

ADS IWG Change Request

One request per form  
Please submit requests as separate documents  
Shaded blocks for use by secretariat

Date	26 April 2026	Please use month name (e.g., "January")
Document	ADS-20-46/Rev.3	
Agenda Item	5.18.	
Submitted by	UK	Affiliation only—No personal information
Title	Including Behaviour together with ODD in safety assessment	25 words or less (used to post document)
Location	Section [5.3(GTR) / 7.3 (UNR)] – Safety Case Paragraph 5.3.1.3 (GTR) / 7.3.1.3 (UNR)	e.g., impacted section, paragraph number(s)
Summary	Consistency between components of ODD (removing traffic behaviour).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as amended <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred (further discussion) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn

Original Text

"A single ODD could be substantiated in many areas, that is, all these areas fit the ODD definition and bounds.

It is also possible that a new area falls within the existing ODD bounds and therefore deployment in that area (i.e. expanding the area of operation) might not require modification to the ODD, rather confirmation that the new area is within the ODD with no new behaviours or traffic flows. As such, removal or modifications of the area of operation would not on require modification to the ODD as long as the conditions and environment in the new area(s) of operation, including road user behaviour and traffic flows have been considered in the ODD. However, a modification of the area of operation that entails operation in an area with different traffic laws than those for which the ADS's ability to comply has been demonstrated in the safety case (i.e. outside the ODD) would require an amendment to the safety case demonstrating the ADS's ability to comply with those different local/regional/national rules in the new areas area of operation.

For clarity, the area of operation, including the reasons for using that area of operation could be provided as reference (e.g. operational considerations, capability restrictions etc.) and an explanation for the existence of geographic limitations within the ODD definition could be included to clarify the reason for the use of those limitations (e.g. required local/regional approvals, local/regional traffic rules, etc.)"

Revised Text

For the highlighted text:

[It is also possible that a new area falls within the existing ODD bounds and therefore deployment in that area (i.e. expanding the area of operation) might not require modification to the ODD, rather confirmation that the new area is within the ODD **with no new attributes or attribute values behaviours or traffic flows density or dynamic element types.**

As such, removal or modifications of the area of operation would not require modification to the ODD as long as the conditions and environment in the new area(s) of operation, including road **user behaviour and** traffic flows have been considered in the ODD.

However, a modification of the area of operation that entails operation in an area with different traffic laws **or traffic behaviour** than those for which the ADS's ability to comply has been demonstrated in the safety case (i.e. outside the ODD) would require an amendment to the safety

case demonstrating the ADS's ability to comply with those different local/regional/national rules and traffic behaviour in the new areas area of operation.]

Rationale ODD doesn't include definition of traffic behaviour. As a result, the sentence is factually incorrect.

Discussion Middle para in original affected; first and third paras remain unchanged.