Submitted by the expert from France

Informal document **GRVA-19-44**
19th session, 25 June2024
(For review during the
Troy meeting 20-24 May 2024)
Agenda item 4(g) (ii)

GRVA workshop on scenarios – 6-7 May 2024, Paris (France)

Wrap-up

The workshop was organized as mandated by GRVA, see ECE/TRANS/WP.29/GRVA/18, para. 51. The workshop was hosted by the Ministry of Transport in Paris – La Defense in France, with 54 participants included experts from 11 contracting parties (Australia, Canada, China, France, Finland, Germany, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, UK, USA) and from 8 other organizations (AAPC, CLEPA, CITA, FIA, ICEED, IRF global, ITU, OICA and SAFE).

The workshop received presentations from France, Japan and United Kingdom. It had a general exchange on scenarios. Below is the summary of the outcome (consensus and open questions):

A. State of consensus

1. There is a need to clarify concepts and terms, e.g.

   a. A Scenario catalogue and scenario database are not the same; a "scenarios" database is an ICT implementation of a catalogue of scenarios; some approaches for providing a scenarios catalogue wouldn't need an ICT implementation;

   b. Scenario sharing, reference scenarios, harmonized scenarios, collective set of scenarios, metadata, descriptors… needs clarification so that a common language can be adopted.

2. A Scenarios catalogue could be used by different stakeholders: authorities, industry and research institutes. The focus of the working group should be on regulatory purposes, keeping in mind that sharing scenarios among public / industry / academia should contribute to the overall objective of safer systems.

3. Regulatory frameworks based either on type-approval and/or self-certification will make use of scenarios and are likely to use a scenarios catalogue in their respective approaches.

4. There is a clear relationship between the GRVA workshop on scenarios and the IWG on ADS. The discussion on scenarios should be continued in parallel with the IWG on ADS. The thinking on scenarios from the IWG on ADS will become clearer as the work progresses (regulation will drive scenario content, not the reverse).

5. The outcome of the work on scenarios could also be useful for regulations other than ADS.

6. The initial aim of the effort would be to develop a means to facilitate structured communication and sharing of scenarios at a global level between Contracting Parties and other stakeholders.

7. There is a need to further clarify the objectives of this activity and the needs in developing a solution that meets those objectives.

8. The work on scenarios should be based on the ADS safety guidelines and recommendations (GRVA-18-50).

B. Open questions / needs for clarifications / topics for next steps

9. To clarify the needs of a scenario catalogue or database, the different purposes and use cases should be further explored and identified:

   a. e.g. assessing coverage (of ODDs by manufacturers), ensuring mutual acceptance of scenarios used in national / regional regulations, adapting scenarios to specific ODDs, identifying unknown-

unsafe scenarios, seeking for qualification of a limited «core» set of scenarios (common to various ODDs) ; dedicating scenarios to tests / simulation / audit ; …

b. clarifying or prioritizing these purposes would help to shape the solution (e.g. focus on functional / logical / concrete scenarios or a combination of different levels of abstraction? extent of metadata, for example methodologies used to reference or qualify a given scenario)

10. If the decision that there is a need to develop a scenario catalogue / database, then the issues to be tackled are governance and status, including is the use mandatory, how does it tie in with the ADS regulation), responsibilities, finance, operational use. It will be necessary to:

a. Clarify the purpose of the scenario catalogue and hence identify the responsibilities.

b. Establish the necessary Governance associated with the scenarios catalogue / database. This include selecting scenarios, applying appropriate refence and metadata, developing appropriate QA, updating scenarios, etc..

c. Clarify how information from ISMR will be managed and included in a scenarios catalogue / database.

d. Decide on whether there should be a centralized or decentralized catalogue / database, or a combination of both approaches.