

Wrap-up of the 17th ADS IWG Tokyo session

Date: December 8 (Monday) – 11 (Thursday), 2025

Venue: AP Ichigaya, Tokyo

Attendance:

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

Ambassadors: NL, Australia

Secretaries: AAPC, SAE, OICA, JASIC

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

CLEPA, ETSC, OICA, SAE, SAFE, ITU (the number of physical participants: 45, total number including remote participants: 75)

➤ Co-chair/Japan presided at the session.

Agenda item	Action items, notes, etc.
Day 1 1. Welcome and opening remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ GRVA vice Chair/Japan and ADS Co-chairs made opening remarks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I heard that fruitful discussion was made in Vancouver. We've had a lot of nice days in a row recently and the air has gotten dry. Watch out for the flu, it's everywhere now in Tokyo! - To make ADS Regulations endorsed by WP.29 at its June 2026 session we must solve open issues and summarize discussion at this session.
2. Adoption of the agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed agenda (ADS-17-01-rev.2) was approved.
3. Adoption of the previous report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The report of the previous session was approved without any comments (ADS-17-02).
4. Status of work	<p>4.1. Document submission to GRVA (GRVA/2026/2, GRVA/2026/3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Secretary/AAPC explained the status of work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADS-17-10-rev.1: Proposal for editorial corrections to working document GRVA/2026/2 (GTR) - ADS-17-11-rev.1: Proposal for editorial corrections to working document GRVA/2026/3 (UNR) - According to UN Secretariat these editorial corrections might be able to be reflected in formal documents without submitting an informal document. - Documents to be submitted to GRVA will be checked in the next session.
5. Consideration of open issues	<p>5.1. ADS WS amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ambassador/Australia illustrated the status of ADS WS. ➤ The final check of documents will be made in the next ADS WS to be held on January 13-14. (GRVA Vice-chair/Japan) <p>(1) Amendments to GTR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ China explained amendments to GTR. (ADS-17-20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete statistics with unknown sources cited in the cost-benefit analysis in paragraphs 85 and 86. ◇ Result: accepted

5. Consideration of open issues	<p>(2) Amendments to UNR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ UK explained proposed amendments to UN Regulation. (ADS-17-09). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to paragraph 2.37. the definition of “vehicle type”. - Addition of footnotes 9 and 10 to paragraph 3.1. - Addition of specific provisions to paragraph 4.4. (a) - Amendments to paragraph 4.5. - Amendments to Section 9, Annex 1, and Appendix 1 ➤ These amendments were already approved by ADS WS. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ Thanks to the efforts of ADS WS members, there are no square brackets now. The industry made comments on mutual recognition, but their concern will be addressed by Interpretation document. (GRVA Vice-chair/Japan)
5. Consideration of open issues	<p>5.2. DSSAD amendments (ADS-17-22r1 and ADS-17-23r1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DSSAD Co-chair/Japan explained amendments to DSSAD provisions. (ADS-17-23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to paragraph 2.11. the definition of “DSSAD” - Amendments to table “the data elements of time-stamp data to be recorded, along with any additional information” in paragraph 5.2.1., Annex 8 - The table “the data elements of time-series data to be recorded during a triggering event” in paragraph 5.3.1., Annex 8 is still incomplete in DSSAD Sub-group. ➤ DSSAD small group is still under discussion on this issue. It will take a few more days. (EC) ➤ There might not be enough time to discuss this issue. (OICA) ➤ Mind the entire schedule. It will not be included in 1st iteration unless it is endorsed by GRVA at its May session at the latest. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ DSSAD small group is requested to finalize the amendments by Tuesday. The finalized amendments will be sent to DSSAD Sub-group for confirmation. If accepted by DSSAD Sub-group, it will be submitted to ADS IWG for approval by Thursday. If it is not the case, the current text remains. (Co-chair/Japan)
5. Proposals to resolve open issues	<p>5.1. ADS WS amendments</p> <p>(1) Amendments to GTR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Giving more information on amendments to GTR would be appreciated. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ Comments were raised in ADS WS that the statistics on accident reduction do not cite the sources of the data. However, the statistics with appropriate sources cannot be found. The statistics were deleted for that reason. (China) ➤ Are you still looking for the data? (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ According to UN Secretariat the data is not compulsory. Therefore, I gave up. (China) ➤ We could not get reliable data. (Ambassador/NL) ➤ Understood. I think it is premature to write down any data now. (Co-chair/Canada) <p>(2) Amendments to UNR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ JRC explained the amendments to Annex 1. (ADS-17-19) ✧ Result: accepted.

5.3. Transition from ADS to ADAS

- UK explained updated proposal on allowing ADS to ADAS transitions under certain safe circumstances (ADS-17-05).
 - The assistance system must be a hands-on system.
 - For the UNR the assistance system must meet the requirements of Reg 171.
 - The transition must take place on a highway not any other type of road.
- The proposal goes in the right direction but still carries a risk. I have some ideas to amend the proposal, but we do not have enough time to discuss it now. This should be challenges for the future. Alternatively, ADS turned off and ADAS turned on can be performed in turn. It makes only a few seconds' difference. Would it be necessary to prepare lengthy text for the sake of a few seconds? (Canada)
- Would transition from ADS to ADAS increase the value of ADS? (Co-chair/Canada)
- I share the intention of the proposal to avoid the mode confusion. (France)
- How about a requirement on a manufacture to avoid the mode confusion? (ITU)
- Agree with Canada. It's a good start to discussion but it is not a matter of discussion which can be agreed in a week or so. (NL)
- Agree with ITU. Just leave it to technological advancement. (SAFE)
- ✧ Result: revisit it on Thursday

5.4. Approval of ESC via ADS UNR

- Still under discussion. Both amendments to UN R140 (ESC) and additional text to ADS UNR are necessary. (OICA)
- ADS UNR and other UN Regulations should be separated. Mixing up these Regulations would lead to confusion. (Canada, Ambassador/NL)
- It is difficult to see how ESC can maximize the ADS performance. How can an ADS drive such that it needs the ESC to intervene? (ITU)
- Even with an ADS, the ESC may be needed if the vehicle hits a patch of ice. ESC is expected to work on snowy roads or at the time of abrupt flat tires. (Co-chair/USA)
- ✧ Result: wait for a proposal by Thursday

5.5. Updates to Annex 5/7 (ODD analysis)

- CLEPA explained updates to Annex 5/7 (ADS-17-13).
 - Scenario versus situation
 - The description on AI was deleted from the explanation on Figure 2. The phrase "For AI centric ADS systems" was changed to "For modern ADS systems".
- There is no definition of "modern". It should be deleted. (Co-chair/Canada)
- Noted. (CLEPA)
- "ADS systems" should be just "ADS"
- ✧ Result: accepted. The phrase "For AI centric ADS systems" was changed to "For ADS".

	<p>5.6. use of AI in ADS decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CLEPA explained the proposal to remove ambiguity in paragraph 6. of Introduction. (ADS-17-14-rev.1). Based on very recent discussion with some members, CLEPA would like to change the text in their proposal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADS software does not include the use of online in-vehicle learning that self modifies system behavior. ➤ Canada, UK, and ITU supported the proposal. ➤ NL thinks this is indeed a good proposal, and would like to come back to this later this week in order to check this new proposal ➤ If ADS modifies its behavior by learning after type approval, that ADS type would be different from the one already type approved. (SAFE) <p>✧ Result: accepted.</p>
<p>6. Proposals to amend the GRVA working documents</p>	<p>6.1. Para. 45 of the GTR rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ OICA explained the proposal to clarify introduction section of the GTR and align it with UNR (ADS-17-06-rev.3). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The phrase “the safety of an ADS, and vehicles equipped with an ADS” in para.45. of GTR was amended as “the safety of vehicles with regard to their ADS”. <p>✧ Result: accepted.</p>
<p>Day 2</p> <p>5. Proposals to resolve open issues</p>	<p>5.5. Updates to Annex 5/7 (Introduction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Germany explained the proposal to remove a reference to self-certification and integrate a binding text instead of a recommendation (ADS-17-26). ➤ Why was the word “should” changed to “shall”? (JRC) ➤ To make a binding text. (Germany) ➤ This introduction was prepared to offer directions. A new burden should not be placed when the effectiveness of the approach is unknown. It is premature. (SAFE) ➤ The proposed binding text will be covered by 7.3.2.13.1. (UK) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “7.3.2.13.1 The manufacturer may refer to the methodology outlined in Annex 7 as a suitable approach to derive behavioral competencies and scenarios that are ODD-relevant or alternative methods, providing they are equally comprehensive.” ➤ Any requirements should not be included in Annexes. (Ambassador/Australia) ➤ Annex 7 indicates an example. (France) ➤ Result: keep the current text as it is.

6. Proposals to amend the GRVA working documents	<p>6.2. para 2.17. footnote to “User-initiated deactivation of the ADS, Item (1) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to delete the footnote because it is redundant with 6.2.2.3.2. <p>✧ Result: accepted.</p> <p>6.3. para. 2.3.1. Definition of “edge case”, Item (2) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to delete the definition because the word “edge case” is not used at all in the text. <p>✧ Result: accepted.</p> <p>6.4. para. 4.2.2.1.2. (c)/ 6.2.2.1.2. (c), Item (3) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to align the text with para. 4.2.2.3.2./ 6.2.2.3.2. <p>✧ Result: keep the current text as it is because the current text is clear enough.</p> <p>6.5. para. 4.3.6./6.3.6. Management of signals from other systems, (ADS-17-04 Germany)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to change “other vehicle systems” to “other systems of the ADS vehicle” <p>✧ Result: accepted.</p>
6. Proposals to amend the GRVA working documents	<p>6.6. para. 4.1.2.1./6.1.2.1. Crash causation, (ADS-17-15 SAE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to change “The driving behavior of the ADS shall not cause a collision” to “The driving behavior of the ADS shall not cause a reasonably foreseeable collision that constitutes a critical occurrence”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Does not support the proposal. It is difficult to judge whether it is “foreseeable” and/or “critical”. (France) ➤ How about “a reasonably foreseeable collision involving a safety relevant object”? (UK) ➤ The proposal lowers the bar a little too much. More discussion will be necessary. (Canada) ➤ Why is ADS allowed to cause a collision while a human driver is not allowed to cause even a minor accident. (Japan) ➤ A human driver is not obliged to report on a minor accident. (SAE) ➤ Prefer the current text. (France) ➤ Agree with France and Japan. It is subject to judicial decision. (Norway) <p>✧ Result: keep the current text as it is, add to interpretation document</p> <p>6.7. para. 4.1.4.4.1./6.1.4.4.1. Remote termination, (ADS-17-18 SAE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No need to change. The proposal makes no difference. (UK) ➤ It is necessary to retain 6.1.4.4. and 6.1.4.4.2. (Japan) ➤ The phrase “stable stopped condition” does not mean to stop the vehicle in a safe place of the road. SAE’s concern should be addressed by Interpretation document. (Canada) <p>✧ Result: keep the current text as it is. SAE’s concern would be addressed by Interpretation document.</p> <p>6.8. para. 5.1.8.5.3. /7.1.8.5.3. Data retention, item (4) of ADS-17-12</p> <p>✧ Result: accepted</p> <p>6.9. para. 5.2.1.3.1. /7.2.1.3.1. Simulation toolchain data management, (ADS-17-08 OICA)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to clarify wording under the data management provisions of the test environments. Change “throughout its lifecycle” to “over the lifecycle of the ADS”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lifecycle of ADS or ADS feature? (NL) ➤ How about changing “over the lifecycle of the ADS” to “until the ADS has been decommissioned”? (JRC) ➤ Noted. (OICA) ✧ Result: accepted with JRC proposal reflected. <p>6.10. para. 5.2.1.4.1. /7.2.1.4.1. Competency of personnel in testing (ADS-17-09 OICA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to delete 5.2.1.4.1. /7.2.1.4.1. because it is covered by 5.1.6.1./7.1.6.1. (SMS). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It should be retained because it is a pillar of reliability assurance. (JRC) ➤ It is not time to revise it because we must review all the related text. (Canada) ➤ Redundancy in SMS and safety cases would not increase manufacturers’ burden. (Co-chair/Canada) ✧ Result: keep the current text as it is. Add clarification to interpretation document. <p>6.11. para. 5.2.1.13.2. /7.2.1.13.2. Simulation tool calibration, item (5) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to delete the last sentence and move it to Interpretation document because it is not a requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted <p>6.12. para. 5.3.1.3./ 7.3.1.3. Area of operation (ADS-17-17 SAE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to add “A change that affects only the ADS feature’s intended area of operation within the jurisdiction(s) originally covered by the safety case will not be considered a change in ODD warranting a new safety case.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No added value can be seen by adding this sentence. (France) ➤ Subparagraph (a) should be changed simply to “geographic limitations”. (UK) ✧ Result: SAE proposal was not accepted. SAE’s concern will be addressed by Interpretation document. UK proposal was accepted. <p>6.14. “Safety description”, “Safety concept”, “Safety case”, Item (7-9) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted <p>6.13. para. 6.3.2.2.3./8.3.2.2.3. and 6.3.3.1./ 8.3.3.1. Confirmatory testing (ADS-17-16 SAE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In conducting confirmatory testing, the authority or service will, except for on-road testing, use the same test methods and protocols as those used by the manufacturer in its original testing or any agreed-upon additional testing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Without the proposed text, confirmatory testing may be performed in different ways depending on the authorities. (Co-chair/USA) ➤ A surprise to manufacturers should be avoided. (SAE) ➤ Cannot support. (France)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Flexibility should be allowed for confirmatory testing. (ITU) <p>Result: Keep the current text as it is. SAE's concern can be addressed either by Interpretation document or 2nd Iteration.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Day 3</p> <p>6. Proposals to amend the GRVA working documents</p>	<p>6.7 para. 4.1.4.4.1./6.1.4.4.1. and 4.1.4.4.2./6.1.4.4.2 Remote termination, (ADS-17-27 Australia)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ “By a user” in 4.1.4.4.2. is not necessary. It is not necessarily a user. (ETSC) ➤ The current text includes “by a user”. I prefer to keep the current text as it is if you can live with it. Any new arguments should be avoided. Of course there is room for future discussion. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ Noted. (ETSC) <p>✧ Result: accepted, with proposed deletion of “by a user” (subject to Japan’s agreement later in the week)</p> <p>6.15. para. 7.3.3.2., 7.3.3.4., 7.3.3.6. Unclear requirement, Item (10) of ADS-17-12</p> <p>✧ Result: Keep the current text as it is. This concern will be addressed by Interpretation document.</p> <p>6.16. para. 6.1.8.1. (d)/8.1.8.1. (d) Verb missing, Item (11) of ADS-17-12</p> <p>✧ Result: Keep the current text as it is. (No amendment proposal was presented.)</p> <p>6.17. para. 6.3.1.4. (b)/ 8.3.1.4. (b) No definition of “Integrity level”, Item (13) of ADS-17-12</p> <p>✧ Result: Keep the current text as it is. This concern will be addressed by Interpretation document.</p> <p>6.18. para. 6.3.2.2.1./ 8.3.2.2.1. Behavioral competencies and scenarios, Item (14) of ADS-17-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to add “and scenarios”. <p>✧ Result: accepted. Agreement to remove footnote 15 of UNR (and corresponding footnote in GTR).</p> <p>6.7. Remote termination</p> <p>✧ Result: ADS-17-27 deleting “by a user” was accepted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Plan to make comments on ADS-17-27 this week. (Japan) <p>6.19. para. 6.4.1./8.4.1. Confidentiality of manufacturer information (ADS-17-07 OICA/CLEPA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to add “The information is not intended to be shared publicly.” ➤ What is the meaning of “publicly”? Can the concerned authority share the information with its related organizations? (Norway) ➤ It is incompatible with domestic laws. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ Do not support. It should be addressed by Interpretation document. (JRC) ➤ Interpretation document is the right place. (UK) ➤ It is not necessary. The Government knows how to handle it very well. (Co-chair/Canada)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: Keep the current text as it is. The concern will be addressed by Interpretation document. <p>6.20. para. 6.3.1.3. (g)/8.3.1.3. (g) Addition of traceability requirement in Safety Case Assessment list (ADS-17-03 Canada)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to add “Unique labelling of claims, arguments and evidence as per 5/7.3.3.1.2 and”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Result: accepted <p>6.21. Bracketed text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ para. 5.3.1.4.1.4./7.3.1.4.1.4. Item (6) of ADS-17-12 ◇ Result: keep the square bracket. Text covering both GTR and UNR will be considered. To resolve later in the week. ■ para.6.3.1.1. / 8.3.1.1. Item (12) of ADS-17-12 ◇ Result: remove square bracket of 8.3.1.1. Canada will refine the wording of 6.3.1.1. To resolve later in the week. ■ Short time reporting template Annex (ADS-17-21 JRC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to remove brackets on the time duration of the short-term reported entry. ➤ DSSAD’s most recent proposal regarding the time duration is 10 seconds, but it is not their final decision. (UK) ◇ Result: Accepted but may need to realign with DSSAD.
7. Guidance document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Secretary/OICA presented “Proposal for Interpretation/Guidance document” (WS12-05-rev.1). ➤ UK explained 6.B. Section 4.1./6.1. “Performance of the DDT”. ➤ What is the difference between Interpretation document and Guidance document? (SAE) ➤ Guidance document indicates evaluation methods whereas interpretation document is supplemental explanation. Both elements are included for the time being. They can be separated if necessary. (UK) ➤ Interpretation document has higher priority. It will be promoted by a small group. Welcome new group members. No addition of requirements to Interpretation document. (JRC) ➤ As for ISMR, Interpretation document will be drafted by February 2026 and Guidance document will be drafted by April 2026. (JRC) ➤ Note the following. (GRVA Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do not add requirements to Interpretation document. - Keep the scope of ADS. - The same assessment can be performed regardless of the area. ➤ If the task will be allocated to several OPIs, there is a risk of redundancy. (OICA) ➤ It is already fixed that the work will be performed by OPIs. OPIs will do clearly-defined their quota of work. (Ambassador/NL)

<p style="text-align: center;">Day 4</p> <p>8. Unfinished business</p>	<p>5.3. ADS/ADAS transition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: No agreement. ➤ A compromise proposal might be allowing transition to ADAS which is automatically activated by turning on the ignition. <p>5.4. ESC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The direction would be adding alternative methods to UNR 140 and keeping UNR “ADS” as it is. ESC can be assessed by safety case approach in UNR “ADS”. Plan to amend UNR 140 and UNR 13 in time for GRVA in May. (OICA/CLEPA) ➤ FADS TF will discuss this issue next Monday. (Co-chair/Japan) <p>6.7. Remote termination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Japan has no problems in deleting “by a user”. <p>6.21. para.6.3.1.1. (ADS-17-28 Canada)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted
<p>DSSAD update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: Delete Annex 8 Data accessibility 4.1. ➤ DSSAD Subgroup continues to discuss the time duration of the short-term reported entry. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ There may be a need to explore the possibility of late submission to GRVA on this issue. (EC) ➤ The decision is up to Co-chairs on how to handle the open issue, i.e., the time duration and the definition of “detected object”. Basically, submission deadline should be met. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ If no values are shown in the table, it will be difficult to get approval. (OICA) ➤ You can apply for approval by using a safety case approach. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ A manufacturer can decide the time duration at its discretion because no values are fixed by the Regulation. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ GRVA at its January session can send the proposal back to DSSAD Subgroup. Then, DSSAD Subgroup will make decision at its Seoul session in February and ADS IWG will endorse it at its Shanghai session to be held in the following week. (Co-chair/Canada) ➤ DSSAD Subgroup has had a long discussion so far, but no agreement has been reached. CPs have different opinions. It is still unknown whether an agreement will be reached before long. (Co-chair/Japan) ➤ We can ask GRVA for guidance on this issue. (Co-chair/Canada) <p>Result: DSSAD and ADS Leadership will decide the way forward.</p>

<p>8. Unfinished business</p>	<p>5.3. ADS/ADAS transition (ADS-17-29 NL, UK, FIN, NOR ETSC, CAN)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to add “However, any sustained lateral assistance system that is permitted or required to be automatically enabled at the initiation of the power train may be set to the same state as it was prior to ADS activation.” ➤ Support. (UK) ➤ Only lateral assistance system? How about DCAS? (SAFE) ➤ It is a partial solution. The intention will be written in Interpretation document. (UK) ➤ Thank you for providing a compromise proposal. It is necessary to review it in the future. (OICA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: accepted <p>6.21. para. 5.3.1.4.1.4. /7.3.1.4.1.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose to delete this paragraph because it is covered by SMS. (Canada) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✧ Result: Delete. To be addressed by Interpretation document.
<p>9. Next steps Chaired by Co-chair/Canada</p>	<p>Exchange views on implementation items after June 2026</p> <p>Bucket 1: New items/ Remaining items/ Parking lot items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADS/ADAS transition (UK, Canada, OICA) - Remote system (UK, Australia, OICA) - Remote assistance (Australia, Japan) - Remaining issues with DSSAD (UK) - Streamline ADS Regulations (JRC) - Scenarios (NL) - Review ISMR items (inclusion of near miss, etc.) (EC) - Clean up text safety case & audit ➤ How do you proceed with remaining issues with DSSAD? (EC) ➤ It will be decided by GRVA. (Co-chair/Canada) <p>Bucket 2: Tidy up of Interpretation document, Upgrade essentials to Regulation (Items that may result in GTR/UNR amendments during the course of the interpretation document creation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C&C driver concept (OICA) - Confirmatory testing (JRC) - Scenarios (JRC) - C&C driver concept is the most basic concept, and it is difficult to reach agreement on it. For the time being cases on C&C driver will be collected. (Japan) - Remote assistance (Japan) - Understood that C&C driver is a general concept. It would be difficult to set clear evaluation criteria. It is better not to be involved deeply in this matter. If the ADS complies with ADS regulation, it will be considered as C&C driver level. (SAE) <p>Bucket 3: Operation, Harmonization of evaluation criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - External HMI (wide-ranging discussion with other IWGs required) (ITU) - Can follow the way CS/OTA Workshop is doing. (France) - Smooth implementation of mutual recognition (UK) - Liability, Use of ISMR data, share information and/or experience (cannot be addressed by ADS IWG) (NL)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mutual recognition, AI, ADS/ADAS transition (Germany) - AI not changing software but changing parameters during its operation. Harmonization, Connectivity (Influence of communication interruption/time lag and data quality) (Ambassador/NL) - Test phases (OICA) - Cooperation with other groups (CS/OTA, AI, Scenario, etc.) (CLEPA) - “Relevant authority” for ISMR (EC)
8. Unfinished business	<p>Para. 2.36. the definition of “safety-relevant object” (ADS-17-30 UK) Para 4.1.2.1./6.1.2.1. Use consistent language between 6.1.2.1 and 6.1.2.8 (ADS-17-30 UK)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Support. Is the footnote to 4.1.2.1./6.1.2.1. kept? (CLEPA) ➤ Yes. (UK) ➤ Support. (JRC, SAE) ➤ Isn’t it necessary to add “other road users”? (France) ➤ “Other road users” are included in “safety relevant objects”. (UK) ➤ How will the following case be evaluated? (Secretary/AAPC) - An ADS vehicle hit a ball, then the ball hit squarely on the head of a pedestrian. ➤ It is incompatible with Road Transport Laws (Accidents shall not be caused) in Japan. “Safety-relevant object” should be clearly defined. (Japan) ➤ There is a separate provision requiring “ADS should ensure compliance with road traffic regulations.” On top of that 4.1.2.1./6.1.2.1. says “The driving behavior of the ADS shall not cause a collision involving a safety relevant object. “ Therefore, the compliance with Road Traffic Laws is guaranteed. (UK) ◇ Result: Put square brackets and resolve this issue in #18 ADS web-session in January.
9. Next steps	<p>9.1. #18 web-session: January 14 (Wednesday) 14:00-15:30 (CET) 9.2. #19 Shanghai hybrid session: February 9-13 9.3. Bangkok hybrid session: April 27-May 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Will hybrid sessions from now on be jointly held by ADS IWG and ADS WS? (Japan) ➤ Yes. The main topic will be consideration of Interpretation document. (Co-chair/Canada)
10. Closing remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It was a successful session resolving many of the open issues. (Ambassador/NL) ➤ It is grateful to have a lot of participants from industry. Great work of OPIs is much appreciated. (Co-chair/Canada)