



ATIS-0500031.v002

ATIS Standard on -

**TEST BED AND MONITORING REGIONS DEFINITION AND METHODOLOGY**



As a leading technology and solutions development organization, the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) brings together the top global ICT companies to advance the industry's most pressing business priorities. ATIS' nearly 200 member companies are currently working to address the All-IP transition, 5G, network functions virtualization, big data analytics, cloud services, device solutions, emergency services, M2M, cyber security, network evolution, quality of service, billing support, operations, and much more. These priorities follow a fast-track development lifecycle — from design and innovation through standards, specifications, requirements, business use cases, software toolkits, open source solutions, and interoperability testing.

ATIS is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The organization is the North American Organizational Partner for the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), a founding Partner of the oneM2M global initiative, a member of and major U.S. contributor to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), as well as a member of the Inter-American Telecommunication Commission (CITEL). For more information, visit [www.atis.org](http://www.atis.org).

---

### Notice of Disclaimer & Limitation of Liability

The information provided in this document is directed solely to professionals who have the appropriate degree of experience to understand and interpret its contents in accordance with generally accepted engineering or other professional standards and applicable regulations. No recommendation as to products or vendors is made or should be implied.

NO REPRESENTATION OR WARRANTY IS MADE THAT THE INFORMATION IS TECHNICALLY ACCURATE OR SUFFICIENT OR CONFORMS TO ANY STATUTE, GOVERNMENTAL RULE OR REGULATION, AND FURTHER, NO REPRESENTATION OR WARRANTY IS MADE OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR AGAINST INFRINGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS. ATIS SHALL NOT BE LIABLE, BEYOND THE AMOUNT OF ANY SUM RECEIVED IN PAYMENT BY ATIS FOR THIS DOCUMENT, AND IN NO EVENT SHALL ATIS BE LIABLE FOR LOST PROFITS OR OTHER INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES. ATIS EXPRESSLY ADVISES THAT ANY AND ALL USE OF OR RELIANCE UPON THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS DOCUMENT IS AT THE RISK OF THE USER.

NOTE - The user's attention is called to the possibility that compliance with this standard may require use of an invention covered by patent rights. By publication of this standard, no position is taken with respect to whether use of an invention covered by patent rights will be required, and if any such use is required no position is taken regarding the validity of this claim or any patent rights in connection therewith. Please refer to [<http://www.atis.org/legal/patentinfo.asp>] to determine if any statement has been filed by a patent holder indicating a willingness to grant a license either without compensation or on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms and conditions to applicants desiring to obtain a license.

---

*Published by*

**Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions**  
**1200 G Street, NW, Suite 500**  
**Washington, DC 20005**

Copyright © 2017 by Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions  
All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For information contact ATIS at 202.628.6380. ATIS is online at < <http://www.atis.org> >.

# **Test Bed and Monitoring Regions Definition and Methodology**

**Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions**

Approved February 13, 2017

## **Abstract**

This document describes and provides the technical details of the approach of characterizing wide scale indoor wireless location performance, for the purposes of E911, through representative testing in a test bed and subsequently applying its results to live wireless network emergency call statistics gathered from a number of diverse monitoring regions.

## Foreword

---

The Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) serves the public through improved understanding between carriers, customers, and manufacturers. The Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ESIF) provides a forum to facilitate the identification and resolution of technical and/or operational issues related to the interconnection of wireline, wireless, cable, satellites, Internet, and emergency services networks.

The mandatory requirements are designated by the word *shall* and recommendations by the word *should*. Where both a mandatory requirement and a recommendation are specified for the same criterion, the recommendation represents a goal currently identifiable as having distinct compatibility or performance advantages. The word *may* denotes an optional capability that could augment the standard. The standard is fully functional without the incorporation of this optional capability.

Suggestions for improvement of this document are welcome. They should be sent to the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, ESIF, 1200 G Street NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20005.

At the time of consensus on this document, ESIF, which was responsible for its development, had the following leadership:

S. Sherwood, ESIF Chair (Verizon Wireless)

R. Hixson, ESIF 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair (NENA)

R. Marshall, ESIF 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair (Comtech)

J. Green, ESIF ESM Co-Chair (Sprint)

K. Springer, ESIF ESM Co-Chair (AT&T)

The **Emergency Services & Methodologies [ESM]** Subcommittee was responsible for the development of this document.

## Revision History

---

Date	Document Number	Description
6/16/2016	ATIS-0500031	Document approved.
2/13/2017	ATIS-0500031.v002	Document updated to include new Appendix B, additional supporting materials, and supporting text in Clause 4.

# Table of Contents

---

1	Scope, Purpose, & Application .....	1
1.1	Scope .....	1
1.2	Purpose .....	1
1.3	Application .....	1
2	Normative References .....	1
3	Acronyms & Abbreviations.....	2
3.1	Acronyms & Abbreviations .....	2
4	Approach to Indoor Location Performance Establishment.....	3
5	Indoor Location Performance Monitoring Regions.....	5
5.1	Morphology Classification & Considerations for Application of Results .....	5
5.1.1	<i>Application from Test bed to Monitoring Regions</i> .....	5
5.1.2	<i>Application from Monitoring Regions to other Areas</i> .....	6
5.2	San Francisco Monitoring Region .....	7
5.3	Chicago Monitoring Region.....	8
5.4	Atlanta Monitoring Region.....	11
5.5	Denver Monitoring Region .....	12
5.6	Philadelphia Monitoring Region.....	13
5.7	New York Monitoring Region.....	15
5.8	Special Considerations for Non-National Wireless carriers .....	17
6	Indoor Location Test Bed Regions .....	18
6.1	Background.....	18
6.2	San Francisco Test Bed Region.....	18
6.2.1	<i>Dense Urban Test Polygon</i> .....	18
6.2.2	<i>Urban Test Polygons</i> .....	18
6.2.3	<i>Suburban Test Polygon</i> .....	22
6.2.4	<i>Rural Test Polygons</i> .....	23
6.3	Atlanta Test Bed Region .....	27
6.3.1	<i>Dense Urban Atlanta Test Polygons</i> .....	28
6.3.2	<i>Urban Atlanta Test Polygon</i> .....	30
6.3.3	<i>Suburban Atlanta Test Polygon</i> .....	31
6.3.4	<i>Rural Atlanta Area Test Polygon</i> .....	32
6.4	Test Building Types and Test Cases.....	32
7	Testing Methodologies.....	33
8	How to Analyze Test Results.....	36
8.1	Test Bed Results.....	36
8.1.1	<i>High-Level Process Flow</i> .....	37
8.1.2	<i>Test Bed Outputs</i> .....	38
8.2	Applying Test Bed Data to Live Calls .....	45
8.2.1	<i>Assigning Live Wireless 911 Calls to a Given Morphology</i> .....	46
8.2.2	<i>Applying Test Data to Live Wireless 911 Calls</i> .....	47
	Appendix A. Detailed Calculations with 4 Technologies and 4 Morphologies.....	49
	Appendix B. Morphology Definitions for the Six E911 Performance Monitoring Regions .....	55

## Table of Figures

Figure 5.2-1 -- The 9 Counties Forming the San Francisco Monitoring Region .....	8
Figure 5.3-1 – The 6 Counties Forming the Chicago Monitoring Region .....	10
Figure 5.4-1 – The 13 Counties Forming the Atlanta Monitoring Region .....	12
Figure 5.5.-1 – The 8 Counties Forming the Denver Monitoring Region .....	13
Figure 5.6-1 – The 8 Counties Forming the New Philadelphia Monitoring Region .....	15
Figure 5.7-1 – The 17 Counties Forming the New York Monitoring Region .....	16
Figure 6.2-1 – Urban and Dense Urban Test Polygons in San Francisco .....	19
Figure 6.2-2 – A Wide Variety of Residential Structures in the Expanded Urban SF Polygon .	20
Figure 6.2-3 – Example of San Francisco Row Houses in the Expanded Urban Polygon .....	20
Figure 6.2- 4 – Example of Steep Terrain in the Expanded Urban Polygon .....	21
Figure 6.2-5 – San Jose Urban Polygon—New (Brown) and Old (Orange).....	22
Figure 6.2-6 – Suburban Polygon in Silicon Valley (Blue) .....	23
Figure 6.2-7 – Rural Polygon No. 1 (Flat Agricultural) .....	24
Figure 6.2-8 – Rural Polygon No. 2 (Foothills).....	25
Figure 6.2-9 – Example of Structures and Mild Forestation in Rural Polygon No. 2 .....	26
Figure 6.2-10 – Example of Structures with More Forestation in Rural Polygon No. 2 .....	26
Figure 6.3-1 – Dense Urban Polygon—Downtown Atlanta .....	28
Figure 6.3-2 – Dense Urban Polygon—Midtown Atlanta .....	29
Figure 6.3-3 – Urban and Dense Urban Polygons in Atlanta and Suburban Polygon Boundary .....	30
Figure 6.3-4 – Suburban Atlanta Test Bed Polygon .....	31
Figure 6.3-5 – Rural Atlanta Area Test Bed Polygon (in Butts County) .....	32
Figure 8.1-1 – Test Bed Data Consolidation Process Flow .....	37
Figure 8.1-2 – Depiction of Collection and Compilation of Live 911 call Statistics.....	38
Figure 8.2-1 – Diagram Illustrating Use of Cell Sectors in Morphology Assignments .....	46

## Table of Tables

Table 5.2-1 – CMAs and Counties in the San Francisco Monitoring Region .....	7
Table 5.3-1 – Counties in the Chicago CMA Monitoring Region.....	9
Table 5.4-1 – Counties in the Atlanta CMA Monitoring Region.....	11
Table 5.5-1 – Counties in the Denver Monitoring Region .....	13
Table 5.6-1 – Counties in the Philadelphia Monitoring Region .....	14
Table 5.7-1 – Counties in the New York Monitoring Region .....	16
Table 7.1-1 – Factors Affecting Crowd-Sourced Wi-Fi Location Performance.....	35
Table 8.1-1 – Minimum Accuracy Data from Test-Bed to Evaluate Live Calls.....	39
Table 8.1-2 – Indoor Test Bed Results from Test Bed Area 1 .....	40
Table 8.1- 3 -- Indoor Test Bed Results from Test Bed Area 2.....	40
Table 8.1-4 – Combining Results from Two Test Bed Areas Using Direct Method.....	41
Table 8.1-5 – Minimum Indoor Accuracy Data.....	41
Table 8.1-6 – Minimum Outdoor Accuracy Data.....	41
Table 8.1-7 – Illustrative Indoor Accuracy Data .....	43

Table 8.1-8 – Illustrative Outdoor Accuracy Data .....	43
Table 8.1-9 – Computing Performance in Morphology 1 .....	43
Table 8.1-10 – Computing Performance in Morphology 2 .....	44
Table 8.1-11 – Test Bed and Other Data with Fix Counts in Morphology 1 .....	44
Table 8.1-12 – Indoor/Outdoor Blending Using Fix Counts in Morphology 1 .....	45
Table 8.1-13 – Technology Performance Table.....	45
Table 8.2-1 – Technology Performance Table.....	47
Table 8.2-2 – Illustrative Summary Live Wireless 911 Call Data from an Area of Interest.....	47
Table 8.2-3 – Location Accuracy for an Area of Interest.....	47
Table 8.2-4 – Location Accuracy for an Area Showing Individual Call Accuracy Assignments	48
Table A.1 – Illustrative Indoor Test Bed Results .....	49
Table A.2 – Illustrative Outdoor Test Results .....	49
Table A.3 – Computing Dense Urban Performance .....	50
Table A.4 – Computing Urban Performance.....	50
Table A.5 – Computing Suburban Performance .....	51
Table A.6 – Test Bed and Other Data with Fix Counts .....	51
Table A.7 – Indoor/Outdoor Blending Using Fix Counts .....	52
Table A.8 – Technology Performance Table .....	52
Table A. 9 – Illustrative Summary Live Wireless 911 Call Data from an Area of Interest .....	53
Table A.10 – Location Accuracy for an Area of Interest .....	53
Table A.11 – Location Accuracy for an Area Showing Individual Call Accuracy Assignments	54

## ATIS Best Practices Recommendation

# Test Bed and Monitoring Regions Definition and Methodology

## 1 Scope, Purpose, & Application

---

### 1.1 Scope

This document describes and provides the technical details of the approach of characterizing wide scale indoor wireless location performance, for the purposes of E911, through representative testing in a test bed and subsequently applying its results to live wireless network emergency call statistics gathered from a number of diverse monitoring regions.

This document provides the definition of the six wireless network monitoring regions across the U.S. and the detailed definition of the test bed with its two test areas in and around the San Francisco and Atlanta metropolitan regions. The document describes in detail the test bed morphologies and their boundaries in the test areas, the test building types, the test cases within the test buildings, and the general test methodology. The detailed mathematical procedures to apply the benchmark results from the test bed to the live emergency call statistics in the monitoring regions are also presented.

### 1.2 Purpose

It is intended that through the application of the concepts and techniques defined in this document, the wireless industry and public safety will have a uniform consensus methodology that is both sound and efficient, that can be used in establishing wireless E911 indoor location performance in a consistent and repeatable manner.

### 1.3 Application

All stakeholders involved in indoor wireless E911 location performance characterization will find the contents of this document applicable to their efforts. It defines for wireless carriers, location technology vendors, test services vendors, and experts in the field the network monitoring regions to be used in establishing compliance with FCC location accuracy requirements, the test bed with its two distinct regions and characteristics, the test methodology, and the mathematical procedures to apply the test bed results to the live network call statistics obtained from the monitoring regions. It is anticipated that technical teams involved in planning, performing, and overseeing field testing related to the test bed and analyzing its results, as well as wireless carrier technical personnel involved in applying the results of the test bed to their networks, will make frequent use of the techniques described in this document.

## 2 Normative References

---

The following standards contain provisions which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this Standard. At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid. All standards are subject to revision, and parties to agreements based on this Standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the standards indicated below.

FCC 15-9, PS Docket No. 07-114, 4<sup>th</sup> Report and Order, *Fourth Report and Order In the Matter of Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements*<sup>1</sup>

ATIS-0500013, *Approaches to Wireless E911 Indoor Location Performance Testing*<sup>2</sup>

ATIS-0500022, *Test Plan Input for a Location Technology Test Bed*<sup>3</sup>

ATIS-0500027, *Recommendations for Establishing Wide Scale Indoor Location Performance*<sup>4</sup>

ATIS-0500030, *Guidelines for Testing Barometric Pressure-Based Z-Axis Solution*<sup>5</sup>

## 3 Acronyms & Abbreviations

---

For a list of common communications terms and definitions, please visit the *ATIS Telecom Glossary*, which is located at < <http://www.atis.org/glossary> >.

### 3.1 Acronyms & Abbreviations

AGNSS	Assisted Global Navigation Satellite System
A-GPS	Assisted-Global Positioning System
AP	Access Point (i.e., Wi-Fi Base Station)
ATIS	Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions
BLE	Bluetooth Low Energy
CMRS	Commercial Mobile Radio Services
CMA	Cellular Market Areas
CSRIC	Communications Security, Reliability and Interoperability Council
CTIA	Cellular Telephone Industries Association, now known as CTIA-The Wireless Association
DL	Dispatchable Location
E911	Enhanced 911
ESIF	Emergency Services Interconnection Forum
ESM	Emergency Services & Methodologies
FCC	Federal Communications Commission

<sup>1</sup> This document is available from the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554: < <http://www.fcc.gov> >.

<sup>2</sup> This document is available from the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, 1200 G Street, NW Suite 500 | Washington, DC, 20005: < <https://www.atis.org/docstore/product.aspx?id=25009> >.

<sup>3</sup> This document is available from the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, 1200 G Street, NW Suite 500 | Washington, DC, 20005: < <https://www.atis.org/docstore/product.aspx?id=27856> >.

<sup>4</sup> This document is available from the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, 1200 G Street, NW Suite 500 | Washington, DC, 20005: < <https://www.atis.org/docstore/product.aspx?id=28219> >.

<sup>5</sup> This document is available from the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, 1200 G Street, NW Suite 500 | Washington, DC, 20005: < <https://www.atis.org/docstore/product.aspx?id=28274> >.

FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standard (A FIPS Code is a 5 digit code assigned to each county)
GDOP	Geometric Dilution of Precision
GPS	Global Positioning System
ISP	Internet Service Provider
OS	Operating System
OTDOA	Observed Time Difference of Arrival
PSAP	Public Safety Answering Point
RF	Radio Frequency
RTT	Round Trip Time
TBS	Terrestrial Beacon System
TTF	Time to First Fix
Wi-Fi	Wireless Fidelity

## 4 Approach to Indoor Location Performance Establishment

ESIF ESM has provided recommendations for indoor location performance characterization based on representative indoor testing and monitoring in select regions in ATIS-0500027. That document outlines the key parameters that need to be characterized for a wide selection of existing and emerging indoor location technology solutions. It also identifies six market regions as candidates for indoor test bed implementation. Those regions are Metropolitan San Francisco, Denver, Chicago, Atlanta, and Philadelphia, in addition to Manhattan in New York City because of its unique dense urban environment.

The FCC, in its 4<sup>th</sup> Report and Order, adopted the approach of representative evaluation and testing of indoor location technology performance for wireless E911. In the Order, the FCC placed indoor location performance benchmarks to be met by wireless carriers (CMRS providers) over a multi-year time frame. It also required that CMRS providers certify at certain timeframes that they have deployed compliant technology throughout their network “consistent with the compliant technology’s performance in an independent test bed”. Moreover, “to demonstrate further compliance with these metrics, CMRS providers must submit aggregated live 911 call data from the six cities recommended for indoor testing by the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ATIS ESIF).”

Accordingly, through the regulatory process, the six market regions identified in ATIS-0500027 have been used interchangeably, either as candidate areas for establishing a test bed to represent the entire U.S., or as areas to monitor live E911 location performance across the U.S., when coupled with the appropriate representative test bed data.

Subsequent to the 4<sup>th</sup> Report and Order and in response to its requirements, ESIF re-examined and refined the test bed locations for representative testing. It also began work to define blending methodologies for assessing accuracy compliance. Through technical contributions to ESM and extensive dialogue within it related to the resolution of this issue, convergence was reached on using a two-region test bed, with one region in the eastern U.S. and one on the West Coast, to capture the representative indoor location test data. Metropolitan San Francisco and Metropolitan Atlanta as well as the areas surrounding them were selected as the two test bed regions. Each of these two test regions would have good, albeit distinct, representation of the four basic morphologies (environments) where wireless calls are placed, namely, the dense urban, urban, suburban, and rural morphologies.

The rationale for selecting Metropolitan San Francisco as a test bed region is obvious, since it served very well as a representative area with diverse morphologies and building types during the CSRIC III testing. The rationale for selecting Atlanta, for example over Philadelphia (which was used as an example in ATIS-0500027), is that Atlanta