

Wrap-up of the 12th ADS IWG Helsinki session

Date: July 7 (Monday) – 11 (Friday), 2025

Venue: Trafficom conference room, Helsinki

Attendance:

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

Ambassadors: NL, Australia

Secretaries: AAPC, SAE, OICA, JASIC

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

ETSC, CLEPA, OICA, SAE, SAFE, ITU (the number of physical participants: around 50, remote participants: around 20)

➤ ADS IWG Co-chair/EC presided at the session.

Agenda item	Action items, notes, etc.
<p>Day 1</p> <p>1. Welcome and opening remarks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Deputy Director General, Trafficom made a welcome speech. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hope that participants from the hot south would cool down in Helsinki. - There is usually no business schedule on our calendar in July in Finland. We put off the summer vacation till next week to host ADS IWG meeting. - Trafficom works on reducing the number of traffic casualties and hopes that introduction of ADS vehicles would contribute to it. ➤ Co-chairs made opening remarks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Helsinki meeting is one of the few physical meetings left. It would not be possible to incorporate all potential considerations in the 1st iteration. We should only consider new proposals for the first iteration if they are critical for the regulation and should concentrate on completing our task.
2. Adoption of the agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed agenda (ADS-12-01) was approved.
3. Adoption of the previous wrap-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The members were invited to send comments, if any, on the wrap-up of the previous session (ADS-12-02).
4. Status of work: GTR/UNR Integration document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Secretary/AAPC explained the structure of Consolidated draft texts for a new UN GTR and UN Regulation on Automated Driving Systems (ADS-12-03). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - left column: GTR text, middle column: UNR text, right column: comments - The ADS WS text was already integrated. ➤ 44 documents have been submitted so far. They are new proposals from OPIs, and amendment proposals from OPIs, CPs, and industry. Typos and minor amendments would not be discussed. Only major open issues would be discussed. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ Open issues which were not resolved would not be reflected in the consolidated document. Original text would be kept as it is. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ Secretary/AAPC requested members not to submit documents anymore. Instead, he wants the integration document reflecting the result of the Helsinki meeting to be reviewed. ➤ Would “General requirements” section be necessary for UN Regulation? (Secretary/AAPC) ➤ It is necessary for both GTR and UNR. (Japan)

<p>4. Status of work: GTR/UNR Integrated document</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maintenance of the regulatory text would become easier if the numbering of GTR and UNR is the same. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ “Purpose” section is included in GTR but not in UNR. (Secretary/AAPC) ➤ The section without any text could be indicated as “reserved”. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ From a technical service standpoint, the current numbering for UNR should be followed. (France/UTAC) ➤ We should ask the opinions of UN Secretariat. (CLEPA) ➤ It is not necessary to have the same numbering between GTR and UNR. The numbering is not so important. (Co-chair/Canada) <p>◇ Result: Consult UN Secretariat</p>
<p>5. Status report on ADS WS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ambassador/Australia reported on the status of ADS WS activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GTR text is mostly done. - As for UNR, issues on mutual recognition and the contents of “Introduction” section are still under discussion. - How to proceed with Task 3 (Interpretation document)? This will be discussed under agenda item 12 - 36 responses to a survey of intermediate review were received. They are under analysis. - Announcement of future meeting schedule ➤ The necessity of interpretation document is questionable. Regulatory text should be self-explanatory. Interpretation document exceeding regulatory text should be avoided. (OICA)
<p>6. Remaining priority open items</p>	<p>1. scope</p> <p>1.1. The proposed addition of L6 and L7 category to scope was accepted without any objections.</p> <p>1.2. The proposed wording which does not require approvals to both ALKS and ADS regulation was accepted. Check how this should be included in the text on Safety Case (OPI/JM)</p> <p><u>3. Definition</u></p> <p>3.3. “Dynamic Driving Task (DDT)”</p> <p>3.3.1. “the ADS is in operation” was amended to “the ADS feature is active”.</p> <p>3.3.2. “Sensing the ODD boundary” is not correct expression. The better wording would be considered.</p> <p>3.7. “ADS off”, 3.8. “ADS on”, and 3.9. “ADS standby” are deleted because these terms are not used in text. Suggestion to include this in the interpretation document.</p> <p>3.12. to be further considered.</p> <p>3.14. “DSSAD” and 3.14.4. “Detected objects”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ These definitions will be considered by DSSAD IWG, if they are necessary. (EDR/DSSAD Co-chair/Japan) - A big surprise. ADS IWG had never discussed this definition nor agreed to add this definition. - EDR/DSSAD IWG had not agreed on the definition “Detected objects” - The definitions 3.14.1., 3.14.2., 3.14.3. were accepted by DSSAD IWG. <p>◇ Result: 3.14.1., 3.14.2., 3.14.3. were accepted. 3.14. and 3.14.4. were not accepted.</p> <p>3.17.2. “Driver” and 3.17.3. “Fallback user”</p> <p>Which is the proper word, “user” or “occupant” for these definitions?</p> <p>◇ Result: to be further considered.</p>

	<p><u>5.1. Performance of the DDT</u> 5.1.4.2.: Accepted. 5.1.5.4.1.: to be further considered by UK, NL, and CLEPA. 5.1.6.1. and 5.1.6.2.: to be further considered. ➤ OPI/DDT(UK) requested the IWG members to review Annex “ODD”.</p> <p><u>5.2. Interactions between the ADS and its Users (ADS-12-06-rev.1)</u> 5.2.2.1.2. (a), (b), and (c) ✧ Result: make an inquiry with GRSG because GRSG is responsible for these systems/parts. (d): to be further considered by OPI/User and OICA. 5.2.2.2.2. ✧ Result: Chinese proposal to change the word “immediate” to “timely” was not accepted because the definition of “timely” will be additionally required. Chinese proposal to change the word “enable” to “activate” was accepted. 5.2.2.2.5.: to be further considered. ➤ It is strange to say that one ADS feature activates another ADS feature. (AAPC) ➤ Outcome – accepted with changes ‘The ADS shall obtain the passenger’s consent to perform the role of fallback user before executing a transition from ADSF-2 to ADSF-1. 5.2.2.3.7.(to be renumbered 5.2.2.3.8): Accepted with changes. ➤ Such detailed requirements are not necessary. (Co-chair/Canada) 5.2.2.3.9.(to be renumbered 5.2.2.3.10.) ✧ Result: The industry proposal to add “[unless there is a deliberate action by the user----]” was not accepted and the original text was kept. This item is to be added to a parking lot for further consideration in the future. 5.2.2.3.10.(to be renumbered 5.2.2.3.11.) ✧ Result: accepted with the following changes. - “If applicable” was deleted. - “The direct view to the outside environment” was changed to “the direct vision to the outside environment”.</p>
<p>Day 2 6. Remaining priority open items</p>	<p>5.2. Interactions between the ADS and its Users (continuation from Day 1) 5.2.2. ✧ Result: accepted with some wording improvements. 5.2.2.1.4.(b) ✧ Result: accepted with the following change. - “If applicable” was replaced with “in case of a Type 1 feature”. 5.2.2.1.6. ✧ Result: accepted. (“Features that have a system-initiated deactivation of the ADS to a fallback user” was replaced with “a Type 1 feature”.) 5.2.2.1.6.(a): need further consideration. 5.2.2.2.3. ✧ Result: accepted. (“Process” was replaced with “procedure”.) 5.2.2.3.1. ✧ Result: accepted. (The footnote from the integration document was moved to this new paragraph with some changes.) 5.2.2.3.7. and 5.2.2.3.9. need further consideration. 5.2.4.1.1. and 5.2.4.1.2.</p>

	<p>◇ Result: accepted with some modifications.</p> <p>5.2.4.1.9.</p> <p>◇ Result: amendments to 5.2.4.1.9. was accepted replacing “owners and drivers” with “operators”.</p> <p>➤ China proposal to replace “ADS vehicle user” “target user” and “user” with “ADS user”, except for “the road user”.</p> <p>◇ Result: accepted for 3.2.9., 4.2.6., 4.3.3.1., and 6.3.1.7. However, “the target user” in 5.2.2.1. is kept as it is because it has a specific meaning.</p> <p><u>6.2, 7.2, 7.3.2, 7.3.3 Testing and credibility</u></p> <p>➤ OPI/Testing (JRC) explained the remaining priority open items. (ADS-12-45)</p> <p>7.3.3.3.1. The assessor [shall/may] require the use of track testing to confirm the performance of the ADS in a number of selected relevant nominal, critical, and failure scenarios.</p> <p>➤ China, France, Norway, and ETSC favors “shall”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Track testing plays an important role in assessment testing. (France/UTAC) - Track testing covers assessment testing which cannot be performed by real-world testing. (Norway) - China can compromise to move this paragraph to interpretation document. <p>➤ UK, Canada, EC, and Japan favors “may”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UK wants to avoid performing unnecessary tests. - It is meaningless to mandate track testing without specifying which track testing should be tested. (Co-chair/EC) - This section (7.3.3. Confirmatory testing) is a place for stipulating assessment tools and not for manufacturers’ requirements.(Co-chair/Canada) - If necessary, the authority can require the manufacturer to do the track testing. SAE proposal “the assessor may conduct or require the manufacturer to conduct track testing” is supported. (Japan) <p>◇ Result: need further consideration</p> <p><u>6.4. Post-deployment Safety</u></p> <p>➤ OPI/ISMR(JRC) explained “ISMR open items”. (ADS-12-46)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open item 1: agreed to move 6.4.1. and 6.4.2. to Chapter 4 “General requirements”. - Open item 2 (Title sections to be tidied up (minor editorial change): accepted. - Open item 6 (Occurrence list – complex/emergency maneuvers): <p>◇ Result: need further consideration</p> <p>➤ Complex/emergency maneuvers should be kept in the occurrence list. (OPI/ISMR)</p> <p>➤ Complex/emergency maneuvers should be deleted. (OICA)</p> <p>➤ Cannot support deletion of complex/emergency maneuvers. However, any misunderstanding should be avoided. (UK)</p> <p>➤ Collecting data should be minimized. The treatment of confidential data should be decided by each country. (Co-chair/USA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open item 11:
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted to delete the redundancy in the template because the assessment section already requires to ensure the confidentiality of the sensitive and business confidential reported information. - Open item 12: ✧ Result: accepted to add the footnote “----- the root cause analysis will identify and explain the issue” to the template. - Open item 18: ✧ Result: accepted the updates of the templates for “corrective actions”. <p>Other amendment proposals:</p> <p>3.5.2. (e): amendment proposal by China (ADS-12-31)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted. <p>6.1.5.3.(renumbered 6.1.8.2.): proposal by the industry to delete (h) and (i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ (h) and (i) are so important. That is incomprehensible. (Japan) ➤ Oppose deletion of (h) and (i). Are there any alternatives? (UK) ➤ There might be a way to combine (h) and (i) with some wording change. Secretary/AAPC will consider amendments. <p><u>6.1. SMS and Audit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JRC explained its proposal to streamline the SMS section and add more details to the Audit section. (ADS-12-24) <p>6.1.3.2. (b) (renumbered 6.1.6.2. (b))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted with replacing “but not limited to” with “at least”. ➤ When does “post deployment phase” terminate and who decides it? (Japan) ➤ It is not decided yet. For that, the definition of “life cycle” must be made. (JRC) ➤ Let’s deal with it in the 2nd iteration. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ I would be confused if I were to conduct an audit in accordance with this regulation. Would there be any authorities or technical services who are ready to conduct an audit in this manner? (Norway) ➤ It is hard to say “Yes”, but this section is essential for them to conduct an audit. (JRC) ✧ Result: need further consideration <p><u>6.3. Safety case for the ADS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ OPI/safety case/Canada presented “Safety Case & Assessment of Safety Case update” and proposed some amendments. (ADS-12-09, -12, -26, -27, -28-rev.1, -35) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6.3.1. “Safety concept” was divided into 6.3.1. “System description” and 6.3.2. “Safety concept”. (ADS-12-09) - Paragraphs were restructured. (Paragraphs with similar contents were put together.) - Still need harmonization with other sections - Proposals were accepted ➤ How to deal with CS/OTA after registration? This issue is one of agenda items in GRVA. (GRVA Chair) ➤ ADS WS is responsible for that issue, but ADS IWG should also pay attention to it. (Co-chair/UK) ✧ Result: need further consideration by France, UK and Canada
--	--

	<p>6.3.1.1.2.(renumbered 6.3.1.4.3.) China proposal on safety concept (ADS-12-04)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: “if applicable” added to (a) and (b). Wording improvements in (e) and (f) were accepted. <p>6.3.1.9.(renumbered 6.3.2.10.) China proposal to delete “abuse of ADS” (ADS-12-22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ “Misuse” can be prevented, but “abuse” cannot be prevented. (OICA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: “if any” was added after “measures or strategies” and “abuse” remains as it is. <p>6.3.1.22.(renumbered 6.3.1.15.) and 6.3.1.2.4.(renumbered 6.3.2.14.) China proposal to allow diversity of system performing the same function (ADS-12-30)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted
<p style="text-align: center;">Day 3</p> <p>7. Presentation from Finland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The representative of Ministry of Transport and Communications made a presentation on “Regulating the deployment of automated vehicles in Finland” (ADS-12-51). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main object is ensuring safety in road traffic by clarifying the rights and responsibilities of various parties. - The law would come into force in the spring 2027. - The regulation of automation in road transport requires both type-approval regulation related to vehicle technology (UNECE and EU) and regulation on the use of vehicles in traffic (legislation on the national level based on the UNECE Conventions on Road Traffic) - Main issues: Which vehicles are deemed to be self-driving? How can these vehicles be identified? Who is responsible for the behavior of ADS vehicles? What kind of sanctions can be imposed? - Identification of ADS vehicles will happen via vehicle register. - Each ADS vehicle must have a legal entity responsible for it (Automated driving provider) - Remote management provider is responsible for organizing the remote management operations. - Administration sanctions will be imposed both on the Automated driving providers and Remote management operators for breaching their duties. ➤ There were Q&As on Finland position on the 1968 Road Traffic Convention (asked by Co-chair/Canada), registration of traffic robot (asked by UK), application to Level 3 ADS vehicles (JRC). ➤ VTT gave a presentation entitled “AI-Powered vehicle” (ADS-12-52).

<p>8. Status report on FADS activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ France made a presentation entitled “Regulatory fitness for ADS” (ADS-12-50). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topic 1: ADS of vehicles of categories X and Y Problem: 5.2.2.3. does not restrict deactivation to manual driving on vehicles of category X/Y - Topic 2: controls and information for occupants GRSG TF AVRS is amending UN R121 to be fit for ADS vehicles, whereas ADS IWG draft also contains requirements about controls, tell-tales etc. Art. 5.7.1 in R121 is in conflict with art 5.2.2.1.2.b of the ADS regulation - Topic 3: systems active at the same time as an ADS Most systems that can perform part of the DDT must not be active at the same time as an ADS, because the ADS performs the entire DDT in all situations. However, some low-level or specific functions (ESC, AFS) go beyond what would be expected of an ADS because they actuate vehicle subsystems that might not be accessible to the ADS (control of individual wheels, matrix lamps...) ➤ ADSF way of thinking can be applied to other systems. (Ambassador/NL) ➤ Shall not be activate/maybe activate table for ADSF seems reasonable. (UK) ➤ Revisit these on Thursday afternoon. Topic 1 will also be considered for the user section (OC/RB)
<p>6. Remaining priority open items: EDR/DSSAD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Co-chair/Japan reported on EDR/DSAD status (ADS-12-47). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EDR/DSSAD IWG submitted 3 documents (ADS-12-47, -48, -49). - The majority of the DSSAD Guidance has been transferred to Annex 7 of the Regulation. - General requirements have also been added to the Main Body of the Regulation: 4.2. (General Requirement), 5.3.(Other Requirement), 6.3.(Safety Case), 7.3.(Assessment of the Safety Case Content) - The EDR/DSSAD IWG will be held in Paris during the week of 29 September, to update the DSSAD Guidance. - The updated content will be submitted at the ADS-IWG meeting in Canada in October. ➤ Is the data storage procedure stipulated? (SAE) ➤ Yes. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ Will the DSSAD Guidance document update be reflected in ADS regulation? (OICA) ➤ Yes. (Co-chair/Japan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: EDR/DSSAD proposal (ADS-12-49) was accepted. The DSSAD Guidance document update will be reflected in ADS regulation accordingly.
<p>6. Remaining priority open items: non-DDT tasks</p>	<p>5.3.7. [While a Type 2 feature is active,] the ADS shall manage relevant non-DDT-related tasks (which would otherwise be performed by a driver) in accordance with the manufacturer’s safety case. Alternatively, where the ADS does not perform such necessary tasks, the safety case shall describe how these tasks are performed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Why will this requirement be applied to only Type 2 feature? It should be applied to also Type 1 feature. (Japan) ➤ I suppose that it is because a fallback user in Type 1 feature Vehicle is expected to do relevant non-DDT-related tasks. (AAPC)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In case fallback users should not be occupants, the wording should be amended accordingly. (UK) ➤ It is not necessary to narrow down the scope of this requirement to Type 2 feature. (Co-chair/EC) ✧ Result: also need consideration for fallback users
10. Screening of new proposals	<p>3. Definitions</p> <p>3.18.4.(renumbered 3.18.) “Suppressed” means a condition in which a control function is limited or has limited effect until a threshold is exceeded <u>in relation to manual driving control</u>. (“Suppressed” is used in 5.2.2.1.2. Refer to ADS-02-06 proposed by OPI/User safety.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted with the addition of underlined part. <p>3.19.2.(renumbered 3.21.2.) “Priority vehicle” means a vehicle [operated while making use of/subject to] exemptions, authorizations, and/or right-of-way under traffic law [while performing a specified function].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Only emergency vehicles? (UK) ➤ Vehicles performing a specific function such as school buses are included. (AAPC) ➤ Are military vehicles included? (Germany) ➤ Military vehicles performing a specific function will be included. (AAPC) ➤ In summary, ADS shall abide by traffic rules. (Co-chair/Canada) ✧ Result: accepted (“subject to” was chosen.) <p>3.21.(renumbered 3.23.) “Failure” and 3.22.(renumbered 3.24.) Refer to ADS-12-38 proposed by OICA/CLEPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted with minor modifications. <p>3.30.(renumbered 3.34.) “(Driving) situation” and 3.31.(renumbered 3.35.) “Traffic scenario” Refer to ADS-12-23 proposed by UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted together with 3.34.1. “Nominal situation”, 3.34.2. “Critical situation”, 3.34.3. “Failure situation”, 3.35.1. “Nominal scenario”, 3.35.2. “Critical scenario”, 3.35.3. “Failure scenario”. <p>A new definition “Operational design conditions (ODC)” Refer to ADS-12-43 proposed by China.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Only external conditions are considered now. A new conceptual definition should not be introduced now. (UK) ➤ This definition is included in ISO 34501 “Road vehicles — Test scenarios for automated driving systems — Vocabulary.” (SAFE) ➤ It is OK to include this definition in the interpretation document. (China) ➤ It should not be included even in the interpretation document. (OICA) ➤ It can be considered in the 2nd iteration. (China) ✧ Result: to be considered in the 2nd iteration. <p>3.33. “Relevant authority”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: deleted because the situation differs depending on the country. <p>3.39. “Vehicle Type with regard to its Automated Driving System (ADS)” derived from ADS WS activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: added

	<p>3.17.2.(renumbered 3.14.2.) “Driver” means an <u>ADS</u> user who performs in real time part or all of the DDT for a particular <u>ADS</u> vehicle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted with the addition of underlined part. ➤ What about the other “user” in the whole text? (NL) ➤ All we need to do is to change the definition “User” to “(ADS) user”. (UK) <p>3.17.3.(renumbered 3.14.3.) “Fallback user” means a user <u>an occupant</u> designated to perform the DDT pursuant to an ADS fallback response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted replacing “a user” with “an occupant”. <p>3.17.4.(renumbered 3.14.4.) “(ADS) passenger”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted.
<p>9. Mid-term review; Outcomes from the survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Ambassador/Australia reported on the outcomes from the survey. ➤ The outcomes of the survey made us realize that resolving the currently recognized open issues and finalizing ADS regulation by June 2026 is essential. (Japan) ➤ For that, Co-chairs should be on the same page and collaborate with GR Chairs. (Co-chair/Canada)
<p>10. Screening of new proposals</p>	<p>5.1. Performance of the DDT 5.1.5.4.1., 5.1.6.1., and 5.1.6.2. Refer to ADS-12-34 proposed by OPI/DDT(UK).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted with some modifications <p>5.1.2.5.(renumbered 5.1.2.2.) Refer to ADS-12-15 proposed by China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted. <p>5.1.3.2.(renumbered 5.1.3.3.) In the event of a collision involving the ADS vehicle, if required to stop by applicable law, the ADS shall <u>fall back to an MRC or bring the vehicle to standstill immediately</u> as appropriate. During this process the user may initiate deactivation of the ADS if the design of the ADS allows. Refer to ADS-12-16 proposed by China.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ OICA opposed to the word “immediately”. ◇ Result: accepted with deleting the word “immediately”. This issue would be addressed in the interpretation document. <p>5.2.2.3.7.(renumbered 5.2.2.3.8.) Refer to ADS-12-06 proposed by OPI/User.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Avoid getting into the details. (Co-chair/Canada) ◇ Result: accepted with the deletion of the 2nd sentence.
<p>Day 4 10. Screening of new proposals</p>	<p>6.1. SMS 6.1.3.2.(b)(iv) (renumbered 6.1.6.2.(b)(ix)) Management of human factors, including human-centered design processes <u>for safety-relevant interactions</u> (e.g., ISO 9241-210).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted with addition of underlined part. <p>6.1.2.4. The manufacturer shall demonstrate its <u>safety analysis process and approach</u> including a top down (from possible hazard to design) and a</p>

	<p>bottom-up approach (from design to possible hazards) in its identification of hazards.</p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-17 proposed by China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted with some modifications and moved to 6.3.2.1.1. <p>6.1.5.3.(i) (renumbered 6.1.8.2.(h))</p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-18 proposed by China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted replacing “automotive” with “ADS vehicle” and was incorporated into 6.1.8.2.(h). <p>4.3.4.1.(renumbered 4.4.5.2.), 6.1.1.2.(c) (renumbered 6.1.2.2.(c)), and 6.1.6.2.(renumbered 6.1.4.2.)</p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-37 proposed by OICA/CLEPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: minor amendments were accepted. ➤ Secretary/AAPC pointed out that similarly, “fleet” in paragraph 39.(renumbered 40.) in A. “Introduction” must be replaced with “in-service”. <p>Testing and credibility</p> <p>7.3.3.2.1.(renumbered 7.3.3.3.1.) The assessor [shall/may] require the use of track testing to confirm the performance of the ADS in a number of selected relevant nominal, critical, and failure scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JRC proposed long text using the word “shall”. ➤ The assessor being the subject of the sentence may cause a misunderstanding. Japan proposed to change the text to read, “Track testing shall be conducted ----.” ➤ Amendments to “The assessor shall conduct or require track testing -- -” was about to agree. ➤ The assessor will not be forced to do something. Legally this doesn’t work. It should be either deleted or amended. (Co-chair/Canada) ◇ Result: revisit it on Day 5. ➤ Related members <p>6.2.1.3.4.(renumbered 6.2.1.3.4.1.) The manufacturer shall document the input data used to develop, verify, and validate the simulation toolchain(s).</p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-19 proposed by China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data used to develop are overwhelming and meaningless. (SAFE) ◇ Result: accepted. <p>6.2.1.3.8.(renumbered 6.2.1.3.6.5.)</p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-21 proposed by China</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted. <p>6.3. Safety Case for the ADS</p> <p>6.3.2.12. and 6.3.2.13.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted. <p>6.3.3.7. There shall be at least one claim for each goal or regulatory requirement <u>as defined in 6.3.3.2.</u></p> <p>Refer to ADS-12-40 proposed by OICA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It should read, “Each requirement defined under 6.3.3.2, 6.3.3.4, 6.3.3.6 and as may be defined by the manufacturer shall have at least a claim.” (OPI/Safety case/Canada) ◇ Result: Canada amendment proposal was accepted.
--	--

6.1.5.3.(renumbered 6.1.8.2.) (h) and (i) are combined to be (h) "To share learnings derived from occurrence analysis which have triggered SMS processes for the continuous improvement of the ADS vehicle safety."

✧ Result: Accepted.

- OPI/ISMR(JRC) proposed to add a footnote to "Emergency maneuver" in the occurrence list. The foot says, "The manufacturer shall only report a subset of safety relevant emergency maneuvers as described in its safety case."
- Can they explain the emergency maneuver phenomena without braking? (Co-chair/Canada)
- It is questionable to limit reporting to a subset of safety relevant emergency maneuver. Every emergency maneuver is worth exploring. (Japan)

✧ Result: Revisit this issue on Day 5.

Annex Definition of Thresholds for Critical Occurrences

2. Injury level threshold

2.2. The threshold is triggered by the attendance in the area of the collision of an ambulance.

- Amendment proposal: "After the initial notification, if the manufacturer determines that medical assistance/attention was not given, the manufacturer may, in agreement with relevant authority, deem the injury level threshold was not met and change the classification of the occurrence."

✧ Result: Accepted.

6.4.1.

✧ Result: delete square brackets and accepted.

5.2.2.1.6. (d) Ensure the system-initiated deactivation procedure includes sufficient time for the fallback user to perceive the need to take over and to safely re-engage with the driving task.

✧ Result: accepted.

OICA/CLEPA propose to add requirements allowing the ADS to switch to ADAS upon request of the user. The UK was supportive in principle if concerns are addressed but a number of Contracting Parties (Norway, NL) object for different reasons. One is that we should not add new requirements at this stage. In addition, this is an issue which would require more research and discussion. Therefore, this option is noted as Parking lot for the next version of this Regulation.

Introduction (Refer to ADS-12-29 proposed by Ambassadors)

- The Introduction is so long although the number of total pages in UN ECE documents are expected to be cut by 10 % every year. (Co-chair/Canada)
- Figure 1. Should be reconsidered because it may not represent ADS regulation. UK gave a new direction at #8 ADS Tokyo session in April. Refer to ADS-08-12 "Assessment flow chart". (UK)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ introduction may not be necessary for regulatory text. There are other means such as posting it to UNECE website when GRT/UNR on ADS are published. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ Norway and ETSC agree with the proposed introduction, however, suggest to include Safety Case and mixed traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: Ambassadors are requested to simplify the introduction. <p>5.3.7. may not be in line with 6.3.2.13.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: amendment to 5.3.7. will be proposed by small drafting group by September ADS on-line session.
<p>11. Next steps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Submit informal documents for GTR/UNR Regulation to September GRVA ➤ Annexes are in progress. Plan to finalize Annexes by the end of September and reach an agreement at #14 ADS Vancouver session in October. ➤ Submit formal documents by October 24 (the deadline for submission of formal documents to January 2026 GRVA). ➤ What should we do at #14 ADS Vancouver session? (SAE) ➤ We will review the two formal documents GTR and UN R on ADS. In addition, we will make informal documents, if necessary, in December Tokyo session. (Co-chair/EC)
<p>12. Task Interpretation document 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ambassador/NL explained “Items identified for Guidelines/Interpretation” (ADS-12-52) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each OPI is requested to propose prioritization. - Put some time aside for consideration of interpretation document at ADS IWG session - Kickoff on-line meeting in September with OPI’s ➤ When will the interpretation document be finalized? (UK) ➤ It plans to be submitted to GRVA in May 2026. (Ambassador/NL) ➤ If the task should be left to OPIs, the interpretation document might be very lengthy. (OICA) ➤ ADS WS/IWG Leadership should discuss how to proceed with the interpretation document. Japan prefers concise document. Too many OPI meetings are not desirable because the Asians must sit up late to join those meetings. (Japan) ➤ Items should be prioritized to avoid too much burden on the members. (Co-chair/Japan)
<p>Day 5 10. Screening of new proposals</p>	<p>Emergency maneuver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hope to keep “Emergency maneuver” in occurrence list with footnote. It will be harmonized with DSSAD definition. (OPI/ISMR/JRC) ➤ Three comments. (Co-chair/DSSAD/Japan) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) DSSAD IWG takes care of the definition “Emergency maneuver” (2) Confidentiality of data/information will be addressed by interpretation document (3) The large number of items for reporting is not a big issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: Item “Emergency maneuver” is kept in the occurrence list. This item will be reviewed in the 2nd iteration. <p>5.3.7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Non-DDT-related tasks include refueling. (ETSC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: amendment to 5.3.7. will be proposed by small drafting group by September ADS on-line session.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Co-chair/UK explained “introduction of requirements for resilience to electromagnetic interference” ADS-12-54. Insert new text in SMS section. (1) 6.1.2.X. Cyber security management system (compliance with UN R155 for UNR on ADS only) (2) 6.1.8. Software Update Management System (compliance with UN R156 for UNR on ADS only) (3) 5.3.X. The effectiveness of the ADS shall not be adversely affected by magnetic or electrical fields. (compliance with UN R10/07 or later series for UNR on ADS only) ➤ What will happen to countries which do not apply UN R155. R156, and/or R10? (AAPC) ➤ UK proposal seems to be on the right track. The latest version of UNR should always be referred to. (Ambassador/NL) ➤ Are there any other measures to be applied to both GTR and UNR? (Co-chair/Canada) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: ADS IWG members are invited to send comments on the UK proposal. Co-chair/UK will amend the proposal by #13 ADS on-line meeting in September. <p>5.2.2.3.2.(renumbered 5.2.2.3.3.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted. <p>7.3.3.3.1. The assessor [shall/may] require the use of track testing ----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in favor of “shall”: China and France - in favor of “may”: Canada and USA ➤ Let’s choose “may” and the decision will be made by each Contracting Party. (USA) ➤ Track testing should be mandatory. (Japan) ➤ OPI/testing proposed to delete this provision and move it to section 3. “Application for approval”. ➤ Majority of ADS IWG members in the end accepted using “may” instead of “shall”. ✧ Result: China will consider this approach.
<p>13. meetings</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Next</p>	<p>Way forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcome of #12 ADS discussion will be reflected in the consolidated document in a few weeks. (Co-chair/EC) ➤ Each OPI should update his own text and submit it to Secretary/AAPC. Then Secretary will make consolidated GTR/UNR text. (Japan) ➤ Agree. (Secretary/AAPC) ➤ Detailed schedule will be announced by ADS Leadership. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ Prioritization of items for interpretation document will be discussed at #14 ADS Vancouver session. <p>Next meeting #13 online only 10-11 September</p> <p>Next in-person meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ #14 ADS IWG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date/time: start at 13:00 (local time) on October 13 (Monday) till October 17 (Friday), the adjournment time has not decided yet. - Venue: WOSK Center for Dialogue in Vancouver, Canada

	<p>(FYR: #28 ESV Conference will be held in Tront, May 12-15, 2026)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ #9 ADS WS<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Date: September 18 (Thursday) – 19 (Friday)- Venue: Palais des Nations in Geneva
--	--