# Department for Transport

# Submitted by UK ITS/AD-12-12 How to define automated vehicles in UN-ECE regulations lan Yarnold



Moving Britain Ahead

Official sensitive

14th June 17



#### $M_1$ = a passenger car



- It's safe, clean and quiet.
- It meets numerous ECE regulations and others worldwide
- It's tested before placing the market, and
- It has a driver



#### $M_1 = a passenger car$



- It's safe, clean and quiet.
- It meets numerous ECE regulations and others worldwide.
- It's tested before placing the market, and
- It has a driver <u>for some of</u> <u>the time.</u>



#### $M_1 = a$ passenger car



- It's safe, clean and quiet.
- It meets numerous ECE regulations and others worldwide.
- It's tested before placing the market, and
- It <u>might have/doesn't have</u> a driver.



**M**<sub>1</sub> = a passenger car

This vehicle has the same number of seats but is it a passenger car?



- How do we define it?
- It's clean and quiet.
- How do we assess it for safety?
- Should it comply with the same regulations as a passenger car?
- It's not designed for a driver.
- It could be designed for a remote operator.



### N<sub>1</sub> = light duty/goods vehicle



#### This "vehicle" fulfils a delivery function but is a goods/duty vehicle?

- It's clean and quiet.
- It travels at low speeds 6km/h.
- Does it meet any regulatory requirements
- (EMC, Safety, etc)?
- It doesn't have a driver.
- It <u>probably has</u> a remote operator.
- Does it use the highway/ interact with other road users?



### N<sub>1-3</sub> = duty/goods vehicle

### N<sub>1-3</sub> = duty/goods vehicle

- As individual vehicles, they are;
- safe, clean and quiet.
- They meet numerous ECE regulations and others worldwide.
- They're tested before placing the market, and
- It <u>does have</u> a driver.



- As a platoon/or a system – the system must be;
- Safe
- <u>Might have/</u> doesn't have a driver.



### The near future situation

 $M_1 = a passenger car$ 



 $L_6/L_7$  = a quadricycle



- It's clean and quiet.
- How do we assess it for safety?
- Should it comply with the same regulations as a passenger car or L<sub>6</sub>/L<sub>7</sub>?
- It's tested before placing on the market, and
- It <u>might have/doesn't</u> <u>have a driver.</u>



## The near future situation?

 $M_1 = a passenger car$ 

and/or

 $L_6/L_7$ = a quadricycle



- It's clean and quiet.
- How do we assess it for safety?
- Should it comply with the same regulations as a passenger car or L<sub>6</sub>/L<sub>7</sub>?
- It's tested before placing on the market, and
- It <u>might have/doesn't</u> <u>have a driver.</u>



### The issues for WP29

How do we define these new vehicles/mobility concepts?

We could re-categorise them as a separate class within RE3/SR1 - say category 'A' (for automated vehicle e.g.  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $A_3$ , etc).

We could create sub-categories of the current system – say category  $M_{1A}$ ,  $M_{2A}$ ,...;  $N_{1A}$ ,  $N_{2A}$ ,...;  $L_{6A}$ ,  $L_{7A}$ , etc).



 $\mathbf{M}_{1}, \mathbf{M}_{1A} \text{ or } \mathbf{A}_{1}$ ?



 $N_3$ ,  $N_{3A}$  or  $A_3$ ?



 $M_1$ ,  $M_{1A}$  or  $A_1$ ?



# The issues for WP29

Whichever system of defining these vehicles we choose, there must be clarity on;

- the technical requirements especially for safety,
- the driver/user interaction and interface design,
- defining the level of technology/autonomous capability.

Solving these issues will be crucial for manufacturers, for governments and for users.