

## Wrap-up of the 7<sup>th</sup> ADS IWG meeting (Petten, the Netherlands)

Date: March 17 (Monday) - 21 (Friday), 2025

Attendance:

Co-Chair: UK, EC, USA, Canada, Japan

Ambassadors: NL, Australia

Secretaries: AAPC, SAE, OICA, JASIC

EC/JRC, Germany, France, NL, UK, Finland, Sweden, Canada, China, Korea, Japan

ETSC, CLEPA, OICA, SAE, SAFE, ITU (participants: 75)

➤ ADS IWG Co-chair/UK chaired the session.

Agenda item	Action items, notes, etc.
Day 1 1. Welcome & opening remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ One of EC action plans is ADS development with responsibility. Experts from JRC Petten and Ispra join ADS IWG with Vision 0 (Zero fatality in traffic accidents) in mind. (Director of JRC)</li> <li>➤ In NL 25% of the land is below sea level but Petten is not. (Petten is located on the dune.) The advent of ADS vehicles is a profound transformation of the traffic system and requires legal preparation. International cooperation would be necessary in this area. (Bernadette van Doorn, Interim Head of Dept. Vehicle and Digital Infrastructure, Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL)</li> </ul>
2. Adoption of the agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The proposed agenda (ADS-07-07-rev.1) was approved.</li> </ul>
3. Adoption of the previous report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The wrap-up of the previous session (ADS-07-01-rev.1) was approved without any modifications.</li> </ul>
4. Status of the working document on common provisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Secretary/AAPC explained document ADS-06-04-rev.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- prepare a base-document for the Tokyo meeting reflecting the results of the Petten meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ OPI submitted amendment proposals, many of which only change the location (section) of the provisions. (OPI: ISMR)</li> <li>➤ Amendment proposals including the change of location would be checked section by section. (Secretary/AAPC)</li> <li>➤ The base document will be reviewed until Wednesday. Respective proposals for improvement would be reviewed thereafter. (Co-chair/Canada)</li> </ul>
5. OPI reports and review of amendment proposals	<p>5.1. Purpose, scope, and definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI illustrated the open issues. (ADS-07-17)</li> <li>➤ Open issues were discussed one by one. (ADS-07-16)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was agreed to delete 3.10. "Event", 3.10.1. "Safety-relevant event", and 3.29.6. "Complex scenario".</li> <li>- 3.25. "Road safety agent", 3.26.1. "Argument", and 3.26.2. "Claim": agreed.</li> <li>- The definition "Functional scenario": added.</li> <li>- The other definitions not agreed would be revisited on Day 4.</li> </ul>

<p>5. OPI reports and review of amendment proposals</p>	<p>5.3. ADS performance of the DDT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 4.1.2. "C&amp;C driver": agreed as it is.</li><li>- 5.1.2.5.1. "Anticipatory behavior": amendment proposal by OPI was agreed.</li><li>- 5.1.2.7. "Priority vehicles": agreed by choosing "applicable" rather than "relevant".</li><li>- 5.1.3.1. and 5.1.4.1. "DDT performance under critical traffic scenario": agreed.</li><li>- 5.1.4.4. "Remote termination": agreed.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ This should be stipulated by other regulations than vehicle regulations. (ITU)</li><li>✓ This can stay here until someone tells us not to do this. (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>✓ Remote termination button would be switched by the manufacturer or service provider ordered by the authority. (Japan)</li></ul></li></ul> <p>5.4. Other requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The Guidance Document is still under preparation by DSSAD IWG. DSSAD IWG would submit a proposal if something should be added to ADS regulation. (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>➤ The common ground between ADS IWG and DSSAD IWG is ISMR. What is the situation over ISMR discussion? (OPI: ISMR)</li><li>➤ DSSAD IWG uses FRAV/VMAD Integration Document as base document. (Co-chair/Japan)</li><li>➤ It is necessary to pay attention to terms and definitions which have been modified since FRAV/VMAD era. (UK)</li><li>➤ It would be helpful if someone would brief us on the DSSAD Guidance Document at the Tokyo meeting. (Co-chair/UK)</li></ul> <p>5.5. ADS and user interactions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ NL/RDW explained open issues. (ADS-07-10)</li><li>- 5.2.1.1. "Signal the presence of a failure": deleted</li><li>- The proposal from the user group on the remaining open items on the user documentation resulted in a lengthy discussion. No agreement was reached and the topic will be revisited in the Tokyo meeting."</li></ul> <p>5.6. Regulations, directives, and standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI: Standards/China explained the document. (ADS-07-04)</li><li>➤ It is necessary to consider how to add this document to GTR/UN R on ADS. We could incorporate this work into the guidance/interpretation document (task 3 of the GRVA workshops) so it is available for both UNR and GTR (Co-chair/UK)</li></ul>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Day 2</p> <p>5. OPI reports and review of amendment proposals</p>	<p>5.7. SMS (ADS-07-15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.1.5.1. "Without prejudice to applicable laws" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Are general requirements not related to vehicle safety necessary? We can see so many such general requirements in the document.</li> <li>✓ (Co-chair/Canada)</li> <li>✓ It indicates that UN requirements do not override the applicable laws of Contracting Parties. It should be included, since it applies to more requirements it would be better to have such requirement in the section of general requirements. (Ambassador/NL)</li> <li>✓ We might be in trouble if the requirements of UN Regulation and those of applicable laws in Contracting Parties would be different. (OICA)</li> <li>✓ It is proposed to move these general requirements to another section. (JRC)</li> <li>✓ Requirements for manufacturers can stay here, otherwise, they should be included in "Introduction" or "Interpretation document".</li> <li>✓ (Co-chair/Canada)</li> <li>✓ 6.1.5.1. can be a foot note for 6.1.5. (Co-chair/UK)</li> <li>✓ UN R "Cyber security" puts this provision under scope section. (OICA)</li> <li>✓ Remove square brackets from this provision and consider the location of this provision later. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- 6.1.5.5. "Monitor in-service ADS vehicles": agreed.</li> <li>- 6.1.5.6. "Collection and analysis of vehicle data and data from other sources" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ It might be difficult to know what should be done by manufacturers to demonstrate this capability. Could it be more specific? (AAPC)</li> <li>✓ Do manufacturers have to show their process only? (OICA)</li> <li>✓ Showing the process is not enough. They also must explain the tools. (JRC)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- 6.1.1.1. "Safety policy; the aims and objectives" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ SAE proposed to add "-- with regard to any and all ADS it manufactures ---" because different SMS might not always be provided for respective ADS.</li> <li>✓ OICA supported SAE proposal.</li> <li>✓ So far SMS certification was only foreseen for one system, this element will have to be checked with the Workshop discussions.(NL/RDW)</li> <li>✓ An SMS can cover multiple ADS. Square brackets will be attached to the added phrase. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>5.8. Safety case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI/Canada explained "Structure after consolidation" (ADS-07-11) and "Safety case update" (ADS-07-19).</li> <li>➤ OPI/Canada introduced a new document "Links between Testing and Safety case sections in ADS harmonized document" (ADS-07-20) which was not yet posted to wiki.</li> <li>➤ An important document should be posted well in advance, otherwise we cannot check it. (Co-chair/Japan)</li> </ul> <p>5.10. Test environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI/JRC explained "Credibility and Testing provisions" (ADS-07-18).</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were some changes in structure.</li> <li>➤ Are confirmatory tests mandatory or left to the judgement of the assessor/authority? (7.3.3.2.1. and 7.3.3.3.1.) (OPI/JRC Ispra)</li> <li>➤ The details for track/real-world testing should be left to the assessor/authority. (JRC Petten)</li> <li>➤ How about combining 7.3.3.2.1. and 7.3.3.3.1. and make it as “--- shall perform physical testing --.” (NL/RWS)</li> <li>➤ Does the term “assessor” mean “manufacturer” or “authority”? In general, requirements for manufacturers are stipulated in Regulations. Requirements for authorities do not fit in regulations. Provided that requirements for authorities are included in regulations, they should be stipulated in the approval section. (Co-chair/Canada)</li> <li>➤ OICA supported Co-chair/Canada. They should not stay here.</li> <li>➤ The wording and the location of these paragraphs may differ depending on the regulations (GTR or UN Regulation). (Co-chair/UK)</li> <li>➤ OPI/JRC plans to finish all the work by Tokyo meeting in April.</li> </ul> <p>5.11. Post deployment safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.4.1. “Without prejudice to the applicable law---“: agreed.</li> <li>- 6.4.2. “Sharing Info with other authorities”; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Do not support. Which authorities? (OICA)</li> <li>✓ This should be decided by each Contracting Party. Is there any reason to include this provision in UN Regulation? (Co-chair/USA)</li> <li>✓ Would it be necessary to stipulate such general non-safety requirement in ADS regulation? (Co-chair/Canada)</li> <li>✓ This is the issue of the 1958 Agreement. Once Contracting Parties apply a UN Regulation, they cannot demand additional requirements on that regulatory item. (UK)</li> <li>✓ Keep this text and consider the appropriate place for this text. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Occurrence list</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Critical occurrence” and “Non-critical occurrence” which must be included in short-time reporting were changed to “Significant occurrence”.</li> <li>- “Notification” is added on top of “Short-term reporting” and “Periodic reporting” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ It is necessary to check these changes in comparison with relevant definitions. (Co-chair/Japan)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Day 3 6. Compliance assessments, annexes, and other new content</p>	<p>6.3. Post-deployment Safety Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI/JRC explained “ISMR Status and open Items” (ADS-07-22).</li> <li>- 3.1.6. “Occurrence”; delete terms “safety relevant event” and “event”: The term “non-critical occurrence” is changed to “significant occurrence”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Criterion for occurrence is vague. How can we judge this unclear criterion? (Co-chair/USA)</li> <li>✓ The criteria are stipulated in the occurrence list more clearly. I will make a link between definition and the occurrence list. (OPI/JRC)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Criterion d) "Injury/fatality as a result of being in the ADS vehicle or being involved in the event" seems to be Criterion for "critical occurrence". (OICA)</li><li>✓ High-level definition of "occurrence" is already available. Criteria a) to e) are proposed because OPI members asked for more precise definition. If high-level general definition is acceptable, discussion will be no longer necessary. (OPI/JRC)</li><li>✓ If the term "occurrence" is used only in ISMR section, the definition would not be necessary. (Co-chair/UK)</li><li>✓ In case the term "occurrence" is deleted from definition section, it would be necessary to include it in interpretation document. (NL/RDW)</li><li>✓ High-level general definition of "occurrence" should be kept. It would be proposed later. (OPI/JRC)</li><li>✓ Criterion b) "ADS vehicles system/component failure" seems that the failure of all the system/components in ADS vehicles shall be reported. (OICA)</li><li>✓ Any failure in ADS vehicles influences ADS performance. It is planned that various relevant information would be included in the interpretation document. (OPI/JRC)</li></ul> <p>- 3.16.1. "Significant occurrence": All short-term reporting items are defined as "Significant occurrence".</p> <p>- "Occurrence list"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ How about moving "Occurrence list" to Annex? (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>✓ If Annex is deemed to be compulsory, "Occurrence list" can be moved to Annex. (OPI/JRC)</li><li>✓ Annex can be either "compulsory" or "guidance" depending on how the main text will be written. (Co-chair/USA)</li><li>✓ Further discussion should be continued. (Co-chair/UK)</li><li>✓ There is no definition for "remote assistant" but keep the list as it is because it seems to take much time for agreement. (OPI/JRC)</li><li>✓ Distinguish between remote operation and remote assistance. Proposal not to include remote operation in this document (ITU)</li><li>✓ The items which fail to have a definition cannot be listed. (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>✓ Further discussion should be continued. (Co-chair/UK)</li></ul> <p>- "The procedure for amending or adding scenarios" (ITU proposal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ It is unclear who would do what. This item should be put on the back burner if it is not urgent. (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>✓ Japan and OICA agreed with Co-chair/Canada. Scenario workshop is in progress.</li><li>✓ It is not urgent. We can follow up with scenario workshop developments. (Co-chair/UK)</li></ul> <p>6.4. Annex: In-Service Reporting Templates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI/JRC explained "ISMR Annex" (ADS-07-23)</li><li>- The definition of "critical occurrence" was changed. Measurable criteria for injury, damage, and restraint system criteria are to be considered.</li></ul>
--	---

<p>7. Discussion points and open issues</p>	<p>6.6 Behavioral competences and scenario identification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI/UK will prepare documents by the Tokyo meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Big picture and comments on approach (ADS-07-24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ADS approval consists of SMS (process audit) and Safety case assessment.</li> <li>✓ Industry suggestions</li> <li>- Need to work on the basis of a robust consolidated document identified</li> <li>- Need to limit 'sub-group' meetings and concentrate more on joint sessions</li> <li>- Check consistency of wording and definitions used throughout the draft text</li> <li>- Ensure assessments match requirements</li> <li>➤ There should be no disparity between consolidated document on common provisions and OPI proposals in the Tokyo meeting. (JRC)</li> <li>➤ Update consolidated document and prioritize open issues by the Tokyo meeting. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul> <p>7.1. definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “ADS feature”:</li> <li>✓ Definitions of ADS features of type 1 and type 2 were accepted.</li> <li>✓ The definition is OK, but there is a concern for misuse. (Canada)</li> <li>- “Scenario vs Situation” :</li> <li>✓ “Traffic scenario” and “Driving situation” are more appropriate terms. (AAPC)</li> <li>✓ SAE and ITU agreed with AAPC.</li> <li>✓ Proper terms should be selected depending on the situation. “Situation” does not necessarily mean “reality” and “scenario” does not necessarily mean “fiction”. It would be a risk to make a batch conversion. (UK/Warwick)</li> <li>- “Nominal”, “Critical”, “Failure”:</li> <li>➤ No need to change these definitions. (UK/Warwick)</li> </ul> <p>7.2. DDT performance requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ OPI/UK explained “DDT open items” (ADS-07-21).</li> <li>- 5.1.2.5.1. “This shall include the anticipation of risks in the driving environment to reduce the likelihood of encountering a critical scenario. (amendment proposal by OPI)</li> <li>✓ “Encountering” should be changed to “engaged in”. (SAE)</li> <li>✓ “Scenario” should be changed to “situation”. (ITU)</li> <li>- 5.1.4.4. “The ADS shall be capable of remote termination.” (amendment proposal by OPI)</li> <li>✓ “Remote termination” should be changed to “deactivation”. (ITU)</li> <li>✓ “When requested by the authority” should be added at the end of the paragraph. (Japan)</li> <li>- 5.1.2.1. The driving behavior of the ADS shall not cause a collision.</li> <li>- 5.1.2.8. The ADS shall not force other road users to take evasive action to avoid a collision with the ADS vehicle.</li> <li>✓ These provisions should be deleted because they are redundant. (OICA)</li> </ul>
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ These provisions coincide with Japanese basic policy. Japan wants to keep them. (Japan)</li> <li>✓ It would be difficult to judge whether the ADS causes the accident or not. (UK)</li> <li>✓ These provisions originated in FRAV/VMAD Integration Document. It is not necessary to re-discuss them. It is not a legitimate reason to delete because they are difficult to judge. (Ambassador/NL)</li> <li>✓ The basic premise of the ADS is that it never collides under normal scenarios. (AAPC)</li> <li>✓ Agreement to add a footnote to help interpret and clarify this provision.</li> <li>➤ ADS members are invited to review the proposed amendment. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul>
<p>Day 4 7. Discussion points and open issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> <li>➤ TF FADS/France explained “Regulatory fitness for ADS” (ADS-07-13)</li> <li>- 3.8. “--- When the ADS is in operation, the DDT is always performed in its entirety by the ADS --- i.e., “the ADS performs “the entire DDT” ---”             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ TF FADS considers that other systems such as ESC can contribute to the DDT together with ADS. (TF FADS/France)</li> <li>✓ There is no contradiction. ESC is a Level 0 system by SAE definition and on standby waiting for its function to be performed. Therefore, ESC can be regarded as part of ADS functions. (SAE)</li> <li>✓ The vehicle stability control function by ESC can be regarded as a kind of ADS function. There is no contradiction. (OICA)</li> <li>✓ The relation between ADS and ESC can be explained in a footnote</li> </ul> </li> <li>- “ADS features Type 1 and Type 2”             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The definitions of “ADS features Type 1 and Type 2” are necessary. (TF FADS/France)</li> <li>✓ They are subject to misuse. (OICA)</li> <li>✓ Agree with France. Without these definitions, GR must respond to each UN Regulation on a case-by-case basis, which is inefficient. (NL/RDW)</li> <li>✓ It is understood that TF FADS members have many questions to ADS IWG. However, it would be appreciated if TF FADS slows down its activities allowing ADS IWG to complete drafting ADS Regulation. Just get rid of your thoughts to include everything in the first iteration of ADS Regulation. (Co-chair/Canada)</li> <li>✓ Agree with Canada. FADS activities are important, whereas finishing ADS IWG task on schedule should be our top priority. (Co-chair/Japan)</li> <li>✓ Scattering ADS requirements in other UN Regulations should be avoided. (OICA)</li> <li>✓ Agree with OICA. These definitions are inevitable in reviewing over fifty relevant UN Regulations. (TF FADS/France)</li> <li>✓ Valet parking applies to Type 2. (NL/RDW)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- “Activation status of ADS and ADS features”             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ TF FADS concluded that the possible states of an ADS are either ‘ADS active, but no ADS feature is active’ or ‘ADS active, and an ADS feature is active’.</li> <li>✓ ADS is not active if the ADS does not perform DDT. (ITU)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ ADS is active when the ADS only monitors surrounding traffic conditions. (AAPC)</li><li>✓ Definitions of the different possible statuses of an ADS and of its features are necessary. (TF FADS/France)</li><li>✓ Volunteers are invited to contribute to this activity. (AAPC)</li><li>✓ SAE and UK joined.</li></ul> <p>7.3. User interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI/NL explained “Open issues Users” (ADS-07-10)</li><li>- Open issues: user monitoring, commonality, interpretation of ‘timely manner’, minimum transition time</li><li>- It is expected to take a lot of time to solve these open issues. OPI wants to submit draft text in time for Helsinki meeting at the latest.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Alignment with activities of IWG on Driver Drowsiness and Distraction Warning system might be necessary. (Australia)</li><li>✓ OPI has a different viewpoint. (OPI)</li><li>✓ It may not be possible to reserve enough time to discuss these open issues in the Helsinki meeting when a lot of members from ADS IWG, GRVA WS on ADS, and EDR/DSSAD IWG join. AAPC)</li></ul></li></ul> <p>7.4. SMS and audit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI/Japan explained “Progress report on SMS and Audit section” (ADS-07-15).</li><li>- Provisions included under the Audit section after Seoul meeting: “The reporting of the audit of the safety management system of the manufacturer shall be performed in such a manner that allows traceability, e.g. versions of documents inspected are coded and listed in the records of the assessor.”<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ These provisions will be included in the base-document for the Tokyo meeting since no objections were expressed. (Co-chair/UK)</li><li>✓ It should be checked whether the audit covers SMS requirements. (UK)</li></ul></li></ul> <p>7.5. Safety case and assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI/Canada explained “Safety case Update” (ADS-07-19).</li></ul> <p>7.6. Testing environment and credibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ OPI/JRC explained “Credibility and testing provisions” (ADS-07-18).</li><li>- 7.3.3.2.1. The assessor [shall/may] use track testing to confirm the performance of the ADS in several selected relevant nominal, critical and failure scenarios.</li><li>- 7.3.3.3.1. The assessor [shall/may] conduct real world testing of the ADS in nominal scenarios.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Are confirmatory tests necessary? (OPI/JRC)</li><li>✓ Propose to change the provision to read; “Track testing shall be performed.” without using the subject “the assessor”. (Co-chair/Canada)</li><li>✓ Text of GTR and UN R would be different. (UK)</li><li>✓ In the UNR, “The assessor” should be changed to “Type approval authority or Technical Service”. (France)</li></ul></li></ul>
--	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Requirements for authorities should not be included in a Regulation. (Co-chair/Canada)</li> </ul> <p>7.7. Post-deployment safety (ADS-07-26)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The definition of “occurrence” was reverted to the original one in VMAD Guideline document.</li> <li>- 3.16.2. (b) the definition “Critical occurrence”: “Other vehicles” was chosen instead of “road users”.</li> <li>- The term “remote assistance” in the Occurrence list will be illustrated in the footnote</li> <li>- Two annexes (Short term &amp; periodic template Annex and Critical Occurrence Annex) will be proposed in time for the Helsinki meeting.</li> <li>➤ The result of post-deployment cannot be explained at the time of Type approval. (China)</li> <li>➤ The response system for post-deployment safety should be explained. (OPI/JRC)</li> </ul> <p>The definition of “manufacturer” proposed by Japan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ This definition makes it clear who is responsible and how far his responsibility is because there are various business models surrounding ADS. (Japan)</li> <li>➤ The current definition in resolution RE3 will do what Japan wants to do. (UK)</li> <li>➤ The manufacturer is defined as “a producer of ADS vehicles”, and only “vehicle manufacturer” should be used. Non-OEM manufacturers who modify conventional vehicles to ADS vehicles may apply for type approval of the ADS vehicle type, if they take the responsibility for the whole modified vehicle. (France)</li> <li>➤ Japanese proposal covers after-market ADS system. (ITU)</li> <li>➤ The multi-stage type-approval system can be applied. This issue should be discussed by GRVA WS on ADS. (UK)</li> <li>➤ The manufacturer is defined as “ADS vehicles marketing OEM”. (Ambassador/NL)</li> <li>➤ The definition “manufacturer” should not disturb the introduction of ADS vehicles and was not accepted. This will be the discussion topic for GRVA WS on ADS. (Co-chair/UK)</li> </ul>
<p>Day 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remaining open items should be prioritized. Assessment sections are still premature. Hard work continues toward the Tokyo meeting. (Co-chair/UK)</li> <li>➤ Plans to make “IWG-ADS open issues tracker”. Created “Posting template” used for submitting new proposals. OPIs are asked to use this template filling in the necessary information. (Secretary/AAPC)</li> <li>➤ Time is very limited. We should refine the current text rather than accepting new proposals. (EC)</li> <li>➤ OICA supported EC comments.</li> <li>➤ A new consolidated document incorporated with changed agreed in #7 ADS session will be a base-document for discussion in #8 ADS session. (Secretary/AAPC)</li> <li>➤ UK, EC, SAE supported this approach. They want the new structure to be reflected in the new base document.</li> <li>➤ The progress differs depending on the subject. Some flexibility should be given. (Co-chair/Canada)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The structure was already agreed in the Seoul session. We should retain the agreed structure. (EC)</li><li>➤ All the changes including the structural changes can be possible just before the WP.29 session when the ADS Regulation will be submitted. (Co-chair/UK)</li><li>➤ Summary by Co-chair/UK.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Prepare a base document equipped with the new structure in clean and track-change modes.</li><li>- Recommend to use “Posting template” for new proposals.</li></ul></li><li>➤ Now that we have a clearer picture of GTR/UNR, it may be time to work on interpretation documents. (EC)</li> <li>➤ Future schedule<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- April 14-18: the 8th ADS Tokyo meeting</li><li>- May 19-21: the 9th ADS web meeting</li><li>- June web meeting as necessary</li><li>- July 7-11: the 10th ADS Helsinki meeting (joint meeting with GRVA WS on ADS)</li><li>- September web meeting: submission of GTR/UNR draft to GRVA, Clear picture of open issues to be addressed for 1st iteration</li><li>- October Canada meeting</li><li>- December Asia meeting: finalize informal document(s) (if any) to be submitted to GRVA at its January 2026 session.</li></ul></li></ul>
--	---