
**Road vehicles — Ergonomic aspects
of transport information and control
systems (TICS) — Procedures for
determining priority of on-board
messages presented to drivers**

*Véhicules routiers — Aspects ergonomiques des systèmes de
commande et d'information du transport (TICS) — Modes opératoires
pour la détermination de la priorité des messages embarqués
présentés aux conducteurs*

[ISO/TS 16951:2021](https://standards.iso.org/iso/16951-2021)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021>



iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/TS 16951:2021](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021>



COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT

© ISO 2021

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, or required in the context of its implementation, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office
CP 401 • Ch. de Blandonnet 8
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva
Phone: +41 22 749 01 11
Email: copyright@iso.org
Website: www.iso.org

Published in Switzerland

Contents

	Page
Foreword.....	iv
Introduction.....	v
1 Scope.....	1
2 Normative references.....	1
3 Terms and definitions.....	1
4 Data collection for the priority index procedure.....	3
4.1 General.....	3
4.2 Appoint an examiner.....	3
4.3 Identify and assemble messages.....	3
4.4 Define driving context and situation.....	3
4.4.1 Consider the sensing capability of the vehicle.....	3
4.4.2 Factors to consider in developing the driving scenarios.....	4
4.4.3 Document the driving context and situation.....	4
4.5 Select the evaluators.....	5
4.6 Evaluate criticality and urgency of a message.....	6
4.7 Instructions for the examiner.....	6
4.8 Alternative method for determining message priority.....	7
5 Data analysis for priority index.....	8
5.1 General.....	8
5.2 Select weights.....	8
5.3 Calculate priority, p_j	8
5.4 Calculate arithmetic mean and standard deviation of priority index across evaluators for each message.....	9
5.5 Calculate P_j and σ_j	9
5.6 Determine priority order.....	9
5.7 Evaluate data quality.....	10
6 Application of results.....	10
6.1 Prioritization of priority ranking.....	10
6.2 How to deal with additional messages.....	10
6.3 Documentation.....	10
6.4 Other.....	11
Annex A (normative) Priority matrix method.....	12
Annex B (informative) System reaction matrix for priority matrix method.....	16
Annex C (informative) Rationale for recommended number of evaluators for priority index method.....	18
Annex D (informative) Example evaluator profile.....	21
Annex E (informative) Driving scenarios.....	22
Annex F (informative) Criticality and urgency as the evaluation criteria.....	25
Annex G (informative) Deriving weight k_c and k_u.....	26
Annex H (informative) Sample report format.....	28
Annex I (informative) “Acceptable” standard deviations σ_j for priority indexes.....	29
Bibliography.....	31

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see www.iso.org/patents).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation of the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

This document was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 22, *Road vehicles*, Subcommittee SC 39, *Ergonomics*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first edition (ISO/TS 16951:2004), which has been technically revised.

The main changes compared to the previous edition are as follows:

- formulae and other errors corrected;
- editorial updates.

Any feedback or questions on this document should be directed to the user's national standards body. A complete listing of these bodies can be found at www.iso.org/members.html.

Introduction

When multiple in-vehicle information systems are present, including both transport information and control systems (TICS) and non-TICS, various kinds of messages will be presented to drivers from these systems and displayed at various times. If these messages are not managed properly, drivers could fail to obtain critical information, which may degrade safety. This document establishes two prioritization methods for TICS and other system-initiated messages or driver-requested messages presented to drivers while driving. Other prioritization methods are possible. The primary method given in this document takes criticality and urgency ratings of such messages into consideration when calculating a priority index. If the mathematical calculations are avoided for some reason, an alternative method presented in [Annex A](#) is applied. The alternative method involves paired comparisons of all possible messages to form a priority matrix. Its relative advantages and disadvantages are discussed in [Annex A](#). [Annex B](#) presents one way of managing messages using the priority obtained by [Annex A](#).

Priority is one of the parameters to consider in determining when, where and how system messages are displayed. As TICS applications are deployed, the number and frequency of TICS messages presented to drivers can be expected to increase. This document will provide road vehicle manufacturers and TICS suppliers with a consistent basis for the management of messages competing for the driver's limited information processing capability. This, in turn, will reduce the driver's workload and help ensure that the most important messages reach the driver. This document complements ISO 15005^[3], a dialogue management standard.

This document is intended for those involved in the design of message management systems that integrate in-vehicle messages. It describes how to establish message priorities. It also specifies criteria for message prioritization and, therefore, serves as an evaluation tool for TICS installed in vehicles as standard equipment and for after-market TICS devices.

[ISO/TS 16951:2021](#)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021>

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/TS 16951:2021

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021>

Road vehicles — Ergonomic aspects of transport information and control systems (TICS) — Procedures for determining priority of on-board messages presented to drivers

1 Scope

This document provides formal procedures and two, alternative, methods (users are advised to choose whichever of the two suits their individual requirements) for determining the priority of on-board messages presented to drivers of road vehicles by transport information and control systems (TICS) and other systems. It is applicable to the whole range of TICS in-vehicle messages, including traveller information, navigation, travel and traffic advisories, “yellow pages” information, warnings, systems status, emergency calling system information, and electronic toll/fee collection, as well as to messages from non-TICS sources such as telephone, warnings and telltales. Although applicable to systems that allow the free generation of messages, it neither provides guidance on how to use the messages deriving from its procedures nor is it applicable to mandatory or legally required messages.

2 Normative references

There are no normative references in this document.

3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

ISO and IEC maintain terminological databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ISO Online browsing platform: available at <https://www.iso.org/obp>
- IEC Electropedia: available at <http://www.electropedia.org/>

3.1 contents of message

information presented to a user by the *TICS* (3.14) or other on-board system

EXAMPLE A message containing system status information, warnings or alarms presented using characters, symbols, figures, audible tones, voices or other means.

3.2 criticality

severity of the impact of the most likely accident or malfunction that can occur when the message is not received or is ignored by the driver

3.3 display

device that allows the presentation of visual, auditory, or haptic dynamic information to a driver

3.4 driving

activities undertaken by the driver to navigate, manoeuvre and handle the vehicle to achieve lateral and longitudinal control

**3.5
evaluator**

person who judges the contents of a message from the point of view of *criticality* (3.2) and *urgency* (3.15) to the driver

**3.6
examiner**

person who manages and conducts the use of this document for determining *priority* (3.10)

**3.7
weighting factor of criticality**

k_c
factor used to calculate the *priority index* (3.11)

**3.8
weighting factor of urgency**

k_u
factor used to calculate the *priority index* (3.11)

**3.9
message management system**

system that controls and evaluates a wide range of information and presents it ergonomically to drivers, allowing them to cope with the information while *driving* (3.4) and assisting them in *driving* safely and comfortably

**3.10
priority**

relative importance of two or more messages which determines their ranking in a time sequence or emphasis of presentation

Note 1 to entry: The message with the highest priority is assigned first place (larger priority ratings correspond to higher priority items).

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW

(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/TS 16951:2021
<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7e5a609c2abd/iso-ts-16951-2021>

**3.11
priority index**

index used to determine which messages should be given precedence when two or more messages are available for presentation

**3.12
scenario**

explanation of the *driving* (3.4) context and situation for the message presented to *evaluators* (3.5)

**3.13
system-initiated message**

message provided by a *TICS* (3.14) or conventional system (both inside and outside of the vehicle) without a specific request from the driver

**3.14
transport information and control system
TICS**

system comprised of an advanced information and telecommunications network for users, roads and vehicles that contributes to solving problems such as traffic accidents and congestion

Note 1 to entry: See ISO 14813-1 for a list of TICS services^[1].

**3.15
urgency**

time within which driver action or decision is expected to be taken if the benefit intended by the system is derived from the message

4 Data collection for the priority index procedure

4.1 General

This clause presents the steps for collecting the data used to calculate a priority index for each message. See the example outputs given in [Annex E](#) and [Annex H](#).

4.2 Appoint an examiner

The priority index procedure requires an examiner to coordinate the data preparation, analysis, and reporting. The role of the examiner is detailed in [4.7](#).

The examiner shall be familiar with the prioritization process, knowledgeable on message management, and have automotive experience.

If the examiner has similar qualifications to that of the evaluators, the examiner may participate as both an examiner and evaluator.

4.3 Identify and assemble messages

It is necessary for the examiner to identify in advance messages that are to be presented to drivers. The messages represent the aggregate output given by the TICS and non-TICS connected to a message management system. The examiner shall collect these messages and prepare them for presentation to the evaluators.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW

4.4 Define driving context and situation

(standards.iteh.ai)

For each message, the examiner shall define, or assist in defining, a driving context and situation in terms of the road environment and the traffic condition in which the message is likely to be presented.

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/1eb59494-070b-4a54-b4d5-7c5869c2a076/iso-ts-16951-2021>

The contextual and situational factors should be defined at the moment when the message is presented because the priority (assignment of criticality and urgency ratings) depends heavily on the driving context. Particular attention should be given to the presentation of messages in potentially hazardous situations. All hazardous situations should be considered, except for highly unlikely possibilities. Based on these situations the examiner may define one or more (normally not more than four) scenarios for a particular message.

The same message in two different scenarios shall be regarded as two different information items to be evaluated. This is because messages may occur in several different driving contexts, and each context could yield a different message priority. For example, the priority given to a message pertaining to a system malfunction will be different depending on whether the driver is starting the car or is relying on the system whilst driving.

If only one scenario is used for a given message, that scenario should represent a reasonable “worst-case” situation. At minimum, a TICS or non-TICS expert and the examiner should agree on the worst-case driving scenario. A traffic safety expert may also be consulted.

4.4.1 Consider the sensing capability of the vehicle

In practice the messages that are provided to the driver will depend on the capability of the vehicle to sense or detect various relevant situations. For example, if the vehicle can detect the driver’s state of arousal, then the driver’s state can be considered in describing the driving scenario.

For situations in which the vehicle is incapable of sensing, the message priority should be determined for a scenario representing a “reasonable” worst-case situation for the factors listed in [4.4.2](#).

4.4.2 Factors to consider in developing the driving scenarios

[Table 1](#) is provided to assist the examiner in developing driving context and relevant situations. A sample of situation and context factors is given in the rightmost column. The examiner may use these or other factors to define driving scenarios. If the context cannot be categorized into one of the candidate factors listed in [Table 1](#), it should be clearly described within the “Other” parentheses. If neither the context nor situation is defined for one of the factors, select “not defined (N-D)” from the list of the candidates.

The following factors should be considered in developing the driving contexts and situations for evaluators to consider when making their ratings.

4.4.2.1 Trip context

The trip context is a factor that considers the aim of the trip (e.g. commuting, leisure), the timing or position along the route (e.g. relative position between start and destination), and the preparatory distance to the next manoeuvre.

EXAMPLE “Close (e.g. 20 m) to turn (or merge)”.

4.4.2.2 Road environment

The road environment is a static factor related to road structure that affects driving. Considerations shall include the road type (e.g. highway, urban road, country road), the speed limit, the number of lanes, and the road width. Consideration shall also be given to the effect on driving of the surrounding environment, including weather conditions and time of day (e.g. morning, daytime, night-time, raining).

4.4.2.3 Traffic situation

The traffic situation is a dynamically changing factor related to traffic or obstacles on the road that affect driving. Considerations here include the relationship to other vehicles, such as headway distance and speed difference to the lead vehicle.

EXAMPLE 1 Headway distance.

EXAMPLE 2 Lateral vehicle exists.

EXAMPLE 3 Speed difference to the lead vehicle.

4.4.2.4 Vehicle condition

This factor originates from the vehicle itself and derives from the relationship between the vehicle and the road. Vehicle condition can be separated into “vehicle type” and “vehicle state”.

EXAMPLE 1 Vehicle type: “passenger vehicle”, “heavy vehicle”.

EXAMPLE 2 Vehicle state: “driving speed”, “driving in left [right] lane”, “negotiating curve [intersection]”, position of the vehicle within a lane.

4.4.3 Document the driving context and situation

The defined driving context, situation, appropriate driver behaviours and/or cognitive demands associated with each message shall be documented. An example for a specific configuration is given in [Annex E](#).

Table 1 — Factors to consider in developing driving scenarios

Driving context/situation	Candidate situational or contextual factors
Trip context	Close to turn (or merge, or diverge) Other (.....) N-D
Road environment:	Highway / urban / country / curve / icy / wet Speed limit (...) Number of lanes (...) Other (.....) N-D
Weather	Rain / fog Time of day (morning / daytime / night-time) Other (.....) N-D
Traffic situation	Headway distance is approx. (...) m or (...) s Lateral vehicle(s) exists (yes or no, approximately (...) m or (...) s) Speed difference to the lead vehicle is approximately (...) km/h N-D
Type	Passenger vehicle / heavy vehicle Other (.....) N-D
Vehicle condition	Driving speed (...) km/h (mph) Driving in left (or right) lane Curve (intersection) negotiation Other (.....) N-D
Status of vehicle subsystem(s)	Systems check after start-up shows all systems are normal Malfunction of system (.....) — provide relevant details Other (.....) N-D
Miscellaneous	Driver's state of arousal N-D
N-D Not defined.	

4.5 Select the evaluators

The examiner shall select a minimum of 5 evaluators (see 5.1 and Annex C).

Evaluators should include experienced human factors and road safety practitioners and others who possess a good understanding of the functions of the subject TICS system. They shall be well-informed of the traffic environment and road environment of the subject country/region and have the ability to evaluate and take into account the safe presentation of messages. Actual use of the system is recommended for all evaluators.

The profile of each evaluator should be recorded. Profiles should include field of expertise, knowledge of road safety, human factors, and knowledge of the systems producing messages that are prioritized (see [Annex D](#)).

4.6 Evaluate criticality and urgency of a message

The contents of messages and the driving scenarios shall be explained by the examiner so that the evaluators have a common understanding of the scenario, the functions of the system, and the contents of messages being examined.

Examiners shall ensure that evaluators understand the definitions of criticality and urgency, the two evaluation criteria composing the priority index. For this, evaluators shall understand the four-category ordinal evaluation scales used to assign criticality and urgency values (see [Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#)).

Each evaluator shall assign a criticality and urgency rating for each message assuming he/she is the driver.

In general, urgency will be time dependent. Controllability is one of the important factors that shall be considered in determining urgency. If the situation is uncontrollable, no action shall be expected from drivers. However, if there is a possibility of controlling the situation, then urgency shall be determined depending on when the system expects drivers to take an action to handle it^[4].

If the examiner has not fully defined the driving context and situation, evaluators shall be instructed to consider all hazardous situations, except for highly unlikely possibilities. They should assume a reasonable worst-case scenario when determining their criticality and urgency ratings.

4.7 Instructions for the examiner

The role of the examiner is to

- a) record information about each evaluator in the evaluator profile (see [Annex D](#)),
- b) create the questionnaire according to [Annex E](#) for the vehicle and system to be evaluated, and distribute the questionnaire and [Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#) to each evaluator (definitions of criticality and urgency should be provided with the questionnaire),
- c) explain the evaluation items and the contents of the message(s) in the questionnaire, while providing a means for evaluators to record the driving context and situation they used in making their evaluations, whenever the examiner's description was not clear or enough,
- d) explain the classification of criticality and urgency according to [Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#),
- e) explain how to record the rating for criticality and urgency in the appropriate column of the questionnaire,
- f) collect the questionnaire, and
- g) analyse the data and report the results.