

To: [Name of the Minister]
[Position Title]
[Country]

12 June 2026

Re: Tesla “FSD (Supervised)” — questions to answer before recognising the approval in [Country]

Dear Minister [Name of the Minister],

I am writing about the provisional EU type-approval granted to Tesla’s “FSD (Supervised)” by the Dutch authority RDW. Several Member States have already begun recognising that approval for their own territory, and [Country] may soon face the same decision. We urge you not to recognise it until a short set of questions has been answered - in public, and by someone other than the manufacturer - and until there is meaningful real-world safety evidence from Dutch roads.

These are the questions we believe you should put to your officials, and to RDW, before deciding:

- 1. Has the system been independently shown both to improve safety and not to introduce new risks?** RDW states that using it correctly makes “a positive contribution to road safety.” That claim must clear two bars, and so far no public evidence is available to clear either. Independent research has found no evidence that assisted driving of this kind delivers safety benefits beyond the crash-avoidance technologies EU law already requires. And independently - by US federal investigators, and in footage from Dutch roads - the system has been shown to behave in ways that create new risks. The system can also be set, by design, to help a driver exceed the speed limit.
- 2. Why is [Country] being asked to adopt a system that US federal authorities are investigating right now?** Two separate investigations are currently ongoing into the US version of the Tesla FSD software: one into the system running red lights, another into its failure to warn the driver when its own cameras are degraded. Drivers in the Netherlands have already filmed it crossing solid lane lines. Were these issues examined during the approval, and resolved for the EU version of FSD (Supervised)?
- 3. How were the risks of driver overreliance assessed - and shown to be controlled over months of ordinary use, not on a test track?** The driver remains legally responsible for manoeuvres the car makes by itself. Yet the more capable such a system appears, the less attentive drivers become; on 31 March the US National Transportation Safety Board linked precisely this overreliance to two fatal crashes, concluding that these systems “function primarily as convenience features rather than safety enhancements.” Driver-monitoring can reduce that effect. Nothing yet shows it removes it.

4. **If something goes wrong on [Country]’s roads, who will investigate?** Europe has no equivalent of the US NTSB or NHTSA - no independent body to examine these systems in service across Europe.

None of this is an argument against the technology in principle. It is an argument against [Country] becoming the place where it is rolled out before these questions are answered. The same NTSB chair recently praised European regulators for being “well ahead” of the United States on vehicle safety - a reputation built over decades. The decision before you will shape how people live and die on [Country]’s roads for years to come; it should not be taken faster than the evidence allows, nor under commercial or public pressure, however considerable that pressure may be today.

Until there has been open deliberation at EU and UN level on the future of the regulatory framework, and credible safety evidence from Dutch roads, we urge you to hold off. We would gladly share the detailed questions we have already put to RDW, and assist your officials in whatever way is useful.

Yours sincerely,



Antonio Avenoso
Executive Director
European Transport Safety Council