

Major results and action items of the twelfth meeting of Informal Group
on "ITS/Automated Driving"

Agenda item	Major results and action item
2-2 Report of WP.1 subgroup regarding automated driving from Ambassador	<p>Common observation 1: At the WP.1 session in March, the basic principles on the role of the driver in automated driving were discussed. Specifically, whether or not the driver's side tasks (other than driving) could be allowed when the driver is able to take over the driving from the system was discussed. Some CPs stated that the result of this discussion should be reflected in the Vienna Convention. The necessity of minor revision of the Convention with regard to Remote Control Parking (RCP) was also discussed.</p>
3-1-1 Cyber security and data protection	<p>Common observation 2: Eighty-six threats related to security were identified. Currently, how to prevent or mitigate these threats is being discussed. Since OEM, software manufacturers and technical services are also involved in software updates, it is important to have guidelines that specify who is responsible throughout the entire process. In addition, the necessity of software type approval numbers (TAN) is being discussed.</p> <p>Agreement 1: CS/OTA TF's TOR were approved.</p> <p>Action item 1: It was decided that CS/OTA-TF would discuss in its next meeting what type of document should be developed (regulations, guidelines, other?) as an outcome and would report its results to the next ITS/AD IWG meeting.</p>
3-2 Definition of Automated Driving Technology for developing a UN regulation	<p>Action item 2: The IWG members confirmed how to generally address Canada's comment regarding the table of definitions of automated driving submitted in March. After the meeting, some expert members discussed the details and revised the table of definitions.</p> <p>Agreement 2: The revised clean version was uploaded on the official website as ITS/AD-12-05-3. It was decided that this will be reported in the WP.29 session in November.</p>
3-3 Proposal for amendment of related documents from Germany	<p>Action item 3: As regards the guidance to GRs, it was decided that, in addition to the description of Level 3 proposed by Germany, the description of Level 4 will also be discussed in the future.</p>

<p>3-4 Brainstorming on how to regulate automated vehicles including the definitions of vehicles categories</p>	<p>Common observation 3: Presentations were given on how to regulate automated driving technologies, including categories of automated vehicles.</p> <p>The UK, while raising questions over how to categorize automated vehicles, suggested that, whatever categorization method is applied, it is necessary to clarify technical requirements related to safety and the definition of levels of automated driving technologies.</p> <p>France proposed that a horizontal regulation based on the regulation domains “Non use-case specific” and “Use-case specific” be established and validation be performed according to “criticality levels”.</p> <p>OICA suggested that it is necessary to establish an additional certification system for automated driving systems and software as their automation level becomes higher, while maintaining the existing type approval system as well.</p> <p>The EC recommended that the complementary certification of electronic systems be considered while keeping the existing type approval concept and proposed the need for technical services to update their competence.</p> <p>Japan proposed the establishment of three vehicle categories “Advanced passenger vehicle”, “Shuttle, Pod” and “Platoon for Trucks” together with their specific use cases to introduce the regulation step by step while considering the order of priority of these three groups.</p> <p>Agreement 3: It was agreed to set up a sub-group to start discussing the categorization of automated vehicles, certification, etc. In addition, it was decided to discuss the future approach based mainly on the documents submitted by France.</p>
<p>4. Other business</p>	<p>Nothing in particular.</p>