October 30, 2020

Background

Automotive safety technology is designed to reduce the incidence and severity of motor vehicle accidents. In particular, advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS) are intended to reduce accidents by delegating discrete portions of driving to the vehicle. ADAS, in combination with a sophisticated onboard computer, is what makes a vehicle autonomous.

ADAS includes both passive and active technologies. Passive ADAS delegates perceptual functions to the vehicle, alerting the driver to hazards. Examples include blind spot monitoring and backup cameras and sensors. Active ADAS automates a difficult driving task when a driver may not have the time or skill to do so. Anti-lock braking systems (ABS) is an example of older active ADAS technology, automatically pulsing a vehicle's brakes when the driver hits the brake pedal too aggressively. Newer examples include parking assist and emergency braking systems.

As various ADAS technologies are developed, adopted and become more prevalent, we anticipate three issues that will affect the defence of claims involving ADAS and considerations around the safe adoption of these technologies in the short term:

- piecemeal adoption of ADAS;
- lack of updated driver norms; and
- inadequate driving skills.

As the technology advances, driving norms will change and best practices will evolve. However, in the interim, stakeholders have to consider how to eliminate, or at least mitigate, the risk arising from these three issues.

Piecemeal adoption of ADAS

The popular perception of a connected and autonomous vehicle (CAV) is an engineered suite of passive and active ADAS technologies, governed by a sophisticated onboard computer, and seamlessly integrated into the body of a vehicle. A layperson would have some familiarity with a few of the technologies typically integrated into a CAV: sensors, navigation, etc. However, the specific types and models of technologies used are generally at a manufacturer's discretion. As a result, for the foreseeable future, the driving public may be exposed to vehicles with markedly different equipment and capabilities, even within the same SAE level of automation.

At one level, this is to be expected. Some ADAS technologies can be expensive and may be restricted to luxury models or lines. In other cases, the manufacturer may have a choice in the type of ADAS technology to equip to address a specific issue, such as the use of radar, light detection and ranging (lidar), or both for vehicle sensors. One manufacturer's technology, capabilities, and business strategy will differ from another. As such, competing models from different manufacturers may have different capabilities, even within the same price point and automation level.

The potential for variance in vehicle capability and equipment raises important questions for manufacturers, insurers, regulators, road authorities and consumers. Can vehicle manufacturers be held liable for failing to equip a particular model of vehicle with a specific class or type of ADAS technology? Should regulators require certain ADAS technologies?

One example of the first issue has already been litigated. In an interesting case from Arizona in the United States, a plaintiff injured in a collision sued an auto manufacturer for failing to equip her vehicle with forward collision warning and crash-imminent braking systems, which existed at the time her vehicle was manufactured. The plaintiff was unsuccessful in that case.

The second issue is something that regulators already address. Transport Canada mandated including ABS and electronic stability controls on all vehicles from 2012 on. More recently, in March 2019, the EU announced that it would make ten ADAS technologies mandatory on all vehicles by 2022, including driver attention monitors, emergency stop detectors and lane departure warnings.

Lacking driver norms

Vehicle technology is just one component of driving safety. The way drivers use and interact with ADAS features will also have a significant impact on their efficacy. As active ADAS features become more sophisticated, drivers have been in a number of accidents, as they appear to have entirely abandoned the task of driving.

In March 2019, a driver operating a CAV with the ADAS engaged was killed when a tractor-trailer crossed its path. Neither the driver nor the ADAS took any evasive maneuvers. Data from the CAV indicated that the ADAS engaged about ten seconds before collision, and that the driver had – contrary to warnings – apparently removed his hands from the steering wheel approximately two seconds after engaging the ADAS.

This case suggests that the driving public has not sufficiently developed or established norms about the proper use of active ADAS. In particular, some of these accidents seem to occur because the notion of a driver keeping their attention on the road and the vehicle runs counter to the popular conception of CAVs making drivers redundant. In a November 2019 news story, a driver admitted to sleeping behind the wheel of a CAV for 14 miles. The story also explains how CAV drivers attempt to trick or otherwise circumvent the driver oversight software.

Examining driver error may complicate analyzing accidents involving CAVs. It may be that a norm of continued human oversight will have to be developed, just as the norm of wearing seatbelts was developed. Legislation mandating continued human oversight is a necessary step, but it is by no means the only one. Legislators and regulators will have to consider whether driver attention technologies will be mandatory on CAVs of a certain level, and will have to devise mechanisms for enforcing compliance with those technologies.

Legislation alone is not enough to develop good driver norms. A robust public safety awareness campaign and safety reminders, like those used to encourage seatbelt use, will likely be needed. Developing such norms will take time and may never be fully adopted. Even today, with seatbelt laws in place for a generation, vehicle occupants still occasionally fail or refuse to use them.

Inadequate driver skills

Finally, we anticipate a similar but a slightly different issue in relation to driver skills, which is exemplified best by drivers failing to fully understand the limitations of CAV sensors. This is because of the different limitations of different types of passive ADAS sensors (radar, lidar and cameras). Lidar may fail to recognize obstacles in poor lighting conditions. Cameras must first be "trained" to recognize hazards and may fail to register a novel hazard. Radar may have difficulty distinguishing between objects near the road and hazards on the road.

Sensor technologies are so new that there is not yet widespread familiarity with their limitations. This lack of knowledge and familiarity can lead drivers to assume that a passive ADAS will detect any hazard or obstacle and that an active ADAS will respond appropriately at all times. Education in these limitations will be necessary for drivers to understand how to use them safely and how to take control of the vehicle safely when necessary.

Driver skills in a world of CAVs will be less about driving a vehicle and more about overseeing a vehicle as it drives itself. Returning to the example of CAV sensors, this will mean knowing the types of items and obstacles that may be immediately apparent to the human eye, but may fool the different sensor technologies used by a CAV. This is just one of many new skills drivers will have to develop.

Equally important are considerations around appropriate marketing of ADAS technologies in a way that is not only accurate, but avoids any misapprehension about the capabilities of the technology by operators of CAVs. Manufacturers may be able to mitigate against defective marketing claims against ADAS technologies on the front-end by carefully considering marketing materials to ensure safe adoption and deployment of ADAS technologies.

By: Jeremy Ablaza

Services: Disputes, Insurance Claim Defence, Transportation, Automotive, Autonomous Vehicles

---

Key Contacts

Robert L. Love
PARTNER

Toronto
RLove@blg.com
416.367.6132

Luke Dineley
PARTNER

Vancouver
LDineley@blg.com
604.640.4219

Josiane Brault
PARTNER

Montréal
JBrault@blg.com
514.954.2557

Edona C. Vila
PARTNER

Toronto
EVila@blg.com
416.367.6554

Table of contents

2024 Series

- Ontario's newly proposed pilot program for automated commercial vehicle testing - November

2023 Series

- Autonomous vehicle laws in Canada: Provincial & territorial regulatory review - January
- Driving into the future: U.K. announces regulatory scheme for the use of automated vehicles - December

2022 Series

Autonomous vehicles: Key 2022 industry hotspots – April

Autonomous vehicle laws in the States: Congress offers hope for national regulatory framework – June

Autonomous vehicles: cross jurisdictional regulatory perspectives update – October

2021 Series

Autonomous vehicles: Moving forward in 2021 – January

Full steam ahead: Recent developments in maritime autonomous technology – February

Next-gen spotlight: 5G, autonomous vehicles and connected devices – March

Raising financing during turbulent times: Debt capital options for tech companies – April

Construction and autonomous vehicles: Considerations for increased adoption – May

Autonomy on the roads: Intelligent Transportation Systems – June

Autonomous vehicles in mining operations: Key legal considerations – July

Autonomous technology in Calgary: Reducing emergency vehicle travel times – August

Autonomous vehicles: Cross jurisdictional regulatory perspectives –September

Transport Canada: 2021 Guidelines for Testing Automated Driving Systems in Canada – October

Autonomous vehicles: Canada's readiness for the future – November

Autonomous vehicle laws in Canada: Provincial & territorial regulatory landscape – December

2020 Series

Driving change: The year ahead in autonomous vehicles – January

Mobility-as-a-service & smart infrastructure: A new risk paradigm – February

The future of farming: Autonomous agriculture – March

Autonomous transportation in the time of COVID-19 – April

Driverless vehicles: Two years of autonomy on Québec roads – May

A review of Canada's vehicle cybersecurity guidance – June

Highlights of the connected and autonomous vehicles report by ICTC and CAVCOE – July

Raising financing during turbulent times: The takeaways – August

Raising financing during turbulent times: Exploring for capital in the public markets – September

Advanced driving assistance systems: Three issues impacting litigation and safe adoption – October

Autonomous vehicles and big data: Managing the personal information deluge – November

Payments on wheels: Self-driving vehicles and the future of financial services – December

2019 Series

The Legal Crystal Ball: Autonomous Vehicles Development to Watch For in 2019 – January

Autonomous Vehicles and Export Controls – February

The State of Insurance and Autonomous Vehicles in Ontario – March

Collective Bargaining and the Implementation of Autonomous Vehicles Technologies – April

Building a Privacy-Compliant Autonomous Vehicles Business – May

The State of Autonomous Vehicles in Alberta – June

Unfamiliar Waters: Navigating Autonomous Vessels' Potential and Perils – July

The Lay of the Land: Obtaining a License for Testing Autonomous Vehicles in Ontario – August

The State of Autonomous Vehicles in Saskatchewan – September

Lingua Vehiculum: The Competition for Connected Car Communication – October

Autonomous Vehicles and Equipment in Construction – November

The Future of Mobility: The 2020 Autonomous Vehicles Readiness Matrix Legal Summit – December

2018 Series

Current Industry Developments – February

Managing Cybersecurity Risks – March

Québec Regulation Update – April

The Connected City – May

Are Patent Wars Coming for AVs? – June

Automated Vehicles May Revolutionize Mobility but Perhaps not Auto Insurance – July

Cleared for Take-off: Autonomous Technology and Aviation Litigation – August

The Ultimate Mobility Synergy: Autonomous Vehicles and Electric Vehicles – September

Automotive and Insurance Industries Consider Hot Issues Faced by the Autonomous Vehicles Sector – October

Insuring Automated Vehicles: The Insurance Bureau of Canada Recommends "Single Insurance Policy" – November

Autonomous and Connected Vehicles – "Ideal" for a Class Action? – December