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## 1. Back ground and Purpose

- Current False Reaction scenarios in Annex3(CEL) Appendix 2 of UN-R152 were established by being referred to R131, and they are being applied to UN-R152 without any validation to confirms whether they are appropriate to AEBS for passenger cars.
- In the current UN-R152, false reaction is defined as activation of AEBS (collision warning or advanced emergency braking) while there is no possibility of collision physically. However, in some cases, even there is no possibility of collision, collision warning is likely to make the driver drive more safely. Therefore, it is essential to research the relation between activation of AEBS (system behavior) and human driver in each situation.
- In this research, plural draft scenarios for the test of system behavior were studied, in a wider view point.
- This document is intended to report progress of study regarding the scenarios and the result of the test by using several passenger cars. Regarding driving behavior of normal drivers in the situations of the draft scenarios will be investigated in the next step.
- If activation of AEBS is confirmed in some scenarios, the manufacturer should explain the design philosophy to the Technical Service according to Annex3(CEL).


## 2. Draft scenarios

- In this research, 8 draft scenarios were studied, and each scenario was confirmed by using several passenger cars.
- Basically the draft scenarios were made by being referred to owner's manuals on each car manufacturers and some other information.


## Draft Scenario 1

Start point of steering input for right turn


- The test vehicle turns right in the intersection
- The related vehicle is waiting in the opposite side of the intersection to turn right.
- The speed of the test vehicle is $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (one condition), and the start points of right turn (steering right) are 3.9 m and 5.9 m (two conditions).


## Draft Scenario 2



- The test vehicle (going straight) approaches the related vehicle which is running at $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- The related vehicle turns left when the value of TTC between the test vehicle and the related vehicle becomes the specified value.
- The speeds of the test vehicle are $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (two conditions), and the specified values of TTC are $4 \mathrm{~s}, 5 \mathrm{~s}$ and 6 s (three conditions).


## Draft Scenario 3



- The test vehicle and the related vehicle pass the small radius curve each other.
- The test vehicle turns left, and the related vehicle turns right. The two vehicles approach in the middle of the curve.
- The speeds of both the test vehicle and the related vehicle are $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (one condition).


## Draft Scenario 4

## Car to Car



Car to Pedestrian


- In the small radius curved road in which the guard pipes are established at the roadside, the related vehicle or the pedestrian target is located just outside of the guard pipes.
- The speeds of the test vehicle are $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (two conditions).
$\square$


## Draft Scenario 5

## with guard pipe

$\xrightarrow{\text { approximately } 5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}}$
$30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$

- Distance between the left side of the test vehicle and the guard pipes is approximately 50 cm .
- The pedestrian walks along the guard pipes. The distance between the left side of the test vehicle and pedestrian is approximately 80 cm .

- The test vehicle (going straight) passes the pedestrian which is walking left side of the test vehicle.
- The directions of walking of the pedestrian are the same direction as the test vehicle and opposite direction as the test vehicle (two conditions)
- The speed of the test vehicle is $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (one condition)

Test vehicle


Real pedestrian

- The distance between the left side of the test vehicle and pedestrian is approximately 80 cm (same as "with guard pipe" condition).


## Draft Scenario 6



- The signboard which notifies reducing the lane is located forward of the test vehicle (going straight), and the test vehicle approaches the signboard.
- . The test vehicle starts the steering input to the right side just when TTC between the test vehicle and the signboard becomes the specified value.
- The specified values of TTC are $2.0 \mathrm{~s}, 1.4 \mathrm{~s}, 0.8 \mathrm{~s}$ (three conditions), and the speeds of the test vehicle are $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (two conditions).


## Draft Scenario 7



- The test vehicle runs straight, and the related vehicle turns left and comes into the opposite lane.
- During the left turn of the related vehicle, the corner of the vehicle slightly touches the lane marking, but it doesn't cross the lane marking.
- Regarding the condition of TTC between the test vehicle and the related vehicle just when the related vehicle approaches the lane marking most, it is approximately 1 s and 0 s (two conditions).
- The speeds of the test vehicle are $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (two conditions).


## Draft Scenario 8

with Pedestrian target*

$30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$
*The condition of "without Pedestrian target" is also carried out.

- The test vehicle changes the lane from the right side to the left side.
- The guard pipes are located at the roadside of the left lane.
- In the condition of "with pedestrian target", the pedestrian target is located in front of the center line of the test vehicle just when changing the lane.
- The speed of the test vehicle is $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (one condition).
- Regarding the condition of steering input, normal steering input and slightly rapid steering input are carried out (two conditions).

3. Test vehicles and the field of the test

Three passenger cars made by Japanese manufacturers were used.

| Test vehicle | Types of body | Registration year, month |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Mini Van (7 seats) | February 2018 |
| B | Sedan (5 seats) | March 2018 |
| C | Station Wagon (5 seats) | January 2018 |

The test was carried out in the second district of Automobile Proving Ground of National Traffic Safety and Environment Laboratory

## 4. Result of the test

## Overview of the test (from scenario 1 to scenario 4)

Both Collision Warning and Emergency Braking were not confirmed.
Collision Warning was confirmed, Emergency Braking was not confirmed.
Collision warning and Emergency Braking were confirmed.

| Draft Scenario | Test conditions |  | Test results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Test vehicle A |  |  | Test vehicle B |  |  | Test vehicle C |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| 1 | Test vehicle $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Start point of steering input : 5.7 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start point of steering input : 3.9 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ Related vehicle $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Start timing of steering input : TTC= 4s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC=5s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC=6s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ Related vehicle $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Start timing of steering input : TTC= 4s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC=5s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC=6s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Test vehicle 20km/h, Related vehicle $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Test vehicle $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Stationary related vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Stationary related vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Stationary pedestrian target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Stationary pedestrian target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Overview of the test (from scenario 5 to scenario 8)

Both Collision Warning and Emergency Braking were not confirmed.
Collision Warning was confirmed, Emergency Braking was not confirmed.
Collision warning and Emergency Braking were confirmed.

| Draft Scenario | Test conditions |  |  | Test results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Test vehicle A |  |  | Test vehicle B |  |  | Test vehicle C |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| 5 | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | With guard pipes | Same direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | With guard pipes | Opposite direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Without guard pipes | Same direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Without guard pipes | Opposite direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Start timing of steering input : TTC=2s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC = 1.4s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC $=0.8 \mathrm{~s}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Start timing of steering input : TTC=2s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC=1.4s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Start timing of steering input : TTC $=0.8 \mathrm{~s}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Approching lane marking most : TTC=1s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Approching lane marking most : TTC=0s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Test vehicle $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | Approching lane marking most : TTC=1s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Approching lane marking most : TTC=0s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Test vehicle $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | without pedestrian target | Normal steering input |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | without pedestrian target | Rapid steering input |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | with pedestrian target | Normal steering input |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | with pedestrian target | Rapid steering input |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Summary

- According to the result of the test, in the draft scenario $1,2,4$ and 6 , collision warning or emergency braking were confirmed.
- Regarding the several draft scenarios in which collision warning or emergency braking were confirmed, further study in order to investigate driving behavior of normal drivers (ex. speed, approaching to the objects)in each scenarios will be done until March of 2020.
- Based on the whole of the study, the material as the technical background of draft proposal to amend the current false reaction scenario will be prepared.

