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## SAE J3016 Definitions - Levels of Automation

| ய ভ | Name | Narrative Definition | Execution of Steering/ Acceleration/ Deceleration | Monitoring of Driving Environment | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Fallback } \\ \text { Performance of } \\ \text { Dynamic } \\ \text { Driving Task } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | System Capability (Driving Modes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Human driver monitors the driving environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | No <br> Automation | the full-time performance by the human driver of all aspects of the dynamic driving task, even when enhanced by warning or intervention systems | Human drive | man driver | Human driver | n/a |
| 1 | Driver Assistance | the driving mode-specific execution by a driver assistance system of either steering or acceleration/deceleration using information about the driving environment and with the expectation that the human driver perform all remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task | Human drive and system | uman drive | Human driver | Some driving modes |
| 2 | Partial Automation | the driving mode-specific execution by one or more driver assistance systems of both steering and acceleration/deceleration using information about the driving environment and with the expectation that the human driver perform all remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task | System | uman drive | Human driver | Some driving modes |
| Automated driving system ('system") monitors the driving environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Conditional Automation | the driving mode-specific performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task with the expectation that the human driver will respond appropriately to a request to intervene | System | System | Human driver | Some driving modes |
| 4 | High Automation | the driving mode-specific performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task, even if a human driver does not respond appropriately to a request to intervene | System | System | System | Some driving modes |
| 5 | Full <br> Automation | the full-time performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task under all roadway and environmental conditions that can be managed by a human driver | System | System | System | All driving modes |

## Example Systems at Each Automation Level

| Level | Example Systems | Driver Roles |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Adaptive Cruise Control OR <br> Lane Keeping Assistance | Must drive other function and <br> monitor driving environment |
| 2 | Adaptive Cruise Control AND Lane <br> Keeping Assistance <br> Traffic Jam Assist (Mercedes, Volvo, <br> Infiniti) | Must monitor driving <br> environment (system nags <br> driver to try to ensure it) |
| 3 | Traffic Jam Pilot <br> Automated parking with supervision | May read a book, text, or web <br> surf, but be prepared to <br> intervene when needed |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Highway driving pilot <br> Closed campus driverless shuttle <br> Driverless valet parking in garage | May sleep, and system can <br> revert to minimum risk <br> condition if needed |
| 5 | Automated taxi (even for children) <br> Car-share repositioning system | No driver needed |

## Level 1 Driver Assistance

- Full attention needed to execute "other" driving task $\rightarrow$ no loss of driver vigilance
- Warning systems (using same sensors as automation systems) augment driver vigilance
- Reduced effort on steering in tight curves frees up driver attention to monitor external hazards:


## Level 2 Partial Automation

- Drivers could be misled to assume higher capability than system has
- Drivers will lose vigilance when system does steering and speed/spacing control
- Drivers will be tempted to abuse the system so they can do other things:



## Level 3 Conditional Automation

- Serious doubts about feasibility of capturing driver's attention to provide fallback within a few seconds, considering:
- Inattention
- Distraction
- Sleep
- Can these driver states be avoided?
- Fallback will be needed under the most challenging emergency driving conditions
$\rightarrow$ Doubts about feasibility (safety) of Level 3


## Broader Human Factors Issues for Automation

- User acceptance based on perceived safety (especially after crashes are reported)
- Interactions with vulnerable road users (bikes and pedestrians), who depend on eye contact with drivers today
- Interactions with other drivers, especially for overly-timid AV driving styles
- Societal risk tolerance determining "how safe is safe enough?" to be different by country


## Regulatory Needs

- California legislation specified that new rules apply to "technology that has the capability to drive a vehicle without the active physical control or monitoring by a human operator"
- What rules are needed to:
- Ensure users are informed/educated about capabilities and limitations of systems
- Require some minimum system safety level
- Reassure other road users that their safety has not been compromised by AVs
- Deter abuses of systems by drivers $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{CNH}^{\prime \prime}$


## Public Policy Choices

- How to balance protecting public safety with encouraging new technological innovations?
- Immature technology will not be safe at first
- How to gain societal consensus on acceptable safety level for automated driving systems?
- How to balance "new economy" jobs creating more advanced automation systems with driving jobs that could be lost eventually?
- How to assess mixed impacts on energy use and traffic, based on increased levels of travel but more efficient unit travel?


