

## A Human Factors Perspective on Automated Driving

M. Kyriakidis<sup>1,2\*</sup>, J. C. F. de Winter<sup>1</sup>, N. Stanton<sup>3</sup>, T. Bellet<sup>4</sup>, B. van Arem<sup>5</sup>, K. Brookhuis<sup>6</sup>, M. H. Martens<sup>7,8</sup>, K. Bengler<sup>9</sup>, J. Andersson<sup>10</sup>, N. Merat<sup>11</sup>, N. Reed<sup>12</sup>, M. Flament<sup>13</sup>, M. Hagenzieker<sup>5,14</sup>, & R. Happee<sup>1,5</sup>

1 Department Biomechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.

2 ETH Zurich, Future Resilient Systems, Singapore - ETH Centre, Singapore.

3 Transportation Research Group, Faculty of Engineering and Environment Department, University of Southampton, UK.

4 Ergonomics and Cognitive Sciences Laboratory, The French Institute of Science and Technology for Transport, Development and Networks, France.

5 Transport & Planning Department, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.

6 Department of Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

7 Centre for Transport Studies, University of Twente, the Netherlands.

8 TNO, the Netherlands.

9 Institute of Ergonomics, Technical University of Munich, Germany.

10 Swedish National Road and Transport Research Institute, Sweden.

11 Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, UK.

12 Human Factors and Simulation Group, Transport Research Laboratory, UK.

13 ERTICO, ITS Europe, Belgium.

14 SWOV, Institute for Road Safety Research, the Netherlands.

---

\* Corresponding author: [miltos.kyriakidis@frs.ethz.ch](mailto:miltos.kyriakidis@frs.ethz.ch)

26 Automated driving can fundamentally change road transportation and  
27 improve quality of life. However, at present, the role of humans in  
28 automated vehicles (AVs) is not clearly established. Interviews were  
29 conducted in April and May 2015 with twelve expert researchers in the  
30 field of Human Factors (HF) of automated driving to identify  
31 commonalities and distinctive perspectives regarding HF challenges in the  
32 development of AVs. The experts indicated that an AV up to SAE Level 4  
33 should inform its driver about the AV's capabilities and operational status,  
34 and ensure safety while changing between automated and manual modes.  
35 HF research should particularly address interactions between AVs, human  
36 drivers, and vulnerable road users. Additionally, driver training programs  
37 may have to be modified to ensure that humans are capable of using AVs.  
38 Finally, a reflection on the interviews is provided, showing discordance  
39 between the interviewees' statements—which appear to be in line with a  
40 long history of human factors research, and the rapid development of  
41 automation technology. We expect our perspective to be instrumental for  
42 stakeholders involved in AV development and instructive to other parties.

43 **Keywords:** Automated driving; Levels of automation; Human Factors challenges;  
44 Interview study; Experts vision

45 **Relevance to Human Factors/Ergonomics theory:** Automated driving can change road  
46 transportation and improve quality of life. However, the role of human drivers within  
47 the automated vehicle is not yet clearly established. This work presents the results of an  
48 interview study among 12 HF scientists involved in automated driving research. A  
49 consensus was revealed regarding the HF challenges that need to be resolved prior to  
50 the deployment of AVs on public roads. The challenges include the synergy between the  
51 humans and automation, potential changes in driving behaviour due to automation, and  
52 the type of information that the drivers shall receive from the automated driving  
53 system. Furthermore, a disparity was identified between the researchers' concerns  
54 regarding the development of AVs and technological advances: although the

55 researchers expressed that AVs should not be introduced unless proven safe, reality  
56 shows that industry is now close to introducing Level 3 and Level 4 AVs on public roads.

## Introduction

Automated driving technology has the potential to fundamentally change road transportation and improve quality of life. Automated vehicles (AVs) are anticipated to reduce the number of accidents caused by human errors, increase traffic flow efficiency, increase comfort by allowing the driver to perform alternative tasks, and ensure mobility for all, including old and impaired individuals (Fagnant and Kockelman 2015; Mui and Carroll 2013).

AVs can be classified according to their technological capabilities and human engagement, ranging from manual driving, where the human driver executes all of the driving tasks, to fully automated driving where no human interaction occurs. In this paper, we adopt the SAE levels of automation (SAE International 2014; 2016) shown in Table 1, which is arguably the most well-known and broadly used taxonomy in the field of automated driving research (International Transport Forum 2015; NHTSA 2016).

Table 1. Levels of automation as defined by the SAE International

Monitoring of driving environment	Level of automation	Description
Human driver	0: Driver only	The human driver performs all aspects of the dynamic driving task
	1: Assisted automation	A driver assistance system performs either steering or acceleration/deceleration, while the human driver is expected to carry out the remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task
	2: Partial automation	One or more driver assistance systems perform both steering and acceleration/deceleration, while the human driver is expected to carry out all remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task
Automated driving system	3: Conditional automation	An automated driving system performs all aspects of the dynamic driving task (in conditions for which it was designed), but the human driver is expected to respond appropriately to a request to intervene
	4: High automation	An automated driving system performs all aspects of the dynamic driving task (in conditions for which it was designed), even if the human driver does not respond appropriately to a request to intervene

	5: Full automation	An automated driving system performs all aspects of the dynamic driving task under all roadway and environmental conditions
--	--------------------	---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

There are suggestions that Levels 3 and 4 automation could be deployed by 2020 (ERTRAC Task Force and Connectivity and Automated Driving 2015), while Tesla announced the introduction of an automated feature that will allow individuals to summon their vehicles from a distance by 2018 (Blum 2016; Korosec 2015). Moreover, a recent study suggests that the public expects Level 5 (full) automation in more than 50% of vehicles by around 2030 (Kyriakidis, Happee, and De Winter 2015).

Along this accelerating evolution of road vehicle automation, Human Factors (HF) research scientists have warned for a long time that the mere fact that you can automate does not mean that you should (Fitts 1951; Hancock 2014). As early as 1983, Bainbridge (1983) presented several ‘ironies of automation’ and explained that “the more advanced a control system is, so the more crucial may be the contribution of the human operator.” Similarly, Parasuraman and Riley (1997) explained the importance of studying how humans may misuse, disuse, and abuse automation technology, and also argued that humans tend to be poor supervisors of automation. With respect to AVs in particular, up to Level 4 automation, human drivers will be a key component, because they should operate the vehicle in conditions not supported by the automation, and will be expected (Level 4), or even required (Levels 2 and 3) to resume manual control when needed.

Studies indicate that many challenges pertaining to the interaction between human drivers and automated systems are yet to be resolved. Such challenges include the impact of automated systems on drivers’ mental workload and situation awareness (Brookhuis et al. 2008; De Winter et al. 2014; Kaber and Endsley 2004; Merat et al. 2012; Salmon, Stanton, and Young 2012; Stanton and Young 2005; Whitmore and Reed 2015), as well as the human drivers’ levels of acceptance (Brookhuis et al. 2008), trust, and reliance on the automated systems (Coelingh 2013; De Waard et al. 1999; Fisher, Reed, and Savirimuthu 2015; Verberne, Ham, and Midden 2012).

Further challenges are associated with potential changes in human drivers’ behaviour due to automation (Gouy et al. 2014), the necessary skills that the humans should retain to perform the driving task manually (Vlakveld 2015), and the role of the humans in the

1 case of an emergency such as when automation fails or exceeds its functional limits  
2 (Leviton, Golembiewski, and Bloomfield 1998). In addition, research has yet to clarify  
3 the required level of supervisory control and cooperation (who is performing what part  
4 of the driving task) between human drivers and automated systems (Banks and Stanton  
5 2016; Coelingh 2013; Hoc, Young and Blosseville 2009; Lu et al. 2016; Marinik et al.  
6 2014).

7 Research challenges also comprise the estimation of the minimum time required by  
8 human drivers to resume manual control when instructed by the automated system  
9 (Gold et al. 2013, 2016; Merat et al. 2014; Mok et al. 2015; Radlmayr et al. 2014;  
10 Schieben et al. 2008; Zeeb, Buchner, and Schrauf 2015), and the interaction between  
11 AVs and other vehicles and road users (Martens and Van den Beukel 2013, Merat and  
12 Lee 2012; Merat et al., submitted; Madigan et al., 2016). Finally, as argued by Hancock  
13 (2015, p. 139), “one empirical question that necessitates vital research at this present  
14 time is the establishment of appropriate epidemiological baselines for the dimensions  
15 of current, manually-operated vehicle performance such as transit time efficiency,  
16 system downtime, injury and fatality”.

17 Therefore, HF research can critically contribute to the development and deployment  
18 of AVs, by working towards a synergy between the human driver, vehicle, and  
19 environment. This paper presents the findings of an interview study with twelve  
20 researchers in the field of HF and automated driving. The aim of the study was twofold:  
21 first, to define the most critical HF challenges related to AVs, and second, to indicate  
22 similarities and distinctive perspectives among the researchers.

23 The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. First, we will describe the  
24 methods of the study, with subsequent sections providing a summary of the  
25 researchers’ opinions in the form of twelve narratives. Finally, we discuss parallels and  
26 idiosyncrasies regarding the opinions of the interviewees, and provide concluding  
27 remarks and suggestions for policy makers and other stakeholders.

28

29

## 30 **Methods**

31

32 Using a 35-item questionnaire interview (provided in the Appendix), the twelve  
researchers articulated their expectations, concerns, and vision about AVs. The

1 questionnaire was designed to reflect the researchers' experience and expertise, and it  
2 addressed four main areas of interest associated with the development of AVs: (1)  
3 challenges from a HF perspective, (2) potential strengths and benefits, (3) deployment  
4 scenarios and likely changes in the status of road transportation, and (4) public  
5 acceptance and expectations. The background and expertise of the participants is  
6 provided in the Section "About the authors" and helps the readers to interpret the  
7 twelve narratives. The questionnaire was built on past research that explored the public  
8 and subject matter experts' opinion on automated driving (Begg 2014; Casley, Jardim,  
9 and Quartulli 2013; KPMG 2014; Kyriakidis, Happee, and De Winter 2015; Payre, Cestac,  
10 and Delhomme 2014; Schoettle and Sivak 2014a, 2014b; Sommer 2013; Underwood  
11 2014).

12 The twelve researchers are currently involved in research activities associated with  
13 HF and AVs, and they all have more than 10 years of experience in the field (mean = 19  
14 years). Nine of the researchers participate in the EU project Human Factors of  
15 Automated Driving (2014d). To increase diversity, three additional researchers  
16 contributed to the study. One of them is involved in the EU projects AdaptiVe (2014a)  
17 and CityMobil2, the second in the UK project GATEway (2014c), and the third  
18 coordinates the EU support action Vehicle and Road Automation (VRA) (2013).

19 The interviews were carried out individually in April and May 2015, with their  
20 duration varying between 45 and 90 minutes. Based on transcripts from audio  
21 recordings of each interview, an initial narrative was generated to describe the  
22 researchers' main insights regarding the four addressed areas of interest. Building upon  
23 these narratives, the researchers then recomposed and finalized their statements, as  
24 presented in the next section.

25

26

27

28

*Neville Stanton*

29

30

31

32

Decades of research have shown that humans are not particularly good at tasks that  
require vigilance and sustained attention over long periods of time (Warm,  
Parasuraman, and Matthews 2008). Today, one of the major challenges in the design of  
AVs is the expectation that drivers will monitor the system constantly and appropriately

1 intervene when required (Stanton, Young, and McCaulder 1997). Experience from other  
2 industries, such as aviation, has shown that automation may actually cause as many  
3 problems as it solves. For example, the disconnection of the autopilot on Air France  
4 Flight 447 from Rio de Janeiro to Paris (which crashed on 1 June 2009, BEA 2012) failed  
5 to communicate the nature of the situation (the blocking of pitot tubes with ice crystals)  
6 effectively to the human pilots. The resultant inputs from the pilots led the aircraft into  
7 an aerodynamic stall, from which it did not recover. The black box voice recorder makes  
8 for chilling reading, as the pilots struggled to regain control of the aircraft.

9       There is concern that AVs could cause similar confusion in drivers, where the drivers'  
10 understanding of the situation is at odds with reality (Stanton, Dunoyer, and Leatherland  
11 2011). Whilst in aviation, people are beginning to wise up to the fact that automation is  
12 causing confusion in pilots (which has been called a 'mode error' in the technical  
13 literature (Sarter and Woods 1995), there is still an assumption that the driver will be  
14 the last line of defence in AVs. Despite two decades of research on AVs, there is still  
15 much to be learnt. HF research can play a substantial role in the development of our  
16 understanding of driving AVs by reproducing a range of situations in simulators. Here  
17 we can observe how drivers are likely to behave as well as get feedback on their  
18 experience.

19       Research should be focusing on maintaining the communication and interaction  
20 between AVs and the driver. Unless a system can be designed that requires no human  
21 input at all (and has no controls within the vehicle) we need to design automation that  
22 supports, rather than replaces, human drivers. To some extent, supportive automation  
23 is already with us, such as Antilock Braking Systems, Lane Keeping Systems, and  
24 Electronic Stability Control (Stanton and Young 2005). These systems can be thought of  
25 as a background automation rather than foreground automation (where the latter takes  
26 over the driving tasks). Background automation allows the driver to drive the vehicle,  
27 but watches over them in case of trouble (Young, Stanton, and Harris 2007). If the driver  
28 brakes too hard, strays out of the lane, or steers too hard, the automation will intervene  
29 in an attempt to save them. Automated Emergency Braking Systems are an extension of  
30 this philosophy, and will brake if the sensors detect an impending accident without any  
31 intervention from the driver.



1 As a cautionary note, with creeping automation taking a more active role in driving,  
2 there are some very salient lessons to be learnt from aviation. This can be illustrated  
3 using the difference between the automation philosophies in Boeing and Airbus. In  
4 Boeing the pilot is king. Although there is a protective layer of automation, this can be  
5 overridden by the pilots. By way of contrast, in the Airbus the computer is king, and the  
6 pilots cannot override this protective layer of automation in normal law mode. Whilst it  
7 is acknowledged that the automation does protect pilots, it can also cause problems as  
8 shown with the AF447. In this incident, the aircraft entered alternate law mode  
9 (although the pilots did not realize this mode change) (BEA 2012). In addition, the flight  
10 controls in the Airbus do not have any feedback (they do in the Boeing), so do not move  
11 at all when the autopilot is in control (whereas they do in the Boeing). Each pilot did not  
12 realize that the other was making control inputs. This would be equivalent to the  
13 steering wheel not moving in a car that is being driven automatically, certainly not  
14 something I would advise to vehicle manufacturers.

15 Overall, automated vehicles are meaningful only if drivers are freed from the driving  
16 tasks, are not anticipated to supervise the system, and are not liable for it. We are,  
17 however, rather far from reaching this point (Walker, Stanton, and Salmon 2015).  
18 Accordingly, it might be more beneficial for the society if research focuses on  
19 background automation, until foreground automation has matured sufficiently.

20

21 *Thierry Bellet*

22 Almost twenty-five years ago, the US Automated Highway System (AHS) program was  
23 launched to conduct long-range research on the design of future Intelligent  
24 Transportation Systems aimed at aiding driving, enhancing the capacity and efficiency  
25 of the highway system, and assisting transportation agencies in managing their facilities  
26 and controlling traffic (Bement et al. 1998).

27 One of the program's main findings was the unclear extent to which human drivers  
28 would accept reduced manual control of their vehicles or be willing to travel in  
29 automated vehicles at close following distances, on narrower lanes, and at higher  
30 speeds (Bement et al. 1998). The program also showed that improving road safety and  
31 increasing road capacity might not be mutually compatible unless society accepts the

1 idea of “automation responsibility” in the case of accidents (Bellet et al. 2003). If not,  
2 the human drivers may be required to remain alert and take back the control of their  
3 vehicles in the case of critical situations. Subsequently, increased safety margins and a  
4 reduction of vehicle speeds are required to allow drivers to rebuild their situation  
5 awareness and adequately resume control of the driving task. However, this would  
6 mean that AVs, compared to manual driving, would actually reduce road capacity.  
7 Therefore, the program concluded that although there are no technical showstoppers  
8 for the overall success of an automated highway system, legal and societal challenges  
9 may be more difficult to resolve, including rejecting the founding paradigm of the driving  
10 task, where responsibility lies with the human driver (Lay, McHale, and Stevens 1996).  
11 Recent developments in AVs have changed the situation. AVs, although in limited  
12 numbers, now exist. It is not a question of whether it is possible to have AVs on the  
13 public roads. It is a question of how, when, and under which conditions they should be  
14 introduced. Of course, the famous Bainbridge’s (1983) ‘ironies of automation’ remain  
15 exactly the same, but now the time has come to propose solutions to these ironies.  
16 Today the main challenge is not to consider the future, but to think about the present.  
17 Facing this challenge, HF research has to clearly define the role of humans in AVs (is the  
18 human still technically a driver), and to support accordingly the design of a human-  
19 centred automation. Synthetically, three main options seem promising: (1) developing  
20 co-piloting systems supporting the driver rather than replacing them, (2) designing  
21 solutions to keep humans in the loop of control during automation, in order to support  
22 situation awareness, (3) defining dedicated areas for full automation without any  
23 responsibility of the driver (e.g., dedicated lane on highways, or platooning for long  
24 tunnels).

25 However, to support such human-centred design of automation, new simulation  
26 tools are required, from realistic AV simulators allowing full-scale immersive tests, to  
27 traffic flow simulations including realistic human driver models that are able to predict  
28 the road safety effects of AVs (Bellet et al. 2012). Such simulation tools could allow us  
29 to test different types of AVs, support decision-making regarding policy and legislation,  
30 and finally permit the introduction of AVs on public roads and their potential  
31 deployment during the next 20 years.

32

1       *Bart van Arem*

2       The deployment of automated vehicles will eventually change road transportation as  
3 it stands today. However, AVs that are able to drive in all situations and at all conditions,  
4 without requiring any human supervision or intervention, will not be introduced into the  
5 market any time soon.

6       Nevertheless, I believe that within the next 10 years AVs could be deployed on public  
7 roads for specific scenarios (e.g., highway driving). The human drivers in those vehicles  
8 will then be supervising the system and intervene if required.

9       Research, therefore, should aim at ensuring that the human drivers remain alert and  
10 situational aware, even when they are not actively controlling the steering wheel and  
11 pedals. This level of automation, however, will not allow the drivers to be engaged in a  
12 large variety of non-driving tasks. This means that the benefits for the consumers as well  
13 as their acceptance and willingness to buy such AVs are limited.

14       Thus, our resources should be focusing on highly automated driving, which will  
15 enable a driver to engage in non-driving tasks, and which is equipped with fail safe  
16 strategies, including a feature that brings the car to a minimal risk condition (cf. SAE,  
17 2016).

18

19       *Karel Brookhuis*

20       Human beings notoriously get bad marks in (low frequency) vigilance tasks, that is,  
21 detecting occasional mishaps. The poor human ability to monitor and supervise  
22 represents a major weakness of automated vehicles in general, and specifically at the  
23 SAE Level 2, since it will be mandatory for human ‘drivers’ to keep monitoring the system  
24 and the environment. Since human drivers should primarily be supervising the system,  
25 rather than engaging in any other activities, the benefits of AVs and in turn their  
26 acceptance and the public willingness to use them, let alone buy them, are debatable,  
27 whilst driver training and licensing will change dramatically. In order to maintain driving  
28 skills, human drivers should keep having the opportunity to drive manually, probably  
29 requiring AVs to stay fully equipped.

30       As system failures cannot be excluded, additional research should focus on four  
31 topics: (1) to define the way in which human drivers should be informed in case of a

1 system failure, (2) depending on the type of failure, what the human driver is able and  
2 allowed to do, (3) to optimize the safe interaction of the new technology with human  
3 drivers, and (4) to ensure public acceptance and trust in automated vehicles.

4 The deployment of SAE Level 5, operating without any human intervention in all  
5 situations and at all conditions, might even never happen, as people are reluctant to  
6 accept any potential harm caused by a machine operating independently. A realistic and  
7 fast way to deploy AVs is by employing segregated lanes, which will be controlled and  
8 maintained by a separately managed infrastructure. In these lanes only authorized AVs  
9 operating at SAE Level 4/5 will be allowed.

10 In conclusion, I am expecting AVs within the next 10 years, but only in a segregated  
11 manner such as low speed vehicles on designated tracks for the transportation of goods.  
12 For this to happen, the safety levels should be clearly demonstrated, while any potential  
13 side effects that may arise from their deployment are adequately communicated to the  
14 people involved and to society in general.

15

16 *Marieke Martens*

17 Automated vehicles in the next couple of years will have operational limitations,  
18 being able to operate only under the specific conditions they can cope with. Once we  
19 can prove that AVs are always able to cope with situations in an acceptable, safe, and  
20 comfortable manner, the AVs may take over control, and the human drivers will become  
21 passengers. Subsequently, liability issues could also be resolved, with the drivers  
22 remaining liable for as long as they are in control of their vehicle, and the original  
23 equipment manufacturers (OEMs) becoming liable once automation accepts the control  
24 of the vehicle.

25 However, if AVs cannot cope with a situation, they will either hand over the control  
26 to the human driver or they will come to an alternative solution such as a transition to  
27 a minimal risk condition. This may include AV coming to a standstill (e.g., safe stop),  
28 which may be dangerous if the AV does not explicitly communicate its intention to other  
29 road users or does not come to safe stop in a predictable manner or at a predictable  
30 location.

1 HF research should specifically focus on the transitions from automation to manual  
2 driving, in order to ensure that the human driver will appropriately respond to the  
3 request of their vehicle to take over control. Additionally, HF research should identify  
4 the behaviour of AVs vehicles when automation is in control, in order for the passengers  
5 to understand the vehicle's actions and to feel comfortable (i.e., no motion sickness; cf.  
6 Diels and Bos 2016), and for other road users to understand and predict the AVs  
7 intentions. This will ensure the maximal benefits in terms of safety, efficiency, comfort  
8 and acceptance.

9 By elaborating current technology, the deployment of SAE Level 3 or AVs operating  
10 on highways will be feasible within the next 5 years. I do not believe in SAE Level 2 (driver  
11 monitoring the environment), since drivers are not able to pay attention to the road and  
12 automation status across long periods. SAE Level 2 is suitable for testing and research  
13 purposes, with expert drivers or technicians assessing the reliability of the automation,  
14 in order to verify readiness for SAE Level 3. Yet, a lot of testing is required to confirm the  
15 safe operation of AVs in different types of conditions, and to understand the operational  
16 envelope of automation. SAE Level 2 systems as we currently see introduced on the  
17 market will only work well if their reliability is actually 'Level 3 ready'.

18 The deployment of SAE Level 5 in mixed traffic conditions may never happen at  
19 acceptable levels. AVs may have to operate at very low speeds in order to meet  
20 appropriate safety requirements, making these vehicles particularly slow in city  
21 environments. However, such AVs could be introduced for specific scenarios and types  
22 of operation, such as public transportation.

23

24 *Klaus Bengler*

25 Automated driving should not become a hype topic; its presentation nowadays  
26 sometimes may be too visionary and confusing/distorting for the public. It is rather  
27 unrealistic, for example, to expect SAE Level 5 automated vehicles soon on public roads.  
28 However, it could indeed be possible to introduce fully automated driving vehicles  
29 operating at low speeds in segregated lanes supported by infrastructure for specific  
30 scenarios. Examples of such applications can be found in public transport or the  
31 transportation of goods.

1 It is important, therefore, to clearly define the functionalities and the range of  
2 applicability of automated vehicles. Based on the current technological and  
3 infrastructural capabilities, automated driving could only be a fraction of individuals'  
4 daily mobility. At present, SAE Levels 4 or 5 AVs can only be applied in very specific  
5 scenarios, such as low speeds and specific areas.

6 In the future, AVs may be able to operate at higher SAE automation levels. In such  
7 vehicles, the mode of driving can be selected based on the situation and conditions at  
8 each particular time of the operation. In other words, the human drivers could remain  
9 drivers, supervisors of automation, or passengers, depending on the mode of  
10 automation. In those vehicles, new families of input elements can be introduced, yet  
11 steering wheels have many advantages, such as clear visual feedback regarding  
12 direction.

13 AVs will be designed to obey the traffic rules in all cases, and therefore the fluency of  
14 their interaction with other vehicles and road users, as well as their acceptance by the  
15 public, is a big topic.

16 Within this context, HF research has four main tasks. First, to define the acceptance  
17 criteria of human drivers regarding the automated driving functionalities. Second, to  
18 determine the individual capabilities of human drivers when using AVs (e.g., situation  
19 awareness, reaction times), and in turn to ensure safety while changing driving modes.  
20 Today, for instance, humans driving manually are able to look outside their windows or  
21 to the dashboard for a small period of time without a problem. It is unrealistic to expect  
22 that human drivers will constantly monitor the automation system. Rather it could make  
23 sense, to define a period that the drivers could divert their view away from the  
24 automated system. Third, to provide design solutions regarding the interfaces installed  
25 in AVs and their interaction with the human drivers. Finally, to investigate the  
26 interaction and communication between AVs and conventional cars and other road  
27 users. AVs will be deployed on the market only if they are proven to be safe, and all the  
28 relevant liability issues are resolved.

29

1        *Jan Andersson*

2        Automated vehicles can eventually change the status of road transportation,  
3 including the use and ownership of vehicles. From a safety, mobility, and traffic  
4 perspective the focus on developing and directly deploying SAE Level 5 AVs would be  
5 the most beneficial, as the majority of the human factors and legal challenges associated  
6 with the SAE Levels 2, 3 and 4 AVs would be avoided. Yet, it is more realistic to expect a  
7 gradual deployment of SAE Levels 2, 3 and 4 AVs, which will introduce different levels of  
8 functionalities and applicability.

9        The main weaknesses of these automation levels, however, are the expectation that  
10 human drivers intervene upon a request by the automation, in addition to the liability  
11 uncertainties. Who would like to use automation if they remain liable at all times for a  
12 system that they partially cannot control?

13        HF researchers need, therefore, to understand how people will be using the  
14 automated functionalities, in order to ensure a smooth process for the human drivers  
15 to regain control of the vehicle. Research has proven that people are poor in monitoring  
16 a technological system (e.g., Endsley 1996), or staying alert when not being engaged to  
17 the driving task, and we should be aware of this when the liability criteria are  
18 determined by legislators. It is crucial, therefore, to define the minimum time  
19 requirements for human drivers to return back in the control loop, for several different  
20 driving scenarios. For this, research would first have to define the human driver's mind-  
21 set, and whether bringing them into the loop is a cognitive or a decision-making aspect.  
22 Furthermore, it is important to define the type and frequency of information that human  
23 drivers should be receiving in order to facilitate and maintain their situation awareness,  
24 primarily when they are not engaged to the driving task.

25        In addition, HF research must determine how people using other transport modes or  
26 conventional vehicles, and vulnerable road users will be interacting with AVs, and to  
27 confirm that the human drivers and all road users are aware of the automated systems'  
28 capabilities and limitations.

29

1       *Natasha Merat*

2       The main concerns and worries towards deployment of automated vehicles are  
3       currently associated with automation SAE Levels 2 and 3. All relevant stakeholders agree  
4       that it is very difficult to establish and ensure whether or not a human driver is aware of  
5       the automated system performance, and research suggests that humans may generally  
6       be poor supervisors of automation in such circumstances (Parasuraman 1987).  
7       Subsequently, it is hard to define the appropriate time that humans need to regain  
8       control of a vehicle during a specific situation, and to confirm that upon regaining  
9       control they respond in a safe and appropriate manner (Merat et al. 2014). As long as  
10      the design of AVs allows human intervention, the impact on safety of road  
11      transportation is debatable.

12      The general public should also be aware that we are far from ready to deploy AVs  
13      capable of operating in all environments and scenarios without any human intervention.  
14      It is therefore more likely that the first AVs will only be operating in dedicated lanes, for  
15      specific driving scenarios.

16      One of today's biggest challenges is to verify that the human drivers are aware of the  
17      AV's limitations, in order to resume control when required, whilst also remaining free  
18      to engage in other activities, beyond driving. Otherwise, if drivers' main task in an AV is  
19      to observe and monitor the vehicle and its operation, the benefits of automation to  
20      consumers are minimal.

21      Therefore, for the next 5 to 10 years, research is likely to focus more on providing  
22      solutions for maintaining human drivers' situation awareness, mainly when they are not  
23      engaged in the driving task. In addition to ensuring that AVs (including their computers  
24      and sensors) are functioning reliably, improvements in the design and performance of  
25      HMIs are required to establish the type and amount of information that drivers should  
26      receive in order to cope with any unexpected situation (Merat and Lee 2012).

27      The long-term potential benefits of AVs on safety, time and traffic efficiency,  
28      mobility, and pollution can be enormous. Yet, all relevant stakeholders have to be  
29      modest and avoid confusing the public by raising unrealistic expectations. Indeed, it  
30      might be possible to have vehicles with automated functionalities on public roads within  
31      the next 10 to 15 years. However, it is rather likely that the cost and maintenance of



1 such vehicles will be quite high, which will be a major barrier towards their deployment  
2 and acceptance by the majority of the public.

3

4 *Nick Reed*

5 Today, challenges towards the introduction of automated vehicles are associated  
6 with levels of automation that rely on the human drivers. Although it is feasible to  
7 deploy conditional automated driving vehicles (SAE Level 3), the expectation that a  
8 human driver can remain alert and rapidly regain situational awareness following a  
9 request by the system is unrealistic. However, if AVs become capable of safely dealing  
10 with a human driver failing to respond to a request to intervene, then fully automated  
11 vehicles cannot be far behind. Research has first to determine a safe and effective  
12 process for re-engaging the driver back in the loop. Second, to educate human drivers  
13 on system capabilities and expected actions; and thirdly, to explore tendencies for  
14 drivers to use automation and adapt their driving behaviour to particular circumstances  
15 of a journey.

16 Current technology suggests that deployment of low speed automated vehicles  
17 operating without human intervention on dedicated routes for specific purposes, such  
18 as public transport, may be possible within three years. Once the technology is mature  
19 enough to support fully automated vehicles, car ownership and vehicle usage patterns  
20 will change. Today, a car is often the second biggest investment a person makes yet will  
21 typically be parked the majority of the time. There is also a trend for younger people to  
22 reject car ownership or license acquisition, probably associated with high insurance  
23 costs for driving. SAE Level 4 and (eventually) Level 5 AVs make mass car sharing models  
24 much more viable. As an on-demand service, people could choose a vehicle that is  
25 appropriate for each individual, specific journey rather than owning an individual vehicle  
26 that is compromised across an owner's various mobility needs. These shared AVs  
27 present additional HF challenges such as how to design AVs that provide an enjoyable,  
28 personalized travel experience for diverse customers and how vehicle interiors should  
29 be redesigned to make journeys comfortable and pleasant without compromising  
30 occupant safety.

31

1        *Maxime Flament*

2        The automation levels have been formulated as a common language. As technology  
3 is advancing, we need to keep a critical eye and avoid getting stuck at an intermediate  
4 level of automation. Indeed, today's HF research raises serious doubt as for the handing  
5 over of the driving task associated with SAE Level 3. It is human nature that a driver,  
6 who is relieved even briefly from their driving task, will engage to other distracting tasks.  
7 From a liability standpoint, the industry will not introduce such a distracting system  
8 unless the automation can bring the vehicle to a minimal risk condition if no driver  
9 response is detected. For this reason, the SAE Level 3 AVs may just never come to the  
10 market.

11        Adding confusion to the definitions, the same vehicle, depending on its environment  
12 and its access to reliable information, could allow more than one level of automation.  
13 The HF challenge in this case will be to clearly inform the driver about the possible levels  
14 of automation at any given time and place, and why this is so. This will lead to trust and  
15 acceptance of automation, but, too much trust may cause over-reliance together with  
16 unintended use, misuse, and even abuse. In fact, the difficulty may come from other  
17 road users: manual drivers, cyclists and pedestrians; knowing the AVs' capabilities, they  
18 may take advantage of AVs in mixed traffic. The challenge for AVs will then be to keep  
19 their place in traffic while guaranteeing reasonable safety. This should lead to innovative  
20 ways to indicate the driving intentions to other road users.

21        AVs should firstly address critical situations caused by boredom and drowsiness, as  
22 well as construction sites, intersections and other stressful areas. AVs could be on the  
23 market within less than ten years, first on highways then gradually on other main roads,  
24 supplemented with valet parking.

25

26        *Marjan Hagenzieker*

27        The role of human drivers is one of the main challenges when discussing automated  
28 driving vehicles. In vehicles where human drivers are expected to intervene, the human  
29 has to be both a driver and a supervisor. However, these two roles require different  
30 training and skills, while they are not in tune. For instance, the less human drivers are

1 manually controlling their vehicles, the more their driving skills will deteriorate (e.g.,  
2 Dragutinovic et al. 2005), which can be critical especially in the case of an emergency.

3 Therefore, HF research should determine the required skills of humans in order to  
4 operate AVs, and to identify any changes in their driving behaviour. Moreover, research  
5 has to define the necessary (re)action times for the types of situations and interventions  
6 that drivers will be asked to perform.

7 In addition, research should assist in redesigning the current driver training  
8 programs. On the one hand, the new programs have to ensure that human drivers are  
9 always capable of performing the driving task. On the other hand, they must instruct  
10 human drivers how to supervise automation, and to maintain their supervisory skills.

11 HF researchers also have to determine ways of communication between AVs with  
12 human drivers, other vehicles, and vulnerable road users. In addition, research has to  
13 determine the consequences of behaviour of AVs, which is potentially very different  
14 compared to the manual driven vehicles. Such large differences in the behaviour of AVs  
15 may impose additional demands on people who do not drive or use AVs. This could raise  
16 questions on whether we should allow AVs to induce such demands to those who do  
17 not own, drive, or use this technology.

18 For fully automated vehicles that do not require any human intervention, research  
19 should focus on proving them safe and reliable. However, it is too optimistic to believe  
20 that such vehicles will be able to operate in large scale mixed traffic in the foreseeable  
21 future. Nevertheless, the deployment of AVs of SAE Levels 3 and 4 on specific stretches,  
22 dedicated areas, and driving scenarios, such as highways, is feasible and could in the mid  
23 and long term improve the safety of road transportation.

24

25 *Riender Happee*

26 Are we ready to deploy automated vehicles on public roads? Certainly not, as we still  
27 have to prove them safe. On the one hand, the role of the human driver in AVs has not  
28 been clearly defined. On the other hand, neither vehicle technology nor the  
29 infrastructure is proven to be ready to support the deployment of automated vehicles  
30 safely operating in real world traffic conditions.

1 Proving safety requires on-road and virtual testing to rigorously assess not only the  
2 technology but also the human interaction with automation. The critical aspects of HF  
3 to date have almost exclusively been tested in driving simulators (De Winter et al. 2014).  
4 Undoubtedly, driving simulators are valuable for gaining insight in human behaviour,  
5 especially in safety-critical scenarios that cannot be easily tested on the public roads.  
6 Yet, the results derived from simulator experiments do not necessarily reflect reality. It  
7 is essential, therefore, to compare the behaviour of drivers in simulators with equivalent  
8 studies on the public roads, in order to eventually build evaluation methods combining  
9 simulator and on-road studies.

10 Testing procedures are required for sensing and control systems in order to  
11 determine whether they operate reliably in complex real world driving conditions. HF  
12 research should focus on establishing procedures to test and determine the safe  
13 interaction between human drivers and automation, not only during transitions of  
14 control, but also regarding the interaction of automated vehicles with other road users.

15 Hands-free driving is already commercially available with restrictions, and eyes-off-  
16 road driving may be possible and legal in the near future, in particular for highway  
17 conditions. AVs can provide transitions to minimal risk condition (e.g., safe stop) if  
18 human drivers do not take over when this is requested by the AV. Such minimal risk  
19 strategies can prevent mishaps in the hopefully rare case that drivers are unfit to resume  
20 control. However, as long as such take-over requests exists, and as long as drivers have  
21 options to resume manual driving, we need to incorporate human factors analysis in the  
22 safety assessment of automated driving.

23

24

## Discussion

### 25 Comparison of the interviewees' statements

26

27 The interviews revealed a consensus regarding HF challenges that need to be  
28 resolved prior to a wide-scale deployment of AVs on public roads, with a number of  
29 distinctive remarks.

30 In line with recent position papers (Casner, Hutchins, and Norman 2016; Norman  
31 2015; Poulin et al. 2015; Trimble et al. 2014), the experts highlighted a complex  
32 interaction between human drivers and SAE Level 2 and 3 automated vehicles. The

1 interviewees stressed that any automated system that removes the human from the  
2 driving task, yet requires the human to monitor and supervise the system and regain  
3 control when necessary, could be unsafe. In other words, one should not expect that  
4 human drivers will always be able to regain control of their vehicles in a safe and  
5 appropriate manner. Moreover, SAE Level 2 and 3 systems may not be welcomed by  
6 drivers because the range of the permitted secondary tasks will be limited (e.g., NHTSA  
7 2012). Thus, drivers may not be able to benefit from automation to a significant extent  
8 (cf. Naujoks, Purucker, and Neukum 2016).

9 The researchers underpinned the importance of additional research on public  
10 acceptance and trust in automation, the interaction of the AVs with other vehicles and  
11 road users, and the amount and type of information that the human drivers shall be  
12 receiving by the automated system. Finally, they referred to the need for additional  
13 experiments to study human driver behaviour while operating in automated mode and  
14 during transitions from manual to automated mode and vice versa, and to validate  
15 findings from simulator experiments with equivalent studies on public roads.

16 Besides areas of wide agreement, the twelve researchers expressed distinctive  
17 statements on different aspect of AVs, including legislation, cost of AVs, and type  
18 approval challenges. The role of human drivers in AVs was discussed, and it was  
19 suggested by several of the researchers that unless AVs (permanently) take over all  
20 functions of the driving task, drivers should remain 'in the loop'. The issue of driving skill  
21 degradation due to automation was raised, stating that training programs will have to  
22 be modified, teaching human drivers about the automation's capabilities and expected  
23 actions.

24 The issue of responsibility in the cases of accidents is a critical factor in AV  
25 deployment, yielding a conflict between roadway capacity and roadway safety.  
26 Specifically, it was stressed that when human drivers are expected to regain control of  
27 their vehicles, large safety margins (i.e., separation between vehicles) will have to be  
28 adopted, while engineers are developing platooning systems that operate with short  
29 inter-vehicle headways. Nevertheless, it was stated that AVs could be broadly deployed  
30 within the next 10 years with an operational design domain confined to highways and  
31 similar roads, with the expectation that human drivers will resume manual control when  
32 leaving the operational design domain.

1 It was stated that automation levels were formulated as a common language, but  
2 that in reality the same AV (depending on its environment and access to reliable  
3 information) may allow more than one level of automation. Finally, it was pointed out  
4 that there is a need for testing procedures regarding sensing and control systems, in  
5 order to determine whether AVs operate reliably in complex real-world driving  
6 conditions. To this end, the Dutch Type Approval Authority has introduced an  
7 amendment to the Exceptional Transport (Exemptions) Decree to facilitate testing and  
8 development of autonomous vehicles on public roads (RDW 2014).

### 9 10 **Comparison of the interviewees' statements with the current state of AVs** 11 **deployment**

12  
13 In the interviews conducted in April and May 2015, the twelve researchers  
14 commented extensively on HF related safety implications of Level 2 and 3 AVs, and some  
15 specifically expressed that AVs should not be introduced on public roads unless proven  
16 safe. However, reality shows that SAE Level 2 automation systems, and even systems  
17 that are close to SAE Level 3 automation, have now been deployed. For example, in  
18 October 2015 Tesla introduced an Autopilot feature that allows for minutes of hands-  
19 free driving, whereas as of October 2016, new cars are equipped with full self-driving  
20 hardware (Tesla, 2016). These observations illustrate that industry marches forward and  
21 that there is a disconnect between academic research and industrial research and  
22 development. Furthermore, it shows that even experts who work in the field of AVs may  
23 underestimate the pace of development in some industries, regarding the introduction  
24 of AVs on the market.

25 The interviewees agreed that we are far from ready to deploy fully (SAE Level 5)  
26 automated vehicles on public roads, with several researchers claiming that fully AVs may  
27 never operate at acceptable levels (Shladover 2016). Instead, SAE Level 4 vehicles could  
28 be introduced on specific routes, under certain conditions, and for distinct applications,  
29 such as segregated areas, low speeds or high speeds on highways only, transport of  
30 goods, or public transport. In agreement with the reviewers' expectations, the projects  
31 CityMobil2 (2014b), GATEway (2014c), and WEpods (2014e) are currently  
32 demonstrating the integration of autonomous transport systems into complex real  
33 world urban environments. Such integration, however, may pose questions concerning

1 the interaction of vulnerable road users with AVs (Lundgren et al. 2017; Núñez Velasco  
2 et al. 2016; Rothenbücher et al. 2016; Merat et al., submitted).

### 3 4 **Concluding remarks**

5  
6 AVs have the potential to substantially reform road transportation by increasing  
7 safety and traffic flow efficiency (SAE Levels 3 to 5), and ensuring mobility for all (SAE  
8 Level 5). It is no longer a question of whether it will be possible to have AVs on public  
9 roads, but rather a question of how, when, and under which conditions. This paper  
10 presents the perspective of twelve researchers in the field of HFs and AVs.

11 Findings indicate that, currently, the main challenge for the deployment of AVs is the  
12 expectation of the human driver to intervene, after a period of not controlling the  
13 steering wheel and pedals. Thus, research should focus on (a) designing AVs that can  
14 inform their occupants about the vehicle's capabilities and operational status, as well as  
15 about upcoming situations that the vehicles cannot solve. In addition, research should  
16 (b) concentrate on defining the automation functionalities that the human drivers would  
17 accept and use, and (c) determine the interaction between the human driver and  
18 automation during transitions of control. Furthermore, research needs to (d) establish  
19 procedures to test, determine, and ensure safety while changing from automated to  
20 manual mode, and (e) investigate the interaction between AVs and human drivers,  
21 conventional cars, and other road users such as cyclists and pedestrians. Finally,  
22 research should (f) explore the modification of the current driver training programs so  
23 that drivers are instructed how to use automation in a safe and acceptable manner. We  
24 expect that these findings can be instrumental for stakeholders involved in the  
25 development of automated driving technology and instructive to other parties.

26 For long-term successful deployment of the AVs all the relevant stakeholders  
27 including the automotive industry, research institutes, policy makers, and governmental  
28 bodies should work together to facilitate a safe deployment of AVs, not only taking  
29 technology into account but also the human factors and the end user's perspective. As  
30 Cummings (2016) stressed, the relevant policy makers and governmental bodies shall  
31 provide leadership to overcome today's inadequate testing and evaluation programs of  
32 the robotic self-driving cars. Cummings suggested that the automated driving

1 community could learn and follow practices from other domains, such as aviation. The  
2 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), for example, has explicit certification processes  
3 for certifying aircraft software, and they would never allow commercial aircrafts to  
4 execute automatic landings without verifiable test evidence. Similarly, road transport  
5 governmental bodies worldwide may have to deny certification to self-driving cars, until  
6 the industry provides greater transparency and reveals how they are conducting the  
7 testing of their cars. Such an action, may hinder short-term deployment and innovation,  
8 but could be essential for the long-term deployment and subsequently for the overall  
9 safety improvement on public roads.

10 It may be argued that our concerns and recommendations hardly differ from early HF  
11 lessons learned from aviation and other automation domains (e.g., Bainbridge, 1983;  
12 Fitts, 1951; Parasuraman, 1987; Wickens et al., 1998). For example, an early report on  
13 HF for future air traffic control stated: “men, on the whole, are poor monitors. We  
14 suggest that great caution be exercised in assuming that men can successfully monitor  
15 complex automatic machines and ‘take over’ if the machine breaks down” (Fitts, 1951,  
16 p. 11, see also De Winter and Dodou, 2014), a statement that closely mirrors the  
17 interviewees’ statements. Why HF researchers seem to convey the same message for  
18 decades is a question that deserves further consideration. Does it mean that HF is  
19 making little fundamental progress while technology advances apace, or does it mean  
20 that HF scientists have a consistent yet crucial role in warning and advising prior to the  
21 introduction of disruptive automation technology?

22

## 23 **Acknowledgments**

24 This work was supported by the Marie Curie ITN HFAuto (PITN-GA-2013-605817,  
25 <http://hf-auto.eu>).

26

## 27 **About the authors**

28 **Miltos Kyriakidis** received his MSc degree in Mechanical Engineering from ETH Zurich  
29 and his PhD degree in Human Factors and Railway Safety from Imperial College London  
30 in 2009 and 2014 respectively. He investigated legal aspects and market acceptance of



1 automated driving at TU Delft in 2014 and 2015. He is currently working at the Singapore  
2 - ETH Centre, conducting research in the fields of human performance, human reliability,  
3 safety and resilience of critical infrastructure. His research interests include human  
4 factors, human performance, human reliability analysis, and safety of complex socio-  
5 technical systems, such as the energy sector, transportation systems, water and  
6 wastewater systems, healthcare and public health, emergency services, and  
7 communication services.

8

9 **Joost C. F. de Winter** received his MSc degree in aerospace engineering and PhD degree  
10 (cum laude) from the Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands, in 2004 and  
11 2009, respectively. He is currently an associate professor at the Department of  
12 Mechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology. His interests include human  
13 factors and statistical modelling, including the study of individual differences, driver  
14 behaviour modelling, multivariate statistics, and research methodology. Joost de Winter  
15 is recipient of the 2014 Human Factors prize awarded by the Human Factors and  
16 Ergonomics Society.

17

18 **Neville Stanton**, PhD, DSc, is both a chartered psychologist and a chartered engineer  
19 and holds the Chair in Human Factors in the Faculty of Engineering and the Environment  
20 at the University of Southampton. He has degrees in psychology, applied psychology,  
21 and human factors engineering. His research interests include modelling, predicting, and  
22 analysing human performance in transport systems as well as designing interfaces  
23 between humans and technology. Prof. Stanton has been working on cockpit design in  
24 automobiles and aircraft over the past 25 years, in a variety of automation projects. He  
25 has published over 30 books and 240 journal papers on ergonomics and human factors,  
26 and is currently an editor of the peer-reviewed journal Ergonomics. The Institution of  
27 Ergonomics and Human Factors awarded him The Otto Edholm Medal in 2001, The  
28 President's Medal in 2008, and The Sir Frederic Bartlett Medal in 2012 for his  
29 contribution to basic and applied ergonomics research. The Royal Aeronautical Society  
30 awarded him and his colleagues the Hodgson Prize and Bronze Medal in 2006 for  
31 research on the design-induced flight-deck error.

32

1 **Thierry Bellet** has 3 master degrees (in Cognitive Psychology, University of Lyon, 1990;  
2 in Ergonomics, University of Paris, 1991 and in Artificial Intelligence, Telecom ParisTech,  
3 1993), and received his PhD in Cognitive Ergonomics in 1998 from the University of Paris  
4 5. His research interests mainly embrace cognitive modelling and simulation of the  
5 human driver (i.e., COSMODRIVE model) and cognitive engineering for advanced driving  
6 aids and vehicle automation. From 1998 to 2008, he collaborated with UC Berkeley  
7 (PATH) on the driver modelling issue for Automated Highway. Since 2000, he also  
8 participated in 20 National and European research projects dedicated to Situational  
9 Awareness modelling, embedded systems for driver monitoring, Human-Machine  
10 Cooperation simulation and the Virtual Human Centred Design of Intelligent Co-Piloting  
11 systems.

12  
13 **Bart van Arem** received his MSc and PhD degrees in applied mathematics, specialising  
14 on queuing theory from the University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands, in 1986  
15 and 1990, respectively. From 1992 to 2009, he was a researcher and a programme  
16 manager with TNO, working on intelligent transport systems, in which he has been  
17 active in various national and international projects. From 2003 to 2012, Bart was a part-  
18 time full professor Applications of Integrated Driver Assistance (AIDA) at the University  
19 of Twente. Since 2009, he has been a full professor of transport modelling with the  
20 Department of Transport and Planning, Delft University of Technology, Delft, the  
21 Netherlands, focusing on the impact of intelligent transport systems on mobility, in  
22 particular cooperative and automated driving.

23  
24 **Karel Brookhuis** completed his studies in Psychology at the University of Groningen in  
25 1979, specialising in experimental psychology and psychophysiology. He then started as  
26 a research fellow (PhD student) at the Institute for Experimental Psychology with a  
27 special topic in psychophysiology (ERP). His thesis is titled "Event Related Potentials and  
28 Information Processing". From 1983 on, he was senior researcher at the Traffic Research  
29 Centre of the University of Groningen. In 1986 he became head (section coordinator) of  
30 the department of "Biopsychological aspects of driving behaviour", later "Task  
31 Performance and Cognition". Since 1994 he was additionally appointed the Research  
32 Manager of the Institute, responsible for the Centre's research planning and quality

1 control. At that time the Centre employed some 50 people. After the Centre was closed  
2 on 1st January 2000, he became professor at the department of Experimental and Work  
3 Psychology of the University of Groningen and (part-time) professor at the Section of  
4 Transport Policy and Logistics at Delft University of Technology.

5

6 **Marieke Martens** is a Professor in the area of Human Factors and Intelligent Transport  
7 Systems. After studying Cognitive Psychologist, she started working at TNO Human  
8 Factors in 1996. She holds a PhD degree from the Free University in Amsterdam on the  
9 effects of expectations on visual attention and perception in driving. In the last 20 years,  
10 she conducted research on driving behaviour, traffic safety, road design, driver support  
11 systems, driver state (fatigue, workload, attention, expectations) and automated  
12 driving. Since 2009 she is affiliated with the University of Twente, working in the area of  
13 driver support and automation from a human factors point of view. Since 2014, Marieke  
14 works as a full Professor of ITS & Human Factors at the Centre for Transport Studies. Her  
15 research interests include driver support, Human Machine Interaction, cooperative  
16 systems, driving simulators, driving behaviour, and traffic safety, and she guides several  
17 PhDs at this topic. She is leading the Human Factors programme of the Dutch Integrated  
18 Testsite for Cooperative Mobility (DITCM).

19

20 **Klaus Bengler** graduated in psychology at the University of Regensburg in 1991 and  
21 received his Doctorate in 1994 in cooperation with BMW. After his diploma he was  
22 active on topics of software ergonomics and evaluation of human-machine interfaces.  
23 He investigated the influence of additional tasks on driving performance in several  
24 studies within EMMIS EU project and in contract with BMW. Multifunctional steering  
25 wheels, touchscreens, and ACC-functionality are examples of his research topics. In 1997  
26 he joined BMW. From several projects he is experienced with experimental research  
27 with different kind of driving simulators, as well as field trials. At BMW he was  
28 responsible for the HMI project of the MOTIV programme, a national fellow of the  
29 PROMETHEUS program. He was work package leader in an actual EU project Speechdat  
30 Car, dealing with voice recognition in vehicles. Within BMW Research and Technology,  
31 he was responsible for projects on HMI research. He was active as a sub-project leader  
32 for subproject 2 "Evaluation und Methodology" within the EU funded integrated project

1 AIDE. He is active member of ISO TC22 SC13 WG8 „Road vehicles - Ergonomic aspects of  
2 transport information and control systems“ and chairman of the German delegation.  
3 Since May 2009 he is leader of the Institute of Ergonomics at Technical University  
4 Munich which is active in research areas like digital human modelling, human robot  
5 cooperation, driver assistance, automated driving and human reliability. Among  
6 intensive industrial cooperation the Institute is engaged in the funded Projects DH-Ergo  
7 on Digital Human Modeling and ECOMOVE on anticipative driving and H-Mode or D3COS  
8 on highly automated and cooperative driving. He is project leader in the German  
9 research initiative UR:BAN that investigates the potential of driver assistance and active  
10 safety systems in the urban area.

11

12 **Jan Andersson** received his MSc degree in psychology and PhD degree (cognitive  
13 psychology) from the Linköping University, Sweden, in 1991 and 1996, respectively. He  
14 is currently a professor (in Human-System-Interaction) at The Swedish Road and  
15 Transport Institute (VTI). He is also affiliated to the Behaviour Science department at  
16 Linköping University. His interests include human factors and fitness to drive, traffic  
17 medicine and self-explaining roads, including the study of individual differences and  
18 research methodology.

19

20 **Natasha Merat** is Professor of Human Factors of Automated Systems, at the Institute  
21 for Transport Studies, University of Leeds and Leader of the Human Factors and Safety  
22 Group. Her main research interests are in understanding the interaction of road users  
23 with new technologies, both in and out of the vehicle. She applies this interest to  
24 studying factors such as driver distraction and driver impairment and more recently she  
25 has been studying the human factors implications of highly automated vehicles,  
26 including the needs of Vulnerable Road Users interacting with AVs.. She has been  
27 Principal Investigator or Project Manager to a number of projects on studying human  
28 factors and driver behaviour, funded by UK research councils, the European  
29 Commission, Highways England and the Department for Transport. Professor Merat has  
30 also been guest editor of two journal series publications in recent years (Human Factors  
31 Journal, 2012, and Transportation Research Part F, 2014), bringing together the latest  
32 results of studies from around the globe on how vehicle automation may affect driver

1 behaviour and performance. She is Chair of the TRB sub-committee on Human factors  
2 in road vehicle automation, an editorial board member of the European Transport  
3 Research Review and the newly established International Journal of Driving Science. She  
4 is also expert member of the European Commission H2020 Transport Advisory Group  
5 and AutoLiv Inc.

6

7 **Nick Reed** joined the Human Factors and Simulation group at TRL in January 2004  
8 following post-doctoral work in visual perception at the University of Oxford and in 2014  
9 became director of TRL's Academy, co-ordinating scientific activities across the business.  
10 He has led a wide variety of research studies using the full mission, high fidelity car and  
11 truck simulators with a number of published articles, conference papers, and  
12 appearances in national and international media. Nick also championed work in the area  
13 of vehicle automation at TRL, culminating in technical leadership of the GATEway  
14 (Greenwich Automated Transport Environment) project – a flagship UK Government  
15 project to investigate the implications of the introduction of automated vehicles in the  
16 urban environment. In 2015, he was awarded a visiting professorship in the Engineering  
17 and Physical Sciences faculty at the University of Surrey and is a chartered psychologist  
18 and chartered scientist.

19

20 **Maxime Flament** joined ERTICO-ITS Europe in 2003. He is Head of Department for  
21 Connectivity and Automation and leading contributor to many European activities on  
22 Road Safety, Connected Vehicles, Automated Driving, large scale Field Operational  
23 Tests, and Digital Mapping. He is European Chair of the Trilateral EU-US-Japan WG on  
24 Automation in Road Transport. He is also Sherpa expert for the European commission  
25 GEAR2030, member of the DG MOVE C-ITS platform, co-chair of the iMobility Forum  
26 Working Group on Probe Data and member of the ERTRAC WG on Connected and  
27 Automated Driving. Maxime holds a MSc (1997) and PhD (2002) in Electrical Engineering  
28 from Chalmers Technical University, Sweden. He also holds an "Ingénieur Civil" degree  
29 from the Free university of Brussels (1997). In 2001, he was visiting researcher at  
30 Stanford University, CA, USA.

31

1 **Marjan Hagenzieker** is Professor Traffic Safety at Delft University of Technology and  
2 Scientific Advisor at SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research. She graduated in  
3 experimental psychology at Leiden University, and received her Doctorate (PhD) on  
4 the effects of rewards on road user behavior, also from Leiden University. Her research  
5 and education activities focus on the road safety effects of the transport system, with  
6 particular interest in road user behavior aspects. Her current research particularly  
7 focuses on how to ensure road safety in modern urban environments with many  
8 different kinds of road users and divergent interests. Specific research topics include  
9 road user interactions with road infrastructure, in-vehicle technology, automated  
10 vehicles, distraction in traffic, and safety of vulnerable road users (e.g., older persons,  
11 bicyclists). She has participated in many EU funded projects in the area of road safety,  
12 and is co-organizer of the Delft Road Safety Course for road safety professionals in Low  
13 and Middle Income Countries.

14

15 **Riender Happee** received his MSc in Mechanical Engineering (1986) and PhD (1992) at  
16 TU Delft. He investigated crash safety at TNO Automotive (1992-2007), is currently at  
17 TU Delft at the Faculties of Mechanical, Maritime and Materials Engineering, and Civil  
18 Engineering and Geosciences, and is visiting professor at the Technical University of  
19 Munich. He coordinates research in the Dutch Automated Vehicle Initiative (DAVI)  
20 <http://davi.connekt.nl>, WEpods, a national project on driverless public transport in  
21 urban conditions <http://davi.connekt.nl/wepods-project> and HFAuto - Human Factors  
22 of Automated Driving, a European project focussing on safe user interaction with  
23 automated vehicles in highway conditions <http://hf-auto.eu>.

#### 24 **ORCID**

25 *Joost C.F. de Winter* [orcid.org/0000-0002-1281-8200](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1281-8200)

26 *Neville Stanton* [orcid.org/0000-0002-8562-3279](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8562-3279)

27 *Natasha Merat* [orcid.org/0000-0003-4140-9948](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4140-9948)

28 *Riender Happee* [orcid.org/0000-0001-5878-3472](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5878-3472)

29

## References

- AdaptiVe. 2014a. *AdaptiVe Automated Driving*. <https://www.adaptive-ip.eu/>.
- Bainbridge, L. 1983. "Brief paper: Ironies of automation." *Automatica* 19 (6): 775-779. doi: 10.1016/0005-1098(83)90046-8.
- Banks, Victoria A., and Neville A. Stanton. 2016. "Keep the driver in control: Automating automobiles of the future." *Applied Ergonomics* 53, Part B:389-395. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.06.020>.
- BEA. 2012. *Final report on the accident on 1st June 2009 to the Airbus A330-203 registered F-GZCP operated by Air France flight AF 447 Rio de Janeiro – Paris*. Paris: Bureau d'Enquêtes et d'Analyses pour la sécurité de l'aviation civile.
- Begg, D. (2014). *A 2050 vision for London: What are the implications of driveless transport*. London, UK.
- Bellet, T., P. Mayenobe, J. C. Bornard, D. Gruyer, and B. Claverie. 2012. "A computational model of the car driver interfaced with a simulation platform for future virtual human centred design applications: COSMO-SIVIC." *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 25 (7): 1488-1504. doi: 10.1016/j.engappai.2012.05.010.
- Bellet, T., H. Tattegrain-Veste, A. Chapon, M. P. Bruyas, G. Pachiaudi, P. Deleurence, and V. Guilhaon. 2003. "Ingénierie cognitive dans le contexte de l'assistance à la conduite automobile." In *Ingénierie cognitive: IHM et Cognition*, edited by G. Boy, 323-414. Paris: Hermès Science-Lavoisier.
- Bement, A. L. Jr., H. H. Richardson, L. D. Dahms, T. B. Deen, J. J. Fearnside, M. M. Finkelstein, T. D. Larson et al. 1998. *Review of the national automated highway system research program*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- Blum, S. 2016. "Tesla Owners 'Summon' Cars to Their Exact Location with New Feature." Inverse. <https://www.inverse.com/article/10067-tesla-owners-summon-cars-to-their-exact-location-with-new-feature>.
- Brookhuis, K. A., C. J. G. van Driel, T. Hof, B. van Arem, and M. Hoedemaeker. 2008. "Driving with a congestion assistant; mental workload and acceptance." *Applied Ergonomics* 40 (6): 1019-1025. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2008.06.010.

- Casley, S. V., A. S. Jardim, and A. M. Quartulli. 2013. A Study of Public Acceptance of Autonomous Cars. Worcester, MA, USA, Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Bachelor of Science.
- Casner, S.M., E. L. Hutchins, and D. A. Norman. 2016. "The challenges of partially automated driving." *Commun. ACM* 59 (5): 70-77. doi: 10.1145/2830565.
- CityMobil. 2014b. <http://www.citymobil-project.eu/>.
- Coelingh, E. 2013. *Autonomous driving: The SARTRE project and beyond*. Presented at AUVSI 2013 Driverless Car Summit, Detroit, MI.
- Cummings, M.L. 2016. "Hands Off: The Future of Self-Driving Cars." U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Washington DC. Retrieved from <http://www.commerce.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2016/3/hands-off-the-future-of-self-driving-cars>.
- De Waard, D., M., Van der Hulst, M. Hoedemaeker, and K. A. Brookhuis. 1999. "Driver behavior in an emergency situation in the automated highway system." *Transportation Human Factors* 1 (1): 67-82. doi: 10.1207/sthf0101\_7.
- De Winter, J. C. F., R. Happee, M. H. Martens, and N. A. Stanton. 2014. "Effects of adaptive cruise control and highly automated driving on workload and situation awareness: A review of the empirical evidence." *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27, Part B (0): 196-217. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.06.016.
- De Winter, J. C. F., and Dodou, D. 2014. "Why the Fitts list has persisted throughout the history of function allocation. " *Cognition, Technology & Work* 16: 1–11. doi: 10.1007/s10111-011-0188-1.
- Diels, C., and Bos, J. E. 2016. "Self-driving carsickness. " *Applied ergonomics* 53: 374-382. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.09.009>.
- Dragutinovic, N., K. A. Brookhuis, M. Hagenzieker, and V. A. W. J. Marchau. 2005. "Behavioural effects of the advanced cruise control use – a meta-analytic approach." *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research* 5: 267-280.



- Endsley, M. R. 1996. "Automation and situation awareness." In *Automation and human performance: Theory and applications*, edited by R. Parasuraman and M. Mouloua, 163-181. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- ERTRAC Task Force Connectivity and Automated Driving. 2015. *Automated Driving Roadmap Status: 3rd Draft for public consultation*. Brussels: ERTRAC.
- Fagnant, D. J., and K. Kockelman. 2015. "Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 77: 167-181. doi: 10.1016/j.tra.2015.04.003.
- Fisher, M., N. Reed, and J. Savirimuthu. 2015. "Misplaced Trust?" *Engineering and Technology Reference*:1-7. doi: 10.1049/etr.2014.0054.
- Fitts, P. M. 1951. "*Human engineering for an effective air-navigation and traffic-control system*." Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- GATEway.2014c. *GATEway, Greenwich automated transport environment*.  
<http://www.GATEway-project.org.uk>.
- Gold, C., D. Damböck, L. Lorenz, and K. Bengler. 2013. "Take over! How long does it take to get the driver back into the loop?" *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* 57 (1): 1938-1942. doi: 10.1177/1541931213571433.
- Gold, C., Körber, M., Lechner, D., and Bengler, K. 2016. "Taking Over Control From Highly Automated Vehicles in Complex Traffic Situations The Role of Traffic Density." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 58 (4): 642-652. doi: 10.1177/0018720816634226.
- Gouy, M., K. Wiedemann, A. Stevens, G. Brunett, and N. Reed. 2014. "Driving next to automated vehicle platoons: How do short time headways influence non-platoon drivers' longitudinal control?" *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27, Part B: 264-273. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.03.003.
- Hancock, P. A. 2014. "Automation: how much is too much?" *Ergonomics* 57 (3): 449-454. doi: 10.1080/00140139.2013.816375.
- Hancock, P.A. 2015. "Automobility: The Coming Use of Fully-Automated On-Road Vehicles." 2015 IEEE International Multi-Disciplinary Conference on Cognitive Methods in Situation Awareness and Decision, Orlando, USA, March 9-12.

- Hoc, J-M., M. S. Young, and J-M. Blosseville. 2009. "Cooperation between drivers and automation: implications for safety." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 10 (2): 135-160. doi: 10.1080/14639220802368856.
- HFauto.2014d. *Human factors of automated driving*. <http://hf-auto.eu/>.
- International Transport Forum. 2015. *Automated and Autonomous Driving Regulation under uncertainty*. OECD, Paris, France.
- Kaber, D. B., and M. R. Endsley. 2004. "The effects of level of automation and adaptive automation on human performance, situation awareness and workload in a dynamic control task." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 5 (2):113-153. doi: 10.1080/1463922021000054335.
- Korosec, K. 2015. "Elon Musk Says Tesla Vehicles Will Drive Themselves in Two Years." *Fortune*. <http://fortune.com/2015/12/21/elon-musk-interview/>.
- KPMG. 2013. "Self-Driving Cars: Are We Ready?" KPMG LLP. <http://www.kpmg.com/us/en/issuesandinsights/articlespublications/pages/self-driving-cars-are-we-ready.aspx>.
- Kyriakidis, M., R. Happee, and J. C. F. de Winter. 2015. "Public opinion on automated driving: Results of an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents." *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 32: 127-140. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2015.04.014.
- Lay, R. K., G. M. McHale, and W. B. Stevens. 1996. The United States department of transportation status' report on the automated highway system program. Washington, DC: Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.
- Levitan, L., G. Golembiewski, and J. R. Bloomfield. 1998. "Human Factors Issues for Automated Highway Systems." *ITS Journal - Intelligent Transportation Systems Journal* 4 (1-2): 21-47. doi: 10.1080/10248079808903735.
- Lu, Z., Happee, R., Cabrall, C. D. D., Kyriakidis, M., & De Winter, J. C. F. (2016). Human factors of transitions in automated driving: A general framework and literature survey. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 43, 183–198. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2016.10.007.
- Lundgren, V. M., Habibovic, A., Andersson, J., Lagström, T., Nilsson, M., Sirkka, A., ... & Saluäär, D. (2017). "Will there be new communication needs when introducing

- automated vehicles to the urban context?" In N. A. Stanton, S. Landry, G. Di  
Bucchianico, & A. Vallicelli (Eds.), *Advances in human aspects of transportation*  
(pp.485-497). Springer International Publishing.
- Madigan, R., Louw, T., Dziennus, M., Graindorge, T., Ortega, E., Graindorge, M. & Merat,  
N. (2016). Acceptance of Automated Road Transport Systems (ARTS): an  
adaptation of the UTAUT model, *Transportation Research Procedia*, 14:2217-  
2226 · December 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.trpro.2016.05.237.
- Marinik, A., R. Bishop, V. Fitchett, J. F. Morgan, T. E. Trimble, and M. Blanco. 2014.  
*Human factors evaluation of level 2 and level 3 automated driving concepts:  
Concepts of operation*. (Report No. DOT HS 812 044). Washington, DC: National  
Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Martens, M.H., and A.P. van den Beukel. 2013. "The road to automated driving: dual  
mode and human factors considerations." 16th International IEEE Conference on  
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC 2013), The Hague, the Netherlands,  
October 6-9.
- Merat, N., A. H. Jamson, F. C. Lai, and O. Carsten. 2012. "Highly automated driving,  
secondary task performance, and driver state." *Human Factors: The Journal of  
the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 54 (5): 762-771. doi:  
10.1177/0018720812442087.
- Merat, N., and J. D. Lee. 2012. "Preface to the special section on human factors and  
automation in vehicles designing highly automated vehicles with the driver in  
mind." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics  
Society* 54 (5): 681-686. doi: 10.1177/0018720812461374.
- Merat, N., A. H. Jamson, F. C. H. Lai, M. Daly, and O. M. J. Carsten. 2014. "Transition to  
manual: Driver behaviour when resuming control from a highly automated  
vehicle." *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27,  
Part B: 274-282. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.09.005.
- Merat, N. Louw, T., Madigan, R., Dziennus, M., & Scheiben, A. (under review)  
Communication Between VRUs and Fully Automated Road Transport Systems:  
What's important? (AAP).

- Mok, B. K.-J., M. Johns, K. J. Lee, H. P. Ive, D. Miller, and W. Ju. 2015. "Timing of unstructured transitions of control in automated driving." 2015 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), pp. 1167-1172.
- Mui, C., and Carroll, P. B. 2013. *Driverless cars. Trillions are up for grabs.* Seattle, WA: Cornerloft Press.
- Naujoks, F., C. Purucker, and A. Neukum. 2016. "Secondary task engagement and vehicle automation - Comparing the effects of different automation levels in an on-road experiment." *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 38:67-82. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2016.01.011.
- NHTSA. 2012. *Visual-manual NHTSA driver distraction guidelines for in-vehicle electronic devices.* Retrieved from <https://www.distraction.gov/downloads/pdfs/visual-manual-nhtsa-driver-distraction-guidelines-for-in-vehicle-electronic-devices.pdf>
- NHTSA. 2016. *Federal automated vehicles policy: Accelerating the next Revolution in roadway safety.* Retrieved from <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=795644>.
- Norman, D. A. 2015. "The Human Side of Automation." *In Road Vehicle Automation 2*, edited by G. Meyer and S. Beiker. 73-79. Springer International Publishing.
- Núñez Velasco, J. P., Rodríguez, P., Farah, H. and Hagenzieker, M. (2016). "Safety of pedestrians and cyclists when interacting with self-driving vehicles: A case study of the WEpods." *ITRL Conference on Integrated Transport 2016: Connected & Automated Transport Systems.* KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. 29-30th of November 2016.
- Parasuraman, R. 1987. "Human-Computer Monitoring." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 29 (6): 695-706. doi: 10.1177/001872088702900609.
- Parasuraman, R., and V. Riley. 1997. "Humans and Automation: Use, Misuse, Disuse, Abuse." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 39 (2): 230-253. doi: 10.1518/001872097778543886.
- Payre, W., J. Cestac, and P. Delhomme. 2014. "Intention to use a fully automated car: Attitudes and a priori acceptability." *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27:252-263. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.04.009.
- Poulin, C., N. A. Stanton, D. Cebon, and W. Epple. 2015. "Responses to Autonomous vehicles." *Ingenia* 62: 8-11. Retrieved from:

- [http://www.ingenia.org.uk/Content/ingenia/issues/issue62/Issue62\\_Letters.pdf](http://www.ingenia.org.uk/Content/ingenia/issues/issue62/Issue62_Letters.pdf).
- Radlmayr, J., C. Gold, L. Lorenz, M. Farid, and K. Bengler. 2014. "How Traffic Situations and Non-Driving Related Tasks Affect the Take-Over Quality in Highly Automated Driving." *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* 58 (1): 2063-2067. doi: 10.1177/1541931214581434.
- RDW. 2014. *Zelfrijdende auto*.  
<https://www.internetconsultatie.nl/zelfrijdendevoertuigen>.
- Rothenbücher, D., Li, J., Sirkin, D., Mok, B., & Ju, W. (2016). "Ghost driver: A field study investigating the interaction between pedestrians and driverless vehicles." *Proceedings of the 25th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. New York, NY.
- SAE International. 2014. *Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to On-Road Motor Vehicle Automated Driving Systems*.
- SAE International. 2016. *Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles*.
- Salmon, P. M., N. A. Stanton, and K. L. Young. 2012. "Situation awareness on the road: review, theoretical and methodological issues, and future directions." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 13 (4): 472-492. doi: 10.1080/1463922X.2010.539289.
- Sarter, N. B., and D. D. Woods. 1995. "How in the World Did We Ever Get into That Mode? Mode Error and Awareness in Supervisory Control." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 37 (1): 5-19. doi: 10.1518/001872095779049516.
- Schieben, A., F. Flemish, M. Martens, E. Wilschut, A. Rambaldini, A. Tofetti, G. Turi, C. Arduino, N. Merat, and H. Jamson. 2008. *Test results of HMI in use on cars and with simulators*. CityMobil Deliverable 3.2.2 EU DG Research.
- Shladover, S. E. 2016. "The truth about "self-driving" cars." *Scientific American* 314 (6): 52-57. doi: 10.1038/scientificamerican0616-52.
- Schoettle, B., and M. Sivak. 2014a. "A survey of public opinion about autonomous and self-driving vehicles in the U.S., the U.K., and Australia." The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute, Michigan, USA.

- Schoettle, B., and M. Sivak. 2014b. "Public Opinion About Self-Driving Vehicles in china, India, Japan, the US, the UK and Australia." The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute, Michigan, USA.
- Sommer, K. 2013. "Continental Mobility Study 2013." Continental AG.
- Stanton, N. A., and M. Young. 2005. "Driver behaviour with Adaptive Cruise Control." *Ergonomics* 48 (10): 1294-1313. doi: 10.1080/00140130500252990.
- Stanton, N. A., M. Young, and B. McCaulder. 1997. "Drive-by-wire: The case of driver workload and reclaiming control with adaptive cruise control." *Safety Science* 27 (2–3): 149-159. doi: 10.1016/S0925-7535(97)00054-4.
- Stanton, N. A., A. Dunoyer, and A. Leatherland. 2011. "Detection of new in-path targets by drivers using Stop & Go Adaptive Cruise Control." *Applied Ergonomics* 42 (4): 592-601. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2010.08.016.
- Tesla, 2016. All Tesla cars being produced now have full self-driving hardware. Retrieved from <https://www.tesla.com/blog/all-tesla-cars-being-produced-now-have-full-self-driving-hardware>.
- Trimble, T. E., R. Bishop, J. F. Morgan, and M. Blanco. 2014. *Human factors evaluation of level 2 and level 3 automated driving concepts: Past research, state of automation technology, and emerging system concepts*. (Report No. DOT HS 812 043). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Underwood, S. E. 2014. "Automated Vehicles Forecast Vehicle Symposium Opinion Survey." Automated Vehicles Symposium 2014, San Francisco, CA.
- Vehicle and Road Automation. 2013. *VRA - Support action for vehicle and road automation*. <http://vra-net.eu/>.
- Verberne, F. M. F., J. Ham, and C. J. H. Midden. 2012. "Trust in smart systems: Sharing driving goals and giving information to increase trustworthiness and acceptability of smart systems in cars." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 54 (5), 799-810. doi: 10.1177/0018720812443825.
- Vlakveld, W. 2015. *Transition of control in highly automated vehicles*. (Report No. 22). The Hague: SWOV.
- Walker, G. H., N. A. Stanton, and P. M. Salmon. 2015. *Human Factors in Automotive Engineering and Technology*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Warm, J. S., R. Parasuraman, and G. Matthews. 2008. "Vigilance Requires Hard Mental Work and Is Stressful." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 50 (3): 433-441. doi: 10.1518/001872008x312152.
- WEpods.2014e. *WEpods project*. <http://davi.connekt.nl/wepods-project/>.
- Whitmore, A., and N. Reed. 2015. "The Role of Physiological Monitoring in the Implementation of Vehicle Automation." *Engineering and Technology Reference*: 1-9. doi: 10.1049/etr.2014.0057.
- Wickens C., Mavor A. S., Parasuraman R., and McGee J. P. (1998) "The future of air traffic control. Human operators and automation". National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
- Young, M. S., N. A. Stanton, and D. Harris. 2007. "Driving automation: Learning from aviation about design philosophies." *International Journal of Vehicle Design* 45 (3): 323-338. doi: 10.1504/IJVD.2007.014908.
- Zeeb, K., Buchner, A., and Schrauf, M. 2015. "What determines the take-over time? An integrated model approach of driver take-over after automated driving." *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 78, 212-221. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2015.02.023.

1 Appendix

2 **A Human Factors Perspective on Automated Driving - Questionnaire**

3  
4 **Instructions**

5 In these interviews we are investigating expert opinions and vision on automated  
6 driving focusing on Human Factors challenges.

7 In the interview we are adopting the SAE levels of automation, as shown in Figure 1.

8 This interview will discuss strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of  
9 automated driving, as well as your vision on the deployment of those vehicles.

10 Short term period: Up to 2020, Medium term: 2020 to 2030, Long term: Beyond 2030.

11  
12 Figure 1: Levels of automation as defined by the SAE International

Summary of Levels of Driving Automation for On-road Vehicles

Level	Name	Narrative definition	Execution of steering and acceleration/ deceleration	Monitoring of driving environment	Fallback performance of dynamic driving task	System capability (driving modes)	BASf level	NHTSA level
<b>Human driver monitors the driving environment</b>								
0	No Automation	the full-time performance by the <i>human driver</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> , even when enhanced by warning or intervention systems	Human driver	Human driver	Human driver	n/a	Driver only	0
1	Driver Assistance	the <i>driving mode</i> -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 <i>human driver</i> perform all remaining aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i>	Human driver and system	Human driver	Human driver	Some driving modes	Assisted	1
2	Partial Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -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 <i>human driver</i> perform all remaining aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i>	System	Human driver	Human driver	Some driving modes	Partially automated	2
<b>Automated driving system ("system") monitors the driving environment</b>								
3	Conditional Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific performance by an <i>automated driving system</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> with the expectation that the <i>human driver</i> will respond appropriately to a <i>request to intervene</i>	System	System	Human driver	Some driving modes	Highly automated	3
4	High Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific performance by an <i>automated driving system</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> , even if a <i>human driver</i> does not respond appropriately to a <i>request to intervene</i>	System	System	System	Some driving modes	Fully automated	3/4
5	Full Automation	the full-time performance by an <i>automated driving system</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> under all roadway and environmental conditions that can be managed by a <i>human driver</i>	System	System	System	All driving modes		

13

Source: SAE Standard J3016 Report



## Questions

The first set of questions relates to SAE levels 3-5 of automation (strengths, weaknesses, threats)

- (1) In automated vehicles where drivers are expected to respond appropriately to a request to intervene, what would you consider as the main strengths and weaknesses (threats)?
- (2) In automated vehicles where drivers are not expected to respond appropriately to a request to intervene, what would you consider as the main strengths and weaknesses (threats)?
- (3) What are your safety expectations of automated driving? How do you vision public acceptance concerning safety expectations of automation - induced accidents?
- (4) What are your expectations in law changes regarding automated vehicles? When do you think that such changes will take place?
- (5) How much would you expect that an automated vehicle would cost, on top of the price of an average vehicle?
- (6) If we assume that all legal issues about automated driving are resolved tomorrow, are we ready to deploy automated vehicles? Which Level?

The second group of questions relates to all levels of automation (vision on automated driving technology)

- (1) When are you expecting highly automated driving vehicles to be deployed on public roads?
- (2) When are you expecting most of the cars to be driven fully automated on public roads?
- (3) In which driving scenario are you expecting the first automated vehicles to be introduced (e.g. highways, parking, maybe asking about passenger cars or trucks)
- (4) When are you expecting highly (and fully) automated vehicles to be operating in cities?
- (5) How do you vision the role of drivers in the future? Supervisor, driver, passenger?
- (6) Do you think that the highly levels of automation are needed? Why not jumping directly to FAD?
- (7) What do you think on Google's decision to directly introduce FAD vehicles?
- (8) The Vienna Convention on Road Traffic requires that 'every moving vehicle or combination of vehicles shall have a driver' and that 'every driver shall at all times, be able to control his vehicle'. The Convention is currently in the process of being amended to allow a car to drive itself so long as the system can be overridden or switched off by the driver. Do you think that this amendment is sufficient? Do we need the Vienna Convention? Do you think that we could abolish it (after all the US or the UK have never ratified it).
- (9) AVs have the potential to reduce crashes and improve roadway efficiency significantly. Yet, AVs will occasionally be crashing and being involved into accidents. Subsequently, a number of ethical dilemmas arise, e.g. what decision a FAD will take when detecting an imminent, unavoidable accident? How should such dilemmas be addressed? For instance, should a HAD or FAD vehicle stop before hitting a cat, even if this could be dangerous for its passengers?

- (10) Do you consider the Human Factors research important for the development and deployment of automated driving vehicles? Why do you consider it important? Why don't you consider it important?
- (11) What would you consider the most important Human Factors issues for the different levels of automation? Why?
- (12) How could HF science contribute to overcome the legal barriers towards the deployment of AVs?
- (13) Towards the deployment of AVs, which are the most critical challenges, the technological or the HFs? An example?
- (14) In automated (non-fully) vehicles should drivers be allowed not to supervise their vehicle for more than a defined period of time? Could you define this period?
- (15) How should a driver be informed about a failure in the system of an automated? Should the car directly come to a stop?
- (16) Today, simulation studies investigate the behaviour of drivers for the different levels of automation. Do you think that results from those studies replicate the behaviour of drivers on real life traffic conditions? How could we overcome this problem?
- (17) How the HFs science should tackle the issues about driver's workload in CAD and HAD modes? How to deal with high-workload to boredom and complacency?
- (18) How HFs scientist can define the sufficient time that a driver needs to safely take over control at any situation? Do we need to precisely define this time before deploying AVs on the public roads?
- (19) Once fully automated vehicles are introduced would we need HFs scientists any longer? Why? Why not?
- (20) In fully automated vehicles would steering wheels be necessary? If yes, how do you vision wheels design, e.g. round or F1 type wheels? Should the wheels be moving or staying still? If not, what could replace the steering wheels?
- (21) In highly automated vehicles what kind of secondary tasks could drivers be engaged in? What kind of secondary tasks should not be allowed?
- (22) In fully automated vehicles what kind of secondary tasks could drivers be engaged in? What kind of secondary tasks should not be allowed?
- (23) While driving in a fully automated vehicle could we be sleeping? Or being drunk? Or should people under 18 or over 90 be allowed to drive them?
- (24) Would you send your fully automated vehicle to pick your kid up from school?
- (25) Should a fully automated vehicle have any marks to indicate its level of automation?
- (26) Do we need complex dashboards in fully automated driving vehicles? Could a "Function" / "Non function" indicator be just sufficient? Any other suggestions?
- (27) How would you expect the status quo of the current car ownership to change in the short / medium / long term? Will people continue buying vehicles when fully automated vehicles are deployed or will sharing?
- (28) Do you think that people will ever be ready to completely relinquish the "control" over their vehicles to a computer?
- (29) What do you think of the current description of automated driving in the media?