

Summary for GRSP and GRRF comments

- ① Page 3, the first paragraph: Change of text from minimum requirements to recommended requirements(minimum legal requirements) ⇒ 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: In case that the system, used in critical situations, is set as default on, indication of the status “on” may not be necessary. ⇒ Agree.
> **Changed**
- ③ Page 4, the sixth paragraph: Change from conditions to system status ⇒ Agree.
> **Changed**
- ④ Page 4, the eighth paragraph: Change from “--- is not guaranteed ---” to “--- may be compromised ---” ⇒ 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: Change from “ensure” to “support” ⇒ 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: Change from “--- be displayed ---” to “--- be signaled ---” ⇒ Agree.
> **Changed**
- ⑦ Page 6, the second paragraph: Change from minimum requirements to main recommendations ⇒ According to the first comment as described above, the original words were taken in.
> **Unchanged**
- ⑧ Page 6, the second paragraph: Addition of sentence. ⇒ Agree.
> **Added**

- ⑨ Page 7, the second paragraph: Change from “--- uncertain ---” to “--- less known ---” ⇒ “Less known” would be acceptable, but “unclear” will be better.
> **Changed**
- ⑩ Page 7, the second paragraph: Change from “--- Of particular concern is ---” to “--- A potential concern may be ---” ⇒ Agree.
> **Changed**
- ⑪ Page 11, the fourth paragraph: Deletion of the paragraph ⇒ Agree.
> **Changed**

The underlined texts above refer to GRSP and GRRF comments.

* * * * *