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# 1 Introduction

This document provides templates and summaries for the following email discussion:

* [AT111-e][607][POS] Integrity definitions, KPIs, and use cases (Swift)

Scope: Discuss proposals and attempt to reach consensus on definitions, KPIs, and use cases for positioning integrity.

Intended outcome: Summary with potential agreeable TP

Deadline:  Thursday 2020-08-20 1100 UTC

The intention is to reach consensus on the initial principles of integrity as an input to the remaining Study objectives. Best attempts have been made to accurately capture and represent all submissions that contained proposals relating to one or more of the individual topics. Please let the email Rapporteur know of any accidental oversights as part of the initial review phase.

# 2 Integrity Definitions

The submissions containing integrity definitions are listed below. To assist the review process, they have been grouped according to those which included a broader suite of integrity definitions (including KPIs) (Table 1) and those which only proposed KPI definitions (Table 2).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdoc [Reference] | Source |
| [R2-2006541](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006541.zip) [1] | Swift Navigation, Deutsche Telekom, u-blox, Ericsson, Mitsubishi Electric, Intel Corporation, CATT, UIC |
| [R2-2007646](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007646.zip) [2] | ESA |
| [R2-2007937](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007937.zip) [3] | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |

**Table 1.** Submissions containing general integrity definitions (including KPIs)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdoc [Reference] | Source |
| [R2-2006954](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006954.zip) [4] | Ericsson |
| [R2-2007050](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007050.zip) [5] | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [R2-2007102](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007102.zip) [6] | Apple |
| [R2-2007158](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007158.zip) [7] | OPPO |
| [R2-2006564](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006564.zip) [8] | Vivo |
| [R2-2006673](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006673.zip) [9] | CATT |
| [R2-2006754](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006754.zip) [10] | Intel Corporation |
| [R2-2007936](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007936.zip) [11] | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [R2-2006579](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2006579.zip) [12] | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [R2-2007073](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_111-e/Docs/R2-2007073.zip) [13] | Sumitomo Electric |

**Table 2.** Submissions containing specific KPI definitions

* Please comment on the following:

1. Which of the definitions do you agree should be included in the Study?
2. Which of the definitions do you feel should be modified?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Swift Navigation | 1. We agree with the consensus view for the definitions provided in [1], which are decoupled from specific industry implementations and establish a consistent, principles-based framework for interpreting each term and the relationships between each term within the 3GPP architecture. These definitions are also independent of specific technologies, meaning they can apply to multiple positioning methods and use cases within 3GPP. This flexibility extends to the multitude of use cases and higher accuracy requirements supported by 3GPP (Section 4 of this document), meaning additional integrity factors (e.g. fault-free feared events) are also accommodated in the definitions [1].   We would also support adding the following definition from [2], including the suggested track changes to align the terminology with definitions in [1].  **Positioning Integrity Function**  Function within the Positioning System that, using the positioning measurements and other data provided to the positioning system, is able to generate the integrity-related data contained within the Positioning Information (e.g. Protection Level) so it can be employed by the positioning system to provide its service to the user application.   1. We believe that the definitions provided in [1] constitute a good baseline, but we acknowledge some definitions could be refined based on the additional views provided in the submissions. In particular, the precise definition of the Protection Level should be FFS. |
|  |  |

# 3 Integrity KPIs

There was strong consensus in submissions [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12] to agree on the four KPIs below (the definitions for which will be determined in Section 2):

* **Target Integrity Risk (TIR)**
* **Alert Limit (AL)**
* **Protection Level (PL)**
* **Time-to-Alert (TTA)**

While there were minor variations on the naming of some terms (e.g. Alarm versus Alert [9, 11]; Error Limit versus Alert Limit [6]; freshness of the positioning [13]), the names presented above represent the majority view. One proposal [4] also introduced the case for adding Continuity and Availability to the stated KPIs.

* Please comment if you agree with the list of four KPIs or think it should be modified:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Swift Navigation | Agree with the four KPIs. |
|  |  |

# 4 Integrity Use Cases

A number of use cases were proposed in submissions [1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13] with respect to 3GPP.

Please indicate the use cases which you feel should be considered for integrity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Swift Navigation | We have a preference to prioritise the Automotive (e.g. navigation, V2X, autonomous driving, vulnerable road users) and Rail use cases, which typically have clearly defined safety and integrity requirements specified by the operator.  Some submissions presented examples of threshold values for the KPIs, which we agree will be useful in future stages of the SI/WI when determining value ranges for the relevant IEs. However, we think it is important to first agree on the KPI definitions and the priority use cases that require positioning integrity before analysing potential KPI thresholds (noting the TIR, AL and TTA are all implementation-defined). |
|  |  |
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