*FIRST DRAFT, DO NOT CIRCULATE...*

**Motivation & problem space**

The Vehicle Signal Specification proposal has been active since at least

early 2016, where it outlined the intention to produce standard data

descriptions among different car brands.

Its original focused on the fact that the data signals on CAN tended to be

completely proprietary and different among every car vendor.

This may have led to the misunderstanding that it would stand or fall on

the condition of car OEMs being able to use the exact same CAN network

standards.

- As we will see later, a standard like VSS is not only for the low-level

network but also for other data exchange across cars, and cloud-based

application.

- APIs and agreements are needed on other levels of systems than the

low-level CAN bus

- Translations/mappings are possible from one level to another - thus if

CAN networks are not speaking VSS signals directly, they can still be

mapped into those.

- In-car networks are changing in parallell, which in any case may replace

CAN with Ethernet/TCP-IP style communication, or other types of

vehicle-buses that \*anyhow\* require a different encoding of data in signals

since they are not based on the specific size limit imposed by CAN frames.

In such cases, having a specification of standard data can help.

The proprietary nature of CAN buses is still a reality today, and a

challenge to change since it incurs significant cost and involves large

parts of the OEM electrical engineering departments that rely on the signal

standards.

Of course, more standardization may over time reduce development cost and

concerns, but in the shorter time it might incur an expense.

Unfortunately the (perceived) focus on CAN signals has led to some fairly

vague concerns hampering the uptake of VSS in the beginning, which is

thankfully changing now.

It is possible that additional non-technical (business strategy) concerns

were hampering the project because there was unclarity to what extent

companies would release control over what they have (or take on a major

effort to adjust what they have).

Concerns among OEMs included the current situation of CAN buses being

generally accessible (through ODB2-port or similar) and that the idea that

the proprietary nature of signals was preventing unauthorized access to

OEM-only features. Some such features might have a minor to medium impact

(boosting engine power) or serious impact (unlocking cars and

start-prevention systems with the intention of theft). Keeping data

definitions secret has of course been very ineffective as a prevention,

since the knowledge of many OEM-proprietary signals exist among

proponents of both legal and illegal activities and tooling.

It was however clear early on that regardless of the possibility to make

CAN and similar networks adhere to a standard, standardizing the data

descriptions using VSS or similar would still open up for programming

standards on other levels, both within the car (application API) and

outside (big data exchange, cloud/web applications or other)

It is essentially /required/ to have some kind of data API if data is to be

used by applications. Therefore, this would be useful, perhaps even

necessary, to define even if there is a translation required from the CAN

level to this API level. If the desire is there to create a 3rd party

application development ecosystem, then those developers would likely

require some standardization of those APIs so that they are not different

everywhere. This makes a standard like VSS useful as a definition of a

shared API, regardless if

\*\*\*\*\* Rework this

First, that the work on a common standard is challenging and in certain

cases. The key in this project, as with others, is to separate the

technical concerns from the possibility to control

It is possible that non-technical (business strategy) concerns were

hampering the project because there was unclarity to what extent companies

would release control over what they have (or take on a major effort to

adjust what they have).

\*\*\*\*\*

The usage of VSS as an underlying signal description database in the

protocol work by W3C Automotive Working group have also proven in practice

that the idea behind the hierarchical data description of VSS goes beyond

the low-level signalling buses like CAN.

The licensing of VSS is unique in that it started from the beginning with a

well-known free and open-source license. Since the signal specification

definition was mostly perceived as a document, a permissive

Creative-Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license was used whereas some of the

software had other licenses. This was later unified and the project now

continues under one single license, namely the Mozilla Public License, v2

(MPLv2). Using this style of open-source ensures maximum usability of the

specification by all companies and this can be an advantage for companies

betting on the VSS, or any derivative thereof.

**Data model & data characteristics**

The hierarchical organization tree-format is the basis of the VSS, like many other data model descriptions.

In addition to this, companies have researched into data ontologies, which

are descriptions and organization of data that adds additional

metadata including relationships between parts, or relationships between a

description of data, and a description of the (sensor) source of that data.

These aspects cannot be encoded in a plain tree but are efficiently added

to the tree-like structure of VSS. This is very interesting work that

leads to the type of more complete thinking of data relationships that is

necessary for the future's efficient data handling.

The most well known data ontology work to us is an extension of VSS. While

the work has been ongoing for a while it has recently been referred to by

name: VSSo.

For the reason that tree/category/hierarchy is the natural way to chunk up

many data items into a working organization - all projects seem to do it in

some fashion. Seemingly competing initiatives, are quite naturally also

organizing data in a tree-like fashion and the choice of project to use

really only falls back on style and desires, but also on the ability to not

get stuck within one ecosystem. The latter depends on licensing. Open

source licenses cannot take away the usage rights that have been given, and

if a project is not extending in the direction that the user wants, there

is explicit possibility to take what is there and simply make your own

derivative in another direction. This is a future-safe way to handle the

choice of a project license.

The VSS project continues as an open source project that encourages

additions and change-requests which makes the future open towards any

"derivations", renamed databases, or similar, possible while keeping the

investment already put into VSS.

**Contents**

The VSS is both a concrete database and a set of standards and tools for how to write

and extend the database. Thus, looking at content only does not give the

full picture. However, the current VSS (open to modification by change

requests) has already encoded a number of typical data items in a

proposed tree structure. The top level includes:

\* ADAS

\* Body

\* Car

\* Drivetrain

\* OBD

\* Vehicle

\* Cabin

\* Chassis

\* Media

\* Private

This in turn includes sub-chapters for:

\* Cabin, Infotainment, InteriorLights,

\* SingleDoor, SingleHVACStation, SingleShade, ...

\* ExteriorLights, ExteriorMirror...

\* Chassis, Wheel ...

\* BatteryManagement, ElectricMotor, Enginea, FuelCell, FuelSystem, Transmission, ...

etc.

Each data item in the VSS includes name, purpose, data type, unit, and other such metadata: