# **Transparency Assessment of Automated Vehicle**

Yuan-Cheng Liu SHAPE-IT ESR 07 Chair of Ergonomics



Technical University of Munich

### BACKGROUND

- There is yet a data-driven approach to estimating how transparent is the AV\*
- The assessment method was developed (**study 1**) and then adapted to the driving simulator study (study 2)

# **FUNCTIONAL TRANSPARENCY**

### Study 1: online-study

- Defined by actual understanding and time used
- Used to assess three brands of HMIs\* (VW, BMW, Tesla)
- Found differences in users with different ADS<sup>\*</sup> experiences

## INCLUDING WORKLOAD

Study2: simulator study

- Three different HMI designs
- Transparency assessment with workload measurements (NASA-TLX, EEG, ECG, EDA)
- Under analysis

### WORKLOAD MEASUREMENTS

- Determine which objective ulletworkload measurement is most sensitive to different HMI designs
- ECG, EDA (EEG could only be ulletused for general evaluation)





Figure 1. Comparing levels of ADS experience given HMI designs (exp stands for experienced in ADS experience levels).



**ADS Experience Levels** 

Figure 2. Comparing HMI designs given ADS experience levels (exp stands for experienced in ADS experience levels).



Figure 3. HMI designs used in Study 1.

\*AV: automated vehicle; \*HMI: human-machine interface; \*ADS: automated driving assistance

Table 1. HMI designs used in study 2, including different system understandability (trans-fog v.s. trans designs) and different HMI understandability (fog v.s. trans-fog designs).



### **FUTURE WORKS**

- Transparency assessment method for dynamic environments (e.g., driving simulator, test track)
- Relationships between functional transparency assessed in online studies and in simulator studies



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement 860410

