

University of Groningen

Legal Aspects of Automated Driving

Vellinga, Nynke

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.112916838](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.112916838)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Vellinga, N. (2020). *Legal Aspects of Automated Driving: On Drivers, Producers, and Public Authorities*. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.112916838>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Legal Aspects of Automated Driving

On Drivers, Producers, and Public Authorities

Nynke E. Vellinga

Colofon

Cover: © Ida Varošaneč

Printing: Ridderprint BV, <www.ridderprint.nl>

ISBN e-book: 978-94-034-2265-7

ISBN printed book: 978-94-034-2266-4



university of
 groningen

Legal Aspects of Automated Driving

On Drivers, Producers, and Public Authorities

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
 University of Groningen
 on the authority of the
 Rector Magnificus Prof. C. Wijmenga
 and in accordance with
 the decision by the College of Deans.

This thesis will be defended in public on
 Thursday 20 February 2020 at 16.15 hours

by

Nynke Elske Vellinga

born on 8 November 1988
 in Leeuwarden

Supervisors

Prof. A.J. Verheij

Prof. G.P. Mifsud Bonnici

Assessment Committee

Prof. A.R. Lodder

Prof. J.B.H.M. Simmelink

Prof. M.H. Wissink

Acknowledgements

There are many people I want to express my gratitude to for the help and support I have been so lucky to receive, but naming every single person would require an entire annex to this thesis. Therefore, I will only name a few people that have contributed in an exceptional way to the PhD process.

First of all, my supervisors, Albert and Jeanne. Thank you for having faith in me, that I could, despite uncertainties, finish a PhD research and for not losing faith during rough patches. If it had not been for you, this thesis would not lie before you today.

I am extremely grateful to those who made sure that I did not at any point – literally – fall apart: doctor Bergwerff and Jantsje (for keeping me alive), their team, André (foar hieltyd alles wer te plak setten), Manon, Kirsten, Edwin and the Brink-team. Without your help it would have been impossible not to fall apart and to live the life I am living today.

Dear Lauren, Ida and Yasmin, thank you for your help with this thesis and the fun we had in the process. Ida, thank you so much for the beautiful cover. Thank you Lauren for all the hard work you put into the language check. Thanks to the three of you, the thesis does not look like a hot mess.

Thank you Oskar, Karen, Gerard, Catherine and Ida for chocolate, Christmas lights and bringing the Circle of Life to our office, for all the laughter and support. You are the best officemates ever!

I would like to express my gratitude to all my colleagues at the Private Law department and the TLS department. A special thanks goes out to my colleagues of the TLS and European Law departments for their understanding, their jokes and the joint lunches: Peter, Martin, Lauren, Esra, Carolin, Jonida, Matthijs (chocolate!), Justin, Mel, Carola, Lorenzo, Adi, Evgeni, Bettina, Hans, Saleh and Karien. Thank you Charlotte, Sarah, Carien, Leonieke, Carljne, Tim and Benedikt of the Private Law department for our weekly meetings, new ideas, and making me feel part of your department even though my office was at the other side of the building. Stefan and Evert, thank you for giving me the opportunity to teach. Thank you Berend, Pauline, Hein, Kai, Monique and Eveline for your continuous support and encouragement.

Pierte en Rients, tige tank foar jimme stipe en help troch de jierren hinne.

Willie, Gert, Tineke and Ellen, thank you for turning a necessity into so much fun, your laughter, and kind words of encouragement.

Ydwine, tige tank foar dyn briefkes, leave wurden, en foar alle wille dy't wy tegearre belibbe hawwe.

Dear Trix, you have been such a great support and you are always so helpful. Thank you for that, and thank you for all the fun we have had working together. You are an amazing friend!

I have been very fortunate with my loving family. I would like to thank in particular André, Jaqueline, Elske, Henk, Albert, Caroline, Erwin and Lara for your encouragements, support, and warm words.

Dear Namkje, you are the best sister ever! Thank you for leading the way, for all the fun we have had and for your loving support.

Leave Heit and mama, words cannot describe how grateful I am to you. You have been the best support anyone can ever wish for. Thank you for teaching me that the size of my medical file does not define me and that I can achieve anything I set my mind to. Your loving, encouraging words, your help whenever and wherever I needed it, and your endless support have led me in life to where I am today. Ik haw jimme ûneinich leaf.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	13
1.1	The Coming Collision Between Automated Vehicles and the Law	13
1.2	Technology, Terminology and Taxonomy	15
1.3	Safety Expectations	19
1.4	Changing Roles and Effects	21
1.5	Research Question	23
1.6	Delimitations of Research	26
1.7	Sources and Methodology	29
1.8	Legal Framework	31
1.8.1	Geneva Convention on Road Traffic 1949 and the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic 1968	31
1.8.2	Product Liability Directive	33
1.8.3	International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea of 1972 (COLREGS 1972)	34
1.8.4	Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago Convention)	35
1.8.5	Directive 2007/46/EC on the Approval of Motor Vehicles	36
1.8.6	Dutch Civil Code	36
1.9	Structure	37
2	From the Testing to the Deployment of Self-Driving Cars: Legal Challenges to Policymakers on the Road Ahead	39
2.1	Introduction	40
2.2	Terminology and Technology	41
2.3	Interests at Stake and Actors Involved	45
2.4	Legal Consistency	48
2.5	Testing: Four Jurisdictions' Legal Frameworks	49
2.5.1	Binding Regulation: California	49
2.5.2	Non-binding Regulation: USA and UK	50
2.5.3	Granting Exemptions: The Netherlands	54
2.5.4	Evaluating the Legal Instruments	55

2.6	Post-testing: The Driver in International and National Traffic Laws -----	59
2.6.1	The Driver in International Law: Vienna Convention on Road Traffic 1968 and the Geneva Convention on Road Traffic 1949-----	59
2.6.2	The Driver in National Law: The Netherlands, California and the United Kingdom -----	63
2.6.3	The Interpretation of <i>Driver</i> -----	66
2.7	Post-testing: Liability and Insurance -----	68
2.7.1	Current Developments-----	68
2.7.2	The Effects of Liability Law and the Influence of Insurance -----	71
2.8	Conclusion -----	75
	Epilogue: New Legal Developments-----	77
3	Automated Driving and its Challenges to International Traffic Law: Which Way to Go? -----	81
3.1	Introduction-----	82
3.2	The Functions of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> -----	84
3.2.1	The Function of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Technical Regulations-----	84
3.2.2	The Function of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Capacity Requirements -----	85
3.2.3	The Function of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Rules of Conduct -----	85
3.2.4	The Function of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Liability Law -----	87
3.3	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> in the Conventions-----	87
3.3.1	The Functions of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> in the Conventions-----	87
3.3.2	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> and Control -----	88
3.3.3	The Definition of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> -----	88
3.3.4	The Interpretation of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> -----	89
3.4	The Driver of an Automated Vehicle-----	91
3.4.1	The Possible Drivers of an Automated Vehicle -----	91
3.4.2	An Automated Vehicle is Driverless within the Meaning of the Conventions -----	93
3.5	The Laws of Other Modes of Transport as a Source of Inspiration [Option 1] -- -----	94
3.5.1	Maritime and Aviation Traffic Law-----	94

3.5.2	A Distinction Between Operation and Responsibility -----	95
3.5.3	The Vehicle and the Conventions -----	96
3.5.4	Responsibility -----	98
3.5.5	Arguments For and Against This Approach -----	99
3.6	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> : A different driver per function [Option 2] -----	100
3.6.1	The Interpretation of the Notion of <i>Driver</i> Depending on its Function-	100
3.6.2	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Technical Requirements -----	100
3.6.3	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Capacity Requirements -----	101
3.6.4	The Notion of <i>Driver</i> in Rules of Conduct -----	101
3.6.5	Arguments For and Against This Approach -----	102
3.7	The User Operating the Controls? [Option 3] -----	103
3.7.1	The Start Button as a Control of the Automated Vehicle -----	103
3.7.2	The Controls and the Driver of an Automated Vehicle -----	103
3.7.3	Arguments For and Against This Approach -----	104
3.8	Functioneel Daderschap [Option 4] -----	105
3.8.1	The Dynamic Driving Task and the Notion of <i>Driver</i> -----	105
3.8.2	Inspiration from Dutch Law -----	106
3.8.3	Functioneel Daderschap and the Conventions -----	108
3.8.4	Arguments For and Against This approach -----	109
3.9	The Way Forward -----	110
3.9.1	The Four Approaches -----	110
3.9.2	Towards a Driverless Future -----	111
	Epilogue: Developments on the Notion of <i>Driver</i> -----	112
4	Careless Automated Driving? -----	121
4.1	Introduction -----	122
4.2	The User of the Vehicle and his Duty of Care -----	123
4.2.1	Renting a Vehicle: An Example -----	123
4.2.2	Duty of Care -----	125
4.2.3	Consenting to the Current State of the Vehicle -----	125
4.2.4	Risks Created -----	126

4.2.5	Severity of the Consequences-----	127
4.2.6	Preliminary Conclusion -----	128
4.3	The Owner of the Vehicle and His Duty of Care-----	128
4.3.1	Duty of Care -----	128
4.3.2	Ability to Prevent the Automated Vehicle From Driving -----	128
4.3.3	Consequences of a Duty for the Owner -----	129
4.4	The Manufacturer of the Vehicle and His Duty of Care -----	129
4.4.1	Duty of Care -----	129
4.4.2	Fail-safe -----	130
4.4.3	Consequences of Equipping the Vehicle with a Fail-safe-----	130
4.5	The Role of the Vehicle Authority -----	131
4.5.1	Protection of Road Users-----	131
4.5.2	Requirement to Equip the Automated Vehicle with a Fail-safe -----	131
4.5.3	Consequences of the Requirement for the Position of the Vehicle Authority -----	132
4.6	Conclusion -----	133
	Epilogue: A Closer Look at the Liability of the Vehicle Authority -----	134
5	Automated Driving: Liability of the Software Producer and the Producer of the Automated Vehicle -----	137
5.1	Introduction -----	138
5.2	Technology -----	139
5.2.1	Degree of Automation -----	139
5.2.2	Machine Learning -----	139
5.3	Two Scenarios -----	140
5.4	The Product Liability Directive-----	141
5.5	The Software of the Automated Vehicle as a Product-----	142
5.5.1	Software and the Product Liability Directive -----	142
5.5.2	Electricity-----	143
5.5.3	Software, its Carrier and the Absence of a Carrier-----	143
5.5.4	Software of the Automated Vehicle -----	147

5.6	When is an Automated Vehicle Defective? -----	148
5.6.1	Justified Expectations -----	149
5.6.2	Different Types of Defects -----	151
5.6.3	An Independent Expectation for the Automated Vehicle -----	153
5.6.4	The Time When the Product Was Put Into Circulation -----	155
5.7	The Defences of the Producer -----	155
5.7.1	The Existence of the Defect at the Moment the Product Was Put Into Circulation -----	156
5.7.2	The Development Risk Defence -----	159
5.8	Conclusion -----	162
	Epilogue: Consequences of the Proposed Derogation from the Development Risk Defence -----	164
6	On Automated Driving, Type-approval, Road Authorities and Liability: a Dutch Example -----	167
6.1	Introduction -----	168
6.2	Type-approval -----	168
6.3	The Liability of the Road Authority: a Dutch Example -----	168
6.3.1	An Example -----	168
6.3.2	The Liability of a Road Authority Under Dutch Tort Law -----	169
6.3.3	The Influence of the Type-approval -----	169
6.4	Conclusion -----	170
	Epilogue: (Type-)approval and Liability Risks -----	171
7	Conclusion -----	177
7.1	Main findings -----	177
7.1.1	The Geneva Convention and Vienna Convention Are Not Compatible With Automated Driving -----	177
7.1.2	Software should be a Product within the Meaning of the EU Product Liability Directive -----	178
7.1.3	Two Defences of the Producer Lead To Undesirable Results -----	178
7.1.4	The Influence Of The (Type-)approval Of A Vehicle On Liability Risks Will Increase -----	179

7.2	Additional Findings	182
7.3	Further Research: The Road Ahead	183
	Table of Cases	185
	Table of Treaties, Instruments, and Legislation	187
	Bibliography	191
	Summary	225
	Samenvatting	233