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# 1. Introduction

This document summarizes the following email discussion:

* [AT113bis-e][612][POS] LS to SA2 on scheduled location time (Qualcomm)

Scope: Draft an LS to SA2 indicating that RAN2 intend to support a scheduled location time. Questions for clarification on the SA2 CR can be discussed.

Intended outcome: Approved LS

Deadline: Tuesday 2021-04-20 0800 UTC

The corresponding incoming LS is in

[1] R2-2102665 (S2-2102048), "LS on Scheduling Location in Advance to reduce Latency", SA2.

The question to RAN2 is:

"SA2 would like to ask RAN1 and RAN2 whether support can be provided for a scheduled location time as part of Rel-17 and as defined in the attached CR to TS 23.273. SA2 also invite RAN1 and RAN2 to provide any other comments on support of this feature which may be applicable to support in 5GC."

A draft reply LS with an initial proposed response was submitted to this meeting in:

[2] R2-2103899, "[draft] Response LS on Scheduling Location in Advance to reduce Latency, Qualcomm Incorporated, LS out To:SA2; Cc:RAN1, RAN3.

# 2. Discussion

The draft reply LS in [2] is proposed to be modified as shown below (according to the scope of this email discussion shown section 1).

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**  RAN2 thanks SA2 for their LS on Scheduling Location in Advance to reduce Latency and the endorsed CR 0151r1 to TS 23.273 in S2-2102047.  RAN2 discussed the subject matter and ~~agreed to add~~ intend to add support for a scheduled location time as part of Rel-17 and as defined in the CR 0151r1 to TS 23.273 in S2-2102047.  **2. Actions:**  **To SA2 group.**  **ACTION:** RAN2 kindly asks SA2 to take the above information into account. |

**Question 1:** Do you agree with the above proposed response to SA?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No/With modification | Comment |
| CATT | With modification | Please see the additional question in Q2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | With modification | Before RAN2 tells SA2 that we intend to add support for a feature as defined in the SA2 endorsed CR, we must fully understand what is in the CR and how the feature works. Instead of jumping to conclusion in the first meeting (where we had 30 minutes of discussion time), we should allow opportunity for RAN2 to ask SA2 for clarifications on the proposed new feature. Note that SA2 LS also invites comments on the feature from RAN1 and RAN2 and it is fair to send the comments and questions first, and once we get a better understanding we can indicate support for the feature on the RAN side also.  So, the 2nd para in the LS should say:  *RAN2 discussed the subject matter and have some questions for clarification to enable us to better understand the feature. Before RAN2 can decide on support of the feature as defined in the SA2 endorsed CR 0151r1 to TS 23.273 in S2-2102047, RAN2 would first like to understand what the CR describes. Please see below for RAN2 questions*: |
| Intel | Yes | But would be ok to ask question for clarifications. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Multiple companies suggested to include questions to SA2 on the incoming LS and/or attached CR in S2-2102047.

Please provide the question RAN2 should ask SA2 in the Table below. Please phrase your question or comment in a suitable way for inclusion in the LS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Proposed question to SA2 to be included in the response LS | Comment |
| CATT | Could SA2 clarify what the time unit of Scheduled Location Time and the range is if possible? | We take the CR as requirement from SA2 but different time unit (e.g. timeslot or seconds) from SA2 would require different solutions in RAN2.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]  SA2 may not be able to answer the question of time unit and range  [Intel] Same view as Huawei on time unit and range. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would like to know how scheduled location time can work with deferred MT-LR for periodic or triggered location. From our understanding,   1. Deferred MT-LR is triggered according to the event that is defined according to the UE behaviour, which is sporadic in nature and for this, we cannot appoint a time “T”. 2. Deferred MT-LR for periodic triggering is triggered according to the periodic timer and the UE starts the measurement at expiry of the periodic timer. This is duplicated with the functionality of the proposed “T” |  |
| Nokia | 1. The definition of scheduled location time is unclear since the SA2 endorsed CR describes the scheduled location time differently in different parts of the CR and there is a different description of scheduled location time in the SA2 LS itself. RAN2 would like to have a clear definition of scheduled location time first as this impact what is signalled to UE and/or NG-RAN. Please see below for detailed comments:  ---  In section 4.1c it says “*The request includes the scheduled location time T*” which is described as the start of location preparation phase. So, time T is the scheduled location time.  Section 4.1c also says “*the scheduled location time allows an external LCS Client, AF or the UE to specify a time in the future at which a current location of the UE is to be obtained*”. However, in Figure 4.1c-1, the time when the LCS client, AF or UE obtains the location is T+t2. The time T in the figure is shown as the time at which the UE or NG-RAN obtains the location measurements.  The SA2 LS description also states “…*support scheduling of location of a target UE in advance using a scheduled location time* ***at which location measurements for the target UE would be obtained by the UE*** *(in the case of DL measurements)* ***and/or NG-RAN*** *(in the case of UL measurements)*”. This seem to align with the time T in Figure 4.1c-1 which show it as a scheduled **measurement** time.  In section 6.3.1, step 25 describes the schedule location time as the time at which **the LMF** must obtain the UE location, not the time at which the LCS client receives the location or the time at which the LMF schedules the measurement.  ---  2. In section 6.1.2, there is the following editor’s note:  *Editor's note: Feedback from RAN is needed to verify whether location measurements can be scheduled to occur at a UE or NG-RAN at a specific scheduled location time*  Please clarify the requirement whether measurements in UE/NG-RAN need to be scheduled at the scheduled location time received from 5GC or at a time before the scheduled location time received from 5GC. |  |
| Intel | We can list the different descriptions on T mentioned by Nokia above as described in SA2 CR, and ask SA2 what’s the correct understanding on T. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3. Other Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia | Scheduling a request for location information ahead of time is a useful feature. However, we wonder what use cases are envisioned by SA2 when they endorsed this feature. It also looks like a feature that allow scheduling measurements or estimating position ahead of time if the request can be scheduled ahead of time, but all component steps in the location preparation and location execution phases still takes the same amount of time as it takes before to perform those steps and so this is not really a latency reduction enhancement. An LCS client getting the location at the time it was willing to have it gives it the perception of reduced latency. If possible, we would like to ask SA2 for use cases it considered in evaluating this feature. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4. Summary

TBD