

A Survey of Sensor Technologies for Perception in Automated Driving

Enrique Martí, Miguel Ángel de Miguel, Fernando García, *Member, IEEE*, and Joshué Pérez,

Abstract—After more than 20 years of research, ADAS are common in modern vehicles available in the market. Automated Driving systems, still in research phase and limited in their capabilities, are starting early commercial tests in public roads. These systems rely on the information provided by on-board sensors, which allow to describe the state of the vehicle, its environment and other actors. Sensors are the first stage of any automated driving architecture, representing a key factor in the design of the system. This survey reviews existing and upcoming sensor solutions applied to ADAS and Automated Driving, based in both well-known and novel sensing technologies, applied to the most common tasks in perception. They are put in context making a historical review of the most relevant demonstrations on Automated Driving developed by academy and other institutions, focused on their sensing setup. Finally, the article presents a snapshot of the future challenges for sensing technologies and perception, finishing with an overview of the commercial initiatives and manufacturers alliances that will show the intention of the market in sensors technologies for Automated Vehicles.

Index Terms—Automated Driving, sensors, perception, OEM.

I. INTRODUCTION

Every year more than one million people die on road accidents and several million more get injured [1]. In addition to the social cost, it also has an important economic impact for nations worldwide. According to [2] the most frequent causes for car accidents in the European Union are human related: speeding, driving under the effects of alcohol or drugs, reckless driving, distractions or just plain misjudgments. Automated Driving systems, also called self-driving vehicles, aim to take the human driver out of the equation. Thus, they are designed to be a valuable tool towards reducing the number of traffic accidents.

Based on recent developments and demonstrations around the world, there is a tendency to think that Automated Driving with a high level of automation will be available in a few years.

The architecture of autonomous vehicles is usually divided into three categories: perception of the environment, behavior planning and motion execution [3]. Autonomous vehicles obtain information about their surroundings using different sensors, such as cameras, LiDARs and radars. Raw data is processed to extract relevant features which are the input to the following stages (behavior planning and motion execu-

tion), that will perform tasks such as path planning, collision avoidance or control of the vehicle among others.

Perception is a very challenging problem for several reasons. First, the environment is complex and highly dynamic, with some cases involving a large number of participants (dense traffic, populated cities). Second, it needs to work reliably under a wide range of external conditions, including lighting and weather (rain, fog, snow, dust). Perception errors are propagated and can cause of severe accidents. Some real examples include the 2016 Tesla AutoPilot accident [4], where a man was killed after its car crashed a truck: the camera failed to detect the gray truck against a bright sky while radar detection was discarded as background noise by perception algorithms. Later in 2018, a Tesla model X crashed a highway divider after the lane following system failed to detect faded lines and the concrete divider was not recognized, killing the driver [5]. Also in 2018, an experimental self-driving Uber vehicle killed a woman crossing the road [6] in the night, dressed in dark clothes. Only the LiDAR provided a positive detection, that was discarded as a false positive by perception algorithms.

This article reviews sensor technologies and perception algorithms, and explores their relation to provide an integral view of the process that leads from raw sensor data to meaningful information for the driving task. This topic has been previously investigated in the literature, but usually centered on ADAS implementation [7], [8] or at a more general level within Automated Driving [9].

The content of the article is organized as follows. Section II describes the sensors commonly used for perception explaining the technologies, drawbacks and advantages, and related emerging technologies that can be used in the future. It also presents a taxonomy of information that allows to link sensor technologies with the next section. Section III starts describing the most important competences in perception, to proceed with a state of the art of perception algorithms and techniques grouped by competences. Sensors used on each work are enumerated, and their advantages and disadvantages discussed. Section IV gives a perspective of the evolution of perception in Automated Driving, presenting the most relevant works and demos in the history of the discipline with a focus in sensor technologies used for each one. Finally, section V contains a discussion of the current state of the discipline and the future challenges for sensors and perception in Automated Driving systems. It includes a review of the most relevant alliances between OEMs (Original Equipment Manufacturers) and technological companies involved in automated driving projects at the time of writing the article.

E. Martí and J. Pérez work in the Automated Driving group, Fundación Tecnalia, Derio, 48160 Spain. Corresponding e-mail: enrique.marti@tecnalia.com.

M. de Miguel and F. García are in Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Leganés, 28911, Spain

Manuscript received November 9, 2018; revised Xxxx 0, 201x.

II. SENSORS AND TECHNOLOGIES

This work is focused in exteroceptive sensors, leaving proprioceptive sensors and communications out of the scope of the review. Exteroception in Automated Driving is related with information in the surroundings of the vehicle, as opposed to proprioception that is related with the state of the vehicle itself (speed, accelerations, component integrity). Proprioceptive sensors and communications are out of the scope of this review.

Next subsections present the advantages, drawbacks and current challenges for the three principal sensor technologies for exteroceptive perception in Automated Driving: artificial vision, radar and LiDAR. Each one is followed with a review of relevant emergent technologies in the field.

In II-D a taxonomy of information domains is presented. It is useful for several purposes. First it allows to link sensors technologies with perception algorithms described in section III, since the first provide the raw data needed by the second. Second, the categorization is used to structure the subsequent analysis (section II-E) about the suitability and adequacy of the presented sensing technologies for perception in Automated Driving. This last part includes also the expected performance under different environmental and weather conditions.

A. Artificial Vision

Artificial vision is a popular technology that has been used for decades in disciplines as mobile robotics, surveillance or industrial inspection. This technology offers interesting features, as the low cost of sensors –for most popular types– and providing range of information types including spatial (shape, size, distances), dynamic (motion of objects by analyzing their displacement between consecutive frames) and semantic (shape analysis).

Cameras available in the market offer a wide range of configurations in resolution (from less than 0.25 to more than 40 Mpx), frame rate (up to thousands of frames per second (FPS)), sensor size, and optics parameters. Automated driving, however, pose some particular challenges to camera sensors and artificial vision technology:

- Varying light and visibility conditions: driving happens at day, at night, indoors, or at dusk or dawn with the sun close to the horizon. Dark spots, shadows, glares, reflections and other effects difficult the implementation of reliable artificial visible algorithms. Extending the capturing spectrum can solve some of these problems. Far infrared cameras (wavelength 900-1400 nm, also called thermal cameras) are effective for pedestrian and animal detection [10][11], in the dark and through dust and smoke. Near Infrared (750-900 nm) complements visible spectrum with a better contrast in high dynamic range scenes, and better night visibility. In [12] authors compare visible light, near infrared and far infrared cameras in different light and atmospheric conditions.
- Scenes with a High Dynamic Range (HDR) contain dark and strongly illuminated areas in the same frame, as entering or exiting a tunnel. Common sensor technologies have single shot dynamic range of 60-75 dB, which cause

a loss of information in the extremes (under- or overexposure). In 2017 Sony launched a 120 dB automotive sensor and 2k resolution. An automotive grade sensor combining HDR capabilities and Near Infra-Red light detection is analyzed in [13] and the work [14] presents a sensor with 130 dB range (global shutter) and up to 170 dB (rolling shutter).

These and some other problems are analyzed in [15] from the perspective of recording scenes in sports.

1) *3D technology*: Traditional camera technology is essentially 2D, but there are some types of vision sensors that can perceive depth information. This section describes the three principal types that are already available as commercial devices, although not always targeting the automotive market.

Stereo vision: depth is calculated [16] from the apparent displacement of visual features in the images capture by two carefully calibrated monocular cameras pointing in the same direction and separated by some distance (known as baseline).

One of the greatest advantages of stereo vision systems is their capability to provide dense depth maps, as opposed to sparse sensors (e.g. LiDARs). Stereo vision drawbacks include issues with low-textured patterns (e.g. solid colors) that difficult establishing correspondences between frames.

Monocular SLAM (Simultaneous Location And Mapping) algorithms share some of the working principles of stereo system: the motion of a single monocular camera creates an artificial baseline between consecutive frames, from which depth and camera motion are estimated. Some works as [17][18] represent a good alternative to stereo sensors for location and mapping.

Structured light: a monocular camera coupled with a device that illuminates the scene with a known pattern of infrared light. The distortion of the light pattern when projected over an irregular surface is captured by the camera and translated to a depth map.

Structured light devices overcome some limitations of stereoscopic systems, they do not depend on texture patterns and lowering the computational burden. However, they require the same high-accuracy calibration [19] and its operative range (usually below 20 meters) is limited by the power of the emitter and the intensity of ambient light. Reflections can affect its performance.

Time-of-flight: an active sensing technology [20], based in the same round-trip-time principle of LiDAR sensors (see II-C): an emitter composed of infrared LEDs floods the scene with modulated light that is captured by the sensor after being reflected by elements in the environment. The round-trip-time can be calculated for each pixel based on the phase shift of incoming light, which is then translated to a distance.

Using a non-directed source of light (as opposed to the low divergence laser emitter in LiDAR) has advantages as the ability to create dense depth maps and a high refresh rate exceeding 50 Hz. However, its operative range is short for automotive applications (10-20 meters) and has problems working under intense ambient light. Some research lines as indirect time-of-flight [21], pulsed light time-of-flight or avalanche photodiodes [22] could increase working range to 50-250 meters.

2) *Emerging vision technologies*: In event-based vision the elements of the sensor (pixels) are triggered asynchronously and independently when they detect a change on light intensity (an *event*). The sensor produce a stream of events that can be grouped in time windows for getting a frame-like image. Independence of sensor elements raises the dynamic range of the sensor to 120 dB, allowing high speed applications in low light conditions. [23] shows tracking at 1000 FPS under regular indoor lightning conditions, although the sensor works in sub-microsecond time scales. Events can be the input to visual odometry [24] and SLAM [25] applications, relieving the CPU of time consuming operations on raw images.

There is an active line of research [26] around sensors capturing light polarization, which perform consistently under adverse meteorological conditions and provide exotic types of information (e.g. materials, composition, water in the road).

B. Radar

Radar technology use high frequency electromagnetic waves to measure the distance to objects based on the *round-trip time* principle, which is the time it takes the wave to reach the object, bounce on it and travel back to the sensor.

Most modern automotive radars are based on the Frequency-Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) technology, and use digital beamforming [27] to control the direction of the emitted wave. FMCW consists on emitting a signal with a well known and stable frequency that is modulated with another continuous signal that varies its frequency up and down (typically using a triangular shape). Distance is determined using the frequency shift between the emitted and reflected signals. Radars also exploit Doppler effect to get a direct observation of the relative speed of the target with respect to the sensor.

One of the strongest arguments for including radar sensing in automated vehicles is its independence of light and weather conditions. It works in the dark, and detections are almost equally good with snow, rain, fog or dust [28]. Long range radars can see up to 250 m in very adverse conditions, where no other sensor works.

Radar sensors present some difficulties and drawbacks:

- Sensible to target reflectivity: processing radar data is a tricky task, due to the heterogeneous reflectivity of the different materials. Metals amplify radar signal, easing detection of vehicles but increasing the apparent size of small objects as discarded cans in the road, while other materials (e.g. wood) are virtually transparent. This can cause false positives (detect a non existing obstacle) and false negatives (not detecting an actual obstacle).
- Resolution and accuracy: radars are very accurate measuring distance and speed along the line that connects the sensor with a target. However, horizontal resolution depends on the characteristics of the emitted beam. Raw angular resolution in digital beamforming systems falls between 2 to 5 degrees [29], that can be improved to 0.1-1 degrees using advanced processing techniques [30]. With this angular resolution, it can be difficult to separate (detect as independent targets) a pedestrian from a nearby car at 30 m distance. At 100 m distance it

can be impossible to separate vehicles in neighbor lanes, determine if a vehicle is in our same lane, and even if a detection is a vehicle or a bridge over the road.

1) *Emerging radar technologies*: One of the most active research area is related with high resolution radar imaging for automobiles. Apart from benefits in target tracking and object separation, a higher resolution can get richer semantic information and enable further applications as target classification and environment mapping. An example can be found in [28], where a 90GHz rotating radar in the roof of a car is used to map the environment, including vehicles, static objects and ground. The paper [31] demonstrates the feasibility of radars operating between 100 and 300 GHz, analyzing atmospheric absorption and reflectivity of materials usually found in driving scenarios.

One of the key technologies that can lead to high resolution radar imaging are meta-material based antennas [32], [33] for efficient synthetic aperture radars. Some manufacturers as Metawave [34] are starting to offer products oriented to automotive sector based on the technology.

C. LiDAR

LiDAR (Light Detection And Ranging) is an active ranging technology that calculates distance to objects by measuring round-trip time of a laser light pulse. Sensors for robotic and automotive applications use a low power near-infrared laser (900-1050 nm) that is invisible and eye-safe. Laser beams have a low divergence for reducing power decay with distance, allowing to measure distances up to 200 m under direct sunlight. Typically, a rotating mirror is used to change the direction of the laser pulse, reaching 360 horizontal coverage. Commercial solutions use an array of emitters to produce several vertical layers (between 4 and 128) that generate a point cloud representing the environment. LiDAR sensors feature an extraordinary accuracy measuring distances, averaging a few millimeters in most cases and degrading to 0.1-0.5 meters in the worst cases. This makes LiDAR a good choice for creating accurate digital maps.

However, they have several drawbacks to take into account:

- Low vertical resolution: in low cost models, which usually feature less than 16 layers, vertical resolution (separation between consecutive layers) falls down to 2 degrees. At 100 m distance, this is translated into a vertical distance of 1.7 m. High end models reduce this to 0.2-0.4 degrees, but at a much higher cost.
- Sparse measures (not dense): Commercial device Velodyne HDL64 has a 2 mrad divergence [35] (0.11 degrees) and a vertical resolution of 0.42 degrees. At 50 meters distance, the 0.3 degree gap between layers is equivalent to a blind strip 0.26 meters tall. In low end devices (Velodyne VLP16) this gap grows to 1.5 meters. Small targets can remain undetected, and structures based on wires and bars are virtually invisible.
- Poor detection of dark and specular objects. Black cars can appear as invisible to the LiDAR, since they combine a color that absorbs most radiation with a non-Lambertian material that does not scatter radiation back to receiver.

- Affected by dense rain, fog and dust. Infrared laser beams are affected by rain and fog because water droplets scatter the light [36], reducing the operative range of the device and producing false measures in the front of the cloud. The effect of dust has been explored in [37]. LiDAR performance in these scenarios is worse than radar, but still better than cameras and human eye.

1) *Emerging LiDAR technologies:* FMCW LiDAR [38] emits light continuously to measure objects speed based on Doppler effect. In the last years some research prototypes suitable for the automotive market start appearing [39]. Apart from improving target tracking capabilities, observation of speed can be useful to enhance activity recognition and behavior prediction, for example by detecting the different speeds of limbs and body in cyclists and pedestrians.

Solid state LiDAR is an umbrella term that includes several technologies, two of which are oscillating micro-mirrors and Optical Phased Array (OPA). The first technology combines one or many laser emitters that are directed with micro-mirrors that can rotate around two axes, so that the beam can be directed within a cone. Manufacturer LeddarTech commercializes devices based on this technology [40]. Optical phased arrays [41] is a technology similar to that used for EBF radars. that allows to control the direction of the beam with high accuracy and speed. Quanergy [42] is one of the few manufacturers commercializing devices based on this technology.

OPA technology has additional advantages over mechanical LiDAR: the scan pattern can be random in the entire FoV (Field of View), which is great for characterizing fast moving objects. It is possible to observe only a region of interest within the FoV. Also, it is possible to augment the point density within each frame for better resolution. The three features can be combined to do fast low resolution inspection of the full FoV, and then tracking with high resolution the objects of interest for enhanced shape recognition even at far distances.

D. Relevant information domains

The task of a perception system is to bridge the gap between sensors providing data and decision algorithms requiring information. A classical differentiation between both terms is the following: data is composed by raw, unorganized facts that need to be processed. Information is the name given to data that has been processed, organized, structured and presented in a proper context.

The following taxonomy (table I) is tightly related with the goals of perception stage (covered in section III). It allows to present conclusions about the suitability of each sensor technology for the different perception tasks in a clear and organized way.

Elements with an asterisk are derived information. This is, they that can be inferred from sensed data but not directly observed. It is mostly related with internal state of external entities, as the intentions of human beings and animals.

E. Using sensors for perception

Sensor selection and arrangement is one of the most important aspects in the design of a perception system for automated

TABLE I
INFORMATION TAXONOMY IN AUTOMATED DRIVING DOMAIN

Category	#	Information type
Ego-vehicle	1	Kinematic/dynamic (includes position)
	2	Proprioceptive (components health/status)
Occupants	3	Driver awareness/capacities
	4	* Driver intentions (mind model)
	5	Passenger status (needs, risk factors)
Environment	6	Spatial features: location, size, shape, fine features
	7	Identification: class, type, identity
	8	Semantic features: signs, road marks, regulation
	9	Contextual factors: weather, driving situation (e.g. jam, off-road, emergency)
External actors	10	Spatial features: location, size, shape, fine features
	11	Kinematic/dynamic: position, motion
	12	Identification: class, type, identity
	13	Semantic features: vehicle lights, pedestrian clothes, gestures
	14	* Situational engagement: collaborative/aware (adults, other vehicles) vs non-collaborative/unaware (animals, children)

vehicles. It has a great impact in its cost, with some setups having several times the price of the rest of the vehicle. This epigraph summarizes two aspects of the uttermost importance: type of information acquired and impact of environmental factors. For an analysis of spatial coverage and range see [43].

The characteristics of a sensing technology determines its suitability for acquiring certain types of information, and restricts its range of operative conditions. Figure 1 relates the principal sensing technologies currently used in the automotive market and Automated Driving initiatives with relevant types of information identified in Table I. The adequacy of a sensor for acquiring a certain type of information (or equivalently, the expected quality of that type of information when captured by that sensing technology) is classified in three levels: Good (green shading, tick), Medium (yellow shading, letter M) and Bad (red shading, letter B).

		Visión (mono)	Visión (3D)	Radar	LIDAR 2D	LIDAR 3D
Type of information						
Spatial configuration (6, 10)	Location	B	M	✓	✓	✓
	Size	✓	✓	M	✓	✓
	Shape	✓	✓	B	M	✓
	Fine features	✓	✓		B	M
Kinematics (11)	Velocity, accelerations	B	M	✓	✓	✓
Identification (7, 12)		✓	✓	M	B	✓
Regulation/semantics (8, 13)	Traffic signs	✓	✓			B
	Road marks	✓	✓			M
	Gestures (humans)	✓	✓			M
	Clothes (humans)	✓	✓			
	Vehicle lights	✓	✓			
Context (9)	Weather	✓	✓			
	Driving situation	M	M			M

Fig. 1. Sensor adequacy for relevant types of information

Sensors and perception are expected to work uninterruptedly during vehicle operation. Weather and other environmental

factor can degrade sensor performance, but each technology is affected in a different way. Figure 2 summarizes the effect of common external factors in the performance of the analyzed sensing technologies, using the same notation as Figure 1.

Technology	Low light (dark)	Direct sunlight	Rain	Dust / Fog
Vision (mono, visible light)	✗	✓	M	✗
Vision (stereo, visible light)	✗	✓	M	✗
Vision (near IR)	✓	✓	M	M
Vision (far IR)	✓	✓	M	M
Vision (ToF)	✓	✓	M	M
Radar	✓	✓	✓	✓
LiDAR 2D	✓	✓	M	M
LiDAR 3D	✓	✓	M	M

Fig. 2. Sensor robustness under atmospheric and environmental factors

III. PROBLEMS AND APPLICATIONS

This section analyzes the state of the art in perception systems for Automated Driving. A set of behavioral competences is identified, followed by a systematic literature review that analyzes the solutions for each category, organized by sensor technology.

A. Behavioral competencies

Behavioral competencies in Automated Driving “refers to the ability of an automated vehicle to operate in the traffic conditions that it will regularly encounter” [44]. The NHTSA defined a set of 28 core competencies for normal driving [45], that have been augmented to a total of 47 by Waymo [46] in their internal tests. Table II selects a subset of those behavioral competencies and arranges them in categories that are used to structure the state of the art in perception algorithms in a purpose oriented approach. This set of competences represents the link between perception and decision (planning), as a counterpart to the information taxonomy presented in the previous section (Table I), which linked sensors and perception algorithms. Both tables can be combined to evaluate the suitability of sensor technologies for creating some set of Automated Driving capacities.

The next subsections describe the state of the art in perception techniques for the three identified categories of behavioral competencies.

B. Automatic Traffic Sign Detection and Recognition (TSDR)

Traffic signs are visual devices with a well defined aspect, that transmit a clear and precise piece of information about traffic regulation, warnings about factors affecting driving and other informative statements. The spatial and temporal scopes of applicability are also defined in the sign, either explicitly or implicitly. Acquiring information from road traffic signs involves two major tasks: Traffic Sign Detection (TSD) which

consists on finding the location, orientation and size of traffic signs in natural scene images, and Traffic Sign Recognition (TDR) or classifying the detected traffic signs into types and categories in order to extract the information that they are providing to drivers.

Below are shown the most relevant solutions according to the type of sensor and the technology used.

1) *Camera based solutions:* Cameras are the most common sensor for TSDR. They can be used for TSR, TSD or both at the same time. As an example of TSR, [47] proposes a method based on the Polar-Fourier Grayscale Descriptor, and [48] a learning method based on a histogram intersection kernel. For TSD, [49] proposes a method based on a fast Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) inspired in the YOLOv2 network. This algorithm can detect the position of the traffic sign and classify it according to its shape. [50] detects stop and yield signs with a statistical template built using color information in different color spaces (YCbCr and ErEgEb). TSD techniques can also be applied to traffic light detection, as in [51], where a Bayesian inference framework to detect and map traffic lights is described. A different approach is proposed by [52] that uses a dual focal camera system composed of a wide angle camera and a telephoto camera which is moved by mirrors in order to get higher quality images of the traffic signs. Camera sensors can also perform TSD and TSR tasks as is shown in the following works where first the signals are detected attending to their color or shape, and then they are classified using machine learning techniques (CNN or SVM) [53], [54], [55]. In [56] a system composed by eight roof-mounted cameras which takes images every meter perform offline TSDR to create a database with more than 13,000 traffic signs annotations

2) *LiDAR based solutions:* LiDAR sensors have been used for TSD. Their 3D perception capabilities are useful to determine the position of the sign and its shape, and can also use the intensity of reflected light to improve detection accuracy based on the high reflectivity of traffic signs. [57] performs detection in three steps: first the point cloud is filtered by laser reflection intensity, then a clustering algorithm is used to detect potential candidates, followed by a filtering step based on the lateral position, elevation and geometry that extracts the signs. [58] goes one step further and makes a primary classification attending to the sign shape (rectangular, triangular and circular).

3) *Sensors Fusion solutions:* A system that combines LiDAR and Cameras can improve the sign detection and recognition as it has the advantages and the information of both sources. [59] trains a SVM with 10 variables: 9 of different color spaces provided by the camera (RGB, HSV, CIE $L^*a^*b^*$) and the intensity provided by the LiDAR. After 3D geometric feature verification of the detected signs, the classification is made using HOG features and a linear SVM. [60] method, first detects traffic signs from mobile LiDAR point clouds with regard to a prior knowledge of road width, pole height, reflectance, geometrical structure and traffic-sign size. Then traffic signs are normalized to perform classification based on a supervised GaussianBernoulli deep Boltzmann machine model.

TABLE II
BEHAVIORAL COMPETENCES AND RELATION WITH INFORMATION TAXONOMY (SEE TABLE I)

Competence	Information type	Behavior
Automatic Traffic Sign Detection and Recognition (TSDR)	8	Detect Speed Limit Changes, Speed Advisories, Traffic Signals and Stop/Yield Signs
	8	Detect Access Restrictions (One-Way, No Turn, Ramps, etc.)
	8	Detect Temporary Traffic Control Devices
	6, 8	Detect Passing and No Passing Zones
Perception of the environment	8	Detect Lines
	6, 8	Detect Detours
	6	Detect faded/missing roadway markings, signs and other temporary changes in traffic patterns
	9	Perception under weather or lighting conditions outside vehicles capability (e.g. rainstorm)
Vehicles, pedestrians and other obstacles detection	10, 12, 13	Detect Non-Collision Safety Situations (e.g. vehicle doors ajar)
	10, 11, 12, 13	Detect Stopped Vehicles, Emergency Vehicles, Lead Vehicle, Motorcyclists, School Buses
	6(, 1)	Detect Static Obstacles in the Path of the Vehicle
	6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	Detect Pedestrians and Bicyclists at Intersections, Crosswalks and in Road (Not Walking Through Intersection or Crosswalk)
	10, 11, 12	Detect Animals
	10, 12, 13	Detect instructions from Work Zones and People Directing Traffic in Unplanned or Planned Events, Police/First Responder Controlling Traffic, Construction Zone Workers Controlling, Citizens Directing Traffic After a Crash (Overriding or Acting as Traffic Control Device)

C. Perception of the environment

The purpose of this competence is to characterize and describe the road, which represents the most direct piece of environment of a vehicle. This involves two different aspects: characterize road surface geometry and detect road marks (lanes and complements traffic signs as stops, turns or stopping lines).

Road marks, as traffic signs, are designed to be detected and correctly interpreted by human drivers under a wide variety of external conditions. This is achieved using reflective painting and high contrast colors. Cameras and less frequently LiDARs have been used for detecting them. Road geometry description has been approached using cameras, LiDARs and radars.

In the following lines, the most relevant works about this topic are presented, organized by the type of sensor they use.

1) *Camera based solutions*: can be grouped in three categories depending on the specific sensor configuration.

Single Monocular: It is the simplest configuration. Using only one camera looking at the road in front of the vehicle it is possible to estimate the road shape and its lanes, the position of the vehicle in the road and to detect road marks that provide driving information. A survey of the most relevant algorithms used for this purpose, mainly for camera sensors is presented in [61].

Multiple Monocular cameras: Some works [62], [63] arrange multiple cameras around the vehicle (typically four, one on each side) to get 360-degree visual information of the surroundings of the vehicle. A different configuration is used in [64], where two lateral cameras are used to localize the vehicle.

Binocular or Stereo: The main advantage of using binocular cameras is that, as they provide 3D information, it is possible to detect the ground plane and road boundaries [65], [66], improving road mark detection.

2) *LiDAR based solutions*: Main application of LiDARs in road perception is related with detecting the ground plane and road limits, as well as detecting obstacles that could occlude parts of the road. In recent works, LiDAR based solutions also take advantage of the higher reflectivity of road marks with

respect to the pavement (gray and black material) to detect lane markings [67], [68] and pavement markings [69] Poor road maintenance can affect mark reflectivity to the point of making them undetectable by LiDAR. This can be solved by fusing LiDAR data with cameras able to perceive non reflective lane marks [62]. Some works use a 2D LiDAR sensor to extract road geometry and road marks [70], [71].

3) *Radar based solutions*: Radars have been used to determine road geometry based on the principle that the road acts as a mirror for the sensor, returning a very small amount of the emitted power, while the sides of the roads return a slightly higher amount of power. Road limits have been estimated using radar images, getting a maximum error of half a lane at zero distance from the host vehicle and less than one lane width at 50 meters distance. This information can be fused with camera images to improve both detections [72], [73], [74].

D. Vehicles, pedestrians and other obstacles detection

This section reviews the use of different sensors for detecting other elements in the road, including vehicles, pedestrians and any other kind of obstacle that may appear such as motorcycles, bicycles, animals, etc. The advantages and disadvantages of sensors for this application are discussed. This competence involves moving elements that can be in the path of the vehicle, so it requires extracting more information. Apart from detection and classification, it is also important to determine the position of obstacles with respect to the automated vehicle, their motion direction and speed, and future intentions when possible. This information will be the input to other systems like path planners or collision avoidance systems (reviewed in [75]).

1) *Camera based solutions*: The use of cameras for obstacle detection can be performed with different configurations as in the previous competences. Single monocular camera, multiple cameras, stereo cameras and infrared cameras are used in different works.

A camera can be placed on different locations. The front of the vehicle is the most common placement since the most

critical obstacles will be in front of the vehicle, but many works explored other positions in order to increase the FoV. On the side-view mirror, in the passengers window [76] or looking backwards [77], it is possible to detect and track vehicles trying to overtake the ego-vehicle, helping to take the decision of lane-change [78], [79], [80]. An omnidirectional camera mounted on the top of the vehicle has been used in [81] to detect obstacles and estimate ego-motion. In addition to monocular cameras, stereo cameras are widely used for obstacle detection as they provide 3D information of the position of the obstacles. A large review of the different algorithms used for this kind of cameras can be found in [82]. Infrared cameras are independent of scene illumination and can detect obstacles at night [83]. Relevant moving elements (vehicles, pedestrians, animals) are easy to detect with this type of cameras because they are usually hot, but it has to be complemented with a different obstacle detection source (like in [84]), since cold obstacles like parked vehicles or trees can be not perceived. [85] presents and explains in detail several camera solutions and the algorithms used for detection.

2) *LiDAR based solutions*: LiDAR technology allows to detect and classify surrounding elements, providing a very accurate 3D position and its shape. As it is an active sensor its performance is not affected by the illumination of the scene, so it can work also at night. Several approaches for LiDAR obstacle detection are shown in [86].

3) *Radar based solutions*: The primary use of automotive radars is detection and tracking of other vehicles on the road. They provide information of target position and relative speed, which is very useful for collision avoidance systems and path planning algorithms. Radars have the advantage of a good performance in adverse weather conditions (night, rain, fog, etc), and a large range of detection over 150 m [87]. Because of its low resolution radar detections are usually fused with other sensors as cameras [88] or, in some works, with LiDAR [89].

4) *Multiple sensors fusion solutions*: This competence requires estimating a large number of variables simultaneously, creating difficulties for any single sensor solution. This is a good scenario for sensor fusion systems, that can combine the strengths of each sensor to improve the solution. Almost every possible combination have been tested, including radar and vision, LiDAR and vision, radar and LiDAR, and other multiple modalities. The most common ones are described in the following lines. Radar and LiDAR fusion [89] increases the precision of the speed obtained only with LiDAR and keeps a good position and speed estimation quality when radar is unavailable (especially in curvy roads). Radar and vision fusion techniques use radar information to locate areas of interest on the images, which are then processed to detect vehicles and improve their position estimation [90]. LiDAR and vision sensors are fused in [91]. Obstacles are detected and tracked with the LiDAR, and the targets are classified using a combination of camera and LiDAR detections.

IV. RELEVANT WORKS AND DEMOS

This section describes some of the most relevant technological demonstrations, competitions, challenges and commercial

platforms related with automated driving, starting from pioneering works in late 1980s until present day. Figure 3 shows the timeline, with the focus on the sensors equipped by each platform.

The timeline allows to discern different stages ("ages") in the development of Automated Driving technology, and to identify trends and approaches from the perception point of view for Automated Vehicles.

A. Pioneer works (1980-2000)

Pioneer works in Automated Driving starts around mid-1980s. The Bundeswehr University of Munich developed automated vehicles based on visual guidance, as VaMoRs [92] and VaMP [93]. Perception was built over a saccadic vision system: cameras mounted on a rotating platform that allowed them to focus in relevant elements.

The Cybercar concept is born in early 1990s [94], and in 1997 a prototype is installed in Schiphol airport to transport passengers between the terminal and long stay parking [95]. The vehicle lacked pedals and steering wheels, and used a LiDAR and vision system to do automated driving in a dedicated lane with semaphores and pedestrian crossings.

Also in 1997, the National Automated Highway System Consortium presented a demonstration of Automated Driving functionalities [96], intended to be a proof of technical feasibility. The demo showed road following functionality based on vision sensors, distance maintenance based on LiDAR, vehicle following based on Radar and other functionalities including cooperative maneuvers and mixed environments.

The University of Parma started in 1996 a project with its vehicle ARGO [97], equipped with two cameras that allowed road following, platooning and obstacle avoidance. The vehicle completed over 2000 km of autonomous driving in public roads [98].

B. Proof of feasibility (2000-2010)

In year 2004 DARPA started its Grand Challenge series to foster development of Automated Driving technologies. The achievements over those three years not only represented a huge leap forward, but also called the attention of powerful agents.

Two first challenges (2004 and 2005) consisted in covering a route over dirt roads with off-road sections, with a strong focus in navigation and control. Stanford University won the 2005 edition, equipping its vehicle Stanley with 5 LiDAR units, a frontal camera, GPS sensors, an IMU, wheel odometry and two automotive radars [99]. The Urban Challenge (2007) changed the focus to interaction with other vehicles, pedestrians and obeying complex traffic regulations. Carnegie Mellon University team ended in first position with its vehicle Boss [100] [101], featuring a perception system composed by two video cameras, 5 radars and 13 LiDAR (including a roof mounted unit of the novel Velodyne 64HDL).

These events triggered the attention of Google. The company hired around 15 scientists from the DARPA challenge, including the winners of 2005 and 2007 [102], [103]. Google's (and Waymo's) approach to self-driving vehicles is largely




Fig. 3. Timeline of relevant AD demonstrators and its sensor setup for Perception systems

founded in LiDAR and 3D mapping technologies [104]. All their vehicles have had a roof-mounted spinning LiDAR: Toyota Prius (2009), the Firefly prototype (2014) and Chrysler Pacifica (2016-present).

Meanwhile, University of Parma created the spin-off VisLab in 2009. As opposed to Google approach, they represent one of the strongest supporters of artificial vision as the main component of perception systems for AD. In 2010 they completed the VisLab Intercontinental Autonomous Challenge (VIAC): four automated vans drove from Italy to China over public roads that included degraded dirt roads and unmapped areas [105]. The leading vehicle did perception (with cameras and LiDARs), decision and control, with some human intervention for selecting the route and managing critical situations [106]. In 2013 the PROUD test put a vehicle with no driver behind the wheel in Parma roads for doing urban driving in real traffic [107].

C. Race to commercial products (2010-present)

In the last decade the landscape of Automated Driving has been dominated by private initiatives that foresee the coming of Level 4 and 5 systems in a few years. This vision gave birth to several companies devoted to this end, most of which were founded by people coming from the DARPA experience, or hired them to lead the project [104].

Examples include the robotaxi company nuTonomy, co-founded by the leader of the MIT team in 2007 DARPA Urban Challenge. Cruise has been founded by a member of the same team. Otto was founded by an engineer in Google's Street View project. Uber hired up to 50 people from the CMU Robotics Lab for its self-driving car project. Zoox robotaxi company is co-founded by a member of the Stanford Autonomous Driving team [108], and Aurora has a similar story with people from Uber, MIT and Waymo [109].

Car manufacturers reacted a bit slower. Some of them started independent research lines, for example BMW has been testing automation prototypes in roads since 2011 [110] and Mercedes-Benz Bertha project [111] drove in 2013 a 103 km route in automated mode using close-to-market sensors (8 radars and 3 video cameras), but in the end most manufacturers have created coalitions with technological startups as enumerated in section V-B1.

Mobileye started working in a vision-only approach to Automated Driving [112] a few years ago. After testing in real conditions [113], they presented a demo with an automated Ford equipped just with 12 small monocular cameras for fully automated driving in 2018 [114].

Electric car manufacturer Tesla entered the automated driving scene in 2014. All their vehicles were equipped with a monocular camera (based on Mobileye system) and an automotive radar that enabled the Level 2-3 AutoPilot functionality. Starting 2017 new Tesla vehicles include the "version 2" hardware, composed by a frontal radar, 12 sonars, and 8 cameras. This sensor set is claimed to be enough for full Level 5 automated driving [115], which will be available for a fee (when ready) through a software update.

In 2015 VisLab was acquired by Ambarella, a company working on low power chips able to process high resolution

dense disparity maps from stereo cameras [116]. Its latest demo [117] fused data from 10 stereo pairs into a ultra-high resolution 3D scene delivering 900 million points per second. Long range vision mix a forward facing 4k stereo pair with a radar for better performance under low light or adverse weather conditions.

Delphi Automotive completed in 2015 an automated trip between San Francisco and New York city using a custom Audi Q5 with 10 radars, 6 LiDARs and 3 cameras onboard. In 2017 they acquired nuTonomy (the first company to deliver a robotaxi service in public roads) and created Aptiv. Aptiv presented an automated taxi for CES conference in january 2018, as part of a 20 vehicle fleet that has been serving a set of routes in Las Vegas for some months. The taxis have an extensive set of 10 radars and 9 LiDARs embedded in the bodywork, plus one camera.

Meanwhile, Waymo had grown a fleet of Chrysler Pacifica minivans that has self-driven 10 million miles by october 2018. They put efforts on improving production scalability and cutting prices of LiDAR sensors to less than one tenth in a few years. They claim to have created two “new categories of LiDAR” [118] in the way, one for close range perception including below the car, and the other for long range. The long-range LiDAR can reportedly zoom dynamically into objects on the road, letting the vehicle see small objects up to 200 m away. This reminds the features of OPA solid state LiDARs (see section II-C1): random sampling across the scanning area and adaptive resolution.

V. DISCUSSION

The last section of this article presents a discussion of the future challenges for sensors and perception systems in new automated vehicles, both from the technical and implantation point of view. A description of the next commercial initiatives and OEMs forecasts is shown followed by the final conclusions.

A. Future challenges

As shown in sections II and III there exist many works that solve the most important perception competences, based on different types of sensors and with a large variety of algorithms. However, there still exist some challenges that need to be solved in order to achieve a functional secure automated vehicle.

1) *Technical challenges*: Sensor setups in Automated Driving are usually focused on the areas relevant for the usual driving tasks (covered in section III). But for a commercial system expected to work in the real world there are still some specific challenges that do not have a proper solution yet.

Very short distance, including close to or below the car. A person, animal or object right below the vehicle or intersecting the path of the wheels represents a safety issue. While most situations can be anticipated when the element approaches the vehicle from the distance, it is not the case right before starting the vehicle, while executing high accuracy maneuvers in certain conditions (close to people or other moving elements).

This problem can be tackled by adding redundant sensors like [81] which uses a 360-degree-view parking system or a special LiDAR monitoring this area used by Waymo. In the future there will be a need of specific devices for this task.

Very long distance Detection and classification above 200 meters is an open issue. Among current approaches, Ambarella integrates a Ultra High Resolution camera (cited in IV) that is claimed to be enough for discerning small objects at that target distance, subject to the limitations of visible light cameras.

Solutions based on saliency (a common term in artificial vision [119], [120], [121] to name relevancy or importance) can be an alternative to the high resolution and computational cost associated to brute force approaches. Solid state LiDAR capable of random and adaptive sampling is a potential candidate solution for such technology, achieving something similar to Waymo’s claims about their custom built LiDARs.

Environmental and weather conditions Section II summarizes the suitability of common technologies under different conditions, some of which surpass human capacities. This is an always active field of research, following the road when most marks are covered by snow, improving detection under heavy rain or dense fog are examples of problems that can be solved at sensing level without requiring further efforts on processing algorithms.

2) *Implantation challenges*: The final goal of research in automated driving is to bring technologies to market, either for private customers or for shared applications (automated fleets). Commercialization and implantation is feasible only if products fulfill certain scalability, costs, and durability requirements. Some sensors are among the most expensive and fragile components of a vehicle, so their implantation is a key factor in the development of automated driving vehicles.

Production scalability and costs. Mature technologies as visible light cameras and radars have already scaled up their production and reduced costs so that every vehicle can equip them without a significant impact on its price. This remains a challenge for LiDAR devices and other breakthrough technologies. It is difficult to get an exact estimation of an acceptable cost, it depends on the use of the vehicle (private or commercial fleet) in between many other factors. For a discussion on costs and impact of Automated Mobility services, see [122].

Durability and tolerance to failure. The perception system of an Automated Vehicle must work for long periods under harsh conditions, as the rest of critical components in a vehicle. Low mean-time between-failures (as for mechanical LiDARs), external factors (a stone chip at high speeds can damage a sensor) or intentional attacks [123] are important factors to consider in the future sensors technologies.

B. Commercial initiatives

In the last decade the automotive market has grown the offer and complexity of ADAS [124]. The most requested ADAS in 2009 [125] were Anti-lock braking system and Parking Assistance by Warning (SAE Level 0). Today most advanced cars equip an ensemble of ADAS that place them between SAE Levels 2 and 3.

1) *OEMs in Automated Driving*: Around 2015 most important OEMs decided to take serious initiatives towards bringing high and fully Automated Driving (SAE Levels 4 and 5) to the market. In order to accelerate their roadmaps, they established alliances with technological companies startups and technology/research centers that can hint about their approach to Automated Driving.

Table III shows a resume of the most promising research and collaboration for Automated Driving with OEMs involved. The most relevant works are leaded by Ford, GM and Daimler, based on LiDARs, cameras and radar technologies. However, the influences of Waymo and Tesla, and the alliances with other actors (i.e.: NVIDIA, Apple or Intel-Mobileye) plays an important role in this automated race. Another important consideration is that most of the OEMs started their Automated program just two years ago.

C. Conclusions

Choosing the sensors configuration of an automated vehicle can be challenging. Each sensor has different strengths and weaknesses regarding the type of information acquired, overall accuracy and quality and working conditions. This survey has reviewed the most popular sensors technologies, describing their characteristics and how they are applied to get useful information to solve the main perception competences. The relevant works and demos section provide a good perspective of how different manufacturers and research groups do perception tasks and which kind of sensors they use for that purpose. Finally, the section V-B1 can form an intuition about where are the manufacturers going in the autonomous vehicle process and how are they planning to get there.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been partly supported by ECSEL Project ENABLE-S3 (with grant agreement number 692455-2), by the Spanish Government through CICYT projects (TRA2015-63708-R and TRA2016-78886-C3-1-R), and Comunidad de Madrid through SEGVAUTO-TRIES (S2013/MIT-2713).

REFERENCES

- [1] W. H. Organization, *Global status report on road safety 2015*. World Health Organization, 2015.
- [2] P. Thomas, A. Morris, R. Talbot, and H. Fagerlind, "Identifying the causes of road crashes in Europe," *Annals of advances in automotive medicine. Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine. Scientific Conference*, vol. 57, pp. 13–22, 2013.
- [3] S. Behere and M. Torngren, "A functional architecture for autonomous driving," in *Automotive Software Architecture (WASA), 2015 First International Workshop on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 3–10.
- [4] NTSB, "NTSB Opens Docket on Tesla Crash," p. 702, 2017. <https://www.nts.gov/news/press-releases/Pages/PR20170619.aspx>
- [5] —, "Preliminary Report HWY18FH011," Tech. Rep., 2018. <https://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/HWY18FH011-preliminary.aspx>
- [6] —, "Preliminary Report HWY18MH010," National Transportation Safety Board, Tech. Rep., 2018. <https://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/HWY18MH010-prelim.pdf>
- [7] S. Yenkanchi, "Multi Sensor Data Fusion for Autonomous Vehicles," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Windsor, 2016. <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/5680>
- [8] A. Ziebinski, R. Cupek, H. Erdogan, and S. Waechter, "A survey of ADAS technologies for the future perspective of sensor fusion," *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 9876 LNCS, pp. 135–146, 2016.
- [9] S. Pendleton, H. Andersen, X. Du, X. Shen, M. Meghjani, Y. Eng, D. Rus, and M. Ang, "Perception, Planning, Control, and Coordination for Autonomous Vehicles," *Machines*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 6, feb 2017.
- [10] R. O'Malley, M. Glavin, and E. Jones, "A review of automotive infrared pedestrian detection techniques," *Signals and Systems Conference, 208.(ISSC 2008). IET Irish*, pp. 168–173, 2008.
- [11] B. Besbes, A. Rogozan, A. M. Rus, A. Bensrhair, and A. Broggi, "Pedestrian detection in far-infrared daytime images using a hierarchical codebook of surf," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 8570–8594, apr 2015.
- [12] N. Pinchon, O. Cassignol, A. Nicolas, F. Bernardin, P. Leduc, J.-P. Tarel, R. Brémond, E. Bercier, and J. Brunet, "All-Weather Vision for Automotive Safety: Which Spectral Band?" in *Advanced Microsystems for Automotive Applications 2018*. Springer, Cham, sep 2018, pp. 3–15.
- [13] S. Maddalena, A. Darmon, and R. Diels, "Automotive CMOS image sensors," *Advanced Microsystems for Automotive ...*, pp. 401–412, 2005.
- [14] M. Strobel and D. Döttling, "High dynamic range CMOS (HDRC) imagers for safety systems," *Advanced Optical Technologies*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 147–157, jan 2013.
- [15] B. Pueo, "High speed cameras for motion analysis in sports science," *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 53–73, dec 2016.
- [16] R. A. Hamzah and H. Ibrahim, "Literature survey on stereo vision disparity map algorithms," *Journal of Sensors*, vol. 2016, pp. 1–23, dec 2016.
- [17] J. Engel, T. Schöps, and D. Cremers, "LSD-SLAM: Large-Scale Direct monocular SLAM," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 8690 LNCS, no. PART 2. Springer, Cham, 2014, pp. 834–849.
- [18] J. Engel, V. Koltun, and D. Cremers, "Direct Sparse Odometry," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 611–625, jul 2018.
- [19] P. Garbat, W. Skarbek, and M. Tomaszewski, "Structured light camera calibration," *Opto-electronics Review*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 23–38, jan 2013.
- [20] M. Hansard, L. Seungkyu, C. Ouk, and R. Horaud, *Time-of-Flight Cameras Principles, Methods and Applications*. Springer, 2011.
- [21] F. Villa, R. Lussana, D. Bronzi, F. Zappa, and A. Giudice, "3D SPAD camera for Advanced Driver Assistance," *2017 International Conference of Electrical and Electronic Technologies for Automotive*, no. November, 2017.
- [22] Panasonic, "Panasonic Develops Long-range TOF Image Sensor," 2018. <https://news.panasonic.com/global/press/data/2018/06/en180619-3/en180619-3.html>
- [23] E. Mueggler, B. Huber, and D. Scaramuzza, "Event-based, 6-DOF pose tracking for high-speed maneuvers," in *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, sep 2014, pp. 2761–2768.
- [24] A. Censi and D. Scaramuzza, "Low-Latency Event-Based Visual Odometry," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, Hong Kong, 2014, pp. 703–710.
- [25] A. R. Vidal, H. Rebecq, T. Horstschaefer, and D. Scaramuzza, "Ultimate SLAM? Combining Events, Images, and IMU for Robust Visual SLAM in HDR and High Speed Scenarios," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2017.
- [26] M. Garcia, T. Davis, S. Blair, N. Cui, and V. Gruev, "Bioinspired polarization imager with high dynamic range," *Optica*, vol. 5, no. 10, p. 1240, oct 2018.
- [27] J. Hasch, "Driving towards 2020: Automotive radar technology trends," in *2015 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility, ICMIM 2015*. IEEE, apr 2015, pp. 1–4.
- [28] G. Reina, D. Johnson, and J. Underwood, "Radar sensing for intelligent vehicles in urban environments," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 14661–14678, jun 2015.
- [29] M. Schneider, "Automotive Radar - Status and Trends," Tech. Rep., 2005. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.329.35711&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [30] D. Kissinger, *Millimeter-Wave Receiver Concepts for 77 GHz Automotive Radar in Silicon-Germanium Technology*, ser.

TABLE III
OEM PROJECTS AND ALLIANCES IN AUTOMATED DRIVING

OEM	Test site	Technologies	Since	Collaborations	Forecast	Test fleet
Ford	Detroit, Arizona & California (USA)	LiDAR, and mapping	~2016	Argo, Velodyne, SAIPS, civilmaps.	Level 4 (2021)	Fusion Hybrid (~100 by 2018)
GM	Detroit, S. Francisco & Scottsdale (USA)	LiDAR, HD map, radar, camera	~2016	Waymo and Jaguar-Land Rover	2020 (Fortune)	~50 vehicles (2017)
Renault-Nissan	Japan, USA & China	Front radar, LiDAR. Speed/steering control	~2017	Transdev, Microsoft.	<2030 (Level 5) 2020 (Level 3)	—
Daimler	Germany	Vision, data fusion, radar.	2015	Bosch	2020	Commercial cars (Level 2)
Volkswagen-Audi Group	Germany	LiDAR, data fusion, adaptive cruise control, Traffic Jam Assist, self-parking	2015	Delphi (2015) Aurora (2017)	2025 (Level 4)	Commercial cars (Level 3, Traffic Jams)
BMW	Germany, China	Vision, LiDAR, DGPS	2011	Intel, Baidu, HERE	2022 (Level 5)	Commercial cars (Level 2)
Waymo	California (USA)	LiDAR, vision system, radar, data fusion, RT Path plan..	2010	Fiat-Chrysler, Velodyne.	—	100 autonomous Pacifica minivans
Volvo	Sweden. & Uber: San Francisco, Pittsburgh	Vision, LiDAR, GPS, V2I	2011	Uber (U.S), Autoliv (Sweden)	~2020	Commercial cars (Level 2)
Tesla	USA	Camera, radar, AI	~2015	Apple, Mobileye and Nvidia	~2020 Level 5)	Commercial cars (Level 2)
Hyundai	South Korea	AI, LiDAR, Camera	2014	KIA, Aurora	AD Level 3. 2020 (Highways). 2030 (city streets)	—

SpringerBriefs in Electrical and Computer Engineering. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2012.

- [31] M. Köhler, J. Hasch, H. L. Blöcher, and L. P. Schmidt, "Feasibility of automotive radar at frequencies beyond 100 GHz," *International Journal of Microwave and Wireless Technologies*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 49–54, feb 2013.
- [32] E. Brookner, "Metamaterial Advances for Radar and Communications," in *IEEE International Symposium on Phased Array Systems and Technology (PAST)*. IEEE, oct 2016, pp. 1–9.
- [33] T. Sleasman, M. Boyarsky, L. Pulido-Mancera, T. Fromenteze, M. F. Imani, M. S. Reynolds, and D. R. Smith, "Experimental Synthetic Aperture Radar with Dynamic Metasurfaces," *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 6864–6877, feb 2017.
- [34] Metawave, "Metawave - Revolutionizing the Future of Wireless Communications," 2018. <https://www.metawave.co/>
- [35] C. Glennie and D. D. Lichti, "Static calibration and analysis of the velodyne HDL-64E S2 for high accuracy mobile scanning," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 1610–1624, jun 2010.
- [36] M. Wang, W.-Q. Liu, Y.-H. Lu, X.-S. Zhao, B.-C. Song, Y.-J. Zhang, Y.-P. Wang, C.-H. Lian, J. Chen, Y. Cheng, J.-G. Liu, and Q.-N. Wei, "Study on the measurement of the atmospheric extinction of fog and rain by forward-scattering near infrared spectroscopy," *Guang Pu Xue Yu Guang Pu Fen Xi/Spectroscopy and Spectral Analysis*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1776–80, aug 2008.
- [37] T. G. Phillips, N. Guenther, and P. R. McAree, "When the Dust Settles: The Four Behaviors of LiDAR in the Presence of Fine Airborne Particulates," *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 985–1009, aug 2017.
- [38] D. Nordin, "Optical Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) Range and Velocity Measurements," *Thesis*, p. 110, 2004.
- [39] C. V. Poulton, D. B. Cole, A. Yaacobi, and M. R. Watts, "Frequency-modulated Continuous-wave LIDAR Module in Silicon Photonics," in *Optical Fiber Communication Conference*, no. c, Anaheim, 2016, pp. 4–6.
- [40] P. Olivier, "LEDDAR optical Time-of-Flight sensing technology: A new approach to detection and ranging," LeddarTech, Quebec, Tech. Rep., 2016. https://leddartech.com/app/uploads/dlm_uploads/2016/02/Leddar-Optical-Time-of-Flight-Sensing-Technology-1.pdf
- [41] P. F. Mcmanamon, T. A. Dorschner, D. L. Corkum, L. J. Friedman, D. S. Hobbs, M. Holz, S. Liberman, H. Q. Nguyen, D. P. Resler, R. C. Sharp, E. A. Watson, T. A. Dorschner, L. J. Friedman, D. S. Hobbs, M. Holz, D. P. Resler, and R. C. Sharp, "Optical phased array technology," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 268–298, feb 1996.
- [42] L. Eldada, "LiDAR and the Autonomous Vehicle Revolution for Truck and Ride Sharing Fleets," San Francisco, 2017. https://higherlogicdownload.s3.amazonaws.com/AUVSI/14c12c18-fde1-4c1d-8548-035ad166c766/UploadedImages/2017/PDFs/Proceedings/ESS/Wednesday1330-1400_{_}LouayEldada.pdf
- [43] B. Schoettle, "Sensor Fusion: A Comparison of Sensing Capabilities of Human Drivers and Highly Automated Vehicles," University of Michigan, Tech. Rep. SWT-2017-12, 2017. http://www.umich.edu/{_}umtriswt.
- [44] C. Nowakowski, S. E. Shladover, C.-Y. Chan, and H.-S. Tan, "Development of California Regulations to Govern Testing and Operation of Automated Driving Systems," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, vol. 2489, pp. 137–144, 2015.
- [45] NHTSA, "Federal Automated Vehicles Policy," NHTSA, Tech. Rep. September, 2016. https://www.transportation.gov/AV{_%}0Apapers3:/publication/uuid/2E47DA05-79E3-4DA5-BE3B-B172900149A1
- [46] Waymo, "On the Road to Fully Self-Driving," Waymo, Tech. Rep., 2017. <https://storage.googleapis.com/sdc-prod/v1/safety-report/waymo-safety-report-2017-10.pdf>
- [47] D. Frejlichowski, "Application of the polar-fourier greyscale descriptor to the automatic traffic sign recognition," in *International Conference Image Analysis and Recognition*. Springer, 2015, pp. 506–513.
- [48] J. Gao, Y. Fang, and X. Li, "Learning local histogram representation for efficient traffic sign recognition," in *Image and Signal Processing (CISP), 2015 8th International Congress on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 631–635.
- [49] J. Zhang, M. Huang, X. Jin, and X. Li, "A real-time chinese traffic sign detection algorithm based on modified yolov2," *Algorithms*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 127, 2017.
- [50] G. Villalón-Sepúlveda, M. Torres-Torriti, and M. Flores-Calero, "Traffic sign detection system for locating road intersections and roundabouts: the chilean case," *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 6, p. 1207, 2017.
- [51] S. Hosseinyalamdary and A. Yilmaz, "A bayesian approach to traffic light detection and mapping," *ISPRS journal of photogrammetry and remote sensing*, vol. 125, pp. 184–192, 2017.
- [52] Y. Gu, T. Yendo, M. P. Tehrani, T. Fujii, and M. Tanimoto, "Traffic sign detection in dual-focal active camera system," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2011 IEEE*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1054–1059.
- [53] S. Miyata, "Automatic recognition of speed limits on speed-limit signs

- by using machine learning,” *Journal of Imaging*, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 25, 2017.
- [54] Y. Yang, H. Luo, H. Xu, and F. Wu, “Towards real-time traffic sign detection and classification,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 2022–2031, 2016.
 - [55] S. B. Wali, M. A. Hannan, A. Hussain, and S. A. Samad, “An automatic traffic sign detection and recognition system based on colour segmentation, shape matching, and svm,” *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 2015, 2015.
 - [56] R. Timofte, K. Zimmermann, and L. Van Gool, “Multi-view traffic sign detection, recognition, and 3d localisation,” *Machine vision and applications*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 633–647, 2014.
 - [57] S. Gargoum, K. El-Basyouny, J. Sabbagh, and K. Froese, “Automated highway sign extraction using lidar data,” *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 2643, pp. 1–8, 2017.
 - [58] S. Weng, J. Li, Y. Chen, and C. Wang, “Road traffic sign detection and classification from mobile lidar point clouds,” in *2nd ISPRS International Conference on Computer Vision in Remote Sensing (CVRS 2015)*, vol. 9901. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2016, p. 99010A.
 - [59] L. Zhou and Z. Deng, “Lidar and vision-based real-time traffic sign detection and recognition algorithm for intelligent vehicle,” in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2014 IEEE 17th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 578–583.
 - [60] H. Guan, W. Yan, Y. Yu, L. Zhong, and D. Li, “Robust traffic-sign detection and classification using mobile lidar data with digital images,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 2018.
 - [61] A. B. Hillel, R. Lerner, D. Levi, and G. Raz, “Recent progress in road and lane detection: a survey,” *Machine vision and applications*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 727–745, 2014.
 - [62] H. Lee, S. Kim, S. Park, Y. Jeong, H. Lee, and K. Yi, “Avm/lidar sensor based lane marking detection method for automated driving on complex urban roads,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2017 IEEE*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1434–1439.
 - [63] C.-H. Kum, D.-C. Cho, M.-S. Ra, and W.-Y. Kim, “Lane detection system with around view monitoring for intelligent vehicle,” in *SoC Design Conference (ISOCC), 2013 International*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 215–218.
 - [64] S.-S. Ieng and D. Gruyer, “Merging lateral cameras information with proprioceptive sensors in vehicle location gives centimetric precision,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Nagoya, Japan: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, may 2003.
 - [65] M. Schreiber, C. Knöppel, and U. Franke, “Laneloc: Lane marking based localization using highly accurate maps,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2013 IEEE*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 449–454.
 - [66] U. Ozgunalp, R. Fan, X. Ai, and N. Dahnoun, “Multiple lane detection algorithm based on novel dense vanishing point estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 621–632, 2017.
 - [67] B. Yang, L. Fang, Q. Li, and J. Li, “Automated extraction of road markings from mobile lidar point clouds,” *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 331–338, 2012.
 - [68] T. Li and D. Zhidong, “A new 3d lidar-based lane markings recognition approach,” in *Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 2197–2202.
 - [69] H. Zhang, “Rapid Inspection of Pavement Markings Using Mobile Laser Scanning Point Clouds,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, mar 2016. <https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/handle/10012/10343>
 - [70] Y. Nie, Q. Chen, T. Chen, Z. Sun, and B. Dai, “Camera and lidar fusion for road intersection detection,” in *Electrical & Electronics Engineering (EESYM), 2012 IEEE Symposium on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 273–276.
 - [71] D. Kim, T. Chung, and K. Yi, “Lane map building and localization for automated driving using 2d laser rangefinder,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2015 IEEE*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 680–685.
 - [72] K. Kaliyaperumal, S. Lakshmanan, and K. Kluge, “An algorithm for detecting roads and obstacles in radar images,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 170–182, 2001.
 - [73] B. Ma, S. Lakshmanan, and A. O. Hero, “Simultaneous detection of lane and pavement boundaries using model-based multisensor fusion,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 135–147, 2000.
 - [74] F. Janda, S. Pangerl, E. Lang, and E. Fuchs, “Road boundary detection for run-off road prevention based on the fusion of video and radar,” in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*. IEEE, jun 2013, pp. 1173–1178.
 - [75] A. Mukhtar, L. Xia, and T. B. Tang, “Vehicle detection techniques for collision avoidance systems: A review,” *IEEE Trans. Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 2318–2338, 2015.
 - [76] W.-C. Chang and C.-W. Cho, “Real-time side vehicle tracking using parts-based boosting,” in *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 2008. SMC 2008. IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 3370–3375.
 - [77] W. Liu, X. Wen, B. Duan, H. Yuan, and N. Wang, “Rear vehicle detection and tracking for lane change assist,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2007 IEEE*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 252–257.
 - [78] J. D. Alonso, E. R. Vidal, A. Rotter, and M. Muhlenberg, “Lane-change decision aid system based on motion-driven vehicle tracking,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 2736–2746, 2008.
 - [79] K.-T. Song and H.-Y. Chen, “Lateral driving assistance using optical flow and scene analysis,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2007 IEEE*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 624–629.
 - [80] N. Blanc, B. Steux, and T. Hinz, “Larasidecam: A fast and robust vision-based blindspot detection system,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2007 IEEE*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 480–485.
 - [81] T. Gandhi and M. M. Trivedi, “Vehicle surround capture: Survey of techniques and a novel omni-video-based approach for dynamic panoramic surround maps,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 293–308, 2006.
 - [82] N. Bernini, M. Bertozzi, L. Castangia, M. Patander, and M. Sabbatelli, “Real-time obstacle detection using stereo vision for autonomous ground vehicles: A survey,” in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2014 IEEE 17th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 873–878.
 - [83] D. Olmeda, C. Premebida, U. Nunes, J. M. Armingol, and A. de la Escalera, “Pedestrian detection in far infrared images,” *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 347–360, 2013.
 - [84] S. J. Krotosky and M. M. Trivedi, “On color-, infrared-, and multimodal-stereo approaches to pedestrian detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 619–629, 2007.
 - [85] S. Sivaraman and M. M. Trivedi, “Looking at vehicles on the road: A survey of vision-based vehicle detection, tracking, and behavior analysis,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1773–1795, 2013.
 - [86] B. Li, T. Zhang, and T. Xia, “Vehicle detection from 3d lidar using fully convolutional network,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.07916*, 2016.
 - [87] C. Blanc, R. Aufrere, L. Malaterre, J. Gallice, and J. Alizon, “Obstacle detection and tracking by millimeter wave radar,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 322–327, 2004.
 - [88] F. Garcia, P. Cerri, A. Broggi, A. de la Escalera, and J. M. Armingol, “Data fusion for overtaking vehicle detection based on radar and optical flow,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2012 IEEE*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 494–499.
 - [89] D. Göhring, M. Wang, M. Schnürmacher, and T. Ganjineh, “Radar/lidar sensor fusion for car-following on highways,” in *Automation, Robotics and Applications (ICARA), 2011 5th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 407–412.
 - [90] G. Alessandretti, A. Broggi, and P. Cerri, “Vehicle and guard rail detection using radar and vision data fusion,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 95–105, 2007.
 - [91] C. Premebida, G. Monteiro, U. Nunes, and P. Peixoto, “A Lidar and vision-based approach for pedestrian and vehicle detection and tracking,” in *IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, Proceedings, ITSC*. IEEE, sep 2007, pp. 1044–1049.
 - [92] E. Dickmanns and A. Zapp, “Autonomous High Speed Road Vehicle Guidance by Computer Vision 1,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 221–226, jul 1987.
 - [93] R. Gregor, M. Lützel, M. Pellkofer, K. H. Siedersberger, and E. D. Dickmanns, “EMS-Vision: A Perceptual System for Autonomous Vehicles,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 48–59, mar 2002.
 - [94] M. Parent and P. Daviet, “Automatic Driving For Small Public Urban Vehicles,” in *Proceedings of the Intelligent Vehicles '93 Symposium*. IEEE, 1993, pp. 402–407.
 - [95] U. Ozguner, T. Acarman, and K. Redmill, *Autonomous Ground Vehicles*. Artech House, 2007.
 - [96] C. Thorpe, T. Jochem, and D. Pomerleau, “The 1997 automated highway free agent demonstration,” in *Proceedings of Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*. IEEE, 1997, pp. 496–501.

- [97] A. Broggi, M. Bertozzi, A. Fascioli, and G. Conte, “the Experience of the ARGO Autonomous Vehicle,” in *Enhanced and Synthetic Vision*, J. G. Verly, Ed., vol. 3364. International Society for Optics and Photonics, jul 1998, pp. 218–229.
- [98] —, *Automatic Vehicle Guidance : the Experience of the ARGO Autonomous Vehicle*. World Scientific, 1999.
- [99] S. Thrun, M. Montemerlo, H. Dahlkamp, and A. Et, “The robot that won the DARPA Grand Challenge,” *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 23-9, no. 9, pp. 661–692, 2006.
- [100] Tartan Racing, “Boss at a glance,” 2005. <http://www.tartanracing.org/press/boss-glance.pdf>
- [101] C. Urmson, “DARPA Urban Challenge Final Report for Tartan Racing,” Tech. Rep., 2007. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3116/38e299acef3cbd3423649b77ef73c2a94fc1.pdf>
- [102] M. Montemerlo, J. Becker, S. Bhat, H. Dahlkamp, D. Dolgov, S. Ettinger, D. Haehnel, T. Hilden, G. Hoffmann, B. Huhnke, D. Johnston, S. Klumpp, D. Langer, A. Levandowski, J. Levinson, J. Marcil, D. Orenstein, J. Paefgen, I. Penny, A. Petrovskaya, M. Pflueger, G. Stanek, D. Stavens, A. Vogt, and S. Thrun, “Junior: the Stanford entry in the Urban Challenge,” *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 569–597, sep 2008.
- [103] J. Levinson, J. Askeland, J. Becker, J. Dolson, D. Held, S. Kammel, J. Z. Kolter, D. Langer, O. Pink, V. Pratt, M. Sokolsky, G. Stanek, D. Stavens, A. Teichman, M. Werling, and S. Thrun, “Towards fully autonomous driving: Systems and algorithms,” in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*. IEEE, jun 2011, pp. 163–168.
- [104] L. Chapell, “The Big Bang of autonomous driving,” 2016. <http://www.autonews.com/article/20161219/OEM06/312199908/the-big-bang-of-autonomous-driving>
- [105] M. Bertozzi, A. Broggi, E. Cardarelli, R. I. Fedriga, L. Mazzei, and P. P. Porta, “VIAC expedition toward autonomous mobility,” in *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 3, sep 2011, pp. 120–124.
- [106] A. Broggi, P. Medici, P. Zani, A. Coati, and M. Panciroli, “Autonomous vehicles control in the VisLab Intercontinental Autonomous Challenge,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 161–171, apr 2012.
- [107] A. Broggi, S. Cattani, P. Medici, and P. Zani, “Applications of computer vision to vehicles: An extreme test,” *Studies in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 411, pp. 215–250, 2013.
- [108] J. Levinson, “Automatic Laser Calibration, Mapping, and Localization for Autonomous Vehicles,” Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 2011. <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/9275866>
- [109] S. J. Anderson, S. B. Karumanchi, K. Iagnemma, and J. M. Walker, “The intelligent copilot: A constraint-based approach to shared-adaptive control of ground vehicles,” *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 45–54, 2013.
- [110] M. Aeberhard, S. Rauch, M. Bahram, G. Tanzmeister, J. Thomas, Y. Pilat, F. Himm, W. Huber, and N. Kaempchen, “Experience, results and lessons learned from automated driving on Germany’s highways,” *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 42–57, 2015.
- [111] J. Ziegler, P. Bender, M. Schreiber, H. Lategahn, T. Strauss, C. Stiller, T. Dang, U. Franke, N. Appenrodt, C. G. Keller, E. Kaus, R. G. Herrtwich, C. Rabe, D. Pfeiffer, F. Lindner, F. Stein, F. Erbs, M. Enzweiler, C. Knoppel, J. Hipp, M. Haukeis, M. Trepte, C. Brenk, A. Tamke, M. Ghanaat, M. Braun, A. Joos, H. Fritz, H. Mock, M. Hein, and E. Zeeb, “Making bertha drive-an autonomous journey on a historic route,” *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 8–20, 2014.
- [112] Mobileye, “Our Technology - Mobileye,” 2018. <https://www.mobileye.com/our-technology/>
- [113] S. Edelstein, “Intel/Mobileye Self-Driving Cars Begin Testing in Jerusalem - The Drive,” 2018. <http://www.thedrive.com/tech/20919/intel-mobileye-self-driving-cars-begin-testing-in-jerusalem>
- [114] S. Scheer, “Exclusive: Intel’s Mobileye gets self-driving tech deal for 8 million cars,” 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-israel-tech-intel-mobileye-exclusive/exclusive-intels-mobileye-gets-self-driving-tech-deal-for-8-million-cars-idUSKCN11I0K7>
- [115] A. Hawkins, “Tesla has been working on a backup plan in case its self-driving promises fail,” 2017. <https://www.theverge.com/2017/8/9/16119746/tesla-self-driving-hardware-upgrade-hw-2-5>
- [116] Ambarella, “Ambarella Introduces CV2 4K Computer Vision SoC with CVflow Architecture and Stereovision,” 2018. <https://www.ambarella.com/news/122/74/Ambarella-Introduces-CV2-4K-Computer-Vision-SoC-with-CVflow-Architecture-and-Stereovision>
- [117] AUVSI, “Ambarella testing its fully autonomous EVA vehicle on the roads of Silicon Valley —,” 2018. <https://www.auvsi.org/industry-news/ambarella-testing-its-fully-autonomous-eva-vehicle-roads-silicon-valley>
- [118] W. team, “Introducing Waymo’s suite of custom-built, self-driving hardware,” 2017. <https://medium.com/waymo/introducing-waymo-suite-of-custom-built-self-driving-hardware-c47d1714563>
- [119] L. Zhang, L. Yang, and T. Luo, “Unified saliency detection model using color and texture features,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. e0149328, 2016.
- [120] A. Palazzi, D. Abati, S. Calderara, F. Solera, and R. Cucchiara, “Predicting the Driver’s Focus of Attention: the DR(eye)VE Project,” (preprint) *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, may 2018.
- [121] P. Duthon, M. Colomb, and L. J. Kuntzmann, “Visual saliency on the road: model and database dependent detection,” in *Actes du 20ème congrès national sur la Reconnaissance des Formes et l’Intelligence Artificielle*, jun 2016.
- [122] P. M. Bösch, F. Becker, H. Becker, and K. W. Axhausen, “Cost-based analysis of autonomous mobility services,” *Transport Policy*, vol. 64, pp. 76–91, may 2018.
- [123] J. Petit, B. Stottelaar, M. Feiri, and F. Kargl, “Remote Attacks on Automated Vehicles Sensors: Experiments on Camera and LiDAR,” in *Black Hat Europe*, 2015, pp. 1–13.
- [124] J. Pérez, D. Gonzalez, and V. Milanés, “Vehicle Control in ADAS Applications: State of the Art,” in *Intelligent Transport Systems: Technologies and Applications*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, oct 2016, pp. 206–219. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/9781118894774.ch11>
- [125] Frost & Sullivan, “2009 European Consumers Desirability and Willingness to Pay for Advanced Safety and Driver Assistance Systems Market Research,” Tech. Rep., 2010. <https://store.frost.com/2009-european-consumers-desirability-and-willingness-to-pay-for-advanced-safety-and-driver-assistance-systems.html>



Enrique Martí is a Senior Researcher on Automated Driving at Tecnalia Research and Innovation since 2017. He holds a B.E. degree in Computer Sciences (2009), a M.Sc. in Computer Science and Technology (2010) and a PhD (2015) from University Carlos III de Madrid, with a thesis on sensor fusion systems sensitive to context information. He has more than 10 years of experience in Sensor Fusion and Estimation, including participation in national and European R&D projects and creation of commercial information fusion products for large scale surveillance. He has worked as Lead Engineer in Navigation and Localization systems in a private company building custom UAVs for industrial inspection. His research interests include sensor technologies, information fusion, estimation techniques, machine learning and optimization applied to automated vehicles.



Miguel Ángel de Miguel was born in Madrid, Spain in 1993. He received the B.S degree in electronics engineering in 2015 and the M.S. degree in industrial engineering in 2017, both from University Carlos III de Madrid. In 2013 he joined the Intelligent Systems Lab where he has collaborated in industrial research projects for three years. Currently, he is a Ph.D. student and an assistant lecturer in the university he studied. His research interests include the areas of path planning and control with a focus on applications for autonomous vehicles.



Fernando García is Visiting Professor at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid. Where he focuses his researches in Intelligent Vehicles and Intelligent Transportation Systems involving the use of Computer Vision, Sensor Fusion, and Human Factors, as well as Vehicle Communication. He has been recipient of the Master in Robotics and Automatics Scholarship at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid in 2008, the Barreiros Foundation Award in the domain of Automotive and Vehicle Applications in Spain in 2014 and finalist to the best PhD Thesis Dissertation

Award in the period 2013-2015 given by ITSS Spanish Chapter, and the award to the innovation in the automotive sector, diagnosis "Galeria de innovacin Motortec 2015". He has organization experience in the ITSS conferences and is member of the BoG and Vice-president of the Spanish Chapter of the IEEE-ITSS since January 2017.



Joshué Pérez is a Research leader on Automated Driving at Tecnia Research and Innovation, since 2015. He received the B.E. degree in electronic engineering from the Simón Bolívar University, Venezuela, in 2007. His M.E. degree and his Ph.D. degree from the University Complutense of Madrid were achieved in 2009 and 2012, respectively. He received the best PhD thesis award in intelligent control from the Spanish Committee of Automation (CEA). He has more than 11 years of experience in the Intelligent Transportation System field, where he

has been working in national and European projects ranging from ADAS up to fully automated vehicles. His research interests include fuzzy logic, modeling, control, path planning, Cybercars, cooperative maneuvers, automated vehicles, Shared Control, and vehicle standards. He is associate editor of IEEE Intelligent Vehicle Symposium. In 2014, he was guest editors of the IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine, in the special issue of ELECTRO-MOBILITY. He has technically led 20+ EU and national projects for demonstrating different ADAS technologies. He has more than 100 publications related to Automated Driving, ADAS and cooperative maneuvers.