

## Overview Findings GRSG-TF-AVRS 29-31 January 2025

- “Sent as a logic signal to the ADS” . Currently the ADS is not assigned as the entity to handle non-DDT issues. => update definition or add statement that the ADS may also handle non-DDT issues
- Dependency. IF requirements are transferred to the ADS Regulation, how to make sure an approval to this ADS Regulation is obtained. The individual Regulation will rely on it. ADS could be handled through national approval. How to make sure that an approval issued for a Regulation, covers all requirements in case an ADS is performing the DDT. Usually, R16 requires meeting the requirements of UN R14; several regulations require meeting the requirements of e.g. UN R10 on EMC.
- ADS active, activated, turned on, in operation, performing the DDT. Important to discuss and align.  
GRSG-TF-AVRS preference would be to state: “when an ADS is performing the DDT”
- How to handle non-DDT requirements; parallel approach is advised
  1. Develop non-DDT requirements for ADS, which should be included in existing regulations
  2. Develop non-DDT requirements for inclusion in the UNR ADS/GTR ADS

However, a difficult limitation applies to track 2: the scope of the IWG ADS and WS ADS is focused on the conversion of the Integration Document, which only contains DDT requirements. Adding non-DDT requirements at this stage can lead to a lot of lengthy discussions. Another issue is that no safety experts from GRSG/GRSP take part in these discussions.

Proposal, if track 2 is to be followed, to extend the mandate of the IWG to include non-DDT issues and to have a dedicated TaskForce within the IWG to oversee these non-DDT provisions.

- Industry prefers to follow track 2 and not having to update individual approvals due to the introduction of a new type of ADS. How could this be facilitated ?
- Current way of working is to indicate: “send a logic signal to the ADS” and then to include the expected ADS behaviour (examples) in an Excel overview (similar to GRSP-TF-AVRS)
- Necessity to distinguish between ADSF-1 and ADSF-2. If no distinction, requirement to send logic signal to the ADS is introduced where we don’t have such requirement right now for ALKS. This seems too restrictive and will trigger new series of amendments.
- Complexity due to the possible variety of ADS systems. Could have ADSF-2 that requires an on-board or off-board operator, crew member. Could be ADSF-2 that only operates when no occupants are on-board e.g. valet parking feature. In both cases, no need to find alternative solution for non-DDT requirements. How to distinguish ?

Submitted by the expert from the Netherlands

- PTI: how is the possibility created to be able to test a category X or Y vehicle for PTI
- Bidirectional: some TFs already wish to include bidirectional vehicles.
  1. Do we agree this is no problem ?
  2. Any comments on the proposed definition as included in NL proposal: [GRSG/2025/10](#) which will be discussed at GRSG in April 2025 ?
- Where reference is made to “driver”, “driver’s compartment” etc., we currently update the text by adding “if applicable”. What is common practice among TF-AVRS/FADS groups ?