

**Response to Law Commissions' third consultation on Automated Vehicles
(Law Commission Consultation Paper 252; Scottish Law Commission Discussion
Paper 171)**

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?

Alastair Shipman

What is the name of your organisation?

Imperial College London

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

Personal response

CHAPTER 4: SELF-DRIVING AND HUMAN INTERVENTION

Consultation Question 1 (Paragraph 4.114)

We provisionally propose that:

(1) a vehicle should not be classified as self-driving if, with the ADS engaged, the user-in-charge needs to monitor the driving environment, the vehicle or the way it drives;

(2) it is nevertheless compatible with self-driving to require the user-in-charge to respond to a clear and timely transition demand which:

- (a) cuts out any non-driving related screen use;
- (b) provides clear visual, audio and haptic signals; and
- (c) gives sufficient time to gain situational awareness;

(3) to be classified as self-driving, the vehicle must be safe enough even if the human user does not intervene in response to any event except a clear and timely transition demand.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Point 1: Agreed.

Point 2: self-driving cars can require the user-in-charge to respond, only if the user-in-charge is has easy access to the operators (e.g.: driving wheel, brakes, etc). For SAE Level 5 autonomy, this will not be the case.

Point 3: Agreed.

Consultation Question 2 (Paragraph 4.115)

We welcome views on whether self-driving features should be designed to ensure that they can be used by people with hearing loss.

I agree- there should be advances in monitoring systems and alert systems that allow a vehicle to highlight the important features, without relying on auditory cues (e.g.: without the system saying "look at the road"). This is the case as auditory cues are: liable to interpretation, can be drowned out by surrounding sounds (e.g.: a siren/motorway/construction), and can be slower to impart information than visual cues.

Therefore, self-driving cars can and should be designed to accommodate people with hearing loss.

CHAPTER 5: HOW SAFE IS SAFE ENOUGH?

Consultation Question 3 (Paragraph 5.118)

We provisionally propose that the decision whether a vehicle is sufficiently safe to "safely drive itself" should be made by the Secretary of State, as informed by advice from a specialist regulator.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

There has to be a final answer at some point- otherwise the progress on this front will be much slower.

Consultation Question 4 (Paragraph 5.119)

We welcome observations on which of the following standards is most appropriate when assessing the safety of automated vehicles:

- (a) as safe as a competent and careful human driver;
- (b) as safe as a human driver who does not cause a fault accident;
- (c) overall, safer than the average human driver.

[Respondents chose from the following options: as safe as a competent and careful human driver; as safe as a human driver who does not cause a fault accident; overall, safer than the average human driver; none of the above.]

As safe as a competent and careful human driver

Assumptions:

-A competent and careful human driver is safer than an average human driver.

-A competent and careful human driver will be able to prevent some non-fault accidents (e.g. by noticing an out of control vehicle behind themselves).

Vehicles will never be 100% safe, and self-driving cars fall into this category. To improve safety, therefore, we have to look on a comparative scale. I have picked what I interpret to be the most stringent category from the above.

Consultation Question 5 (Paragraph 5.120)

We welcome observations on how automated vehicles can be made as safe as reasonably practicable.

- 1) when interaction with screens is allowed, ensure that those screens are placed in a position where peripheral vision can see the road conditions (e.g.: on the windscreen). This might be a heads-up display, or a drop-down screen, or equivalent.
- 2) require that the car highlights to neighbours whether it is in self-driving mode or not, providing information to surrounding cars or pedestrians. This could be an LED screen on the doors/bonnet/rear windscreen, or equivalent.

Consultation Question 6 (Paragraph 5.121)

We welcome practical suggestions for how AV regulators can fulfil their public sector equality duty.

Not certain.

CHAPTER 7: ASSESSING SAFETY PRE-DEPLOYMENT

Consultation Question 7 (Paragraph 7.99)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) safety assessment should use a variety of techniques;
- (2) manufacturers/developers should submit a safety case to regulators showing why they believe that the automated driving system is safe;
- (3) regulators should:
 - (a) provide guidelines for what is in the safety case;
 - (b) audit the safety case;
 - (c) prepare guidance for manufacturers and developers on preferred standards; and
 - (d) carry out at least some independent tests.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

3b) the audit should allow for the addition of new elements to the safety case, should be independent of industrial and state influence, etc.

3d) I think there should be a full battery of independent tests for all new vehicle systems that wish to enter commercial use. Partial testing should be performed periodically, especially after software updates.

Consultation Question 8 (Paragraph 7.100)

We seek views on whether an approval authority that intends to use a scenario database as part of the testing procedure should consult road user groups on the range of scenarios to be included.

Agreed, but there should be further groups that are consulted. For example, academics interested in finding edge cases, insurance stakeholders interested in liability conditions, etc.

CHAPTER 8: INITIAL APPROVALS AND CATEGORISATION – PROPOSALS

Consultation Question 9 (Paragraph 8.17)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) unauthorised automated driving systems should be prohibited; and
- (2) this should be subject to an exemption procedure by which the Secretary of State may authorise unauthorised systems to be used in tests and trials.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Secretary of State, with advice from regulatory bodies.

Consultation Question 10 (Paragraph 8.25)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) the Government should establish a domestic scheme to approve automated driving systems (ADSs) for use on roads in Great Britain (a “national ADS approval scheme”);
- (2) manufacturers should have a free choice to apply for approval under either the UNECE system of international type approvals or through the national scheme;
- (3) developers should be able to submit an ADS for national approval, even if they are not responsible for manufacturing the whole vehicle.

Do you agree?

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

Other

Is one more stringent than the other? It would be difficult to justify the use of one over the other for the purposes of safety, but for other purposes (e.g.: a requirement to perform equally well while driving on either side of the road), then no issues.

Consultation Question 11 (Paragraph 8.43)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) an ADS approval scheme should be established through regulation under the Road Traffic Act 1988, without further legislative reform;

(2) an ADS should be defined as a combination of software, hardware and sensors, which can be installed in a “type” of vehicle;

(3) when an ADS is approved, the approval should be accompanied by specifications for:

(a) the type of vehicle in which it can be installed; and

(b) how the ADS is installed within the vehicle;

(4) where an ADS is installed in a pre-registered vehicle, an example vehicle should be submitted to the regulator for approval of the installation.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 12 (Paragraph 8.44)

We invite observations on the appeal process in regulation 19 of the Road Vehicles (Approval) Regulations 2020, including:

(1) how it works in practice; and

(2) how well it is suited to the proposed national ADS approval scheme.

Not certain of my ability to contribute in this area.

Consultation Question 13 (Paragraph 8.71)

We provisionally propose that:

(1) once an ADS has received type approval at either international or domestic level, an Automated Driving System Entity (ADSE) would need to submit the vehicle to the UK safety regulator for categorisation as able to safely drive itself;

(2) the safety regulator should make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for how the vehicle should be classified;

(3) it should be open to the safety regulator to recommend that an ADS-enabled vehicle is classified in one of three ways: as not self-driving but driver assistance; as self-driving only with a user-in-charge; or as self-driving without a user-in-charge;

(4) the safety regulator should only recommend classification as self-driving (either with or without a user-in-charge) if it is satisfied that:

(a) an ADSE is registered as taking responsibility for the system;

(b) the ADSE was closely involved in assessing safety and creating the safety case; and

(c) the ADSE has sufficient funds accessible to the regulator to respond to improvement notices, to pay fines and to organise a recall.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Not certain of my ability to contribute in this area.

Consultation Question 14 (Paragraph 8.77)

We provisionally propose that a new legislative framework should provide regulation making powers to specify:

- (a) who should assess whether a vehicle is capable of self-driving;
- (b) the procedure for doing so; and
- (c) criteria for doing so.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 15 (Paragraph 8.78)

We seek views on whether the new legislation should include provisions for appeals against a categorisation decision. If so, should these be similar to those in regulation 19 of the Road Vehicles (Approval) Regulations 2020?

Not certain of my ability to contribute in this area.

Consultation Question 16 (Paragraph 8.83)

We seek views on whether the regulator that classifies vehicles as self-driving should have power to allow their deployment in limited numbers, so as to gather further data on their safety in real world conditions.

Yes- there is a requirement for real-world data to fully assess the safety of vehicles.

CHAPTER 10: ASSURING SAFETY IN USE

Consultation Question 17 (Paragraph 10.82)

We provisionally propose that legislation should establish a scheme to assure the safety of automated driving systems following deployment, giving scheme regulators enhanced responsibilities and powers.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Similar to an MOT?

Consultation Question 18 (Paragraph 10.83)

We provisionally propose that the enhanced scheme should give regulators the following responsibilities and powers:

- (1) scheme regulators should be responsible for comparing the safety of automated and conventional vehicles using a range of measures;
- (2) to do this the regulator should have power to collect information on:
 - (a) leading measures (instances of bad driving which could have led to harm) and
 - (b) lagging measures (outcomes which led to actual harm);
- (3) regulators should have power to require an ADSE:
 - (a) to update software where an update is needed to ensure safety and continued compliance with the law;
 - (b) to keep maps up-to-date, where an AV relies on maps to ensure safety and compliance with the law;
 - (c) to communicate information about an ADS to users in a clear and effective way, including where necessary through training.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

I wonder if the leading data should be anonymised?

Consultation Question 19 (Paragraph 10.84)

We welcome views on the following issues:

- (1) Should scheme regulators be empowered to approve software updates that apply only within the UK, without requiring the manufacturer to return to the original type approval authority?
- (2) Should the scheme should also deal with cybersecurity?
- (3) Are other powers needed? (Note that data is discussed in Chapter 17.)
 - 1) Any updates should be designed to be timely- if the original approval authority would take too long, then the regulators should be empowered to approve.

Consultation Question 20 (Paragraph 10.100)

Should the authority administering the scheme to assure safety while automated vehicles are in use be kept separate from type approval authorities (as is already the case)? Alternatively, should both functions be combined in a single body?

[Respondents chose from the following options: single body; separate bodies; other.]

Other

I am uncertain of the impact of this on many areas, but my main response is that both parties should have a shared view of what constitutes a 'safe' car. This is satisfied as long as both parties (safety assurance and safety approval) have the same, up-to-date information and testing procedures.

Consultation Question 21 (Paragraph 10.101)

What formal mechanisms could be used to ensure that the regulator administering the scheme is open to external views (such as duties to consult or an advisory committee)?

I am not certain of my ability to contribute here.

CHAPTER 11: INVESTIGATING TRAFFIC INFRACTIONS AND COLLISIONS

Consultation Question 22 (Paragraph 11.24)

We provisionally propose that a statutory scheme to assure AVs in-use should:

- (1) investigate safety-related traffic infractions (such as exceeding the speed limit; running red lights; or careless or dangerous driving);
- (2) investigate other traffic infractions, including those subject to penalty charge notices;
- (3) if fault lies with the ADSE, apply a flexible range of regulatory sanctions.

Do you agree?

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

Other

If this is a safety assurance scheme, why is it covering non-safety related infractions?

Consultation Question 23 (Paragraph 11.53)

We provisionally propose that the regulator which assures the safety of AVs in-use should have powers to impose the following sanctions on ADSEs:

- (1) informal and formal warnings;
- (2) fines;
- (3) redress orders;
- (4) compliance orders;
- (5) suspension of authorisation;
- (6) withdrawal of authorisation; and
- (7) recommendation of attendance at a restorative conference.

Do you agree?

[Respondents chose from the following options: informal and formal warnings; fines; redress orders; compliance orders; suspension of authorisation; withdrawal of authorisation; recommendation of attendance at a restorative conference.]

Informal and formal warnings, Fines, Redress orders, Compliance orders, Suspension of authorisation, Withdrawal of authorisation

The regulator should be able to impose sanctions up to and including the withdrawal of authorisation for the use of AVs.

A recommendation to attend a conference might be appropriate, but seems more in the purview of a judge?

Consultation Question 24 (Paragraph 11.54)

We provisionally propose that the legislation should provide the regulator with discretion over:

- (1) the amount of any monetary penalty; and
- (2) the steps which should be taken to prevent re-occurrence of a breach.

Do you agree?

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

Other

If the regulator can define the steps that should be taken to prevent re-occurrence, are they required to do so? Or instead are they simply allowed to define (and adapt) the safety case, and ADSEs can achieve that level of safety however they wish?

Consultation Question 25 (Paragraph 11.69)

We provisionally propose that a specialist incident investigation unit should be established:

- (1) to analyse data on collisions involving automated vehicles;
- (2) to investigate the most serious, complex or high-profile collisions; and
- (3) to make recommendations to improve safety without allocating blame.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 26 (Paragraph 11.82)

We provisionally propose that the UK Government should establish a forum for collaboration on the application of road rules to self-driving vehicles.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 27 (Paragraph 11.83)

We welcome views on:

- (1) the issues the forum should consider;
- (2) the composition of the forum; and
- (3) its processes for public engagement.

1) Issues.

- When an ADS can 'break the rules'
- Best practice (non-binding) definition

I am not certain of my ability to contribute on the remaining points.

CHAPTER 12: THE USER-IN-CHARGE

Consultation Question 28 (Paragraph 12.24)

We provisionally propose that that the user-in-charge:

- (1) should be defined as an individual in position to operate the controls of a vehicle while an ADS is engaged and who is either in the vehicle or in direct sight of the vehicle; and
- (2) is not a driver while the ADS is engaged, and would not be liable for any criminal offence or civil penalty (such as a parking ticket) which arises out of dynamic driving.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

What does direct sight mean?

Consultation Question 29 (Paragraph 12.37)

We provisionally propose that following the end of the transition demand period:

- (1) the user-in-charge should re-acquire the legal obligations of a driver, whether or not they have taken control of the vehicle; and
- (2) if, following a failure to respond to a transition demand, the vehicle stops in a manner which constitutes a criminal offence, the user-in-charge should be considered a driver and should therefore be liable for that offence.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

This will require a well defined transition demand period.

Consultation Question 30 (Paragraph 12.45)

We seek views on whether a person with a provisional licence should be allowed to act as a user-in-charge, if accompanied by an approved driving instructor in a vehicle with dual controls.

I can't see how this is different to normal driving lessons.

Consultation Question 31 (Paragraph 12.53)

We provisionally propose that legislation should create new offences of:

- (1) using an automated vehicle as an unfit or unqualified user-in-charge; and
- (2) causing or permitting the use of an automated vehicle by an unfit or unqualified user-in-charge.

Do you agree?

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

Other

Assuming there will be cars that do not permit user interaction (SAE level 5), these offences would not be applicable. Is this covered?

Otherwise, yes, these should be offences.

Consultation Question 32 (Paragraph 12.59)

We provisionally propose that persons carried without a user-in-charge should be guilty of a criminal offence.

Do you agree?

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

No

I think this is open to interpretation? The user-in-charge will either be the person in the driving seat, or a remote-user. In traditional driving, the person in the driving seat is responsible, no? Why are people who are in a car responsible for the lack of authority of the person in the driving seat?

Consultation Question 33 (Paragraph 12.60)

We seek views on whether the new proposed offence of being carried without a user in-charge should only apply if the person:

- (1) knew that the vehicle did not have a user-in-charge; and
- (2) knew or ought to have known that a user-in-charge was required.

Yes- see my response above.

Consultation Question 34 (Paragraph 12.66)

We provisionally propose that a user-in-charge who takes over control of the vehicle:

- (1) should be considered a driver; but
- (2) should have a specific defence to a criminal offence if, given the actions of the ADS, a competent and careful driver could not have avoided the offence.

Do you agree? If not, we welcome views on alternative legal tests.

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

Yes

This parallels the 'competent and careful' level of ADS defined earlier (as opposed to 'on average safer than a human').

Consultation Question 35 (Paragraph 12.94)

We provisionally propose that the user-in-charge should be liable for criminal offences which do not arise from the dynamic driving task, including those related to:

- (1) insurance;
- (2) maintaining the vehicle in a roadworthy condition (including installing safety critical software updates);
- (3) parking;
- (4) duties following accidents to provide information and report accidents to the police; and
- (5) ensuring child passengers wear seatbelts.

Do you agree?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes, the user-in-charge should be liable for all offences not arising from the dynamic driving task; the user-in-charge should be liable for some but not all of the offences listed; no, the user-in-charge should not be liable for any offences; other.]

The user-in-charge should be liable for some but not all of the offences listed

Safety critical updates should be installed automatically. This should not be left to users, as installation issues may occur. Therefore, users should not be liable for this.

For the remaining issues, I agree.

Consultation Question 36 (Paragraph 12.95)

We provisionally propose that the legislation should include a regulation-making power to clarify those roadworthiness failings which are (and those which are not) the responsibility of the user-in-charge.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

The roles of the user-in-charge should be well defined.

CHAPTER 13: REMOTE OPERATION: NO USER-IN-CHARGE VEHICLES

Consultation Question 37 (Paragraph 13.67)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) where an individual is exercising latitudinal and longitudinal control (steering and braking) over a vehicle remotely, that should not be regarded as a form of “self-driving”; and
- (2) where lateral and longitudinal control are exercised by an ADS, all other forms of remote operation should be regulated as “self-driving”.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

From the perspective of the car, yes, this makes sense.

However, from the perspective of a pedestrian, remote driving will look almost identical to self-driving. It should be necessary to highlight that a car is in self-driving mode (e.g.: with an LED screen) to identify to neighbours that the car is not under human control.

We welcome views on whether the current definition of when a vehicle “drives itself” under the Automated and Electric Vehicles Act 2018 should be amended to deal with some forms of remote operation which may involve a degree of “monitoring”.

Yes. I think it will be easier to differentiate between non-human control ('driving itself'), remote human control (possible delays in response owing to technological latency, or remote user workload), and user-in-charge control (human control subject to transition period).

Consultation Question 38 (Paragraph 13.86)

We provisionally propose that:

- (4) the regulation of self-driving vehicles should distinguish between an Automated Driving System Entity (which vouches for the design of the system) and an operator (responsible for the operation of individual vehicles);
- (5) all vehicles authorised for use on roads or other public places with no user-in charge should either:
 - (a) be operated by a licensed operator; or
 - (b) be covered by a contract with a licensed operator for supervision and maintenance services;
- (6) it should be a criminal offence to use a NUIC vehicle on a road or other public place unless it is operated by a licensed operator or is covered by a contract with a licensed operator for supervision and maintenance services.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 39 (Paragraph 13.92)

We welcome views on whether NUIC operators should be required to demonstrate professional competence through a safety management system, as set out in a safety case.

Yes- much like air traffic controllers, remote operators should be trained and regulated.

Consultation Question 40 (Paragraph 13.108)

We provisionally propose that, irrespective of the nature of the vehicle, a licensed operator should be under a duty to:

- (1) supervise the vehicle;
- (2) maintain the vehicle;
- (3) insure the vehicle;
- (4) install safety-critical updates and maintain cybersecurity; and
- (5) report accidents and untoward events (as defined by the regulator).

Do you agree?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes, a licensed operator should be subject to all the listed duties; a licensed operator should be subject to some but not all of the listed duties; no, a licensed operator should not be subject to any of the listed duties; other.]

Yes, a licensed operator should be subject to all the listed duties

Similar to my response above- public users should not be responsible for safety critical software updates. However, a licensed operator should be competent to ensure these are carried out.

Consultation Question 41 (Paragraph 13.109)

We provisionally propose that legislation should include a regulation-making power by which some or all of these duties could be transferred to the registered keeper or owner, if it was shown that it was appropriate to do so.

Do you agree?

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

Other

I'm not certain I understand. If there is a registered owner, why does the licenced operator have responsibilities? Is this only the case if the owner releases their vehicle for NUIC purposes? In which case, I would think that the duties initially lie with the owner?

Or, perhaps the converse: if an operator leases part of a fleet to private owners, then yes, it would be appropriate for these owners to have some responsibility for the vehicle. However, this should not extend to safety critical features.

Consultation Question 42 (Paragraph 13.116)

We welcome views on how accessibility standards for Highly Automated Road Passenger Services (HARPS) might be developed.

Not certain if I can contribute to this- but it definitely is important.

We provisionally propose that:

(1) an accessibility advisory panel should be formed to include:

(a) the Equalities and Human Rights Commission; and

(b) representative groups for disabled and older persons;

(2) the Secretary of State should be obliged to consult with the accessibility advisory panel prior to setting any national minimum standards on HARPS;

(3) there should be a duty to periodically re-consult the accessibility advisory panel at set intervals to ensure requirements keep pace with developing evidence of technical feasibility and changing needs.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Not certain if I can contribute to this- but it definitely is important.

We welcome views on what the set interval for periodically re-consulting the accessibility advisory panel should be.

Not certain if I can contribute to this- but it definitely is important.

Consultation Question 43 (Paragraph 13.133)

We welcome views on who should administer the operator licensing scheme.

An independent body.

CHAPTER 14: CRIMINAL OFFENCES BY ADSES AND THEIR SENIOR MANAGERS

Consultation Question 44 (Paragraph 14.107)

We provisionally propose that:

(1) it should be a criminal offence for an ADSE to omit safety-relevant information or include misleading information when putting a vehicle forward for classification as self-driving or responding to information requests from the regulator;

(2) the offence should apply to senior managers (where it was attributable to the manager's consent, connivance or neglect);

(3) the offence should not apply to more junior employees;

(4) the offence should carry a higher sentence if it is associated with a death or serious injury;

(5) the offence should be prosecuted in England and Wales by either the regulator or the Crown Prosecution Service and in Scotland by the Procurator Fiscal.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 45 (Paragraph 14.108)

We seek views on the following proposed offences.

Offence A: non-disclosure and misleading information in the safety case

When putting forward a vehicle for classification as self-driving, it would be a criminal offence for the ADSE to

(1) fail to provide information to the regulator; or

(2) provide information to the regulator that is false or misleading in a material particular where that information is relevant to the evaluation of the safety of the ADS or the vehicle.

The ADSE would have a defence if it could show that it took reasonable precautions and exercised all due diligence to prevent the wrongdoing.

The penalty would be an unlimited fine.

Offence B: non-disclosure and misleading information in responding to requests

When a regulator requests specific information from an ADSE (whether before or after deployment), it would be a criminal offence for the ADSE to

(1) fail to provide information to the regulator; or

(2) provide information to the regulator that is false or misleading in a material particular

where that information is relevant to the evaluation of the safety of the ADS or the vehicle.

The ADSE would have a defence if it could show that it took reasonable precautions and exercised all due diligence to prevent the wrongdoing.

The penalty would be an unlimited fine.

Offence C: offences by senior management

Where offence A and/or offence B committed by a body corporate is proved—

(3) to have been committed with the consent or connivance of an officer of the body corporate; or

(4) to be attributable to neglect on the part of an officer of the body corporate, then that officer is guilty of the offence.

An officer includes any director, manager, secretary or other similar officer or any person who was purporting to act in any such capacity.

We see this as equivalent to offences under the Human Medicines Regulations 2012 and General Product Safety Regulations 2005, which carry a penalty of a fine and/or a maximum two years' imprisonment.

Offence D: aggravated offences in the event of death or serious injury following non-disclosure or provision of misleading information to the AV safety regulator

Where a corporation or person commits Offences A to C, that offence is aggravated where the misrepresentation or non-disclosure:

(5) related to an increased risk of a type of adverse incident; and

(6) an adverse incident of that type occurred; and

(7) the adverse incident caused a death or serious injury.

We see this as equivalent to the offence of causing death by dangerous driving, which carries a penalty of an unlimited fine and/or a maximum of 14 years' imprisonment.

Not certain if I can contribute to this.

Consultation Question 46 (Paragraph 14.109)

We welcome views on whether an ADSE should be under a duty to present information in a clear and accessible form, in which safety-critical information is indexed and signposted.

Agreed.

CHAPTER 15: NEW WRONGFUL INTERFERENCE OFFENCES

Consultation Question 47 (Paragraph 15.10)

We provisionally propose that legislative amendment should clarify that the tampering offence in section 25 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 applies to anything that is physically part of a vehicle and any software installed within it.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Not certain if I can contribute.

Consultation Question 48 (Paragraph 15.11)

We welcome views on whether the tampering offence should apply to external infrastructure required for the operation of the AV.

Not certain if I can contribute.

Consultation Question 49 (Paragraph 15.53)

We provisionally propose that there should be an aggravated offence of wrongfully interfering with an AV, the road, or traffic equipment contrary to section 22A of the Road Traffic Act 1988, where the interference results in an AV causing death or serious injury, in:

(1) England and Wales; and

(2) Scotland.

Do you agree?

[Respondents chose from the following options: yes, in both England and Wales and Scotland; in neither jurisdiction.]

Yes, in both England and Wales and Scotland

Not certain if I can contribute.

Consultation Question 50 (Paragraph 15.55)

We provisionally propose that the appropriate mental element for the aggravated offence is intent to interfere with a vehicle, the road or traffic equipment.

Do you agree?

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

Other

Not certain if I can contribute.

Consultation Question 51 (Paragraph 15.62)

We seek views on whether an approved work defence for repair or maintenance operations authorised by a vehicle manufacturer or Automated Driving System Entity is desirable.

Not certain if I can contribute.

CHAPTER 16: CIVIL LIABILITY

Consultation Question 52 (Paragraph 16.24)

We provisionally propose that the way the Automated and Electric Vehicles Act 2018 deals with contributory negligence and causation is:

- (1) adequate at this stage; and
- (2) should be reviewed by the UK Government in the light of practical experience.

Do you agree?

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

Other

Not certain if I can contribute.

Consultation Question 53 (Paragraph 16.32)

We provisionally propose that measures should be put in place to compensate the victims of accidents caused by uninsured AVs.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Not certain if I can contribute- but this seems appropriate.

Consultation Question 54 (Paragraph 16.47)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) product liability law should be reviewed to take account of the challenges of emerging technologies;
- (2) any review should cover product liability as a whole, rather than be confined to automated vehicles;

it should not, therefore, form part of this project on automated vehicles.

Do you agree?

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

Other

Not certain if I can contribute.

CHAPTER 17: ACCESS TO DATA

Consultation Question 55 (Paragraph 17.65)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) for a vehicle to be classified as self-driving, it needs to record the location as well as the time at which the ADS is activated and deactivated;
- (2) the Government should work within the UNECE to ensure data storage systems for automated driving record these data; and
- (3) any national system to approve an ADS should require these data to be collected, subject to safeguards.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

There should be far more data recorded than simply the time/location of handover, including local conditions, reason for handover, etc.

Consultation Question 56 (Paragraph 17.71)

We provisionally propose that legislation should impose a duty on those controlling AV data to disclose data to insurers, where the data is necessary to decide claims fairly and accurately.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

This should be transparent- all relevant datasets should be disclosed to all parties involved.

Consultation Question 57 (Paragraph 17.81)

We provisionally propose that:

- (1) initially, DSSAD data from self-driving vehicles should be stored for three years; and
- (2) the issue should be reviewed in the light of experience.

Do you agree?

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

Yes

Consultation Question 58 (Paragraph 17.95)

We provisionally propose that:

(1) when an ADSE applies for categorisation of its vehicle types as self-driving, it should present the regulator with details on how data will be recorded, stored, accessed and protected;

(2) the regulator should only categorise a system as self-driving if it is satisfied that that the ADSE has systems to abide by its obligations under the GDPR.

Do you agree?

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

Yes