Michael Weissman

18 Dec 2018

Does the proposed definition include all the key functions required to safely perform the driving task?

Does the proposed definition capture all the behaviours that lead to driver distraction and a reduction in driving performance?

How could a distinction between manageable and unmanageable levels of driver distraction be used to inform the way distraction is regulated? What evidence-based distinctions could be considered?

Should conventional and technology-based causes of distraction be treated equally in the Australian Road Rules? Why?

Can you provide examples of effective non-regulatory approaches to driver distraction that assist drivers to self-regulate their behaviour in a dynamic driving environment?

Can you provide examples of strategies successfully implemented by other international jurisdictions and industries (for example, aviation) that could be applicable to driver distraction?

Are there other parties besides the vehicle driver who can influence the risk of driver distraction? If so, are there mechanisms to ensure those parties are doing all that is reasonably practicable to ensure safety?

Can you provide examples of effective strategies for ensuring that new in-vehicle technology and mobile apps minimise driver distraction?

This is not an example - but a suggestion

To keep it simple a fundamental way of risk control is (a) eyes on task (b) mind on task , and (c) say away from the "line of fire". A driver is exposed continuously to internal communication (this includes the truck controls and messages on driver control display) and external communication (mobile phone calls, GPS). Both these affect the risk control principles i outlined above in particular diverting the eyes & mind but also loosing observing the road conditions and other drivers (line of fire). To address these hazards , I propose to follow the risk hierarchy of risk controls as following : Eliminate - eliminate the ability to receive or send mobile phone information whilst the truck engine is running. This can be done by fitting a certain device to existing trucks and as condition of importation to new trucks . Only when the engine is switched off at rest stops , the driver is able to utilise mobile phone. I don't believe in adding more procedures or policies to the already existing , as these prove in reality of being ineffective and arguably good for revenue raising via fines.

Can you provide examples of strategies to ensure that users of partially automated vehicles are fully informed about their responsibilities, and the limitations of their vehicle's technology?

What evidence is available in support of a performance-based approach or a prescriptive approach for managing the risks of driver distraction?