

Role and Position (Draft)
(Transmitted by the expert from Japan)

1. Role
 - 1) Short term; Preparation of the Round Table
 - 2) Middle term; Study on how to deal with ITS at WP29, including how the organization should be.
2. Understandings for the scope
 - 1) At WP29, In-vehicle Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) are discussed and definition of such systems are on-board systems for safety that utilize information that is received from direct sensing and/or telecommunications via the road infrastructure or other source.
 - 2) It is important to emphasize that certain ITS applications use advanced technologies to provide in-vehicle support for reducing the number of crashes and attendant injuries and deaths. Other ITS applications provide in-vehicle information for purposes other than improved safety. Whatever the primary function, both types of ITS applications can have important unintentional influences on safety (positive and negative.)
 - 3) Certain areas of systems are expected to be discussed primarily for enhancing safety of the vehicles. They include systems that use advanced technologies for enhancing safety, and that advise/warn, assist, and/or substitute [advise/warn, and/or assist] the driver with the purpose of vehicle functions and performance in driving
3. Position
 - 1) The introduction of ITS into market shall not be hindered as far as there are no clear problems on safety.
 - 2) For encouraging introduction of ITS, role of governments in the area of safety should be further studied. Such role of governments may include followings.
 - a) If current regulations that are holding back ITS from market, countermeasures should be studied.
 - b) To develop and apply methodologies for assessing the safety impact, estimation of effectiveness and potential safety degradation
 - 3) In studying the role of governments, role of industries and other means than regulations on vehicle construction should be considered (ex. civil law, industry's guidelines)
 - 4) In particular, it's important to deal with the issues from a view point of

HMI [and an aspect of the driver's responsibility is duly taken into account.]*

- 5) It is preferable to get a common understanding on the above-mentioned role of governments among contracting parties.
- 6) In the current framework of GRs, some technical issues on ITS can be dealt by more than one GR or cannot be discussed at any of the existing GRs.

*) expression is under discussion

NOTE

As for the "driver's responsibility, although it is very important part of the Position, " the discussion about how to describe is not premature. There are following comments.

(Comment from Germany)

" Substantive remark

The division of ITS in 3 functions information, assistance and substitution is a judicious one. Germany has some problems with the term "substitution"; it holds and has never concealed its opinion that the driver's control of the motor vehicle is of paramount importance. This view is confirmed by the 1968 Vienna Convention on Road Traffic with meanwhile more than 60 Contracting Parties and which is quite outspoken about it. The Convention stipulates explicitly that the driver's foremost obligation is to have the control over his vehicle so as to exercise due and proper control at all times and in all circumstances. The more the responsibility which is incumbent to him by virtue of this regulation, is assumed by a device/machine which he cannot overrule, the less he can be held responsible. This begs inter alia the question onto whom the responsibility is then to be shifted: producer of the machine, owner of the infrastructure, some public entity etc. The aspect of the driver's responsibility is thus at the core of the entire debate and should duly be reflected in one way or another.

There is however no intention to turn the text upside down. This all the more because the debate in Germany is far from being completed and because of some necessity to admit already now devices which seem not totally in line with the pure orthodoxy of the exclusiveness of the driver's control. Hence it is suggested to complete the pronouncement in no 4 dealing with HMI and consequently with the extent of the driver's influence, in other words the redefinition of his role in carrying out manoeuvres vis-à-vis the machine, by some words picking up the idea mentioned. The term responsibility however should well be used in that respect."

(Comment from UK)

The issue that we are trying to address here is how the driver interacts with the advanced system and when we can allow the system to take decisions for the driver. For low-level systems this will not be a problem as the driving task will be enhanced. However, as more sophisticated devices appear in vehicles, so the overlap between the driver and autonomous systems will become more difficult, eventually leading to systems that sense-and-react far quicker than the driver - and potentially take over in extreme accident prevention circumstances. The challenge for us is to ensure that manufacturers implement systems that do this in a controlled manner that drivers can rely upon. As a result we should not be overly prescriptive in your strategy document about the driver's responsibility. What we should do is identify the issue as one affecting the driver's role and that this needs to be kept in mind during the development of systems.