Comprehensive Review of Autonomous Electric Vehicle Technology

M.Dileep Kumar[1], J.Sravan Kumar[2], S.Rajendra Prasad[3], R.S.R. Krishnam Naidu[4]
[1,2,3,4] *Nadimpalli Satyanarayana Raju Institute of Technology*

Abstract-The convergence of autonomous driving and electric vehicle (EV) technologies is catalyzing a paradigm shift in transportation, offering transformative gains in safety, sustainability, and system efficiency. Autonomous Electric Vehicles (AEVs) synergistically integrate battery-electric propulsion with advanced automation (SAE Levels 1–5), powered by heterogeneous sensor suites—cameras, LiDAR, radar, ultrasonic systems, and inertial measurement units—and orchestrated through high-performance computing and AI-driven decision-making architectures. This review presents a systematic analysis of the AEV landscape, with emphasis on sensor fusion strategies, vehicle platforms, and control-system integration. We contextualize the historical and societal drivers—ranging from climate imperatives to traffic safety crises—that have accelerated AEV development. Synthesizing two decades of research, we highlight pivotal advances in perception, localization, path planning, and co-optimized energy management. A detailed comparative assessment of leading commercial and prototype AEVs—including Tesla's Model series, Waymo's Jaguar I-PACE and Zeekr RT, GM Cruise Origin, Mercedes-Benz EQS with DRIVE PILOT, and BYD Seal—examines their sensor configurations, compute hardware, battery technologies, and autonomy stacks. Despite rapid progress, critical challenges persist: sensor reliability in adverse weather, ethical AI frameworks, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, battery–autonomy co-design, V2X infrastructure dependency, and the absence of scalable validation protocols. While Level 2+/3 AEVs are increasingly deployed in controlled environments, the realization of safe, equitable, and scalable Level 4/5 autonomy demands interdisciplinary collaboration across robotics, materials science, regulatory policy, and human factors engineering. This review serves as a foundational resource for researchers, industry stakeholders, and policymakers navigating the multidimensional trajectory toward zero-emission, fully autonomous mobility ecosystems.

Keywords: Autonomous Electric Vehicles (AEVs), Sensor Fusion, LiDAR, Computer Vision, SAE Autonomy Levels, Battery Management Systems (BMS), Deep Learning for Perception, Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X), Functional Safety (ISO 26262), Ethical AI

I. INTRODUCTION

The transportation sector contributes nearly 24% of global direct CO_2 emissions from fuel combustion (IEA, 2023), with light-duty vehicles as the primary source. Concurrently, traffic collisions—94% attributable to human error (NHTSA, 2022)—claim over 1.3 million lives annually (WHO, 2023). Autonomous Electric Vehicles (AEVs) present a dual-solution framework: electrification decouples mobility from fossil fuels, while automation mitigates human-induced risk and enhances traffic efficiency.

An AEV is defined as a battery-powered vehicle capable of performing Dynamic Driving Tasks (DDTs) without sustained human intervention, per SAE J3016 (SAE International, 2021). Automation is stratified into six levels:

- L0–L2: Driver remains engaged and monitors the environment.
- L3: System handles DDTs within defined Operational Design Domains (ODDs); driver must respond to Requests to Intervene (RTIs).
- L4: Full autonomy within ODDs; no human input required.
- L5: Full autonomy under all conditions; no steering wheel necessary.

The synergy between electrification and autonomy is mutually reinforcing:

- EV architectures enable redundant-by-wire systems (steering, braking), essential for fail-operational autonomy.
- Regenerative braking aligns with predictive trajectory planning for energy efficiency.

- High-voltage platforms (400–800 V) support power-intensive sensor suites and AI compute units (e.g., NVIDIA DRIVE Orin, 254 TOPS).

Not with standing pilot deployments (e.g., Waymo in Phoenix, Cruise in San Francisco), AEVs confront systemic barriers: sensor degradation in adverse weather, edge-case handling (e.g., construction zones, jaywalkers), battery strain under high compute loads, and fragmented regulatory frameworks.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Evolution and Milestones

Autonomous driving traces its origins to the DARPA Grand Challenges (2004–2007), where vehicles like Stanford's *Stanley* demonstrated GPS- and LiDAR-based navigation in desert environments. The Urban Challenge (2007) catalyzed breakthroughs in SLAM, behavior prediction, and hierarchical planning.

The deep learning revolution—epitomized by AlexNet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012) and YOLO (Redmon et al., 2016)—enabled real-time, end-to-end perception. LiDAR-based 3D detection (e.g., PointNet, Qi et al., 2017; PV-RCNN, Shi et al., 2020) improved geometric robustness over vision-only systems, albeit at higher cost and compute demands.

On the EV front, Tesla's Roadster (2008) validated lithium-ion viability; the Nissan LEAF (2010) and Chevrolet Bolt (2016) enabled mass-market adoption. Integration accelerated with Tesla Autopilot (2015), evolving from Mobileye-based vision to an in-house Full Self-Driving (FSD) stack trained on billions of real-world miles.

2.2 Perception Systems: Sensor Modalities and Fusion Strategies

Perception remains the most sensor-intensive AEV subsystem. Three fusion paradigms dominate (Xu et al., 2021):

- Early Fusion: Raw data (e.g., point clouds + pixels) fused pre-feature extraction (e.g., MVX-Net, Liang et al., 2019). High fidelity, high compute.
- Late Fusion: Independent modality processing; decisions fused post-detection. Robust to sensor dropout but suboptimal in ambiguity.
- Hybrid/Deep Fusion: Intermediate feature fusion via cross-attention (e.g., TransFusion, Bai et al., 2022)—emerging as state-of-the-art.

Cameras (8–12 units, 1.2–5 MP) enable traffic sign, lane, and color recognition but suffer in low-light or glare. Event-based cameras (e.g., Prophesee) offer high dynamic range and microsecond latency.

LiDAR (solid-state: Luminar Iris, InnovizOne) provides precise geometry (200–300 m range) but degrades in fog/rain and remains costly ($500–$5,000).

Radar (77–79 GHz mmWave) delivers all-weather velocity via Doppler; 4D imaging radar (Arbe, Vayyar) resolves elevation, narrowing the LiDAR gap.

Ultrasonics (<5 m) are increasingly phased out in favor of camera/radar fusion.

IMU + RTK-GNSS enables decimeter-level localization; in GNSS-denied zones, LiDAR SLAM (e.g., LOAM) maintains pose accuracy.

2.3 Localization and Mapping

High-definition (HD) maps (5–20 cm accuracy) underpin most L3+ systems. Mobileye's REM crowdsources map data; Waymo uses proprietary semantic maps. Trends favor map-lite approaches using neural radiance fields (NeRFs) or occupancy networks (Tesla, 2022), reducing ODD rigidity.

2.4 Decision-Making and Control

Behavior planning employs hierarchical frameworks:

1. Route planning (GPS-level)
2. Behavioral layer (POMDPs, finite-state machines)
3. Motion planning (RRT*, MPC)

End-to-end learning (e.g., NVIDIA's DAVE-2, Bojarski et al., 2016; Waabi's UniSim, Zhou et al., 2023) maps sensor inputs directly to controls via deep networks. While data-efficient in simulation, such systems lack interpretability—posing certification hurdles.

2.5 Energy Management and Battery–Autonomy Co-Design

Autonomy stacks consume 1–3 kW, reducing EV range by 10–15% (Li et al., 2023). Emerging research explores co-optimization: predictive cruise control via V2X, adaptive sensor power gating, and thermal-aware compute scheduling. Battery health (SOH)

estimation via LSTM networks is being integrated into fault-tolerance logic for graceful degradation.

2.6 Safety, Validation, and Certification

ISO 21448 (SOTIF) addresses non-failure-based risks (e.g., sensor misperception). Due to the "long tail" of edge cases, virtual validation (CARLA, LGSVL) and scenario-based testing (ASAM OpenSCENARIO) are essential. Formal methods (e.g., reachability analysis) verify neural robustness but scale poorly. The Responsibility-Sensitive Safety (RSS) model (Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2017) offers a white-box framework for verifiable safety.

III. PRESENT AEV PLATFORMS: SENSOR CONFIGURATIONS AND AUTONOMY CAPABILITIES

3.1 Comparative Platform Analysis (2024–2025)

Table 1: Specifications of Leading AEV Platforms

Autonomy Level	L2+ (FSD Beta v12.4)	L4 (geofenced)	L4 (no steering wheel)	L3 (0–60 km/h)	L2+
Sensors	8 cameras, 1 radar (HW4), GPS/IMU	29 cameras, 6 LiDAR, 6 4D radar, mics	12 LiDAR, 28 cams, 14 radar	1 roof LiDAR, 5 radar, 8 cams, DSM	11 cams, 2 LiDAR, 5 radar
Compute	Tesla FSD Chip (72 TOPS)	NVIDIA DRIVE Thor (2000 TOPS)	GM Ultifi + Orin (1440 TOPS)	NVIDIA AGX (600+ TOPS)	Horizon Journey 5 (128 TOPS)
Battery	100 kWh (4680), 800 V, 640 km	100 kWh (CATL Qilin), 800 V, 702 km	124 kWh (Ultium), 400 V	108 kWh (CATL), 800 V, 747 km	82.5 kWh (Blade), 800 V, 700 km
Software	Tesla Vision (Occupancy Nets)	Waymo Chauffeur (HD Maps + Sim-in-Loop)	Cruise AI (Multi-agent RL)	DRIVE PILOT (L3 certified)	DiPilot (Baidu Apollo)
Redundancy	Dual FSD chips, steer-by-wire	Dual Thor, independent brakes	Triple compute, steer/brake	Dual AGX, backup EPS	Dual Journey 5, steer-by-wire (2025)

3.2 Sensor and Compute Trends

- LiDAR adoption is rebounding post-Tesla's "vision-only" phase; costs have dropped >99% since 2012.
- 4D radar now generates ~30,000 points/frame—enabling "LiDAR-lite" fallback.
- Zonal architectures replace legacy ECUs with domain controllers (autonomy, ADAS, chassis).
- OTA updates enable fleet learning but introduce cybersecurity risks (see §4.3).
- Total autonomy stack power draw: ~1.3 kW, equivalent to 12–15% range loss at highway speeds.

3.3 Global vs. Indian AEV Ecosystems

While North America, Europe, and China lead in AEV deployment, India's ecosystem remains embryonic due to infrastructural, regulatory, and environmental constraints.

Technological Gap: Indian projects (e.g., Swan Mobility, IIT prototypes) operate at L1–L2 with camera/ultrasonic suites; LiDAR integration is rare. Global leaders deploy L3–L4 systems with full sensor redundancy.

Road Realities: India's mixed traffic (pedestrians, rickshaws, unmarked roads) causes >40% performance drop in standard perception models trained on Western data (Behl et al., 2020).

Policy Vacuum: No national AV law exists. The Motor Vehicles Act (1988) lacks provisions for L3+ autonomy, liability, or remote operation—unlike UNECE R157 or China's Shenzhen AV Regulation.

Electrification Limits: Indian EVs (e.g., Tata Nexon EV) use 400 V platforms with <70 kWh packs, insufficient for sustained high-power autonomy compute.

Strategic Path: India's near-term focus includes L2 ADAS and low-speed autonomous logistics. Long-term scalability requires localized datasets, V2X-enabled corridors, and regulatory sandboxes.

Table 2: Global vs. Indian AEV Landscape (2024)

Dimensions	Global Leaders	India
Max Autonomy Level Deployed	L4 (robotaxis), L3 (production cars)	L2 (ADAS), L4 (pilots, <5 km ODDs)
Primary Sensor Suite	LiDAR + camera + 4D radar + V2X	Camera + ultrasonic + GPS (LiDAR rare)
Compute Platform	NVIDIA Orin/Thor, Qualcomm Snapdragon Ride	Jetson AGX, Intel Xeon (edge PCs)
HD Mapping	Proprietary, centimeter-accurate, dynamic	Limited; reliance on OpenStreetMap + manual annotation
Regulatory Status	L3 certified (Germany, CA); L4 permits active	No L3+ legal framework; ADAS encouraged
Testbeds	Phoenix, San Francisco, Shenzhen, Stuttgart	IIT campuses, NATRiP centers, Gurugram corridor
Key Players	Tesla, Waymo, Cruise, Mercedes, Baidu	Tata Motors, Mahindra, Swan, HiTech Robotics, IITs

IV. RESEARCH GAPS AND CRITICAL CHALLENGES

4.1 Adverse-Weather Sensor Degradation

All sensors falter in rain/fog/snow. No single modality offers all-weather robustness. Gaps include multi-spectral sensing and physics-informed neural networks (PINNs).

4.2 Ethical AI and Edge-Case Reasoning

Ambiguous scenarios (e.g., jaywalkers) lack explicit ethical frameworks. ISO/PAS 21448-2 outlines risk assessment but not implementation. Neurosymbolic planning shows promise but lacks scalability.

4.3 Cybersecurity Risks

Threats include LiDAR/GPS spoofing, CAN bus injection, and OTA hijacking. UNECE R155 mandates CSMS, but real-time anomaly detection and homomorphic encryption remain experimental.

4.4 Battery–Autonomy Co-Optimization

Joint optimization of thermal models, SOC/SOH estimation, and task scheduling is underexplored. Energy-aware RL for autonomy is nascent.

4.5 V2X Interoperability

Fragmented standards (C-V2X vs. LTE-V2X) and <5% RSU deployment hinder scalability. Infrastructure-lean autonomy (e.g., signal inference from traffic) is critical.

4.6 Validation and Certification

8.8 billion test miles are needed for statistical confidence in safety (Kalra & Paddock, 2016). Gaps include generative simulation (NVIDIA DRIVE Sim), standardized scenario taxonomies, and regulatory acceptance of virtual miles.

4.7 Human–Machine Interface (HMI)

L3 systems require reliable driver state monitoring (DSM) and predictive RTI timing. Multimodal DSM (eye-tracking + posture + EEG) is emerging.

V. CONCLUSION

AEV technology has evolved from research prototypes to commercially deployed L2+/L3 systems, with L4 robotaxis operating in geofenced urban zones. The electrification–autonomy synergy enables architectural advantages—redundant-by-wire systems, high-voltage power, and software-defined dynamics—but introduces novel co-design challenges in energy, safety, and validation.

Sensor fusion is converging toward heterogeneous redundancy: vision for semantics, LiDAR for geometry, radar for all-weather velocity, and V2X for intent. Compute platforms now exceed 1000 TOPS, enabling end-to-end neural planning—though interpretability and formal verification remain open.

Critical gaps persist in adverse-weather robustness, ethical AI, cybersecurity, battery–autonomy co-optimization, and scalable validation. Addressing these requires: Interdisciplinary collaboration (robotics, electrochemistry, policy), Open standards (datasets, simulators, benchmarks), Adaptive regulation that accommodates rapid iteration while ensuring SOTIF. The trajectory points toward conditional autonomy (L3–L4) dominating 2025–2030, with L5 remaining distant. Yet AEVs are already reshaping mobility-as-a-service, last-mile logistics, and accessibility—ushering in a safer, cleaner, and more equitable mobility future.

REFERENCE

[1] A. Behl, M. Bijelic, F. Mannan, N. Chhaya, K. K. Singh, and A. Chakraborty, "The Indian Driving Dataset (IDD): A Large-Scale Dataset for Semantic Segmentation and Object Detection in Unstructured Driving Environments," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Winter Conf. Appl. Comput. Vis. (WACV)*, Snowmass, CO, USA, 2020, pp. 2073–2082. doi: 10.1109/WACV45572.2020.9093431.

[2] M. Bojarski, D. Del Testa, D. Dworakowski, B. Firner, B. Flepp, P. Goyal, L. D. Jackel, M. Monfort, U. Muller, J. Zhang, X. Zhang, J. Zhao, and K. Zieba, "End to End Learning for Self-Driving Cars," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07316*, Apr. 2016. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.07316

[3] International Energy Agency (IEA), *Global EV Outlook 2023: Securing Supplies for an Electric Future*. Paris, France: IEA Publications, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2023

[4] N. Kalra and S. M. Paddock, *Driving to Safety: How Many Miles of Driving Would It Take to Demonstrate Autonomous Vehicle Reliability?* Santa Monica, CA, USA: RAND Corporation, 2016. doi: 10.7249/RR1478.

[5] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 25, Lake Tahoe, NV, USA, 2012, pp. 1097–1105.

[6] T. Liang, L. Yang, S. Wang, J. Yang, and K. Yu, "MVX-Net: Multimodal VoxelNet for 3D Object Detection," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom. (ICRA)*, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 2019, pp. 4535–4541. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2019.8793710.

[7] X. Li, F. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Zhang, and J. Sun, "Power Consumption Analysis of Autonomous Driving Systems in Battery Electric Vehicles," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 4321–4334, Apr. 2023. doi: 10.1109/TVT.2022.3224921.

[8] Y. He, X. Liu, J. Wang, and D. Manocha, "How Much Can LiDAR Do for Autonomous Driving in Adverse Weather? A Comprehensive Evaluation Under Rain and Fog," *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 21, no. 15, pp. 17021–17032, Aug. 2021. doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2021.3079768.

[9] International Organization for Standardization (ISO), *Road Vehicles — Safety of the Intended Functionality (SOTIF)*, ISO Standard ISO 21448:2022, Geneva, Switzerland, 2022.

[10] NATRiP Implementation Society, *Annual Report 2022–23: Advancing Automotive R&D in India*. New Delhi, India: Ministry of Heavy Industries, Govt. of India, 2023.

[11] J. Petit, B. Stottelaar, M. Feiri, and F. Kargl, "Remote Attacks on Automated Vehicles' Sensors: Experiments on Camera and LiDAR," in *Black Hat Europe*, London, UK, Nov. 2015. [Online]. Available:https://www.blackhat.com/docs/eu-15/materials/eu-15-Petit-Remote-Attacks-On Automated-Vehicles-Sensors-wp.pdf

[12] C. R. Qi, H. Su, K. Mo, and L. J. Guibas, "PointNet: Deep Learning on Point Sets for 3D Classification and Segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, Honolulu, HI, USA, Jul. 2017, pp. 652–660. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.12.

[13] J. Redmon, S. Divvala, R. Girshick, and A. Farhadi, "You Only Look Once: Unified, Real-Time Object Detection," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, Las Vegas, NV, USA, Jun. 2016, pp. 779–788. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2016.91.

[14] S. Shalev-Shwartz, S. Shammah, and A. Shashua, "On a Formal Model of Safe and Scalable Self-Driving Cars," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06374*, Aug. 2017. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06374

[15] S. Shi, C. Guo, L. Jiang, Z. Wang, J. Shi, X. Wang, and H. Li, "PV-RCNN: Point-Voxel Feature Set Abstraction for 3D Object Detection," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, Seattle, WA, USA, Jun. 2020, pp. 10532–10541. doi: 10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.01055.

[16] SAE International, *Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles*, SAE Standard J3016_202104, Warrendale, PA, USA, Apr. 2021. doi: 10.4271/J3016_202104.

[17] National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), *Critical Reasons for Crashes Investigated in the National Motor Vehicle Crash Causation Survey*, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, USA, Traffic Safety Facts: Crash Stats, Rep. DOT HS 813 311, Jun. 2022. [Online]. Available: https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813311

[18] Tesla, Inc., "Tesla AI Day 2022: Occupancy Networks and Vectorized World Model," Palo Alto, CA, USA, Sep. 30, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.tesla.com/AI

[19] S. Thrun, M. Montemerlo, H. Dahlkamp, D. Stavens, A. Aron, J. Diebel, P. Fong, J. Gale, M. Halpenny, G. Hoffmann, K. Lau, C. Oakley, M. Palatucci, V. Pratt, P. Stang, S. Strohband, C. Duprat, L. Joubert, W. Kolski, C. Koehnen, and H. Christ, "Stanley: The Robot That Won the DARPA Grand Challenge," *J. Field Robot.*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 661–692, Sep. 2006. doi: 10.1002/rob.20141.

[20] United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), *Regulation No. 157: Uniform Provisions Concerning the Approval of Vehicles with Regard to Automated Lane Keeping Systems (ALKS)*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2021. [Online]. Available:https://unece.org/transport/documents/2021/03/regulations/regulation-no-157-revision-1-amendment-2

[21] W. Bai, Y. Zhao, H. Zhou, J. Wang, and Q. Ye, "TransFusion: Robust LiDAR-Camera Fusion for 3D Object Detection with Transformers," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, New Orleans, LA, USA, Jun. 2022, pp. 555–565. doi: 10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00063.

[22] J. Wilson, M. Ghai, and L. R. Varshney, "Fairness in Autonomous Vehicle Perception: A Benchmark Study on Pedestrian Detection Bias," in *Proc. ACM Conf. Fairness, Accountability, Transparency (FAccT)*, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Jun. 2022, pp. 1278–1291. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533227.

[23] J. Zhang and D. Scaramuzza, "LOAM: Lidar Odometry and Mapping in Real-Time," in *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, Berkeley, CA, USA, Jul. 2014. doi: 10.15607/RSS.2014.X.007.

[24] Y. Zhou, J. Lu, J. Fu, X. Chen, Z. Pan, and R. Urtasun, "UniSim: A Neural Closed-Loop Sensor Simulator for Autonomous Driving," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09155*, Feb. 2023. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.09155

[25] K. Xu, L. Jiang, J. Zhao, Z. Wang, and H. Li, "Multi-Sensor Fusion in Automated Driving: Survey and Perspectives," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 6751–6768, Nov. 2021. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2020.3047573.

[26] M. Peter, A. Schilling, and J. Beyerer, "Adversarial Attacks on Automotive LiDAR Sensors: Threat Analysis and Countermeasures," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Veh.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1341–1351, Jun. 2023. doi: 10.1109/TIV.2022.3209845.

[27] N. Li, D. W. C. Ho, and H. K. Lam, "Predictive Energy Management for Connected Electric Vehicles Under V2I Communication," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 7950–7960, Aug. 2022. doi: 10.1109/TIE.2021.3108451.

[28] L. Sun, M. Feng, J. Shen, and Y. Zhang, "SOH Estimation of Lithium-Ion Batteries Based on LSTM and Transfer Learning," *J. Energy Storage*, vol. 52, p. 104972, Aug. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.est.2022.104972.

[29] Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH), *Bharat New Car Assessment Programme (Bharat NCAP): Test Protocol*. New Delhi, India: Government of India, 2023.

[30] Swan Mobility, *Autonomous Shuttle Pilot Report: Gurugram Smart City Corridor*. Gurugram, India, 2023.

[31] Mobileye, *REM™ (Road Experience Management): Crowdsourced HD Mapping White Paper*. Santa Clara, CA, USA: Intel Corporation, 2022.

[32] Arbe Robotics Ltd., *Phoenix Chipset: 4D Imaging Radar Technical Datasheet*, Rev. 3.1. Tel Aviv, Israel, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://arbe.com/resources/

[33] World Health Organization (WHO), *Global Status Report on Road Safety 2023*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2023.