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# Introduction

In RAN#85, LCS\_NAVIC work item was approved for A-GNSS suport for NavIC constellation in LTE Release-16. This change request captures the minimum performance requirements expected from GNSS receivers supporting NavIC constellation.

*.*

List of candidate, target of email discussion, for 1st round and 2nd round

* 1st round: Qualcomm, Thales, Broadcomm, Nokia, ZTE, OPPO, APPLE, SAMSUNG, Media-tek, Huawei
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: GNSS Receiver Peformance for NAVIC

Minimum performance requirements for GNSS receivers supporting NavIC constellation.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000071 | Reliance Jio, ISRO  | Proposal 1: Minimum performance requirements for GNSS receivers supporting NavIC constellation.Observation 1: Addition of L5 band only constellation. |

## Open issues summary

### Minimum performance requirements for NAVIC constellation

Issue 1-1: Navic requires 12 sec for the time sync. Hence ‘max-response-time’ in minimum requirements criterion of TS 36.171 needs to be updated.

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: ‘max-response-time’ shall be updated for all GNSS
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ ‘max-response-time’ shall be updated to 40ms to meet 95% success criterion

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spirent Communications | For all RAN 4 requirements except Nominal Accuracy we have never before defined any requirements for a regional NSS system (only for global systems). Having a regional NSS raises many issues. We will need to discuss how we intend to do this and agree a way forward. I suggest a discussion paper with proposals should be generated …Once we have an agreed approach, then another paper will be needed that details and justifies the various values proposed for the requirements (2-D accuracy, TTFF and SV levels etc.) |
| Ericsson | Agree with Spirent, we need to have a discussion and justification for the approach and the numbers. |
| Qualcomm | We have the following comments: (1) The current specification framework of 36.171 supports requirements for global constellations only, as specified in clause 4.7 of TS 36.171. NavIC is a non-global GNSS having regional coverage only. The change in section 4.7 (and at other places) require some correction:“Minimum performance requirements are defined for each global GNSS constellation (GPS, Galileo, Modernized GPS, GLONASS , BDS and NavIC).”since NavIC is not a global GNSS constellation. (2) We agree that NavIC capable receiver require longer response time due to NavIC data structure and L5 signal only; we agree that 40 sec is reasonable. However, we cannot change the existing requirements. Therefore, separate Requirements Tables should be introduced for NavIC. For example:

| System | Success rate | 2-D position error | Max response time |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~All~~NavIC | 95 % | 100 m | 40 s |

 |
| Spirent 2 | To help the discussion, here are the questions we would like to be answered.**Background:** The only regional NSS we have so far is QZSS. For QZSS for RAN 4 requirements we treat QZSS as an “add-on” to GPS for Nominal Accuracy only. It is not treated as a “standalone” NSS.**Questions:**1. Do we treat NavIC like QZSS or more like the global NSSs? What is the reason/use case for this decision? 2. If we treat NavIC more like a global NSS do we treat it as a standalone system (so not in combination with any other GNSS)? Do we treat it in combination(s) with other GNSSs (so for example NavIC + GPS + Galileo)? Or both the above?3. Do we define requirements for all the existing RAN 4 tests? Including “moving scenario”?4. For the requirements/tests, for NavIC as a **standalone** system:a) Are the current HDOP conditions realistic? What are the min/max/typical HDOPs for system?b) Is the current condition for six visible satellites realistic? How many SVs are typically visible?c) Given the answers above, are the current 2-D accuracy requirements still achievable?d) Is the current TTFF achievable? (Seems not) Is it acceptable to have an exception for NavIC (standalone)?e) SV power levels: what values and how are they calculated/justified (compared to levels for GPS)? These calculations/justifications should be documented somewhere.5. For the requirements/tests, for NavIC as one NSS in a **multi-constellation** case:a) Do we just treat it as the other GNSSs? (In particular the GEO SVs treated like BDS?)b) How would we set the TTFF?c) For the Nominal Accuracy requirement, how do we treat QZSS and SBAS (which are normally added in with GPS)? Presumably we would have to exclude at least QZSS in this case? **Other points:**1. The calculations for the values for the parameters in Annex C need documenting somewhere.2. In the case of **multi-constellation requirements** including NavIC, the current GNSS scenarios used for many years in RAN 5 will be unusable and a decision will have to be made as to how to handle this – this might require a joint RAN 4 / RAN 5 discussion and decision. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
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