Pedestrian Detection Comparison Scorecard

A practical way to compare options without feature noise

Who it's for: Safety, Operations, and Risk leaders comparing pedestrian detection options in mixed-traffic environments.

What it's for: A structured comparison focused on what tends to determine

real-world effectiveness: site-fit, human factors, governance, maintenance realism,

and support.

How to use it (5 minutes):

- Compare 2–4 options.
- Score each category 0–5 based on what you can confirm (demo, documentation, site walk, and trial plan).
- Use the notes to capture what's confirmed vs what needs validating in a paid trial.

Scoring guide:

0 = Unknown / not evidenced • 1–2 = Weak fit / high uncertainty • 3 = Acceptable • 4

= Strong • 5 = Strong + clearly suited to your conditions

Site context (so the score reflects real conditions)

Site/Location: _____ Date: _____

Assessed by: _____ Roles involved: ☐ Safety ☐ Ops ☐ Risk ☐

Maintenance ☐ Supervisors ☐ Other: _____

Where do people–plant interactions occur? (tick):

☐ Docks/loading bays ☐ Cross-aisles ☐ Intersections ☐ Racking ends ☐ Reversing zones

☐ Yard/doors ☐ Production areas ☐ Waste tip floor ☐ Other:

_____

Operating conditions to account for (tick):

☐ Peak congestion ☐ Night shift / low light ☐ Dust/grime ☐ Washdowns ☐ Outdoor weather

☐ Condensation at doors ☐ High turnover/labour hire ☐ Mixed languages ☐

Contractors/visitors

Quick comparison table (score 0–5)

Category (0–5)	Option A	Option B	Option C	Notes / Evidence (what did you verify?)
1. Fit to exposure scenarios				
2. Alert quality (human factors)				
3. Environment suitability				
4.Ownership & Documentation				
5. Implementation realism				
6. Ongoing support & continuous improvement				
Total (out of 30)				

The scorecard (prompts by category)

1. Fit to exposure scenarios (site-fit)

Score (0–5): ____

Prompts:

- Which specific interaction points on our site does it meaningfully support (e.g., docks, intersections, reversing)?
- Does the proposed approach still make sense during peak congestion and "normal chaos" (not just quiet windows)?
- What are the known limitations / least effective conditions, and how will we recognise them on site?

Notes: _____

2. Alert quality (human factors)

Score (0–5): ____

Prompts:

- Are alerts likely to feel credible and actionable, or like constant noise?
- How does the approach reduce nuisance alerts and alert fatigue in day-to-day workflows?
- What workaround behaviours could emerge (e.g., muting/ignoring/avoidance), and how would we detect them early?

Notes: _____

3. Environment suitability (conditions + upkeep)

Score (0–5): _____

Prompts:

- Is it suited to our conditions: dust, grime, glare, low light, condensation, washdown areas, outdoor weather (as relevant)?
- What happens when conditions worsen—does performance degrade in ways that are visible/understandable to users?
- What is the minimum maintenance standard needed to keep it effective under real constraints?

Notes: _____

4. Ownership and documentation

Score (0–5): _____

Prompts:

- Are limitations and responsibilities explained in plain language (not just technical docs)?
- Who can change configuration/settings, and how are changes requested, approved, recorded, and reviewed?
- What documentation is provided for setup, inspections/checks, training, and review?

Notes: _____

5. Implementation realism (training load, disruption, adoption)

Score (0–5): _____

Prompts:

- What training is needed for operators, pedestrians, supervisors, and contractors/visitors (including refreshers)?
- How will this sit alongside existing traffic management controls (not replacing them)?
- What does a realistic rollout look like across multiple machines/areas while keeping consistency?

Notes: _____

6. Ongoing support & continuous improvement

Score (0–5): _____

Prompts:

- What does support look like in practice (responsiveness, documentation quality, escalation path)?
- What review cadence is recommended, and who typically owns it on site?
- How are learnings (near-misses, proximity events, operator feedback) captured and used to improve over time?

Notes: _____

Trial validation (optional add-on)

If you move to a paid trial, document the basics up front:

Trial areas/shifts included: _____

Peak periods included? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Success criteria (leading indicators): _____

Decision at end of trial: ☐ Proceed ☐ Adjust and re-test ☐ Expand ☐ Stop

Sign-off: Ops: _____   Safety/Risk: _____   Date: _____

Important note

This scorecard is general information only. It is not legal advice or safety consulting. Always align decisions to your workplace risk management process and existing traffic management controls. Pedestrian detection can support safer separation as an engineering control / safety aid, but it does not eliminate residual risk.