



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

30 June 2020

Dr Gillian Miles
Chief Executive Officer and Commissioner
National Transport Commission
enquiries@ntc.gov.au

Dear Dr Miles

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the Discussion Paper, *Review of 'Guidelines for trials of automated vehicles in Australia'*. Brisbane City Council's (Council) responses to the questions that you raised in your discussion paper are attached.

Since the National Transport Commission (NTC) and Austroads *Guidelines for trials of automated vehicles in Australia* (the Guidelines) were first published in May 2017, Council has had experience with applying the Guidelines. Council facilitated the Australia Post trial of small automated vehicles in the suburb of New Farm in 2017 and has been in early discussions with the Department of Transport and Main Roads to potentially extend their Cooperative and Highly Automated Driving trial across to Council controlled roads. In addition, other organisations have approached Council with proposals for trials and Council has been an observer on Transurban's connected and automated vehicle trial on the Brisbane motorway network.

If you have any further questions regarding Council's submission, please contact Ms Marie Gales, Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 1418.

Yours sincerely

Colin Jensen
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Responses to the National Transport Commission’s Discussion Paper, *Review of ‘Guidelines for trials of automated vehicles in Australia’*

No.	Question	Response
1	<p>Should the guidelines be updated to improve the management of trials (section 3 of the guidelines) and, if so, why? Consider in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the standard of evidence required in a traffic management plan • the definition of ‘trial location’ • the stakeholders trialling organisations should engage with • requirements to state the purpose of a trial 	<p>In Council’s limited interactions with agencies seeking to trial automated vehicles, Council has not referenced the guidelines but has required that traffic management plans, trial locations, stakeholders and purpose definition be prepared to its satisfaction.</p>
2	<p>Should the guidelines be updated to improve the safety management of trials (section 4 of the guidelines) and, if so, why? Consider in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the standard of evidence required • human driver or operator inattention • road user behaviour that does not comply with road rules • interaction with enforcement and emergency services • pre-trial testing • any additional key safety criteria. Consider the safety criteria for the first supply of automated vehicles for commercial deployment (Appendix A). 	<p>Guidelines on safety management could address risks to wildlife (e.g. animals in the road corridor) as some tests are being carried out in environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>Reference to interaction with enforcement and emergency services is strongly supported.</p> <p>Road authorities should have the ability to mandate pre – testing before allowing automated vehicles on their networks.</p>
3	<p>What issues have been encountered when obtaining or providing insurance?</p>	<p>This is a matter for the automated driving system entity (ADSE). In proposed trials, the appropriate insurance required by Council has been able to be obtained by the ADSE.</p>
4	<p>Are the current insurance requirements sufficient (section 5 of the guidelines)? If not, how should they change?</p>	<p>Council has followed the policies of the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) in its insurance requirements.</p>
5	<p>Should the guidelines be updated to improve the provision of relevant data and information (section 6 of the guidelines)? Consider in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serious and other incidents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ consistency of reporting requirements ○ disengagements ○ definition of a serious incident 	<p>Council agrees that the guidelines in future should specify end-of-trial reporting and provide guidance to its content. Prominence should be given to incident reporting and numbers and circumstances of disengagements.</p> <p>The guidelines need to provide for the development of a standard to provide for the consistent reporting of outcomes. This will facilitate a more rapid collation of learnings from a range of locations and environments around the country to assist more rapid industry development.</p>

No.	Question	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ broader data recording requirements ● research outcomes and end-of – trial reports. 	
6	Is there any additional information the guidelines should include for trialling organisations?	As mentioned in the Discussion Paper, some case studies of existing trials would be useful.
7	Should the guidelines apply to any other emerging technologies (discussed in chapter 4 or other technologies) and operating domains?	Council is pleased that the National Transport Commission (NTC) has included autonomous pods as Council facilitated the 2017 small automated vehicle trial with Australia Post. At that time there were no guidelines.
8	Are there any additional criteria or additional matters relevant to the trials of automated heavy vehicles that should be included in the guidelines?	There have not been any trials of automated heavy vehicles in Brisbane. Due to the size, weight and behaviour of heavy vehicles, additional safety issues would be present in a heavy vehicle trial. Given the early stage of development of trials with small vehicles, the trials of heavy vehicles on public roads may not happen for some time.
9	Are there currently any regulatory or other barriers to running larger trials? If so, how should these barriers be addressed? (Consider the guidelines, state and territory exemption and permit schemes, and Commonwealth importation processes.)	There are no regulatory or other barriers to running larger trials, the issue centres around the level of confidence that ADSEs and road authorities have in operating in more complex environments. This is subject to confidence that all risks have been identified and managed.
10	Should the guidelines continue to allow commercial passenger services in automated vehicle trials? If so, should the guidelines reference additional criteria that trialling organisations should be subject to, and what should these criteria be?	<p>As early uptake in automated vehicles is most likely to be in commercial passenger services rather than private ownership, the guidelines should still address these issues.</p> <p>The guidelines should address the safety protection of the passenger, and any risks or liabilities that the passenger would voluntarily take on.</p>
11	What challenges have you faced with administrative processes when applying for approving trials of automated vehicles, and how could these be addressed?	There have been no challenges with administrative processes in approving trials. The overall approach is the same as any other application for an activity on a Council road, with consideration of safety, risks, liabilities and indemnities.
12	Are there any other barriers to cross – border trials? Is there a need to change current arrangements for cross border trials?	In the context of Brisbane City Council, “cross border” is only between TMR and Council controlled roads. No cross-border trial has been undertaken to date (but has been raised) and it would be expected that this would be undertaken through a cooperative arrangement between the two agencies.
13	Should there be a more standardised government evaluation framework for automated vehicle trials? If so, what are the trial issues that should be evaluated?	There should be a more standardised government evaluation framework for automated vehicle trials for the reasons raised in the response to Question 5.
14	Should the results of evaluations be shared between states and territories? If so, how should commercially sensitive information be treated?	The results of evaluations should be shared between states and territories. Commercially sensitive information could be released and shared through mutual agreements negotiated between the parties.
15	What works well in the automated vehicle importation process, and what are the challenges?	This matter lies outside Council's jurisdiction.

No.	Question	Response
16	Is there anything further that should be done to facilitate a transition from trial to commercial deployment?	<p data-bbox="724 210 1382 360">At present automated vehicles are a long way from commercial deployment. Commercial deployment will only happen when road authorities are satisfied that all risks have been mitigated and this is likely to be a long evolutionary process over a number of years.</p> <p data-bbox="724 412 1406 649">A key risk is that different jurisdictions will allow commercial deployment (that is “as of right”) at different times and under different circumstances. This will lead to the same vehicle being allowed to do certain functions under certain conditions in one state and completely different functions and conditions in another. There is a role for the Commonwealth to play in harmonisation between state jurisdictions.</p>
17	Are there any matters that the NTC should consider in its review of the guidelines?	The NTC has adequately covered all relevant matters in its review.