During the oral evidence session with the Committee, I mentioned the paper, – 'Ironies of Automation'. My point here is that, whilst this was a paper that was written in the 1980s, many of the points made within it are still relevant today – particularly where we are asking people to monitor technology that is in fact capable of doing a task more quickly, or at a higher resolution than human perception, or where we are expecting people to maintain skills that they are no longer practising.

I did have two further small points that I would like to make:

1. In relation to the question regarding other alternative routes to reducing the accident rate, I would note that we did not discuss the need to remember that autonomous vehicles are only one part of a multimodal transport system. If we are to look at alternative ways to reduce accidents, I would suggest that we should consider how to encourage people to take fewer journeys by car, and either use alternative transport modes, which have lower accident rates (such as rail), or reduce the number of journeys taken.

2. In relation to the question regarding data, I would note that the Horizon Digital Economy Research institute, led by the University of Nottingham (www.horizon.ac.uk) has an extensive research programme and doctoral training centre which considers issues associated with personal data in a range of contexts. A key question of relevance to data in the context of autonomous vehicles is whether the data needs to be personally identifiable at all for it to be of value to car companies or transport providers (including infrastructure managers). Many uses of relevant to HAVs, such as planning or congestion management, only need aggregated data, which will need to be suitably anonymised. If such situations are identified then the sharing of personal data may be more acceptable to users/drivers than perhaps it might be in other contexts, such as personal insurance premiums being determined on the basis of driving performance for example.