



MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: System Technology & Data Security Subcommittee

Location: Teleconference

Date: July 1, 2019

Attendees:

Name	Organization	Executive Committee Member? (Y/N)
Rose Feliciano	Internet Association	N
Ian Griswold	WTIA	N
Jennifer Harris	Washington State House Transportation Committee	N
Devin Liddell	Teague	N
Daniel Malarkey	Sightline Institute	N
Markell Moffett	WSP USA	N
Kelly Rula	Seattle DOT	N
Will Saunders	WA Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO)	Y
Michael Schutzler	Washington Technology Industry Association (WTIA)	N
Thomas Smailus	Washington Society of Professional Engineers (WSPE)	N
Michael Transue	Association of Global Automakers	N
Joseph Williams	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory	N
Ginger Armbruster	City of Seattle	N

Welcome and Introductions

Will Saunders

- Meeting attendees captured.
- Walked through agenda topics.
- Goal of meeting to explore what transparency might look like for Autonomous Vehicles (AV), moving towards a recommendation for Executive Committee

Topic Closed.

Review 6/28 Executive Committee Meeting

Will Saunders and Michael Schutzler

- Presented at the Executive Committee on June 28, including recommendation to adopt AV [Privacy and Data Protection Principles](#) and Data Standards v0.1
- Executive Committee voted to table recommendations, requested further work/research
 - Comments from multiple Executive Committee members (notably Waymo and Uber) brought up questions/concerns Executive Committee asked Subcommittee to address
 - Recommendation suggested collecting and sharing particular data points



MEETING SUMMARY

- Concern from Executive Committee member(s) data already being collected for other purposes, do not want to duplicate effort
- Subcommittee received information that indicated data points were not already being collected
- Potential disconnect between information provided/available to Subcommittee members of that available to/known by Executive Committee private sector members
- Executive Committee Meeting Action Item for Subcommittee – Identify what data is being collected by AV companies in WA State, what data is being reported, and what data is needed.
- Principles may not align with industry best practices or federal standards
 - [Consumer Privacy Protection Principles](#), established 2014
 - [USDOT Automated Vehicle Guidance](#), v2.0 established 2017; v3.0 established 2018
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Rose Feliciano to reach out to Waymo, find out what data is already being reported at federal level, and to what federal agency
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Rose Feliciano to provide to Subcommittee members the federal guidelines referenced at Executive Committee, identifying guidelines specific to data and privacy
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Michael Transue to provide to Subcommittee members the privacy principles endorsed by Association of Global Automakers
- Subcommittee concern about process
 - Subcommittee developed set of principles, members reviewed and provided input
 - Members of entities that had questions/concerns at Executive Committee are or can be members of Subcommittee
 - Feedback received at Executive Committee should have been brought up earlier, during Subcommittee development and review/approval of recommendation to move forward
 - Executive Committee still in forming and norming stages, process for making decisions and working as a group still being developed
- Helpful feedback from Executive Committee discussion – Ensure that Subcommittee principles and research/work fits within landscape of AVs at industry and federal levels

Topic Closed.

Transparency for AV Data Security and Privacy

Will Saunders and Michael Schutzler

- Goal to work towards a more specific recommendation for Executive Committee
 - What data is needed
 - What does transparency look like for AV privacy
 - Who would publish, and how/when
- When companies conduct tests, much of the data is proprietary – indicates how functionality is/is not operating



MEETING SUMMARY

- State needs basic level of AV testing data – Where operating, what vehicle types, etc.
 - Not for individual vehicle/driver/license plate
 - Data to understand process of testing, protection of citizens (data privacy, physical safety, etc.)
 - Higher priority on testing being conducted in public right-of-way
 - Desire to get data to local jurisdictions, able to know *that* an AV is being tested on the roads, *when* the tests are occurring, *how* testing may be conducted
- Question – If Executive Committee was not able to agree on principles, should we be moving forward with more detailed research/work yet?
 - Yes. Executive Committee did not disagree that principles or data standards should exist, simply requesting further research on what may already be available/regulated that WA State can leverage
- Question to meeting attendees – Should we conduct further research specifically on transparency? If so, what should the focus be? What steps can we take now to move towards a recommendation?
 - Will be helpful to obtain and review information provided by Waymo on data collection and federal best practices and guidance already available before moving forward
 - Next meeting (July 15) will be used to establish baseline of what is already out there, what further data WA State may want/need.
 - If an AV is in an accident, what data would WA citizens expect the State to have collected/have the ability to collect?
 - Suggest developing table that defines data already available (and at what level), whether relevant for AV testing and/or future deployments
 - Example of data privacy and security rules to consider – Rules around software updates
 - If software update available, is AV manufacturer/owner/operator/rider responsible for completing update
 - Need rules for to what extent a software update would require further testing prior to redeployment on public roadways
 - Is regulatory framework and enforcement a Federal, State or Local obligation?
 - Currently, states are not required to enforce software updates for connected vehicles
 - States are responsible for determining who is an eligible “driver” – would that extend to AVs?
 - AV licensing at Federal level is potential model being evaluated
 - Would current rules and regulations on auto recalls be different than software updates for AVs?
 - **DECISION:** Table “Software Updates and Robot Licensing” discussion/issue for future discussion
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Michael Transue will ask Association of Global Automakers question “State currently decides who is a qualified driver



MEETING SUMMARY

in the state. If an autonomous vehicle is considered the 'driver', who determines eligibility to operate on a State roadway?

- Question to meeting attendees – Should this subcommittee explore data regarding mobility rather than data specific to AV testing?
 - City of Los Angeles approach to data mobility (specifically, scooters) – Information provided electronically to meeting attendees for review
 - July 15 subcommittee meeting will be looking at transparency from the federal and corporate angle, should we also be looking at it from the mobility angle?
 - Looking at from mobility lens provides opportunity to look forward, ask what data will be needed for transportation ecosystem as a whole when AVs are fully deploying
 - Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS)
 - Fleets
 - Infrastructure
 - Coordination
 - Agreed that MaaS needs to be looked at now. Existing MaaS (TNCs, scooters) issues have already surfaced.
 - **DECISION:** Separate, specific meeting for this topic. Will hold meeting mid-August. Kelly Rula (Seattle DOT) to present on TNCs and Micromobility as they relate to data needs.
 - Need to understand what data requirements other states have.
 - California requires more than other states.
 - Data can be taken out of context, use incorrectly.
 - Want to understand how current states' data requirements/collection/sharing are working or not working now from a policy standpoint.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Rose Feliciano to identify other states' testing requirements related to data collection, privacy and security
- **ACTION ITEM:** Rose Feliciano and Will Saunders to coordinate communication with California on current and planned testing requirements related to data collection, privacy and security

NEXT MEETING: July 15, 2019

MEETING ADJOURNED.