

Note by the secretariat



Presentation 6 (GE.3-06-10)

6th GE.3, 4-5 May 2023

Agenda item 5(a)

Activities until November 2023

GoE on LIAV – WP.1/GE.3

Workplan until November 2023 (based on inf. 2 and inf. 4)



UNECE



With a special focus on potential risks as:

Group 1 (items 1,2,3 from Inf. 4 and questions A,B,D,E,F,H from inf. 2)

- Gaps related to safe **deployment and use** of automated vehicles in road traffic
- Gaps related to entities responsible for automated driving.

Group 2 (items 1,2,3 and questions A,B,C,E,F,G,H)

- Gaps related to automated vehicles with a driver in the vehicle (issues from the scoping draft – road safety outcomes)
- Gaps related to automated vehicles without a driver

Informal GE.3 – **prepare a template (within a month – June 5th),**

(Background facts to be used in introduction, cost benefit analysis, explaining the rationalities, contextualize etc.) items 4&above...)

1) Interaction with other road users (especially vulnerable road users) - Prio 1 (ToR)

2) Interaction with vehicle users (optional)

3) Interaction with traffic authorities, first responders, and other special actors (optional)

4) Special issues of international traffic (optional)

5) New findings that would require GE.3 involvement (optional)

Later, for GE.3:

7) What is the optimal instrument to address each of these individual challenges (e.g. conventions, protocols, resolutions? guidance etc.)?

8) How can we “future proof” a potential instrument **related to each GAP** to ensure it is flexible, agile, and responsive to ongoing change?

List of questions taken from inf. 2 and their assignment to Groups 1 and 2



UNEP

- A. Are there any conditions for when the driver can delegate the dynamic control to the Automated Driving System (ADS)? **Groups 1 and 2**
- B. How can it be determined who has or had responsibility for the dynamic control of the automated vehicle at any given time? **Groups 1 and 2**
- C. **What are the role and responsibilities of the driver when the ADS is engaged, if there still is a driver in the vehicle?**
Group 2
- D. **If some or all of the responsibilities normally attributed to the driver are not borne by the driver anymore, then who should bear these responsibilities as the ADS does not have legal personhood?** **Group 1**
- E. How do we identify possible new entities which bear responsibilities normally attributed to the driver? **Groups 1 and 2**
- F. How do we make the necessary information about these entities available between different jurisdictions to enable enforcement of traffic rules? **Groups 1 and 2**
- G. Who has responsibilities for vehicles where there is no driver in the vehicle? How can their safety in operation be ensured? **Group 2**
- H. Is there a need to define new concepts/terms? **Groups 1 and 2**
- I. How to support international cooperation and data sharing especially between relevant authorities? **Later / GE.3?**
- J. How do we support the determination of liabilities in an accident involving an automated vehicle on national level?
Later / GE.3?

Legacy slides

Proposal 1



UNECE

Group 1 – Risk related to the lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 (tbc)

Group 2 – Risk related to take over request and fallback user expectations during transition demands

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 (tbc)

Group 3 – Risk related to technical performance and skill of the vehicle automation, mode awareness and data protection and hacking.

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 (tbc)

Potential Group 4 – *focus on a new item to be identified (tour de table)*

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: 5, 6 and 11 (tbc)

Proposal 1 - new (not presented) (based on inf. 2 and inf. 4)



UNECE

Group 1 – Gaps related to safe behaviour of automated vehicles in road traffic

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: ... (tbc)

Group 2 – Gaps related to automated vehicles with a driver in the vehicle

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: ... (tbc)

Group 3 – Gaps related to entities responsible for automated driving.

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: ... (tbc)

Group 4 – Gaps related to automated vehicles without a driver

Potential Group 5 – *focus on a new item to be identified (tour de table)*

- Apply the items as appropriate from informal 4: ... (tbc)

Other categories (proposed by University of South Carolina)



UNECE

Discrete and manageable categories of potential risks to road traffic safety and corresponding gaps in international conventions.

These might include:

- 1) Interaction with vehicle users
- 2) Interaction with other road users (especially vulnerable road users)
- 3) Interaction with traffic authorities, first responders, and other special actors
- 4) Special issues of international traffic

Proposal 2



UNECE

Group 1:

Use the previous survey to develop a paper which identifies risks and barriers for int^{al} traffic, identifying impacts, need for common rules and time scales.

Group 2:

Country experience: have countries regulations and why, key issues intended to be addressed in domestic regulations and approaches?

Group 3:

Listen to industry and other stakeholders – what do they perceive as barriers to deployment of ADS and risks/issues to be addressed.

Group 4:

Compile an assessment of needs derived from the three above.