-CM-BD-5 BD — Latency — TC	38
6.1.22	ET-CM-BD-6 BD — Late Billing Details Rate	38
6.1.23	ET-CM-BD-7 BD — Rejected Billing Details Rate	39
6.1.24	ET-CM-BD-8 BD — Incorrectly rejected Billing Details Rate	39
6.1.25	ET-CM-BD-9 BD — Inferred Billing Details Rate	40
6.2	DSRC Discrete — Optional DSRC Toll Declaration Metrics	40
6.2.1	General	40
6.2.2	ET-CM-TD-1 TD — Correct Toll Declaration Generation Rate	40
6.2.3	ET-CM-TD-2 TD — Incorrect Toll Declaration Generation Rate	41
6.2.4	ET-CM-TD-3 TD — Late Toll Declarations Rate	41
6.2.5	ET-CM-TD-4 TD — TSP Charge Parameter Change Rate	42
6.2.6	ET-CM-TD-5 TD — TSP False Positive Rate	42
6.3	Autonomous Discrete Specific Examination Tests	43
6.3.1	General	43
6.3.2	ET-CM-TD-1 TD — Correct Toll Declaration Generation Rate	43
6.3.3	ET-CM-TD-2 TD — Incorrect Toll Declaration Generation Rate	43
6.3.4	ET-CM-TD-3 TD — Late Toll Declarations Rate	44
6.3.5	ET-CM-TD-4 TD — TSP Charge Parameter Change Rate	44
6.3.6	ET-CM-TD-5 TD — TSP False Positive Rate	45
6.3.7	ET-CM-DTD-1 DTD — Correct Charging Rate (charge object detections)	45
6.3.8	ET-CM-DTD-2 DTD — Incorrect Charge Event Recognition Rate	46
6.3.9	ET-CM-DTD-3 DTD — Missed Charge Object Detection Rate	46
6.3.10	ET-CM-DTD-4 DTD Overcharging Rate	47
6.3.11	ET-CM-CR-1 CR — Correct Charge Report Generation Rate	47
6.3.12	ET-CM-CR-2 CR — Incorrect Charge Report Generation Rate	48
6.3.13	ET-CM-CR-3 CR — Charge Report Latency	48
6.3.14	ET-CM-CR-4 CR — TSP Front End Charge Parameter Change Rate	49
6.3.15	ET-CM-CR-5 CR — TSP Front End False Positive Rate	49
6.3.16	ET-CM-DCR-1 DCR — Correct Charging Rate (charge object detections)	50
6.3.17	ET-CM-DCR-2 DCR — Incorrect Charge Event Recognition Rate	50
6.3.18	ET-CM-DCR-3 DCR — Missed Charge Object Detection Rate	51
6.3.19	ET-CM-DCR-4 DCR — Overcharging rate (Incorrect false positive Charge Event Recognition)	51
6.4	Autonomous Continuous Specific Examination Tests	52
6.4.1	General	52
6.4.2	ET-CM-TD-1 TD — Correct Toll Declaration Generation Rate	52
6.4.3	ET-CM-TD-2 TD — Incorrect Toll Declaration Generation Rate	52
6.4.4	ET-CM-TD-3 TD — Late Toll Declarations Rate	53
6.4.5	ET-CM-TD-4 TD — TSP Charge Parameter Change Rate	53
6.4.6	ET-CM-TD-5 TD — TSP False Positive Rate	54
6.4.7	ET-CM-CTD-1 CTD Correct Charging Rate	54
6.4.8	ET-CM-CTD-2 CTD Overcharging Rate	55
6.4.9	ET-CM-CTD-3 CTD Accuracy of Distance/Time Measurement	55
6.4.10	ET-CM-CR-1 CR — Correct Charge Report Generation Rate	56
6.4.11	ET-CM-CR-2 CR — Incorrect Charge Report Generation Rate	56
6.4.12	ET-CM-CR-3 CR — Charge Report Latency	57
6.4.13	ET-CM-CR-4 CR — TSP Front End Charge Parameter Change Rate	57
6.4.14	ET-CM-CR-5 CR — TSP Front End False Positive Rate	58
6.4.15	ET-CM-CCR-1 CCR — Correct Charging Rate	58
6.4.16	ET-CM-CCR-2 CCR — Overcharging Rate	59
6.4.17	ET-CM-CCR-3 CCR — Accuracy of Distance/Time Measurement	59
	Annex A (informative) Examination Test documentation template	61
	Annex B (informative) Examination Framework considerations	62
	Annex C (informative) Statistical considerations	66

Annex D (informative) Methods for reducing sample sizes for very high/low probability metrics during the Evaluation Phase	72
Annex E (informative) Example-specific Examination Frameworks	76
Bibliography	93

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see www.iso.org/patents).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation on the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see the following URL: www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

This document was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 204, *Intelligent transport systems*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first edition (ISO/TS 17444-2:2013), which has been revised with the following changes:

- editorial and formal corrections, as well as changes, to improve readability;
- updated terminology.

A list of all parts in the ISO/TS 17444 series can be found on the ISO website.

Introduction

Electronic tolling systems are complex distributed systems involving critical technology such as dedicated short-range communication (DSRC) and global navigation satellite systems (GNSS), both subject to a certain random behaviour that may affect the computation of the charges. Thus, in order to protect the interests of the different involved stakeholders, in particular Service Users and Toll Chargers, it is essential to define metrics that measure the performance of the system as far as computation of charges is concerned and ensure that the potential resulting errors in terms of size and probability are acceptable. These metrics will be an essential tool when establishing requirements for the systems and also for examination of the system capabilities both during acceptance and during the operational life of the system.

In addition, in order to ensure the interoperability of different systems, it will be necessary to agree on common metrics to be used and on the actual values that define the required acceptable performances although this is not covered in this document.

This document is defined as a toolbox standard of examination tests plus a method for defining and documenting Specific Examination Frameworks to meet specific needs. The detailed choice of the set of examination tests within an Examination Framework depends on the application and the respective context. Compliance with this specification is understood as using the definitions and prescriptions laid out in this document whenever the respective system aspects are subjected to performance measurements, rather than using other definitions and examination methods than the ones specified in this document.

ISO/TS 17444-1 defines a set of charging performance metrics with appropriate definitions, principles and formulations, which together make up a reference framework for the establishment of requirements for EFC systems and their later examination of the charging performance.

These charging performance metrics are intended for use with any toll scheme, regardless of its technical underpinnings, system architecture, tariff structure, geographical coverage, or organizational model. They are defined to treat technical details that may be different among technologies as a “black box”. They focus solely on the outcome of the charging process, i.e. the amount charged in relation to a pre-measured or theoretically correct amount, rather than intermediate variables from various components as sensors, such as positioning accuracy, signal range, or optical resolution. This approach ensures comparable results for each metric in all relevant situations.

The metrics are designed to cover the information exchanged on the front-end interface and the interoperability interfaces between Toll Service Providers and Toll Chargers, as well as information on the end-to-end level.

Metrics for the following information exchanges are defined:

- Charge Reports;
- Toll Declarations;
- Billing Details and associated event data;
- Payment Claims on the level of user accounts;
- End-to-End Metrics which assess the overall performance of the charging process.

The proposed metrics are specifically addressed to protect the interests of the actors in a toll system, such as Toll Service Providers, Toll Chargers and Service Users. The metrics can be used to define requirements (e.g. for requests for proposals) and for performance assessment.

Toll schemes take on various forms as identified in the ISO 17575 series and ISO 14906. In order to create a uniform performance metric specification, toll schemes are grouped into two classes based on the character of their primary charging variable:

- charging based on discrete events (charges associated to the fact that a vehicle is crossing or standing within a certain zone);
- those based on a continuous measurement (duration or distance).

In all these toll schemes, tolls may additionally vary as a function of vehicle class characteristics such as trailer presence, number of axles, taxation class, operating function, and depending on time of day or day of week, such that, for example, tariffs are higher in rush hour and lower on the weekends.

With this degree of complexity, it is not surprising to find that the attempts to evaluate and compare technical solutions for Service User charging have been made uniquely each time a procurement or study is initiated, and with only limited ability to reuse prior comparisons made by other testing entities.

Examination Framework

The Examination Framework that is defined in this document is designed for measuring the metrics defined in ISO/TS 17444-1. The general aim is to achieve a maximum comparability and reproducibility of the results without restricting the technological choices in system design. Specific Examination Frameworks may be defined for the Evaluation and Monitoring Phases of a project due to the differences in the availability of equipped vehicles.

Evaluation Phase

This phase encompasses system evaluation and selection, as well as commissioning and ramp up during implementation. Important aspects of this phase are

- relatively small sample sizes, and
- well controlled behaviour of test vehicles.

Monitoring Phase

After the system has gone into operation its behaviour needs to be monitored for several reasons, such as fine-tuning of the system performance, monitoring of SLAs between contractual partners (supplier, Toll Charger, Toll Service Provider, etc.). In this phase, the following system aspects can be expected:

- very large sample sizes possible, but with unknown behaviour of the vehicles;
- in principle all measurements from implementation phase possible, too.

Readers Guide

To understand the content of this document, the reader should be aware of the methodology and assumptions used to develop the Examination Framework and associated examination tests; therefore, a suggested reading order is given below.

- [Annex A](#) provides details of the underlying considerations for developing the Examination Framework.
- [Annex C](#) provides background statistical information which will enable the reader to determine sample sizes and confidence limits based on the defined performance requirements.
- [Clause 5](#) provides the definition of the Examination Framework for the evaluation of Charging Performance.
- [Clause 6](#) contains the toolbox of Examination Tests for the evaluation of charging performance for the identified scheme types.

- e) [Annex D](#) contains methods which can be used to reduce the required sample sizes for metrics with high/low probabilities during the evaluation phase.
- f) [Annex E](#) provides examples of Specific Examination Frameworks which have been developed in accordance with the methodology in [5.2](#).

Electronic fee collection — Charging performance —

Part 2: Examination framework

1 Scope

This document defines the Examination Framework for the measurement of charging performance metrics defined in ISO/TS 17444-1 to be used during Evaluation and/or on-going Monitoring.

It specifies a method for the specification and documentation of a Specific Examination Framework which can be used by the responsible entity to evaluate charging performance for a particular information exchange interface or for overall charging performance within a Toll Scheme.

It provides a toolbox of Examination Tests for the roles of Toll Charger and Toll Service Provider for the following Scheme types:

- a) DSRC Discrete;
- b) Autonomous Discrete;
- c) Autonomous Continuous.

The detailed choice of the set of examination tests to be used depends on the application and the respective context. Compliance with this specification is understood as using the definitions and prescriptions laid out in this document whenever the respective system aspects are subjected to performance measurements, rather than using other definitions and examination methods than the ones specified in this document.

The following aspects are outside the scope of this document.

- This document does not propose specific numeric performance bounds, or average or worst-case error bounds in percentage or monetary units. Those decisions are left to the Toll Charger (or to agreements between Toll Charger and Service Provider). This document does not consider the evaluation of the expected performance of a system based on modelling and measured data from trial at another place.
- This document does not consider the specification of a common reference system which would be required for comparison of performance between systems.
- This document defines measurements only on standardized interfaces. Proprietary interfaces are excluded, because it is not possible to define standardized metrics on such system properties. These excluded interfaces are among others the link between Toll Charger RSE and central systems in DSRC systems, and the additional sensor input of GNSS modules (inertial sensors, CAN-bus for wheel ticks, etc.).

2 Normative references

There are no normative references in this document.