Transmitted by the experts from UK & JAPAN

Summary for GRSP and GRRF comments

① Page 3, the first paragraph: <u>Change of text from minimum requirements to recommended requirements(minimum legal requirements)</u> ⇒ These are the minimum requirements to fulfill the principles but they are not a legal requirement as stated in "Preface".
> Unchanged

② Page 4, the third paragraph: <u>In case that the system, used in critical situations, is set as default on, indication of the status "on" may not be necessary.</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Changed

③ Page 4, the sixth paragraph: <u>Change from conditions to system status</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Changed

④ Page 4, the eighth paragraph: <u>Change from "--- is not guaranteed ---" to "--- may be compromised ---"</u> ⇒ Because of the complexity of sensor detection, annoyance of warning frequency to the driver etc., the statement was modified.
> Changed

⑤ Page 5, the second paragraph: <u>Change from "ensure" to "support"</u> ⇒ In highly automated driving situation, driver's monitoring becomes more crucial to keep safe handling. Taking into account of practicality, the statement was modified by replacing the word to "prompt".
> Changed

⑥ Page 5, the eighth paragraph: <u>Change from "--- be displayed ---" to "--- be signaled ---"</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Changed

⑦ Page 6, the second paragraph: <u>Change from minimum requirements to main recommendations</u> ⇒ According to the first comment as described above, the original words were taken in.
> Unchanged

⑧ Page 6, the second paragraph: <u>Addition of sentence.</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Added

⑨ Page 7, the second paragraph: <u>Change from "--- uncertain ---" to "--- less known ---"</u> ⇒ "Less known" would be acceptable, but "unclear" will be better.
> Changed

⑩ Page 7, the second paragraph: <u>Change from "--- Of particular concern is ---" to "--- A potential concern may be ---"</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Changed

⑪ Page 11, the fourth paragraph: <u>Deletion of the paragraph</u> ⇒ Agree.
> Changed

The underlined texts above refer to GRSP and GRRF comments.

＊＊＊＊＊