AN AHP-BASED DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR THE SAFETY PRIORITIZATION PROBLEM OF AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES DURING UNAVOIDABLE COLLISIONS

Hannah Faye Culaste¹ John Lennon Calorio²

Highlights

- The rise of self-driving cars brings attention to ethical challenges in artificial decision-making during unavoidable collisions.
- The safety prioritization dilemma is often compared to the trolley problem but is recognized as more complex due to competing priorities and ethical considerations.
- This study proposes an AHP-based decision support system that integrates postcollision repercussions, allowing self-driving car owners to predefine safety preferences.

ABSTRACT

The rise of self-driving cars brings attention to ethical challenges in artificial decisionmaking during unavoidable collisions. This study addresses the safety prioritization problem of autonomous vehicles during unavoidable collisions by modeling it as a multicriteria decision-making challenge using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). The proposed system incorporates diverse factors such as legal, societal, and ethical considerations, allowing vehicle owners to preset their safety preferences. Results demonstrate the potential of this AHP-based decision support system to enhance the transparency and ethical programming of autonomous vehicles, contributing to safer and more systematic emergency decision-making.

Keywords: self-driving car, decision support system, artificial decisions, ethical challenges

1

¹ Hannah Faye Culaste, Research Publication and Branding Lead, Project Technical Assistant IV, PASYENTE Project for Dengue, University of the Philippines-Mindanao, Mintal, Davao City, 9000, Philippines, hcculaste@up.edu.ph

² John Lennon Calorio, Senior Statistician, Center for Research and Development, Davao Medical School Foundation, Bajada, Davao City, 9000, Philippines, jlcalorio@dmsf.edu.ph

ISAHP Article: A Style Guide for Paper Proposals To Be Submitted to the International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process 2024, Web Conference.

1. Introduction

In the advent of self-driving vehicles marketed as being safer than manually driven cars, the issue of artificial decisions in unavoidable crashes come into highlight. One of the most critical issues is how these autonomous systems navigate unavoidable collision scenarios, where split-second decisions carry life-and-death implications. Ethicists argue that determining whose safety should be prioritized and how such decisions are made cannot be condensed into a simple applied trolly problem alone, but instead requires a structured framework that incorporates ethical reasoning and considers post-collision repercussions in the social and legal context. Thus, this study aims to develop a decision support system based on an AHP Model that would allow owners of autonomous vehicles to preset safety priorities for their cars in the event of unavoidable crashes.

2. Literature Review

The most popular angle to addressing the moral dilemma of the safety prioritization problem of autonomous vehicles in collisions has been harm minimization (Schäffner, 2024). However, it is painfully obvious that decisions involving moral dilemma are far more complex, often involving the challenge of balancing social norm, legal implications and personal beliefs. In fact, in the medical setting, the moral dilemma of prioritizing patients for organ donation has long been modeled as a multi-criteria decision-making problem. Case in point is the pioneering study of Lin and Harris (2012), where they created a unified framework for the prioritization of organ transplant patients using analytic hierarchy process.

3. Hypotheses/Objectives

This paper views the safety prioritization problem of autonomous vehicles as a multicriteria decision-making problem. In events of unavoidable collisions, a typical driver must make split-second decisions based on multiple, often competing criteria, including legal implications, societal acceptance of actions, post-collision costs, and personal conscience. To address this complexity, the study employs the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), a multi-criteria decision-making tool, to model these relationships and prioritize decision factors systematically. It aims to provide a framework for integrating ethical considerations into autonomous vehicle systems, allowing owners to preset safety preferences before travel.

4. Research Design/Methodology

The research employs a quantitative design using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) as its core methodology. AHP is utilized to model the safety prioritization problem of autonomous vehicles during unavoidable collisions, structuring the decision-making process into a hierarchy of criteria, safety attributes, and alternatives, as seen in the figure below.

ISAHP Article: A Style Guide for Paper Proposals To Be Submitted to the International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process 2024, Web Conference.



Figure 1. Hierarchy Structure of the AHP model in determining whose safety to prioritize in cases of unavoidable collisions in self-driving cars

5. Results/Model Analysis

To evaluate the model's robustness, a hypothetical collision scenario was constructed. The priorities pre-set by the vehicle owner, and the results of the AHP model can be seen in Figures 2 and 3, respectively.

CoolNeda								-		Local Priorities
Goanvode								1Goal	GoalNode	(
								2Criteria	age to vehicle inc	0.048
								2	number of lives affe	0.172
2Criteria	1damage	2number	3vulnerab	4legal imp	5social ac	Direct valu	es		3vulnerability to dea	0.402
1 damaga ta yahi	1	0.2	0 111	0.2	1				4legal implications	0.318
Idamage to venio	1	0.2	0.111	0.2	1				5social acceptance	0.06
2number of lives	5	1	0.333	0.333	4			LegalImplicatio	nssical vulnerability	0.111
									4.2age	0.778
3vulnerability to	9	3	1	1	7			4.	3pregnancy or disab	0.111
Alogal implication	5	2	1	1	2			SocialAcceptan	cesical vulnerability	0.333
siegar implication	J	3	1	1	3				5.2age	0.5
5social acceptance	1	0.25	0.143	0.333	1			5.	3pregnancy or disab	0.167
0 (0)								3Alternatives	assengers of the c	0.125
Sum of Col									2pedestrian	0.285
									3other vehicles	0.59

Figure 2. The pairwise comparison set by the owner of the vehicle Figure 3. Resulting local in the hypothetical collision scenario.

priorities of the model

6. Conclusions

The study demonstrates that the safety prioritization problem of autonomous vehicles can be effectively addressed using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). The results show that the AHP-based system can incorporate diverse factors, such as legal, societal, and ethical considerations. As an in-vehicle DSS that allows owners to preset priorities before travel, this highlights its potential to enhance the ethical programming of autonomous vehicles, contributing to safer and more transparent and systematic approach to emergency decision-making during unavoidable collisions. Future work should focus on real-world validation, expanding criteria to include broader societal perspectives, and reviewing the connections of criteria to one another.

ISAHP Article: A Style Guide for Paper Proposals To Be Submitted to the International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process 2024, Web Conference.

7. Limitations

This study assumes that the self-driving vehicles in this problem are capable of sensing, calculating and gathering data of the safety attributes and criteria related to the alternatives. At the same time, the author also notes that the problem may be best remodeled into an ANP model, since connections between criteria might exist.

8. Key References

Lin, C. S., & Harris, S. L. (2013). A unified framework for the prioritization of organ transplant patients: analytic hierarchy process, sensitivity and multifactor robustness study. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 20(3-4), 157-172.

Schäffner, V. (2024). Crash dilemmas and the ethical design of self-driving vehicles: Implications from metaethics and pragmatic road marks. *AI Ethics*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00591-7</u>

Saaty, Thomas L., Kirti Peniwati, and Jen S. Shang. "The analytic hierarchy process and human resource allocation: Half the story." *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 46.7-8 (2007): 1041-1053.