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# Introduction

During R2#120 meeting, LS R2-2213320 has been sent to SA2 for the parameters sent between LCS client/UE/AF and LMF

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 would like to thank SA2 for the LS on GNSS integrity requirement provisioning. RAN2 would like to provide the following answer to SA2's question on the parameters that are needed:* + LCS client/UE/AF sends TIR, AL, TTA to the LMF
	+ LMF returns the system available/unavailable indication to the LCS client/UE/AF
 |

While in this meeting, LS R2-2302404 has been received from SA4, enquiring about the range of the paremters.

|  |
| --- |
| CT4 is implementing the GNSS integrity requirements as agreed SA2 CR S2-2300953 defined in TS 23.273 below: *The LCS service request may include integrity requirements including Time-to-Alert (TTA), Target Integrity Risk (TIR) and Alert Limit(AL). Definitions of these parameters are specified in TS 38.305 [9].*However, there is no clear data structure definition of TTA, TIR and AL in TS 38.305, CT4 could not implement this feature based on current definition.CT4 would like to kindly ask RAN2 to define the data structure of TTA, TIR and AL, and provide the related reference to CT4 in order to implement this feature. |

During R2#121bis, the following email discussion has been arranged for the discusison for the reply LS

* [AT121bis-e][417][POS] LS on GNSS integrity parameters (Huawei)

      Scope: Consider the LS in R2-2302404 and draft a reply.

      Intended outcome: Report and approvable LS

      Deadline: Friday 2023-04-21 1000 UTC

In this contribution, we discuss the data structure of the TTA, TIR, AL and propose a reply LS to CT4

# Discussions

In the current LPP spec, only the data structure for Target Integrity Risk has been defined, as follows:

CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation ::= SEQUENCE {

 locationInformationType LocationInformationType,

 triggeredReporting TriggeredReportingCriteria OPTIONAL, -- Cond ECID

 periodicalReporting PeriodicalReportingCriteria OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 additionalInformation AdditionalInformation OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 qos QoS OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 environment Environment OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 locationCoordinateTypes LocationCoordinateTypes OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 velocityTypes VelocityTypes OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 ...,

 [[

 messageSizeLimitNB-r14 MessageSizeLimitNB-r14 OPTIONAL -- Need ON

 ]],

 [[

 segmentationInfo-r14 SegmentationInfo-r14 OPTIONAL -- Need ON

 ]],

 [[

 scheduledLocationTime-r17

 ScheduledLocationTime-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 targetIntegrityRisk-r17

 TargetIntegrityRisk-r17 OPTIONAL -- Need ON

 ]]

}

The reason is that during the previous R2 discussion, we have agreed that only Mode 1 for the integrity report is supported in R2#117

Agreements:

Proposal 3. Release 17 supports only Reporting Mode 1 (PL reporting). Reporting Mode 2 can be revisited in future releases.

Proposal 4. For reporting Mode 1, TTA is not needed.

Proposal 5 (modified). Provide achievable TIR as optional parameter in the Integrity Information Result

While during the discussion in R2#120, for a separate discussion on the assistance data for UE-based integrity, the following contribution has been proposed for adding the AD for alert limit and time to alert, with proposed TP

|  |
| --- |
| [R2-2212892](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk16923%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%20Meetings%5C202211%20-%20RAN2_120%2C%20Toulouse%5CExtracts%5CR2-2212892%20integrity.docx) Integrity measurements definition and missing integrity requirements Ericsson discussion Rel-17 |

We think the data structure of the contribution above can be taken as the baseline for the discussion on the reply LS to CT4

***Question1: Do companies agree to adopt the values for Alert Limit and Time to Alert in R2-2212892 for the data structure of TIR and AL?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Company*** | ***Yes/No*** | ***Comment*** |
| **Nokia** | **No** | **There was no consensus on R2-2212892 in RAN2#120. Multiple companies felt that the AL and TTA are not needed for UE or UE-based positioning integrity. Adding the AL and TTA to ProvideAssistanceData or RequestLocationInformation signalling from LMF will be a new functionality for Rel-17 then, but there does not seem to be a common understanding in RAN2 on how it is used in the overall integrity solution. One solution is to align the CT4/SA2 specification and RAN2 specification by just signalling the TIR alone from the LCS client in Rel-17. Note that there is a stage-2 CR in R2-2304054 which is under email discussion [AT121bis-e][411] that has dependency to what we decide on this issue.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **No** | **The proposals in R2-2212892 misinterpret the Integrity Principle of Operation as specified in TS 38.305, clause 8.1.1a. Proponents of R2-2212892 have still not shown why a Alert Limit and Time to Alert is needed to determine a Protection Level.**  |
| **OPPO** | **No**  | **Agree with Nokia. R17 UE-based positioning integrity only implies that UE reports the PL to the network.. In addition, the reason why the UE needs to receive the TTA and AL via the LPP msg is not clear. In such case, location request should come from external client, i.e., MT-LR, the UE higher layer does not need to know the positioning integrity result.**  |

With the above, we have also drafted a reply LS to CT4 for this issue, we’d like also to collect companies’ view on this

***Quesiton2: Do companies have any comment on the reply LS in draft LS in Annex A?***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Company*** | ***Comment*** |
| **Nokia** | **Please see our comment on Q1. If we agree to just signal TIR from LCS client then the LS needs to be modified accordingly.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **See our comment to Q1 above. There are no *IntegrityRequirements-r17* in RAN2 specifications.** |
| **OPPO** | **TIR is enough** |

# Conclusions

***TBD***

# Annex A: Draft LS

3GPP TSG RAN WG2#121bis-e R2-230

Online, 17th - 26th April, 2023

**Title: Reply LS on GNSS integrity requirement parameters definition**

**Response to: C4-230655 “LS on GNSS integrity requirement parameters definition”**

**Release: Rel-17**

**Work Item: NR\_pos\_enh-Core**

**Source:** **RAN2**

**To:** **CT4**

**Cc: SA2**

**Contact person: Yinghao Guo**

 **yinghaoguo@huawei.com**

**Send any reply LS to: 3GPP Liaisons Coordinator,** **mailto:3GPPLiaison@etsi.org**

**Attachments:** **NA**

# 1 Overall description

RAN2 would like to thank CT4 for the LS on GNSS integrity requirement parameters definition, and would like to ask CT4 to take the following RAN2 feedback into consideration:

**Question**: CT4 would like to kindly ask RAN2 to define the data structure of TTA, TIR and AL, and provide the related reference to CT4 in order to implement this feature.

**Answer**: For TIR, the data structure is defined by IE *targetIntegrityRisk*, which is specified in TS 37.355. For TTA and AL, the following range of values can be adopted with field description

IntegrityRequirements-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

 horizontalAlertLimit-r17 INTEGER (0..50000),

 verticalAlertLimit-r17 INTEGER (0..50000) OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 timeToAlert-r17 INTEGER (1,2000) OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

 ...

}

| ***IntegrityRequirements* field descriptions** |
| --- |
| ***horizontalAlertLimit***This field indicates the horizontal alert limit for the integrity principle of operation by the device along the semi-major axis of the error ellipse. Scale factor 0.01 metre; range 0 – 500 meters.  |
| ***verticalAlertLimit***This field indicates the vertical alert limit for the integrity principle of operation by the device. Scale factor 0.01 metre; range 0 – 500 metres. To be compared to the horizontal protection level determined by the device.  |
| ***timeToAlert***The maximum allowable elapsed time from when the protection level (PL) exceeds the Alert Limit (AL) until the function providing positioning integrity annunciates a corresponding alert. Scale factor 0.1 second. |

# 2 Actions

**To CT4**

**ACTION: RAN2 kindly requests CT4 to take the above answers into consideration.**

# 3 Dates of next RAN WG2 meetings

RAN2 #122 22-26 May 2023 Incheon

 <meeting\_identity> <start\_date> - <end\_date> <town>, <country>