

**Response to Law Commissions' second consultation on Automated Vehicles
(Law Commission Consultation Paper 245; Scottish Law Commission Discussion Paper 169)**

Please note that this consultation response has been reproduced from information entered on the Citizen Space online portal.

Any personal email addresses and phone numbers have been excluded from this document.

Unanswered questions have been deleted from this document.

What is your name?

Bryan Reimer

What is the name of your organisation?

MIT

Are you responding to this consultation in a personal capacity or on behalf of your organisation?

[Respondents chose from the following options: Personal response; Response on behalf of your organisation; Other.]

Personal response

CHAPTER 3: OPERATOR LICENSING – A SINGLE NATIONAL SYSTEM

A single national scheme

Consultation Question 1 (Paragraph 3.82): Do you agree that Highly Automated Road Passenger Services (HARPS) should be subject to a single national system of operator licensing?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Overall the complexity of licensing should be addressed at a national level to ensure consistency across the UK.

Consultation Question 2 (Paragraph 3.86): Do you agree that there should be a national scheme of basic safety standards for operating a HARPS?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Safety should be a key cornerstone of any licensing system.

CHAPTER 4: OPERATOR LICENSING –SCOPE AND CONTENT

Scope of the new scheme

Consultation Question 3 (Paragraph 4.33): Do you agree that a HARPS operator licence should be required by any business which: (1) carries passengers for hire or reward; (2) using highly automated vehicles; (3) on a road; (4) without a human driver or user-in-charge in the vehicle (or in line of sight of the vehicle)?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Consultation Question 4 (Paragraph 4.34): Is the concept of “carrying passengers for hire or reward” sufficiently clear?

Yes

Exemptions

Consultation Question 5 (Paragraph 4.46): We seek views on whether there should be exemptions for community or other services which would otherwise be within the scope of HARPS operator licensing.

Licensing for all types of operators is critical.

Consultation Question 6 (Paragraph 4.54): We seek views on whether there should be statutory provisions to enable the Secretary of State to exempt specified trials from the need for a HARPS operator licence (or to modify licence provisions for such trials).

Adapt perhaps but not exempt.

Consultation Question 8 (Paragraph 4.73): How should a transport manager demonstrate professional competence in running an automated service?

Adequate arrangements for maintenance

Consultation Question 9 (Paragraph 4.89): Do you agree that HARPS operators should: (1) be under a legal obligation to ensure roadworthiness; and (2) demonstrate “adequate facilities or arrangements” for maintaining vehicles and operating systems “in a fit and serviceable condition”?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Consultation Question 10 (Paragraph 4.90): Do you agree that legislation should be amended to clarify that HARPS operators are “users” for the purposes of insurance and roadworthiness offences?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Compliance with the law

Consultation Question 11 (Paragraph 4.124): Do you agree that HARPS operators should have a legal duty to: (1) insure vehicles; (2) supervise vehicles; (3) report accidents; and (4) take reasonable steps to safeguard passengers from assault, abuse or harassment?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Other

Take reasonable steps to safeguard passengers from assault, abuse or harassment? is difficult. They can be responsible for monitoring and reporting but not really the safeguarding.

I agree with 1, 2 and 3.

Consultation Question 12 (Paragraph 4.125): Do you agree that HARPS operators should be subject to additional duties to report untoward events, together with background information about miles travelled (to put these events in context)?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

Anything a strong guidebook should be developed to provide clarity on reporting. Anything outside of testing plans, safety boundaries, etc. should be reported along with operational details (trips, miles, etc.)

CHAPTER 5: PRIVATELY-OWNED PASSENGER-ONLY VEHICLES

Allocating responsibility for a privately-owned passenger-only vehicle: placing responsibilities on keepers

Consultation Question 18 (Paragraph 5.40): Do you agree that where a passenger-only vehicle is not operated as a HARPS, the person who keeps the vehicle should be responsible for: (1) insuring the vehicle; (2) keeping the vehicle roadworthy; (3) installing safety-critical updates; (4) reporting accidents; and (5) removing the vehicle if it causes an obstruction or is left in a prohibited place?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Other

One should be able to transfer responsibility to an operator if necessary.

Will consumers require technical help?

Consultation Question 21 (Paragraph 5.47): Do you agree that for passenger-only vehicles which are not operated as HARPS, the legislation should include a regulation-making power to require registered keepers to have in place a contract for supervision and maintenance services with a licensed provider?

Yes

Maintenance of highly automated systems needs to be undertaken to ensure road worthiness.

CHAPTER 6: ACCESSIBILITY

What we want to achieve

Consultation Question 24 (Paragraph 6.11): We seek views on how regulation can best promote the accessibility of Highly Automated Road Passenger Services (HARPS)? In particular, we seek views on the key benefits and concerns that regulation should address.

One should develop a ramp-up to meeting accessibility requirements (i.e. in years x-y only minimum standards are required; y+ broader standards). A trip based model could also work. The goal is to reduce the barriers / cost to market entry while ensuring the rapid integration of needs for mobility-impaired populations.

Core obligations under equality legislation

Consultation Question 25 (Paragraph 6.31): We provisionally propose that the protections against discrimination and duties to make reasonable adjustments that apply to land transport service providers under section 29 of the Equality Act 2010 should be extended to operators of HARPS. Do you agree?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Other

See response to q24. Long term I am fully supportive but the barriers to market entry are real.

Specific accessibility outcomes

Consultation Question 26 (Paragraph 6.106): We seek views on how regulation could address the challenges posed by the absence of a driver, and the crucial role drivers play in order to deliver safe and accessible journeys. For example, should provision be made for:

(1) Ensuring passengers can board and alight vehicles?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

new research efforts are needed to define such standards.

(2) Requiring reassurance when there is disruption and accessible information?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

(3) Expansion of support at designated points of departure and arrival?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

new research is needed to define what is acceptable.

Developing national minimum accessibility standards for HARPS

Consultation Question 27 (Paragraph 6.109): We seek views on whether national minimum standards of accessibility for HARPS should be developed and what such standards should cover.

Yes - these should be phase-in standards to encourage tech development on the enabling features of HARPS first.

Enforcement mechanisms and feedback loops

Consultation Question 28 (Paragraph 6.124): We seek views on whether operators of HARPS should have data reporting requirements regarding usage by older and disabled people, and what type of data may be required.

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes; no; other.]

Yes

This is critical to ensuring accessibility needs are fully addressed.