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# Introduction

This document is the summary of comments under [112bis-e-R18-Pos-09] on drafting RAN1 reply LS on incoming RAN2 LS in R1-2302281 [1] on RAN dependency for Ranging/Sidelink Positioning.

[112bis-e-R18-Pos-09] Email discussion on RAN2 LS on RAN dependency for ranging & sidelink positioning in R1-2302281by April 26 – Qun (Xiaomi)

* Check points: April 21, April 26

# Background

In [1], RAN2 requests RAN1 to confirm whether RAN2’s response to SA2 is correct, and whether additional SL positioning QoS parameters are needed:

|  |
| --- |
| Regarding issue 2, from RAN2 perspective, SL positioning QoS parameters may include: - for absolute & relative positioning: absolute/relative horizontal accuracy, verticalCoordinateRequest, absolute/relative vertical accuracy, response time, and velocityRequest.- for ranging: distance accuracy, direction accuracy, response time, and velocityRequest.Whether additional QoS parameters are required may need to be addressed during the work item.……**To RAN1****ACTION:** RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to evaluate whether RAN2’s understanding on SL positioning QoS parameters is correct and whether additional parameters are needed. |

# 1st round discussion

There are 8 companies providing their views on the reply LS draft [2-12]. Among them, 4 companies [9,10,11,12] think RAN1 can confirm that RAN2 understanding is correct.

The moderator would like to check whether consensus can be made to agree that RAN2 understanding is correct. Note that we can further discuss (in Q2 and Q3) whether additional clarification or additional parameters from RAN1 perspective is included in the reply LS.

**Q1: Do you agree that RAN1 confirms that RAN2’s understanding on SL positioning QoS parameters is correct?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Some clarification on RAN2’s understanding was suggested to be included in the reply LS [3, 12], including:

* Option 1: RAN1 suggests to use relativeVelocityReuest rather than velocityRequest for relative positioning and ranging as in these 2 cases only relative velocity w.r.t. the reference UE can be estimated.
* Option 2: From RAN1 perspective, the response time was not evaluated in the study item and was not tasked to RAN1 for related normative work
* Option 3: RAN1 assumes that no specific solution is needed to handle to the velocity determination for SL positioning or ranging other than that for the general positioning methods.
* Option 4: RAN1 understands that the direction QoS parameter of ranging direction could correspond to direction either expressed in global coordinate system (GCS) that is referenced to geographic north or expressed in local coordinate system (LCS), and request SA2 to feedback whether the architecture design supports the ranging direction in LCS without translating to GCS.

The moderator would like to check whether there is majority view on potential clarifications on RAN2’s understanding from RAN1 perspective, using the following question:

**Q2: Does RAN1 need to provide further clarification on RAN2’s understanding from RAN1 perspective? If yes, pls indicate which option of clarifications you think is necessary.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

3 companies [9,10,11] think QoS parameters provided by RAN2 are sufficient and no additional QoS parameters are needed. However, some additional QoS parameters are proposed [2, 4, 7], including:

* priority of SL-PRS should be considered in SL positioning QoS parameters
* from RAN1 perspective, SL positioning QoS parameters may include SL positioning accuracy, SL positioning service latency, SL positioning service availability and effective SL positioning distance
* for SL ranging, it is recommended to introduce a DirectionRequest parameters in order to indicate whether a direction is requested (TRUE) or not (FALSE). RAN1 agree that additional QoS parameters may need to be addressed during the work item.

On priority of SL PRS which has been agreed in RAN1, in SA2 LS S2-2301464 to which RAN2 replied, it has been clarified that the meaning of QoS parameters refers to LCS QoS information.

|  |
| --- |
| *Regarding issue 2), RAN2 requires more information about the meaning of QoS parameters for Service Authorization, i.e. whether it is LCS QoS information or PQI like QoS.***SA2 Conclusion:** SA2 concludes that PQI is authorized and provisioned to the UE by 5GC with the mapping to the Ranging/SL positioning service when PC5-U is used as the SLPP transport layer. The positioning QoS parameters (i.e. LCS QoS information) may also be authorized and provisioned. From SA2 perspective, positioning QoS parameters may include accuracy and latency of direction and distance. SA2 would expect RAN WGs to evaluate if that’s a correct understanding. |

From RAN1 perspective, it is not clear whether priority of SL PRS belongs to LCS QoS information or only PQI like QoS. The moderator would suggest that RAN1 informs RAN2 on RAN1 agreement of priority of SL PRS, and asks RAN2 to determine whether SL positioning QoS parameters include priority of SL PRS.

**Q3-1: Do you agree that RAN1 informs RAN2 on RAN1 agreement of priority of SL PRS, and asks RAN2 to determine whether positioning QoS parameters include priority of SL PRS?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN2 is already aware of the RAN1 agreement on priority. It is also already part of the sidelink resource selection flow. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The Moderator would also like to check whether there is majority view on other additional QoS parameters not agreed in RAN1, using the following question:

**Q3-2: Is there any other additional SL positioning QoS parameter(s) needed from RAN1 perspective? If yes, pls indicate which of the following parameters is needed.**

**Option 1: SL positioning service latency, SL positioning service availability and effective SL positioning distance**

**Option 2: DirectionRequest parameters in order to indicate whether a direction is requested (TRUE) or not (FALSE) for SL ranging**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Companies view

Some companies have provided their views in contributions, which are summarized as below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Views |
| [2] | In RAN1’s view, the sensing-based resource allocation has been agreed. In the procedure of sensing-based resource selection, the priority of SL-PRS should be used for sensing. Therefore, we think the priority of SL-PRS should be considered in SL positioning QoS parameters. |
| [3][6] | **RAN1 response**: * ***On the SL positioning parameters, RAN1 suggests to use relativeVelocityReuest rather than velocityRequest for relative positioning and ranging as in these 2 cases only relative velocity w.r.t. the reference UE can be estimated, RAN2’s understanding on the other parameters is correct and no additional parameter is needed.***
 |
| [4][5] | * **From RAN1 perspective, SL positioning QoS parameters may include SL positioning accuracy, SL positioning service latency, SL positioning service availability and effective SL positioning distance.**
	+ **For absolute & relative SL positioning, SL positioning QoS parameters may include absolute/relative horizontal accuracy, absolute/relative vertical accuracy, SL positioning service latency, SL positioning service availability and effective SL positioning distance.**
	+ **For ranging, SL positioning QoS parameters may include distance accuracy, direction accuracy, SL positioning service latency, SL positioning service availability and effective SL positioning distance.**
 |
| [7][8] | RAN1 confirms that QoS parameters for SL absolute and relative positioning are correct. However, for SL ranging, it is recommended to introduce a *DirectionRequest* parameters in order to indicate whether a direction is requested (TRUE) or not (FALSE). RAN1 agree that additional QoS parameters may need to be addressed during the work item. |
| [9] | With regard to SL positioning QoS parameters, RAN1 confirms that RAN2’s understanding is correct, and no additional parameters are needed from RAN1 perspective.  |
| [10] | RAN1 confirms that RAN2’s understanding on SL positioning parameter is correct and that the QoS parameters listed in the LS and those provided by using PC5-U as the transport layer for SLPP are sufficient. |
| [11] | Regarding RAN2’s understanding on SL positioning QoS parameters, RAN1 confirms that the understanding is correct. RAN1 has not identified any other additional SL positioning QoS parameters. |
| [12] | ***Proposal 1: Reply to RAN2/SA2 on the response time, velocity and ranging direction.******Proposal 2: Endorse the reply in the Appendix.***RAN1 thanks RAN2 for providing the reply on the SL positioning QoS parameters. In general, RAN2’s understanding is aligned with RAN1’s. In addition, RAN1 would like to provide the follow-up answers as below.* From RAN1 perspective, the response time was not evaluated in the study item and was not tasked to RAN1 for related normative work.
* RAN1 assumes that no specific solution is needed to handle to the velocity determination for SL positioning or ranging other than that for the general positioning methods.
* RAN1 understands that the direction QoS parameter of ranging direction could correspond to direction either expressed in global coordinate system (GCS) that is referenced to geographic north or expressed in local coordinate system (LCS), and request SA2 to feedback whether the architecture design supports the ranging direction in LCS without translating to GCS.

**2. Actions:****To RAN2, SA2**RAN1 respectfully requests RAN2 and SA2 to take above feedback into account in their future work, and SA2 to feedback whether the architecture design supports the ranging direction in LCS without translating to GCS. |

# Summary and conclusion

TBD
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