

Wksh	Time	ID	Src	Comment	Online Discussion	Disposition
W7S1	8:09:57		P1	[Slide 7] Do I understand correctly that this discussion is about extending an authority (=governmental) to something private? I understand that private entities might indicate rules following the same principles as METR, but these rules are regulations. Am I wrong? I meant: private rules are not regulations	P0->P1: Private rules could be regulatory in the sense that they might still be enforced. P1->P0: My concerns are not related to enforcement P2->P1: ok. So then, what's the difference? P1: Regulations are set up by governmental authorities; rules may be set up by private entities. We must split the System in a Regulation part and a rule part or simply add a flag indicating private rule.	The workshop participants seemed to conclude that private entities can own properties such as a university, hospital, or even a small store with a parking lot and that ADS-equipped vehicles (and driver support systems) should be made aware of these rules/regulations by METR so that they do not get penalized for not obeying them. The participants agreed that it is worth indicating whether a rule is defined by a "governmental" or "private" authority.

W7S1	8:16:24		P1	<p>There might be a university campus and a public road passing through it. In Germany, streets that pass through a campus (university) are public and follow the normal regulations of public roads.</p> <p>There are industrial areas with private roads. Typically the driver will face information that public road regulations apply on these private roads.</p> <p>German Police can give a ticket on a public road passing through a Campus. On a private industrial road, the owner must call the Police in case of problems</p>		<p>Agreed that these conditions exist and that internationally there is a range of implementations. The key is that METR needs to be able to accommodate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - public roads passing through a campus, - private roads on a campus, and - campuses with non-contiguous areas (sometimes called islands), - enforcement by private and/or public entities (according to whatever local rules that might apply) <p>Further, these same relationships can apply to hierarchical jurisdictions. For example, a national road might cut through a local town and be governed and enforced by different bodies than the local roads.</p>
W7S1	8:23:20		P1	<p>If I am Right, in Germany you must ask for authorization to install a traffic sign on your private area.</p>		<p>Agreed that this might be required in some jurisdictions while other jurisdictions might allow autonomy of the private campus.</p>
W7S1	8:24:43		P3	<p>In Japan, we have US military bases where US regulations are valid instead of Japanese ones</p>	P4: embassies?	<p>This is an interesting point, this suggests that contiguous regions of one jurisdiction might have areas within it that are subject to an entirely different jurisdiction rather than being hierarchical in nature.</p>

W7S1	8:27:54		P1	<p>[Slide 8] I doubt that in Germany you can get legal jurisdiction for a territory just by owning it</p> <p>Recently I got News that this seems to be possible in the USA</p> <p>It was said that in the USA this depends on the size of the area. Only possible with a Minimum size</p> <p>yes, it was further said that in this case the private owner can enforce himself (=private Police)</p>		<p>Yes, the rights of land ownership likely varies by region. Private rules are typically not enforced by public law enforcement other than in exceptional conditions (e.g., a vehicular collision); but they might be enforced by the land owner (or land owner's representative, such as private security or towing companies). At least in some jurisdictions, such private enforcement is supported by the judicial system.</p> <p>In the USA, the ability to create such rules and enforce them likely vary by state; many very small business still have regulations that they enforce with the use of private</p>
W7S1	8:35:56		P5	<p>[Slide 10] I vote B - who is liable for the rules?</p> <p>consider enforcement - what does certification indicate or enable?</p>		<p>Based on discussions, there seems to be agreement that providing self-reported (uncertified) rules is better than no rules, but is not as good as certified rules (e.g., where a jurisdiction approves). Thus, METR needs to be able to support providing uncertified rules, but any such rules should be indicated as uncertified.</p>
W7S1	8:40:17		P5	<p>[Slide 11] Option 1 - ground truth necessary for useful METR system</p>	P3: option 1	<p>Agreed, all participants seemed to agree that the METR system needs to declare the boundaries of each jurisdiction so that there is no ambiguity, especially when there are recent boundary changes.</p>

W7S1	8:41:37		P5	[Slide 12] Its about identifying the roadways goverened by the campus		Agreed, when defining jurisdictional boundaries, METR needs to clearly identify whether a road is part of the larger jurisdictional area or a part of the smaller jurisdiction or campus.
W7S1	8:49:14		P1	[Slide 15] the same will happen for public areas, i.e. parts of the public space are not covered by METR		Agreed, while public jurisdictions will typically have at least some rules, they might not have rules in every category.
W7S1	8:50:08		P1	applying METR would require to have the same rules on public and private space, except rules for private space are marked as private""		Agreed, a user system needs to have a seamless experience when crossing from a public to a private area; the workshop participants agreed that METR has the capability to indicate which rules are "private" but different jurisdictions might have different policies on whether distinguishing the private rules from public ones is required..
W7S1	8:51:27		P1	[Slide 16] a robot Vehicle will use its own sensors to continue driving		To the extent that the robot vehicle is still within its operational design domain, it would continue to operate; but if the robot vehicle requires METR, it might be forced to stop or avoid the area.