

TF-AVC#9 1-2 October 2024 - Hamburg

1. There is a need to describe dual-mode vehicles, in order to be able to take them on-board in the work of the TF-AVRS/FADS
2. Please refer to [AVC-07-04](#) for a justification to distinguish between ADS with/without fallback user. In order to be able to describe or categorise dual-mode vehicles, it is required to distinguish between those 2 concepts, in order to prevent ALKS vehicles to be categorised as dual-mode vehicle.
3. Preference to add a subcategory /[D] for dual-mode vehicles rather than just a description. It doesn't seem to make sense to define subcategories /X and /Y without /[D].
A dual-mode vehicle is basically a combination of a conventional vehicle and a vehicle with an advanced ADS, like in subcategories /X and /Y, combined into 1 vehicle concept. If we didn't define a subcategory /[D], we would end up with the following situation:
 - M1/X: fully automated vehicle with occupants
 - N1/Y: fully automated vehicle without occupants
 - M1: could be a conventional vehicle, i.e. a vehicle equipped with or without ADAS or ALKS, or it could be a dual mode vehicle with a fully automated driving mode as in M1/X without fallback user and/or issuing a transition demand. It would not be possible to distinguish a UN approval for a conventional vehicle from a dual-mode vehicle, without going through the approval in detail.Proposal is therefore: add a subcategory /[D], or refrain from defining subcategories /X and /Y and just have a description in R.E.3 rather than subcategories.
4. Definition of dual-mode vehicle; NL point of view in line with proposal from Finland ([AVC-09-02](#))
5. Discussion to reach consensus on using M1G/X versus M1XG. No preference. Just would like to come to a final conclusion.
6. Discussion on [6] km/h provision. Operation from Inside versus Outside the vehicle. Reference to other Regulations e.g. UN R79 on RCM and EU Machinery Directive.
7. Discuss Introduction section in R.E.3 and S.R.1 as mentioned in [AVC-06-10](#)