

Comments from ISO

JOHN SHUTKO, 21. FEB 2019


Comments to Draft Document Arguments-REV-0.docx

Dear Lukas and Dr. Manz,

Although I haven't been able to join in on your meetings I am very interested and have been following the output and contributing where I can. I understand that there is no consensus on requiring AV's to communicate their intended action however as you may know, I believe that it is important for societal acceptance. Therefore, I strongly believe that we should add a paragraph indicating that if an OEM want's to provide these signals that they should be allowed.

The second bullet in section 2 that starts by "the pedestrians and/or VRU can identify....." appears to be incorrectly referring to ISO 23049. ISO 23049 does not indicate that a "driving mode indicator" will increase acceptance. It states:

Society may be more willing to accept these vehicles if they understand that the vehicles are communicating their intention to them



Comments to Draft Document Arguments-REV-0.docx (cont'd)

A “driving mode indicator” that informs that the vehicle is in ADS mode does not communicate the vehicle's intention and therefore will not likely increase acceptance. Therefore that section needs to be addressed or that bullet removed.

Also, for dedicated Level 4 AVs, such as single use AV taxis, which cannot be driven manually, it is not clear to me that a “driving mode indicator” is necessary. Since these vehicles will only be in AV mode I do not understand the value in such a signal. The vehicles will be different in appearance and clear to VRUs that they are AVs. Therefore, if they are moving they are in ADS mode.

I plan to call in tomorrow morning but feel free to reach out to me if you have any questions prior to them.

Thank you,

John Shutko

