Workshop 3 (W3): 12-13 October 2021
Session 1 (S1): 12 October 1400 UTC
Session 2 (S2): 13 October 2200 UTC

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:12:35	98	P1	Slide 10. In a federated governance, how are the difference between legislated at each of the three levels accommodated as being current as of any point in time? Does the input of C-ITS data have any legal standing?	P5->P1: I do not know, but I've taken that question as a note because it could lead to a fairly expansive deep dive. Legal frameworks vary too, so the relevance of C-ITS data will vary. Different kinds of C-ITS data will have different constraints as well. Anything governed by C-ITS Security policy for instance will have those extra-legal constraints that may rub up against laws. Complex.	METR will need to convey all of the rules that are defined by the various levels of regulators that have jurisdiction over a defined area. The applicability of rules from one jurisdiction to the next should be defined by the rules themselves (e.g., the default speed limit on a rural road is X unless otherwise posted). To the extent that the rules have ambiguities (e.g., federal laws in contradiction with local laws), METR will convey both laws and it will be left to the entity responsible for the DDT to determine appropriate actions. Rule conflicts will be discussed further in Workshop 4. C-ITS data has the legal standing that rules assign it. For example, if a rule states that a traffic signal's SPaT message is normative, it has legal status.
W3S1	9:12:36	99	P2	what is the meaning of enact?		Per Oxford English dictionary, "make law" or secondarily "put into practice"
W3S1	9:13:16	100	P2	I mean in the context of deploy. What will be the consequence of enact		It becomes a "current" rule, meaning that it will be "active" (i.e., enforceable) when conditions defined by the rule are met (e.g., time of day, presence of emergency vehicle, etc.) and the rule is not overridden.

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:16:07	101	P2	slides 11 and 12 seem to mix two different issues: (1) decision on a rule and (2) activation of the respective info to the Transport users.		As indicated verbally, the "states" shown within the "approved" state (e.g., "legislated", "warranted") are more appropriately modelled as rule types; however, when discussing the details of the rule lifecycle, it is important to consider the different types and that is why we showed these on the diagram for discussion purposes. This content might be removed from the final diagram presented in the ConOps.
W3S1	9:19:27	102	P1	Slide 12. Assume that when emergency response plan is operational, it becomes operationally decided" and may vary depending on the nature of the emergency and locality.."		The rule types indicate the types of rules that need to be considered. We might remove these types in the final figure. At the present time, we have not identified any pressing need to separate the different types, but it is worth classifying them for our initial discussions in case different needs arise for the different types of rules.
W3S1	9:25:52	103	P3	DATEX II categorisation: 1. Traffic Regs from Competent Authorities 2. ad-hoc traffic regs. (typically safety related emergency response) 3. Planned Dynamic traffic regs. 4. traffic regs by authorised actors		

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:30:13	104	P2	The Status Overridden" seems to be reasonable only for rules that may have different values; e.g. Speed Limit dependent on actual visibility."		While that is one case, there are many other possibilities that can occur (depending on the authorities given to various actors within a region). For example, a police officer might have the authority to direct traffic through a signalized intersection in violation of the displayed signal indication. A road crew might have the authority to post a reduced speed limit overriding the normal speed limit. Normal parking rules might be overridden for a special event. It seems reasonable to allow for any rule to be logically overridden - whether a specific jurisdiction allows for such an operation is a separate decision.
W3S1	9:31:09	105	P3	suspension of parking (for construction or snow clearing) is a good example of overridden		Agreed
W3S1	9:32:54	106	P2	publication in a newspaper seems strange in the context of METR		The context is that in the "existing situation" and as long as there are human drivers, agencies use traditional media (e.g., newspapers, radio, TV, websites) to notify the public-at-large that there is a new "legislated" rules. Within the "proposed system" there will obviously need to be a machine-interpretable version of the rule so that ADS and similar systems can conform to the new rule.

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:54:26	107	P4	Lots of potential liability issues for infrastructure operators such as cloud service providers (CSPs) and edge network providers. Does conformance/attestation of the standard address this risk?	P5->P4: As to conformance, recognize that we are developing the operational concept; we're a long way for determining conformance mechanisms, but will take input on suggestions of course.	In general, we think our vision would impose very little risk on the CSP (i.e., hosting service); however, the disseminator (along with the regulator, translator, and collectors) would be responsible for defining a expiration time for the data that it transmits. In other words, a disseminator could assert that the data transmitted is reliable for 7 days (i.e., the maximum refresh interval). User systems are not ~required~ to refresh their data until the end of that period. Any unexpected changes to rules within that 7 day period would fall into the category of "C-ITS data" that has to be transmitted by separate means (typically local beacons, such as RSUs). In this example, I would imagine most OEMs will have their vehicles refresh every day (e.g., at engine start). Thus, it would seem to me that as long as the CSP does not have a prolonged outage of multiple days, there is no (or very little) impact or risk. Even in the worse case, the risk is that users who need a refresh do not have access and have to either drive in manual mode or have to obtain a remote refresh. None of this would seem to imply a significant liability onto a CSP that only provided a hosting service.

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:55:45	108	P2	how can a user be responsible for obtaining rules from a disseminator. Today I am not responsible whether a traffic sign is properly installed. I probably will be responsible only for a clean windscreen such that I can see the sign.	P5->P2: You also responsible for looking at, reading and understanding the sign, right?	The user system will be responsible for obtaining the rules that are available from the disseminator just as driver's are currently responsible for becoming informed of publicized rules (e.g., being aware of traffic control devices as well as unposted rules such as requirements to wear a seat belt). If the translator, collector, and/or disseminator fail to publicize rules properly, the user obviously cannot be held responsible (unless it had knowledge from other sources). In short, the proposal works in the same manner as the existing situation.
W3S1	9:56:11	109	P1	Slide 29. Acknowledgement of receipt created and retained with acknowledger device for duration of rule effectiveness period? Sending does not necessarily mean that it was received.		Non-repudiation will be required. From the ConOps perspective, we are only concerned with the functionality that is needed and the constraints that need to be considered (e.g. amount of on-board storage). The ConOps is not concerned with the technological methods used to fulfil the need.

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	9:56:21	110	P2	user requests for rules must be anonymous		Agreed that user requests contain data subjected to confidentiality and privacy needs. At the current time, we are proposing that all requests are confidential (i.e., kept between the user and disseminator) whereas privacy (e.g., the disseminator using the data for other purposes) is a bit more subjective. For example, in Europe where the disseminator is likely public, there will likely be a demand that the requests are kept private and only used for the stated purpose (e.g., filtering). Whereas, a subscription-based service offered by a massive tech firm might provide a free disseminator service in exchange for not keeping the information private (e.g., so that it can offer location-specific adverts on your journey). Our proposal is to define the METR ConOps where the privacy issue is highlighted with optional conformance levels.
W3S1	10:08:14	111	P1	Slide 30. Personal classification farm vehicles lower age on and off road.		"Personnel classification" was clarified to read "vehicle occupant/driver classification"; "vehicle classification" was clarified to read "vehicle classification and hierarchy" to accommodate groups such as "farm vehicles"
W3S1	10:09:00	112	P1	Slide 30. Trailer rules vary with length of trailer whether single, dual or triple.	P5->P1: There's a quad running in Australia. Or at least there was. But yes	"Number of trailers" was added
W3S1	10:11:42	113	P1	Slide 30. add chains, tire studs usually for limited time periods (seasons)		"Chains" was added as an example

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S1	10:13:29	114	P1	Slide 31. When not applicable" (e.g., on holidays)"		Added a note that "Each filter can be positive or negative (e.g., 'only on holidays' or 'except holidays')"
W3S1	10:16:39	115	P1	Slide 32. Designated evacuation routes (signage noted) Evacuation plan scenarios for different incidents, events, et al.		Thank you, we will consider these ideas in the ConOps
W3S1	10:18:13	116	P1	Slide 32. Are there any rules too accommodate emergency vehicles right of way and use of roadways on evacuation routes?		METR is limited to providing rules defined by regulators; it does not define the rules themselves. But presumably, METR will need to be able to support the dissemination of rules that regulators might define that provide right-of-way for emergency vehicles.
W3S1	10:19:49	117	P2	Late Submission of evacuation plans could result in a bad dead-lock, that at time of wanted Distribution the Distribution path is no more available.	P5->P2: Right. Typically those plans have to be defined in advance, and when the situation arises, the plans are activated	Agreed; there will likely need to be a balance of providing plans in advance and allowing customization in near real time. In addition, METR will also need to be able to prioritize information in a manner so that when a major event occurs (e.g., collapse of the Bay Bridge during an earthquake), high priority messages can reliably get through the network.
W3S1	10:21:56	118	P1	Slide 36. Schedule for standardization activities?		There is currently a PWI for the METR ConOps. Once we have a complete draft, we will submit a new work item proposal (NWIP) with the draft, which will start the standardization clock for up to 3 years. Hopefully, we will be able to take the draft to completion as a TS within a year or two.

Wkshp	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W3S2	17;19:57	119	P5	one more step = review/refine - to complete the loop		Agreed that the process to develop and refine rules often includes review processes, potentially both before and after rules are implemented. However, this aspect of the process does not seem to impact the design of METR and we propose to treat this as largely out-of-scope. In other words, the exact details of how a proposal evolves into a approved rule or even how proposals are made to evolve existing rules are outside the scope of METR; METR only needs to convey rules one approved.
W3S2	18:04:19	120	P8	Do we need to clarify who is responsible for determining applicability (e.g. vehicle-specific) and conflict (e.g. different speed limits received)?		Yes, we will add resposnibility statements for both of these. In the first case, we propose that 1) the disseminator is responsible for publicising the filters available, 2) the vehicle is responsible for complying with the terms of its agreement with the disseminator by requesting all rules it needs based on the defined filters at the required interval, and 3) the disseminator is responsible for delivering all rules that meet the requested set of filters. We will also add responsibility statements related to checking for conflicts. While this is a responsibility for all of the roles, it is especially important for the disseminator to check for conflicts since the disseminator is aware of all rules for a specific location.