

Original Text (ADS-06-04/Rev.1)	Proposals	Discussion
5.2. Safety of ADS User Interactions with the ADS		One-way safety from user to ADS? What about ADS interactions with users? No (.) for titles
5.2.1.1. At each initiation of the powertrain, the ADS shall signal the presence of a failure that prevents or limits the operation of a feature.	5.2.1.1. Delete	OPI: covered by other requirements. Not directly safety critical.
	Add subsection title and renumber following paragraphs. 5.2.2.1 General requirements	
5.2.4. Information Provision to Users (as appropriate: owners, users, operators, etc.)		Do we need to include operators at all. And if so, do we need a definition for operators?
5.2.5.1. For the ADS users, means shall be provided that facilitates user understanding of the functionality and operation of the system covering at least:		The list under this provision is too long with complex, overlapping, and ambiguous requirements. It should be broken down into discrete requirements that can be amended as desired in the future. Is this provision talking about the “owner’s manual” or other things?
(a) An operational description of the ADS features, capabilities, and limitations (the information should also refer to specific use cases and/or ODD)		What is an “operational description”? What kinds of “use cases”? What “ODD”? What is the meaning of “and/or”?
(b) The correct use of the ADS and its feature(s)	(b) The proper use of the ADS feature(s);	Justifications for limiting to features and replacing “correct” by “proper”. NL: Whatever choice, use consistently throughout the text.

		ITU: "Correct" sounded like "correction by teacher" telling user how they must use the ADS, "proper" sounded more like guidance. Chair: appropriateness of usage
--	--	---

<p>(d) A description of the responsibilities of the user and ADS when an ADS (feature) is active</p>	<p>(c) Any [expectations / requirements] on the fallback user to be ready to resume the DDT upon request;</p>	<p>Proposal to replace (d) with (c) if wording can be agreed.</p> <p>The proposed requirement would only apply to ADS features that might fall back to the user.</p> <p>ITU: Providing information, not setting user requirements. Explanation of differences between systems and user deactivations. Australia: How does this tie in with (e)? SAE: original d explaining what to do when ADS active. New (e) below seems to address same issue, so e) would come after original d) so user knows what to expect when they do something. OPI: starts with proposal for general expectations on user behaviour followed by more specific information. “Expectations” appears to be preferred.</p>
	<p>(c) Any expectations on the fallback user to be ready to resume the DDT upon request;</p>	<p>Word choice accepted, but open issue on order of provisions.</p>
<p>(c) Instructions for the activation and deactivation of the ADS, with clear explanations of the distinctions between user-initiated deactivation and system-initiated deactivation where applicable</p>	<p>(d) Instructions for the activation and deactivation of the ADS, with clear explanations of the distinctions between user-initiated deactivation and system-initiated deactivation where applicable.</p>	<p>Design-specific (hence “where applicable”). Should be stand-alone requirement integrated with similar specifications on ADS features activated by “vehicle owner”.</p>

<p>(e) Information on ADS responses to ADS vehicle user interventions in the dynamic control of the vehicle</p>	<p>(e) Information on how the ADS feature responds to [user vehicle driving control inputs/vehicle driving control inputs by the user], if available.</p>	<p>If the information is available? This appears to be design-specific, so location or structuring should be reconsidered.</p> <p>Australia: Why introducing new language from more general original text. ETSC: Addressing inputs to brakes, steering (not a designated control like button).</p>
	<p>(e) Information on how the ADS feature responds to vehicle driving control inputs by the user, if available.</p>	<p>Chair: return to later OPI: Can reconsider structure for clarity.</p> <p>IWG: Reproduce text in next version of the working document for the 8th session. OPI to lead discussions to provide revised proposal addressing clarity and logical order.</p>
<p>(f) A description of the permitted transitions of roles and the procedure for those transitions</p>	<p>(f) A description of the transitions of user roles and the procedure for those transitions, for example, reversion to manual driving following deactivation of the ADS feature;</p>	<p>Definition of “transitions”, “roles”? Example does not add clarity.</p> <p>OPI: added example to original text. Agree that transitions, roles would benefit from definition.</p> <p>Add new text and discuss again in April.</p>
<p>(g) A general overview of non-driving-related activities (NDRA) allowed when an ADS feature is active where applicable</p>		<p>How are NDRA determined? Should this be NDRA that are prohibited? Connect to SMS risk analyses. Is it possible to provide a general overview where not applicable?</p>
<p>(h) Safety precautions and safety-relevant information for the user</p>		<p>Open-ended summary of everything in the list. How to determine compliance. Link to SMS risk mitigation.</p>
<p>(i) Information related to the HMI of the ADS feature(s) e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Visual tell-tales, icons (ii) Auditory signals (iii) Haptic signals 	<p>(i) Explanations of the visual, audible, and/or haptic signals</p>	<p>UN Regulations refer to audible, not auditory signals. Clarify what information shall be provided.</p>

<p>(j) Instructions on safety and non-safety measures to be taken when there is a malfunction of the ADS]</p>	<p>(j) Information on possible changes in the performance of the DDT by the ADS following a failure of the ADS.</p>	<p>Justification? Safety target? Original concerned behaviour of user (e.g., stay in vehicle). Proposal concerns behaviour of the ADS.</p> <p>Align with terminology used by the Regulations. Link to outcomes of SMS risk mitigation analyses with regard to failures, behavioural competencies of the ADS feature demonstrated under failure scenarios, and/or risks to user(s) in the event of a failure, fallback, MRC stop, etc.</p> <p>OPI: New text aimed at adapted performance of DDT pursuant to failure (e.g., limp home mode). Secy: Consider links to SMS failure analysis leading to demonstration of ADS responses based on severity of failures providing basis to verify that information provided is sufficient.</p>
<p>(k) Extent, timing and frequency of maintenance operations where applicable</p>	<p>Vehicle service intervals for ADS maintenance</p>	<p>“Where applicable” unnecessary. What is a “maintenance operation”? Objective assessment criteria: Link to SMS fault/failure analysis, diagnostics, telltales, severities, etc. SMS identifies risks and mitigations that provide criteria for determining whether the user information addresses what the user needs to know.</p> <p>In principle, the owner’s manual specifies service intervals for maintaining the vehicle in peak condition. Safety also relates to whether items need attention and whether they can be replaced by the owner (DIY) or require a trained professional for repair/replacement.</p> <p>OPI: Where applicable was aimed at type of user. Bus driver might not need info in way vehicle owner would.</p>
<p>(l) Data protection and data security functionalities.</p>	<p>(l) Delete</p>	<p>Justification: Covered by other regulations. Australia: varies by jurisdiction so delete.</p>

		What if a system needs to ask for consent?
--	--	--