Customer Meeting Report

Customer: Rameez Ismail – 7/12/2016

## Attendees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Present |
| Rameez (Customer) | Yes |
| Davide | Yes |
| Sharad | Yes |
| Raymond | Yes |
| Anshuman | Yes |
| Bilgehan | Yes |
| Ryaan | Yes |
| Kostantinos | Yes |
| Akshay | Yes |
| Judith (PD Evaluation) | Yes |

# Agenda points:

Green: Done, Yellow: Partly Done, Red: Not covered

## CAFCR (Mainly the C and A view) & Expectations of NXP & Rameez

From the meeting we were able to clear our doubts about the C view of CAFCR, mainly about the key drivers of the project. Here are the main points regarding these two agenda points

1. **Our main stakeholder in this phase is Gerardo from NXP**
   1. Rameez (“NXP Customer”) is mostly interested in the second and third phase
   2. We should contact him (and another guy from NXP) via email in order to ask questions regarding functional safety
2. **The main aim and expectations of NXP**
   1. To have software & functional safety requirements for ADAS applications implemented in their hardware.
   2. They are mainly interested about the Functional Safety part in this phase.
3. **The main aim and expectations of Rameez**

He suggested us a close collaboration with him, in the second part of the project, in particular:

* 1. He is going to implement the LKA vision part (from image to labelled images)
  2. He wants us to deal with the **safety requirements and the lateral control part.** He suggests to decouple the vision from the control, our system has to work with already labelled images
  3. Requirements also at the vision level are also important for him.
  4. He will also use our Design Document (he prefers SysML)

1. **The main aim of Gijs**
   1. He wants an LKA Demo as a first step, and a fully automated car in the long term
   2. Safety is a collateral goal

## Application of the ISO (We have a few questions after the lecture with Arash)

We didn’t cover this point, Rameez is not an expert on functional safety

## Questions for Rameez:

* **Importance of NCAP – Hard reqs or soft reqs?**

Not an answer from Rameez.

* **ESC Regulation – No ESC points scoring after 2016**

ESC is a mandatory function, but out of scope. We should introduce the safety requirements but assuming the function is there on the car.

* **Delegation of higher ASIL to the ESC?**

Not an answer from Rameez. Extra consideration: According to Arash we should avoid delegating higher ASIL to these systems from the next review of ISO

* **Difference in ALKA and LDWS wrt functionality and warning signals**

LDWS is out of scope, we should keep the car in the center of the lane, all the time. We should introduce the requirements related to it but assume it is already implemented in the car.

* **HMI – soft reqs or suggestions?**

Don’t focus on the HMI, those are mainly part of the LDWS. Our main concern is with the other requirements.

* **Use of the ALKA system for NXP and Rameez?**

ALKA is the final project of Rameez. His main objective is implementation of ALKA on the Bluebox. He also mentioned that Jos den Ouden is responsible for the Prius components. The high level supervisor for ALKA and ACC should be coordinated when the final implementation is happening.

* **How can we help Rameez in his work? What is the significance of our work for him?**

## Look above, first agenda point

## Communication with the Stakeholders

**Gerardo and ?**

They are the main stake holders for the first phase. **The communication should happen via email**

**Rameez**

He can help us a little, but he is not an expert on Functional Safety, he suggested us to **schedule weekly meetings in the Implementation phase.** He will be here at TU/e only on Wednesdays in this phase, but during the implementation he will spend most of his time here.

**Gijs**

**Keep the communication to the minimum necessary**, he is very busy and doesn’t know much about functional safety anyway. His interest on the topic is collateral, not in his main focus

**Jos Den Ouden**

For hardware components related to Prius and ALKA.

## Extra Information from the Meeting

*NOTE: If you have extra information add it here*

Implementation has to be on the Bluebox, otherwise NXP won’t be happy