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Research Objective

The tests described in today’s presentation:

- Were assembled for research purposes
- Provide a way to objectively define, document, and disseminate how BSI and OTSA tests may be performed on the test track
- Help assess the state-of-technology
- Will be useful for evaluating vehicles with higher levels of automation in the future
Blind Spot Intervention (BSI)

- Designed to actively help the driver avoid crashing into another vehicle in an adjacent lane
- Uses steering and/or differential braking to return vehicle back into original travel lane
Subject and Principal Other Vehicles (SV and POV)

2017 BMW 540i
• Active steering for BSI response
• Operational threshold speed of 45 mph

Guided Soft Target (GST)
• Low Profile Robotic Vehicle
• Global Vehicle Target (GVT) Revision F
Test Conditions

- Three scenarios defined in the April 2018 draft research test procedure
  - 3 repeated trials per condition
- Robotic steering controller used for SV heading changes
- 0.7 m/s SV lateral velocity towards the left adjacent lane line
  - Emulates an intentional lane change
- TP includes provisions for performing tests with up to SAE automation level 3
  - Only those relevant to SAE L0 discussed today
Scenario 1: Constant Headway

- $\text{SV}_{\text{speed}} = \text{POV}_{\text{speed}} = 45$ mph
- Robotically-controlled SV steering released within 250 ms after establishing heading toward left lane line
Scenario 2: Closing Headway

- $SV_{\text{speed}} = 45$ mph
- $POV_{\text{speed}} = 50$ mph
- Robotically-controlled SV steering released within 250 ms after establishing heading toward left lane line
Scenario 3: Constant Headway False Positive

- \( SV_{\text{speed}} = POV_{\text{speed}} = 45 \text{ mph} \)
- Robotically-controlled SV steering used to perform a full lane change, not released until end of test
Test Performability

Generally good, most issues pertain to operating a robotic platform at high speed

- Achieving steady state while operating at 50 mph requires considerable testing area
- Can rapidly deplete the platform’s batteries
## Results: BSI Operation

### Scenario 1: Constant Headway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>BSI Activation?</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Min Lat Range (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*POV speed criteria not met for all trials

### Scenario 2: Closing Headway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>BSI Activation?</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Min Lat Range (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Closing Headway
Baseline tests performed. Average yaw rate data used to define an acceptability corridor.

Baseline composite
Baseline composite + 1 deg/s
Baseline composite - 1 deg/s

Acceptability corridor

False Positive Assessment

Baseline intervention causes SV yaw rate to exceed the upper bound of the acceptability corridor.

Results

Scenario 3

Constant Headway False Positive

Yaw rate outside of corridor used to identify a BSI intervention
Concluding Remarks (BSI)

• Generally speaking, the BSI tests described in the April 2018 draft research TP were found to be well-defined, but some minor refinement was needed to enhance performability.

• With regards to the system operation:
  o The test methods were able to elicit BSI activations during 5 out of 6 trials.
  o Each activation prevented an SV-to-POV side impact.
  o No false positives were observed.

• Release of a research report and the refined TP is expected later this year.
Oncoming Traffic Safety Assist (OTSA)

• Designed to actively help the driver avoid a head-on crash with another vehicle in an adjacent lane
• Uses steering and/or differential braking to return vehicle back into original travel lane
Subject and Principal Other Vehicles (SV and POV)

2017 Mercedes E300
• Differential braking for OTSA response
• Operational speeds between 40 - 120 mph

Guided Soft Target (GST)
• Low Profile Robotic Vehicle
• Global Vehicle Target (GVT) Revision F
Test Conditions

• 5 scenarios, applicable as a function of SV automation level
  o Include crash imminent and false positive tests
  o 3 repeated trials per condition

• Up to 2 SV lateral velocities towards lane line
  o Emulates unintended (0.5 m/s) and intended (0.7 m/s) lane line approaches
  o Commanded by a robotic steering controller

• 3 SV/POV speed combinations: 25/25, 45/25 and 45/45 mph

• Includes provisions for performing tests with up to automation level 3
  o Only those relevant to L0 discussed today
Scenario Overview (crash imminent)

- Longitudinal TTC-based inputs
  - SV turn signal (where applicable)
  - SV lane change
- Includes a robotically-commanded “bail-out” provision to insure driver safety
SV Bail-Out Provision

SV must not this enter zone

POV

1 ft (0.3 m)

SV
Scenario Overview (false positive)

- Longitudinal TTC-based inputs
  - Turn signal (where applicable)
  - Lane change
- Includes a full lane change like that used for the BSI false positive tests
Test Performability

- Generally good, level of effort and GST operational considerations greater than those of the BSI tests
  - Additional actor adds complexity to the test choreography
  - Long initial separation during the 45 mph tests require a large test area and good SV-to-POV instrumentation communication (needed for closed loop control)
- Although necessary for safe test conduct, the SV bail-out provision can affect the ability to observe OTSA operation
**Scenario 1**
No TS, 0.5 m/s LV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeds</th>
<th>OTSA Activations</th>
<th>SR Aborts</th>
<th>Secondary Departures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/25</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 2**
TS (no TS), 0.7 m/s LV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeds</th>
<th>OTSA Activations</th>
<th>SR Aborts</th>
<th>Secondary Departures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/25</td>
<td>0/3 (3/5)</td>
<td>3/3 (5/5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 4**
TS, 0.7 m/s LV, False Positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeds</th>
<th>OTSA Activations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/25</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/45</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Results**

- *Testing still in progress*
- All results are preliminary and subject to change as testing continues and validity criteria evolve
- Scenario 2 45/25 tests were also performed without turn signal
- Indicated in parentheses
- Condition is not present in the draft research TP
Example: Scenario 2, 45_45
OTSA Concluding Remarks

• OTSA test inputs appear to be performable, however use of a robotic bail-out provision (necessary for safe test conduct) may confound observation of OTSA operation
  o Important if close SV-to-POV proximity is required to activate OTSA
  o May be vehicle-dependent issue
• Better understanding the interaction of turn signal use and OTSA availability is of interest
• Release of the OTSA test report and draft research TP is expected later this year
Additional Information

• The draft research BSI and OTSA test procedure will be available from the National Transportation Library (NTL)
  o Link: https://ntl.bts.gov/

• Contacts:
  o Taylor Manahan: taylor.manahan.ctr@dot.gov
  o Garrick Forkenbrock: garrick.forkenbrock@dot.gov
Questions?

Thank you!