SLOVENSKI STANDARD
kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17465:2020

01-januar-2020

Vesolje - Ugotavljanje položaja z uporabo sistema globalne satelitske navigacije (GNSS) pri inteligentnih transportnih sistemih (ITS) v cestnem prometu - Opredelitev terenskih preskusov za osnovno zmogljivost

Space - Use of GNSS-based positioning for road Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) - Field tests definition for basic performance

Definition von Feldtests für Grundleistungen

Espace - Utilisation de la localisation basée sur les GNSS pour les systèmes de transport routiers intelligents - Définition des essais terrains pour les performances générales

Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: FprCEN/TR 17465

ICS:

33.070.40	Satelit	Satellite
35.240.60	Uporabniške rešitve IT v prometu	IT applications in transport

kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17465:2020 en,fr,de

TECHNICAL REPORT

RAPPORT TECHNIQUE

TECHNISCHER BERICHT

FINAL DRAFT
FprCEN/TR 17465

September 2019

ICS

English version

Space - Use of GNSS-based positioning for road Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) - Field tests definition for basic performance

Espace - Utilisation de la localisation basée sur les GNSS pour les systèmes de transport routiers intelligents - Définition des essais terrains pour les performances générales

Definition von Feldtests für Grundleistungen

This draft Technical Report is submitted to CEN members for Vote. It has been drawn up by the Technical Committee CEN/CLC/JTC 5.

CEN and CENELEC members are the national standards bodies and national electrotechnical committees of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.

Recipients of this draft are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation.

Warning : This document is not a Technical Report. It is distributed for review and comments. It is subject to change without notice and shall not be referred to as a Technical Report.

CEN-CENELEC Management Centre:
Rue de la Science 23, B-1040 Brussels

Ref. No. FprCEN/TR 17465:2019 E

Contents

Page

European foreword ... 6

1 Scope ... 7

2 Normative references ... 8

3 Terms and definitions ... 8

4 List of acronyms ... 8

5 Definition of the general strategy: what kind of tests? ... 9

5.1 General ... 9

5.2 GBPT characterization ... 9
5.2.1 An hybrid and heterogenic system ... 9
5.2.2 Test combinatory explosion: an issue ... 11
5.2.3 Proposed approach ... 12

5.3 Stakeholders and responsibilities ... 14
5.3.1 Industry value chain ... 14
5.3.2 Roles and responsibilities ... 14

5.4 Main criteria for testing strategy ... 16

5.5 Potential test methods ... 17
5.5.1 General ... 17
5.5.2 Simulations ... 17
5.5.3 Field test ... 17
5.5.4 Record and Replay ... 18
5.5.5 Verification methods face-off table with regard to main criteria for testing strategy ... 19

5.6 Metrics coverage ... 21
5.6.1 Need of refinement of the metrics data sets ... 21
5.6.2 Unique data collection for the accuracy, availability, integrity metrics ... 21
5.6.3 Same data collection for a flexible list of road applications ... 22
5.6.4 Particular case of the integrity risk ... 22
5.6.5 Particular case of the TTFF assessment ... 24
5.6.6 Fit the test methodology to the metrics purposes ... 24

5.7 Recommendation for testing strategy ... 26
5.7.1 General ... 26
5.7.2 Proposal for a homologation plan (case of complex hybridized GBPT systems considered) ... 27

6 Definition of the operational scenario: how to configure the tests? ... 30

6.1 General ... 30

6.2 Preamble **30**

6.3 Status of definition of an operational scenario: discussions **32**
6.3.1 General 32
6.3.2 Set-up conditions 32
6.3.3 Trajectory/motion 33
6.3.4 Environmental conditions 35
6.3.5 Synthesis on the construction of the operational scenario 37

6.4 Descriptions of operational scenarios expected for record and replay testing **38**
6.4.1 General 38
6.4.2 Set-up conditions 38
6.4.3 Selection of roads 40
6.4.4 Selection of kinds of trips 43
6.4.5 Crossing selected roads and trips: proposed organization of tests 45

6.5 Operational scenarios for TTFF field tests **48**
6.5.1 General 48
6.5.2 Set-up conditions 48
6.5.3 Trajectories 49
6.5.4 Environmental conditions 50
6.5.5 Proposed combinations 50

7 Definition of the metrics and related tools: what to measure? **51**

7.1 General **51**

7.2 Accuracy metrics **51**
7.2.1 General 51
7.2.2 Integrity metrics 61

7.3 Availability metrics **66**

7.4 Continuity metrics **67**

7.5 Timing metrics **67**

7.6 Synthesis on the receiver outputs to be collected **70**

7.7 Synthesis of the metrics computation tool functions **70**

8 Definition of the test facilities: which equipment to use? **71**

8.1 General **71**

8.2 Equipment panorama and characterization **71**
8.2.1 Equipment for in-field data collection 71
8.2.2 Laboratory Test-beds 77
8.2.3 Log and Replay Solutions 82

8.3 Equipment Justification **87**
8.3.1 Equipment for in-field data collection 87
8.3.2 “Log & Replay” Solutions 91

9 Definition of the test procedures: how to proceed to the tests? **93**

9.1 General ... 93

9.2 Field tests for recording the in-file data of the standardized operational scenario ... 94
9.2.1 General ... 94
9.2.2 Test plan ... 94
9.2.3 Good functioning verification ... 98
9.2.4 Field test conducting ... 98
9.2.5 Data analysis and archiving ... 99

9.3 Characterization of environment ... 101

9.4 Replay step: assessing the DUT performances ... 101

10 Definition of the validation procedures: how to be sure of the results? ... 102

10.1 General ... 102

10.2 Presentation of a scenario: rush time in Toulouse ... 102

10.3 Quality of the reference trajectory ... 105

10.4 Availability, regularity of the of the DUT's outputs for the metrics computations ... 106

10.5 Statistic representability of the results ... 108

11 Definition of the synthesis report: how to report the results of the tests? ... 112

11.1 General ... 112

11.2 Identification of the DUT ... 112

11.3 Identifications of test ... 112

11.4 Personal responsible of tests ... 113

11.5 Identification of the tests stimuli ... 113

11.6 Report of tests conditions ... 113

11.7 Identification of the files including the test raw data ... 113

11.8 Identification of tools used in post processing for computing the metrics ... 113

11.9 Results ... 113

11.10 Date of report, responsible and contact, lab address and signatures ... 114

Annex A (normative) ETSI test definition for GBLS ... 115

A.1 Synthetic reporting of the ETSI specification for the operational environment and tests conditions ... 115

Annex B (normative) Detailed criteria for testing strategy ... 126

B.1 First criteria: trust in metrology 126

B.1.1 Reproducible results 126

B.1.2 Representative and meaningful results for the road applications 128

B.1.3 Reliable procedure for the metric assessment 128

B.2 Second criteria: Reasonable cost for manufacturers 128

B.2.1 Cost of test benches 128

B.2.2 Cost of the test operations 129

B.2.3 Additional costs 129

B.3 Third criteria: clear responsibility and sharing between actors 130

Annex C (normative) Size of data collection (GMV contribution) 132

C.1 Data campaign definition: sample size 132

C.2 Statistical significance 133

Bibliography 137

European foreword

This document (FprCEN/TR 17465:2019) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN/TC 5 “Space”, the secretariat of which is held by DIN.

This document is currently submitted to the Vote on TR

1 Scope

This document is the output of WP1.2 “Field test definition for basic performances” of the GP-START project.

The GP-START project aims to prepare the draft standards CEN/CENELEC/TC5 16803-2 and 16803-3 for the *Use of GNSS-based positioning for road Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS). Part 2: Assessment of basic performances of GNSS-based positioning terminals* is the specific target of this document.

This document constitutes the part of the Technical Report on *Metrics and Performance levels detailed definition and field test definition for basic performances* regarding the field tests definition.

The purpose of WP1.2 is to define the field tests to be performed in order to evaluate the performances of road applications’ GNSS-based positioning terminal (GBPT). To fully define the tests, this task addresses the test strategy, the facilities to be used, the test scenarios (e.g. environments and characteristics, which should allow the comparison of different tests), and the test procedures. The defined tests and process will be validated by performing various in-field tests. The defined tests focus essentially on accuracy, integrity and availability as required in the statement of work included in the invitation to tender.

This document will serve to:

- the consolidation of EN 16803-1: *Definitions and system engineering procedures for the establishment and assessment of performances*;
- the elaboration of EN 16803-2: *Assessment of basic performances of GNSS-based positioning terminals*;
- the elaboration of EN 16803-3: *Assessment of security performances of GNSS-based positioning terminals*.

The document is structured as follows:

- Clause 1 is the present Scope;
- Clause 5 defines and justifies the global strategy for testing;
- Clause 6 defines and justifies the retained operational scenario;
- Clause 7 defines the metrics and related tools;
- Clause 8 defines the required tests facilities;
- Clause 9 defines the tests procedures;
- Clause 10 defines the validation procedures;
- Clause 11 defines how to report the tests results.

2 Normative references

The following documents are referred to in the text in such a way that some or all of their content constitutes requirements of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

EN 16803-1:2016, *Space — Use of GNSS-based positioning for road Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) — Part 1: Definitions and system engineering procedures for the establishment and assessment of performances*

3 Terms and definitions

No terms and definitions are listed in this document.

ISO and IEC maintain terminological databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ISO Online browsing platform: available at http://www.iso.org/obp
- IEC Electropedia: available at http://www.electropedia.org/

4 List of acronyms

- GNSS Global navigation satellite system
- GPS Global positioning system
- SBAS Satellite based augmentation system
- COTS Commercial on the shelves
- GBPT GNSS based positioning terminal
- OTS On the shelves
- ITS Intelligent transport systems
- ETSI European telecommunications standards institute
- A-GNSS Assisted GNSS
- FAR False alarm rate
- PFA Probability of false alarm
- PMD Probability of miss detection
- PPK Post processing kinematic
- AIA Accuracy, integrity, availability
- SW Software
- LoS Line of Sight

5 Definition of the general strategy: what kind of tests?

5.1 General

The technical solutions for ITS (road environment), focused in the targeted standard, are more and more complex.

One consequence is that their performances and behaviours will no more only depend on their design but also, and strongly, depend on a lot of external situations and parameters, uncontrolled by the stakeholders. Among those parameters, we can quote the dependencies on the status of international worldwide space systems (GNSS), on physical atmospheric conditions, and other environmental conditions in the proximity of the vehicle (traffic, tree foliage, buildings in vicinity etc.).

As an example, this situation implies that any realization of one field test procedure of a given product at a given date and hour, will give a different result than the same test procedure of the same product in the same location at a different date and hour (neither ergodic nor stationary stochastic process).

The obvious consequence is that, if a pure field test strategy is targeted as a preferred solution for the performance assessment aiming homologation of devices, the analysis of the tests results would require specialists, and may frequently result in intangible and unreliable interpretations, the opposite of metrology.

A solution to avoid this issue is to have a total trust in simulations where all the tests conditions are controlled and which could be perfectly repeatable. ETSI addressed a similar issue during its standardization process targeting the GNSS based Location Based Services (See ETSI TS 103 246-1, −2, −3, −4, −5). As a conclusion of its work, ETSI, selected a solution exclusively based on simulations (see Annex A).

Considering that the real-life environment remains complex to be simulated, the pure simulation technique will lead to scenarios with a very great number of parameters to be set-up, inducing risk of human manipulation errors, and anyway a remaining lack of representation of the reality.

New paradigms have to be seriously considered, and this Clause 5 aims to open solutions by analysing the best way to select and phase the tests to be performed in a standardized performance assessment.

5.2 GBPT characterization

5.2.1 An hybrid and heterogenic system

According to Figure 3 of (see EN 16803-1), Positioning-based road ITS system is the integration of the GBPT into the road ITS application. Moreover, GBPT is presented also as a complex assembly of sensors, with multiple interfaces with external systems.

The positioning level, focused in this part of document for the definition of tests, is still an assembly of more or less complex components where at least one (1) component is a GNSS sensor.

The generic architecture of a Road ITS system ((EN 16803-1), Figure 4) shows directly that the evaluation of the metrics related to the positioning (accuracy, integrity, availability) will be complex, since it:

- covers intermediate outputs (position, speed) of a global integrated system, likely not easy to capture in some future finally packaged and installed products: *specific prescriptions and communication protocols should be standardized*;

- *depends on worldwide and independently evolving infrastructures*, namely GNSS infrastructure and telecommunication networks, interacting each other's (Assisted, Differential GNSS) and with the system itself, and in particular influencing strongly its performances;

- covers *sensing of the external environment*[1] and consequently *depends on a huge number of external environmental conditions* (radio propagation for GNSS and telecommunications, light, fog and dust for cam and LIDAR, etc.);

- covers in the same time *sensing of the motion of the vehicle*[2] through odometers and inertial sensors and consequently depends on the vehicle and its driving as well as additional external environmental conditions (ex: meteorological, or road-holding for odometer).

In EN 16803-1:2016, Clause 8 presents a long (even if not exhaustive) list[3] of parameters which should impact the definition of the tests.

Synthesizing together, namely in an integrated lab test facility, the effects of worldwide radio infrastructures (as existing currently or evolving in the future), their local radio propagation in road environment, the motion sensing by inertial sensors, and others phenomena like climatic for odometer or imaging for computer vision is today unfeasible.

Today, the lab facilities for making tests in the environmental conditions interesting each sensor exist separately but are never integrated.



Figure 1 — Typical test bench in laboratories facilities

Left to right: GNSS signal generation (ESA radio navigation lab), radio oriented for radio navigation or telecommunications, motion oriented and climatic oriented for inertial sensors (AIAA 092407), computed vision oriented (JPL robotics facilities)

However, techniques like fusion of sensors and data (e.g. maps) appear more and more mandatory to leverage the potential of automotive applications and businesses, considering the weakness of the GNSS signals propagation environments.

---

1 Also called 'exteroceptive' sensors: GNSS sensors, cam, LIDAR measure physical phenomenon of their extern environment to deduce location data, to be compared to eyes, nose, (…) on the animals.

2 Also called 'proprioceptive' sensors: inertial units, odometer measure physical parameter changes due to motion in order to deduce location data, to be compared to sensors belonging to muscles on the animals.

3 In particular when the performances of other sensors than GNSS are considered – required for hybridized systems.

5.2.2 Test combinatory explosion: an issue

It is the purpose of sensor fusion to make each sensor impacting (improving is expected) the performances of the hybridized solution. However, each sensor has two (2) types of errors:

- principles: imperfections of the used physic law modelling the real world (ex: the GNSS propagation is line of sight, except when refraction like in ionosphere or reflection like multipath are encountered, accelerometer measuring only the sum of motion acceleration and gravity, etc.);

- measures: imperfections in the design and manufacturing (ex: bias and scale factors in inertial sensors, thermal noise in electronic, etc.).

By capturing information from a lot of parameters of the external environment or from the motion, and because many physical principle errors of the measurements exist in the reality, the sensor fusion multiplies also the risks of performance degradations. A strict performance assessment should consequently measure the performances in any combination of favourable/unfavourable conditions for good measurements, sensor by sensor. For GBPT, these combinations are still to be combined to the multiplicity of the road usages, road environment varieties, and finally combined with the multiplicity of installation and set-up in the vehicles. There are then a so vast set of possible combinations that it becomes incredible to build reliably and exhaustively the list of the necessary test scenarios covering correctly the computation of performance metrics.

This combinatory explosion affects as much the lab tests in terms of facilities and scenario diversity, as the field tests or the simulation techniques, where, in addition, some of the physical effects are very complex to model representatively.

This implies that experimenting field tests (where the sensors capture during each test one true representation of the real life, namely one instance at a given instant and in a given location of all of the parameters which control the GBPT performances) provide a unique and not reproducible representation. This representation is thus unable to provide, on one test, whatever its length, a total characterization of the statistical properties (like expected in the metric definition).

In this sense, GMV experiment on Madrid (TR WP1/D1) illustrated that very well: 12 samples of a similar procedure (same location) have been run giving 12 separate cumulated distributive functions of the accuracy metric:



Figure 2 — Diversity of field tests results [TR WP1/D1]