## Collection of research gaps – identified from discussion sections IV through VII

Magnus Gyllenhammar<sup>1,2</sup>, Gabriel Rodrigues de Campos<sup>1</sup>, Martin Törngren<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Zenseact AB, Sweden. <sup>2</sup>KTH – Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden.

The tables presented below provide the basis for conducting the research gap analysis for our survey paper titled: "The Road to Safe Automated Driving Systems: A Review of Methods Providing Safety Evidence". For each discussed method, the eight challenges of Sec. III are classified as either a FC (fundamental challenge), O (obstacle) or U (unclear) (as per TABLE VI in the survey paper) result in a separate row in the table below. Further, for each such row a gap is identified by consulting the discussions of sections IV through VII. Subsequently, the raw identified gaps are collected and eventual connections to similar considerations between different rows, relating to the same method as well as other methods, are given. The table below presents this intermediate step of identified gaps before they are collected into categories and formulated as proper research questions, as presented in Sec. IX-B of the survey paper.

Notably, for operational data collection none of the eight challenges has been identified as posing significant obstacles or unclarities. However, there are other shortcomings of this method highlighted in Sec. VI.A that warrant considerations for using this method to provide safety evidence for the ADS.

1				
			noi	gap
			cat	
				sor
				ese
	Method	Challenge	Identified gap	Ca R
	Operational design domain	C-U-env	- Completeness and appropriate spec.	IX B1
		C-U-inter		IA-DI
	Hazard and risk assessment	C-U-env	FC	
		C-U-inter	FC	
		C-B-resp	$FC \vdash Completeness of hazards$	IX-B1
		C-B-func	FC	
		C-B-adapt		
		C-reqs	D How to automate usage of data to bridge high integrity requirement	ts and the pa
		C-agile	U support agile	IX-B2
les	Process arguments	C-U-env	FC	
iqu		C-U-inter	FC	
hn		C-B-resp	- Quantitative contributions with safety evidence	
tec		C-B-func		IX-B2
gn		C-B-adapt		
esi		C-reas		
D		C-AI	T Processes for AL/ML	IX-B2
		0 111	How to integrate processes with an agile release cycle alt. Produce adeq	uate safety
		C-agile	evidence from within an agile cycle?	IX-R2
		C II on u	ZC	
		C-U-env	TO Line his to formalize completely (isint with formalist cost)	IV D1
	Contract-based design	C-U-inter	The completely (joint with formal; rt_cert)	IA-D1
		C-B-resp		
		C-B-tunc	J Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert.;degradation	n;PCS) IX-B5
		C-AI	O Contracts for Al	IX-B4
	Supervisor architectures	C-B-func	O Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert;degradation	i;PCS) IX-B5

	Method	Challenge	Oldentified gap	Research gap category
Verification and validation methods	Field operational tests	C-U-inter C-B-resp C-reqs C-agile	O O FC Scalability/how to leverage (jointly with EVT) FC How to use FOTs within an agile framework of release?	IX-B3 IX-B5 IX-B5
	Extreme value theory	C-U-inter C-B-resp	$\begin{bmatrix} O \\ O \end{bmatrix}$ How to collect closed loop data? (jointly with FOT)	IX-B3
	Scenario-based V&V	C-U-env C-U-inter C-B-resp C-reqs C-AI	FC FCCompleteness of scenario spaceFCTesting of relevant scenarios considering tactical decisionsOHow to ensure coverage of rare scenarios?CNon-interpolatable results from testing	IX-B1 IX-B3 IX-B2 IX-B4
	Formal methods	C-U-env C-U-inter C-B-resp C-B-func C-reqs C-AI	<ul> <li>FC</li> <li>FC</li> <li>FC</li> <li>Unable to formalise completely (joint with formal;run-time cert)</li> <li>O Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert;degradation;PCS)</li> <li>O How to mitigate the specification gap?</li> <li>O Soundness and completeness for Al-components? Esp. rel. high dependability regs.</li> </ul>	IX-B1 IX-B5 IX-B1 IX-B4

	Method	Challenge	Classification	Identified gap	Research gap category
Run-time risk assessment	Operational data collection	N/A		Appropriate leading safety metrics for operational data connected to safety	IX-B2
	Threat assessment	C-U-env C C-U-inter C	0 0	How to capture uncertainties of C-U-env and C-U-inter?	IX-B2
	Out-of-distribution detection	C-reqs (	0	How to ensure integrity of run-time methods? (jointly with DRA;DSM)	IX-B2
		C-B-resp U	U	Impact from tactical decisions? (jointly with PCS;DSM)	IX-B3
	Dynamic risk	C-B-adapt U	U	How well does DRA accommodate degradations?	IX-B2
	assessment	C-reqs U	U	How to ensure integrity of run-time methods? (jointly with OoD;DSM)	IX-B2
I		C-AI U	U	How to derive quantitative risk metrics for AI/ML-components? (with DSM)	IX-B4

e (self-)adaptation	Degradation strategies	C-B-func	0	Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert;degradation;PCS)	IX-B5
		C-agile	0	How to facilitate frequent releases when considering proper analysis of degradations strategies	IX-B5
	Runtime certification	C-U-env C-U-inter C-B-resp	0 0 0	Unable to formalise completely (joint with formal;run-time cert)	IX-B1
		C-B-func	0	Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert;degradation;PCS)	IX-B5
	Dynamic safety management       C-B-resp       O       Impact from tactical decisions? (jointly with PCS;DRA)         C-reqs       O       How to ensure integrity of run-time methods? (jointly with DRA;OoD)         C-AI       O       How to derive quantitative risk metrics for AI/ML-components? (with DRA)	C-B-resp	0	Impact from tactical decisions? (jointly with PCS;DRA)	IX-B3
im€		C-reqs	Ο	How to ensure integrity of run-time methods? (jointly with DRA;OoD)	IX-B2
Run-t		IX-B4			
	Precautionary safety	C-B-resp	U	Impact from tactical decisions? (jointly with DRA;DSM)	IX-B3
		C-B-func	U	Scalability of method (with CBD;arch.;formal;run-time cert;degradation;PCS)	IX-B5
		C-agile	U	How can PCS help support frequent releases?	IX-B5