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# Introduction

This document is the report of the following offline discussion:

**[AT121][101][IoT NTN enh] GNSS operation (CATT)**

Initial scope: Discuss proposals in 8.6.2.2

Initial intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

         List of proposals for agreement (if any)

         List of proposals that require online discussions

Deadline for companies' feedback:  Wednesday 2023-03-01 06:00 EET

Deadline for rapporteur's summary (in R2-2301951): Wednesday 2023-03-01 12:00 EET

Status: ongoing

# Contact Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| CATT | Xiangdong Zhang | zhangxiangdong@catt.cn |
| Google | Ming-Hung Tao | mhtao@google.com |
| InterDigital | Brian Martin | Brian.martin@interdigital.com |
| Lenovo | Min Xu | xumin13@lenovo.com |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan | Ping.1.yuan@nokia-sbell.com |
| Huawei | Xubin | xubin10@huawei.com |
| Samsung | Jonas Sedin | J.sedin@samsung.com |
| ZTE | Lu Ting | lu.ting@zte.com.cn |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |
| Turkcell | İzzet Sağlam | Izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr |
| Nordic Semiconductor | Jouni Korhonen | Jouni.korhonen@nordicsemi.no |
| Ericsson | Emre A. Yavuz / Ignacio Pascual | emre.yavuz@ericsson.com / Ignacio.pascual.pelayo@ericsson.com |
| CMCC | Jiayao Tan | tanjiayao@chinamobile.com |
| OPPO | Haitao Li | lihaitao@oppo.com |
| Intel | Tangxun | xun.tang@intel.com |
| Xiaomi | Xiaowei jiang | jiangxiaowei@xiaomi.com |

# Discussion

## 3.1 GNSS measurement trigger and GNSS position fix time duration for measurement report

For GNSS position fix time duration for measurement, the following agreements have been achieved:

In RAN1#109 meeting,

**Agreement**

UE reports additional GNSS assistance information and further study the detailed GNSS assistance information, including e.g. GNSS position fix measurement time

* Note: Since RAN1 agreed that GNSS validity duration is reported by UE in Rel-17, it is already included in GNSS assistance information.

In RAN1#110 meeting,

**Agreement**

GNSS assistance information that UE reports to eNB at least consists of:

* GNSS position fix time duration for measurement
* GNSS validity duration

In RAN1#110bis meeting,

**Agreement**

Support eNB to at least aperiodically trigger UE to make GNSS measurement.

**Agreement**

If eNB aperiodically triggers UE to make GNSS measurement, a MAC CE is used.

In RAN1#111 meeting,

**Agreement**

For GNSS measurement in RRC connected, if eNB aperiodically triggers connected UE to make GNSS measurement, UE can re-acquire GNSS position fix with a gap

* FFS details of gap configuration

The UE may re-acquire GNSS autonomously (when configured by the network) if UE does not receive eNB trigger to make GNSS measurement

* FFS based on configured timing

**Agreement**

UE reports GNSS position fix time duration for measurement at least during the initial access stage

* which message carries this information is up to RAN2

Several issues have been discussed in companies’ contributions.

### Message to carry GNSS position fix time duration for measurement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2300175 | **Proposal 1 GNSS position fix time duration for measurement is reported in Msg5, e.g. RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete and RRCreestablishmentComplete messages.** | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Proposal 7: For GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access stage, the following Msg5 message can be used: RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB.** | CATT |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 1: UE reports GNSS position fix time duration in Msg5 during the initial access stage.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 2a: The GNSS assistance information MAC CE can be transmitted at least with Msg5.****Proposal 2b: RAN2 to discuss whether The GNSS assistance information MAC CE can be transmitted with Msg3** | Interdigital, Inc. |
| [5] R2-2300739 | **Proposal 1: UE reports the GNSS position fix duration together with R17 gnss-validityduration to NW in the following RRC messages:****• RRCConnectionSetupComplete****• RRCConnectionReestablishmentComplete****• RRCConnectionResumeComplete****• RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete for HO case.** | Apple |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 7a: It’s suggested to introduce GNSS position fix time duration in the following Msg5 messages: RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCreestablishmentComplete, RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCreestablishmentComplete-NB.****Proposal 7b: It’s no need for UE to report all GNSS position fix time duration for different GNSS start modes via UE capability report procedure.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [11] R2-2301252 | **Observation 1: How the UE reports GNSS assistance information is up to RAN2.****Proposal 1: GNSS assistance information (e.g. GNSS position fix time duration for measurement, GNSS validity duration) is reported at least in Msg5.** | CMCC |
| [12] R2-2301493 | **Proposal 1: UE Information Request/Response procedure can be used to send GNSS position fix time duration and UE does not need to signal availability of this information. Other details are FFS.** | Samsung Electronics Benelux BV |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 1: During the initial access stage, UE can report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement in Msg5.** | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |

There are 8 companies ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [9], [11], [13]) propose to use Msg5 to carry the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, with one company also open on Msg3[4]. And one company [12] proposes to use UE Information Request/Response procedure to send GNSS position fix time duration.

The option of Msg5 to carry the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, one company [2] thinks *RRCreestablishmentComplete* should not be included, because RRC connection reestablishment procedure does not belong to initial access procedure. And two companies [5] [9] think *RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete* should also be included, considering HO scenario.

So the moderator suggests RAN2 discussing the following proposal:

**Proposal 1: For GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, at least the following Msg5 message can be used: *RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB***

* **FFS for *RRCreestablishmentComplete and RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete.***
* **FFs for Msg3**

**Q1: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 1 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Support the proposal 1 and OK to further discuss the use of additional “RRC complete” messages. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | Currently RAN1 only agrees on reporting this during initial access. For other cases mentioned above, the NW should know the UE’s GNSS position fix time from UE’s context. So UE may not need to report this again.  |
| Samsung | No | We can use *UEInformationRequest/Response*. The reason is because this information is not crucial for basic operation. As an example, the coarse location was introduced in *UEInformationRequest/Response* partly for this purpose.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Just minor wording suggestion:**Proposal 1: For UE to report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, at least the following Msg5 message can be used: *RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB**** **FFS for *RRCreestablishmentComplete and RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete.***
* **FFS for Msg3**
 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary：17 companies shared their views. 15 companies agree this question, with one company giving some wording update. One company indicates that RAN1 has only agreed reporting GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during initial access, for other cases, maybe HO or re-establishment, the UE should not report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement again. And one company thinks the procedure of *UEInformationRequest/Response* can be reused.

**(16/17) Proposal 1: For UE to report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, at least the following Msg5 message can be used: *RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB***

* **FFS for *RRCreestablishmentComplete and RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete.***
* **FFS for Msg3**

### Trigger of GNSS measurement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 4: A new DL MAC CE is used by the network to trigger UE to make GNSS measurement in connected mode.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [5] R2-2300739 | **Observation 1: When to trigger GNSS measurement is up to network implementation.** **Proposal 4: New MAC CE as the GNSS measurement command is introduced.** | Apple |
| [10] R2-2301209 | **Observation 1: UE re-acquiring GNSS position fix with a new gap is agreed by RAN1.****Proposal 1: Use the same MAC CE to simultaneously trigger the GNSS position fix and configure the measurement gap.** | Huawei, Turkcell, HiSilicon |
| [11] R2-2301252 | **Proposal 4: A new MAC CE should be introduced for eNB to dynamically trigger UE to make GNSS measurement.** | CMCC |
| [12] R2-2301493 | **Proposal 2: Introduce ability to instruct UE to perform GNSS measurements in an RRCRelease message.** | Samsung Electronics Benelux BV |
| [14] R2-2301880 | **Proposal 3 Introduce a new IE gnss-fixDuration for reporting “GNSS position fix time duration for measurement”. This report is triggered to be reported in the same places where gnss-validityDuration is triggered today.****Observation 2 Using MAC CE to trigger UEs to acquire GNSS position fix carries a major security risk.****Observation 3 Using RRC for reporting the GNSS validity duration and GNSS position fix time duration will trigger SR/BSR when reports are ready while a MAC CE will not trigger SR/BSR. Further RRC is more secure and can reuse the existing gnss-validityDuration IE for the report.****Proposal 5 Introduce a new field gnss-positionFixReq in the UEInformationRequest and UEInformationRequest-NB for triggering the UE to acquire a GNSS position fix.****Proposal 6 Introduce gnss-validityDuration and gnss-fixDuration in UEInformationResponse and UEInformationResponse-NB.** | Ericsson |

Four companies ([3], [5], [10], [11],) think new MAC CE can be used to trigger UE GNSS measurement, one company [12] thinks RRCRelease message can be used to instruct UE to perform GNSS measurement, one companies([14]) thinks there may be security risk using MAC CE to trigger UEs to acquire GNSS position fix, and RRC message (UEInformationRequest) solution is suggested.

The moderator thinks that, the target of GNSS operation enhancement is letting UE perform GNSS measurement and maintain RRC connected state at the same time. So for the RRCRelease option, more discussion on scenario may be needed. And the MAC CE option has been agreed in RAN1, for the security risk, maybe some check with SA3 is needed. For the detail of MAC CE can be further discussed. So moderator suggests the following proposal:

**Proposal 2: Woking assumption: at least for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement, new MAC CE is used.**

**Q2: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 2 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | No | We do think using MAC CE may bring security issue. Besides, we may need to consider how to acknowledgement the reception of such a MAC CE. As the handling of the acknowledgment may lead to the RRC state change, we think it is better to handle the acknowledgement in RRC. We may also enhance the legacy measurement gap configuration a bit to make it also suitable for the GNSS measurement purpose, to minimize the standardization efforts.  |
| InterDigital | FFS | We need to take the discussion on security before making this decision. |
| Lenovo | FFS | We share the concern on security using MAC CE. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | There are several MAC CEs and DCIs from network, long DRX command can change UEs DRX cycle, TA command can change UE’s closed loop TA.This is about UE fixing and coming back to network. If UE’s GNSS is still valid when such fake command is received, then UE can come back to network by simply reporting new GNSS validity duration to network.It does not mean UE is being sent to IDLE mode, so we do not see what is security issue. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | We also have some sympathy on the security concern. Considering the triggering doesn’t have to be that dynamical, maybe it is safer to reconsider using RRC signalling to trigger this.  |
| Samsung | No | We were initially neutral to this, but we think that Ericsson has a very good point on the security aspects that makes us not positive to this approach. Furthermore, while RAN1 made the agreement to use MAC CE, we think that this is not so suitable. As far as we know, we do not have any MAC CE to trigger any type of measurements. RAN1 made the agreement likely because MAC CE is the go-to solution for any of their problem, not because of any other considerations. For instance, any delays due to sending it over RRC rather than MAC is most likely neglible if it takes more than 1 second to perform the GNSS measurement. Another reason is because it would be good to keep measurements and GNSS measurements local to RRC rather than in MAC. In Rel-17 we already have gnss-ValidityDuration in RRC and we also have clauses that GNSS is expected to be acquired before connecting. |
| ZTE | Yes | In our assumption, such MAC CE can be a simple one to just indicate to the UE the allowance of GNSS reacquisition during connected mode. Moreover, Such trigger also can be used by the eNB when eNB see the need to temporarily trigger the UE to re-acquire the GNSS position fix. Regardless of in which cases the trigger is received, generally UE needs to wait till the expiration of GNSS validity duration timer and then performs GNSS reacquisition.We see no security issue (agree with Qualcomm). And the legacy acknowledgement scheme is enough. |
| Apple | Yes | It’s RAN1#110 agreement:***Agreement****If eNB aperiodically triggers UE to make GNSS measurement, a MAC CE is used.* |
| Turkcell | FFS | We shared the security concern |
| Nordic | Yes | Agree with QC comment. |
| Ericsson | No | We see the potential of a fake/tampered MAC CE that triggers the UE to do GNSS measurements to disrupt a UE and stop PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions or stop PDCCH/PDSCH reception. |
| CMCC | Yes | This working assumption is aligned with RAN1 agreements. |
| OPPO | Yes | Fine to follow RAN1 agreement.In legacy, several DL MAC CEs and DCIs such as (long) DRX Command MAC CE and PDCCH skipping can be used by NW to indicate UE to sleep, in which case UE could not receive PDCCH for a period of time . Similarly, using MAC CE to trigger UE’s GNSS measurement would make UE unreachable during the GNSS measurement gap, but UE would come back once the GNSS measurement gap ends and if UE has re-acquired its GNSS location during the measurement gap. We see no security issue for this. |
| Intel | Yes | Ok to follow RAN1 agreement |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Agree with QC |

**17 companies have shared their views. 10 companies support this proposal, which is aligned with RAN1 agreements, four of them think there is no security risk. 7 companies think the MAC CE solution has security risk issue, for the fake/tampered MAC CE may disrupt or suspend the data transmission of UE.**

**The moderator thinks that, RAN1 has achieved an agreement for this issue. We can have a working assumption here, and show our concern on security (if companies insist) to RAN1 and SA3.**

**(10/17) Proposal 2: Woking assumption: at least for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement, new MAC CE is used.**

* **FFS for the security issue**

**Q3: if answer to Q2 is yes, companies are further invited to indicate whether you support to send LS to SA3 to check if there is security issue to use MAC CE for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | FFS | We’re not sure it is a serious risk, there are other MAC CEs which trigger procedures (e.g. Rel-18 LTM uses MAC CE To trigger PCell change). As no permanent ID is expected to be contained in the MAC CE then the risk appears relatively small. On the other hand we have no objection to ask SA3, and would also be fine with RRC Trigger only if there is a concern.  |
| Qualcomm | No | No, this is not MAC CE command to move UE to IDLE mode. |
| Nokia | FFS | We share the same concern as interdigital. There are many other DL MAC CE (e.g. DRX MAC CE or TA Command) which may also cause the incorrect/unexpected UE behaviour. We are not sure why the security concern is only for the MAC CE to trigger GNSS measurement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Maybe not | Maybe we can inform RAN1 about the security concern and ask if RRC signalling can be used instead. |
| Samsung | Yes | We did not agree with Q2, but we think that a condition for Q2 is that we check in with SA3 for this.  |
| ZTE | No | Seems no such need. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | No |  |
| CMCC | FFS | we share same view with InterDigital. |
| OPPO | No | See our comments on Q2. |
| Intel | No | Not needed |
| Xiaomi | NO |  |

14 companies have shared their views on this question. 4 companies think LS is needed. 7 companies think this LS is not needed, because they think there is no security risk for MAC CE solution. One company think we can inform RAN1 about the security concern and ask if RRC signalling can be used instead.

The moderator thinks that, if we cannot achieve an agreement on MAC CE solution for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement, because of, for example, security concern, we anyway need a LS to RAN1 (because RAN1 has given the agreement) and SA3 (because RAN2 cannot determine a security issue by ourselves).

**(4/13) Proposal 3: Send LS to RAN1 and/or SA3 to inform/check security concern on using MAC CE for eNB to aperiodically UE to make GNSS measurement, unless RAN2 agrees to follow the RAN1 agreement on eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement using MAC CE.**

### Content of GNSS measurement triggering MAC CE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 5: The contents of the DL MAC CE can include the time the GNSS measurement can take.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [8] R2-2301895  | **Proposal 8 For GNSS measurement triggered by eNB or UE itself, the measurement gap length can be configured by eNB.** **Proposal 9 For GNSS measurement triggered by eNB or UE itself, the measurement gap length is configured via RRC message.** **Proposal 10 For GNSS measurement triggered by eNB or UE itself, wait for RAN1 conclusion on when to start the GNSS measurement, and whether the start time should be configurable.** | Xiaomi |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 2: GNSS position fix time duration can be used as implicit measurement gap and it’s no need for NW to explicitly configure measurement gap in the trigger MAC CE.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [10] R2-2301209 | **Observation 1: UE re-acquiring GNSS position fix with a new gap is agreed by RAN1.****Proposal 1: Use the same MAC CE to simultaneously trigger the GNSS position fix and configure the measurement gap.** | Huawei, Turkcell, HiSilicon |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 5: Support eNB to configure multiple GNSS measurement configurations in SIB, hence eNB may activate the gap configuration via MAC CE. UE may also report which configuration it applies.** | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |

Two companies ([3], [10]) think the GNSS measurement triggering MAC CE can include the time/gap of GNSS measurement, one company [8] thinks the measurement gap is configured via RRC signalling, one company [9] thinks no explicit measurement gap is needed as the GNSS position fix time duration can be reused. One company [13] thinks GNSS measurement triggering MAC CE can include one of the multiple gap configuration configured via SIB.

Even the UE has reported the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement to network, it is better the network can configure a measurement gap based on the UE reported GNSS position fix time duration, which can be seen as confirmation to the UE report, and is useful to guarantee the network and UE has the same understanding on the actual measurement gap. If new MAC CE is used for for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement, as discussed in Question 2, it may be simpler to use the same MAC CE to simultaneously trigger the GNSS measurement and configure the measurement gap, relative to triggering GNSS measurement by MAC CE, and measurement gap configuration by RRC message. But we can leave the actual format of the MAC CE open, for example, if the MAC CE indicates the actual measurement gap, or the MAC CE indicates one of the multiple gap configurations broadcast via SIB.

**Proposal 3: The GNSS measurement triggering MAC CE should include gap configuration for GNSS measurement.**

* **FFS for the detail format of the MAC CE.**

**Q4: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 3 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | - | We can further discuss the details of the MAC CE only if Proposal 2 is agreed.  |
| InterDigital | No | Gap can be configured by RRC even if we have a MAC CE trigger. |
| Lenovo | No | Gap configuration is better to be RRC. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Gap length according to what UE reported in Msg5 is ok. |
| Nokia | No | We think the GNSS position fix time duration is semi-static and therefore the corresponding measurement gap duration can be configured via RRC. It will be an unnecessary signalling overhead to transmit the semi-static value in each MAC CE triggering the GNSS measurement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | This is related to the previous question. If MAC CE is adopted, then we support this proposal. But at this time, this should be postponed. |
| Samsung | FFS | FFS until we have decided how it is triggered |
| ZTE | No | Firstly we want to clarify that, GNSS position fix time duration is the length of total time required by the UE to acquire/re-acquire GNSS position fix and is determined by the GNSS start mode. Based on the suggestion in Q1, UE and eNB can maintain the same GNSS position fix time duration. Moreover, according to our observation on the discussion in RAN1 and RAN2 till now, most companies think GNSS position fix time duration can be stable (it may be also possible that UE reports a relaxed value during initial random access). Therefore, we see no any need for the eNB to explicitly configure “another” gap. If the configured gap is shorter than the GNSS position fix time duration, it cannot work; if the configured gap is longer than the GNSS position fix time duration, it would cause unnecessary additional service interruption and UE power consumption.Secondly, if gap and maybe start time of GNSS measurement need to be provided in the MAC CE trigger, does it mean the performing of GNSS reacquisition must rely on reception of this MAC CE trigger? And does it also means every time when closing to the expiration of GNSS validity duration timer, the eNB should send this MAC CE trigger? Since the main logical process for the UE is to perform GNSS reacquisition upon expiration of GNSS validity duration timer, we see no any benefit of such MAC CE trigger which needs to be sent repeatedly and we only see unnecessary signalling overhead.Last, there is legacy acknowledgement for Msg5 report and so no need of other confirmation to the UE report. And with the GNSS position fix time duration and GNSS validity duration reported from UE in Msg5, we also think the consistent understanding between UE and eNB can be guaranteed. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes | We need to decide how it’s triggered.  |
| Nordic | Yes | Needs some work what the MAC CE actually carries. Is it a gap configuration as such or index/adjust RRC configured gap configuration based on information received from Msg5? |
| Ericsson | No | RRC should be the means to configure a possible gap |
| CMCC | No | We prefer to include gap configuration in RRC signaling which has higher reliability, similar to legacy measurement gap configuration.  |
| OPPO | No | Prefer to use RRC signalling for gap configuration. |
| Intel | No | MAC CE can be used to activate gap, the gap configuration should be configured in RRC |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their view on this question. 6 companies support this proposal. 7 companies think RRC signalling should be used. Three companies think we can postpone the discussion on the details of the MAC CE until we achieved agreement on how to trigger the MAC CE. One company thinks no explicit GNSS measurement gap is needed.

**Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss the following options for GNSS measurement gap transmission:**

* + **RRC signalling**
	+ **MAC CE triggering GNSS measurement**
	+ **No explicit GNSS measurement gap configuration**
	+ **Postpone the discussion**

### Report of GNSS position fix time duration in connected

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 2: UE reporting GNSS position fix time duration in connected mode is not supported.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 1b: The GNSS assistance information MAC CE can be used in RRC\_CONNECTED and during random access.****Proposal 1c: The GNSS assistance information MAC CE is used regardless of the trigger (gNB aperiodic or UE autonomous)****Proposal 4: GNSS assistance information MAC CE is reported when the UE detects that the GNSS validity duration changes by a configured threshold.** | Interdigital, Inc. |
| [8] R2-2301895  | **Proposal 7 Send LS to RAN1 to ask if UE needs to update GNSS position fix time duration during connected mode.** | Xiaomi |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 1: Working assumption: GNSS position fix time duration can keep unchanged when UE is in connected mode.****Proposal 7c: It’s no need for eNB to request UE to report GNSS position fix time duration in connected mode.****Proposal 7d: It’s no need for UE to report GNSS position fix time duration in connected mode.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [11] R2-2301252 | **Proposal 3: Whether/how to report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement in connected mode can wait for RAN1’s progress.** | CMCC |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 2: Send LS to RAN1 to confirm whether the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement may be changed during the long data connection.** | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |

Two companies ([3], [9]) think there is no necessity to support UE reporting GNSS position fix time duration in connected mode. One company [4] may think the connected UE can report GNSS position fix time duration (include in GNSS assistance information MAC CE) to eNB. Three companies ([8], [11], [13]) think more information from RAN1 is needed.

The moderator thinks that, RAN1 has had some discussion on the issue of whether the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement may be changed during the long data connection, but has achieved no agreement. RAN2 can wait the output of RAN1, or we can send LS to RAN1 to push the progress on this issue.

**Proposal 4: Send LS to RAN1 to check whether the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement may be changed during the long data connection**

**Q5: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 4 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Google | No | We believe the GNSS position fix duration is unlikely to change, but are okay to wait for further RAN1 progress. |
| InterDigital | No | We can wait a bit longer. |
| Lenovo | No | We can wait for RAN1, no need to ask |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Nokia | Yes | To make progress, we prefer to ask RAN1 and highlight the issue then RAN2 awaits the RAN1 feedback. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Maybe no | We can just wait for RAN1. |
| Samsung | No | We do not agree with the idea that we can somehow make some savings by not reporting the GNSS fix time duration in connected mode. We should simply introduce signalling the GNSS fix time in connected mode over RRC using UEInformationResponse/Request.  |
| ZTE | No | Based on our observation on the discussion in RAN1 and RAN2 till now, most companies think GNSS position fix time duration can be stable. It may be also possible that UE reports a relaxed value during initial random access, which would make it even less likely that the change of GNSS position fix time duration occurs. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Turkcell | No |  |
| Nordic | Maybe yes | Don’t know if LS would help anything speeding up progress, however, it does not make harm either. |
| Ericsson | No | Wait for the progress in RAN1 |
| CMCC | No | We don’t think a LS is needed since RAN1 is discussing the issue, and we just wait the RAN1’s progress.  |
| OPPO | No | We can wat for RAN1. |
| Intel | yes | An LS would be helpful to emphasize on this issue to RAN1 |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their views on this question. 13 companies think no LS is needed, for RAN1 is discussing this issue. Three companies think LS may be helpful for the progress. One company may support the LS with doubt on the affect.

**(13/17) Proposal 5: wait for progress of RAN1 on the issue of whether the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement may be changed during the long data connection.**

### Rel-18 UE behaviour if no connected GNSS measurement is triggered

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Proposal 3: By default, Rel-18 IoT NTN UE (supporting the improved GNSS operations) will leave RRC\_CONNECTED state when current GNSS position becoming out-of-date, unless configured by network to perform GNSS measurement (e.g. eNB aperiodically triggers UE to perform GNSS measurement or UE re-acquires GNSS autonomously based on network configuration).** | CATT |
| [14] R2-2301880 | **Proposal 7 An NTN UE that supports release 18, can be configured to not go to IDLE when GNSS position becomes outdated.** | Ericsson |

The moderator thinks that, it cannot be assumed that all the Rel-18 IoT NTN UE will always stay long connection state, and a Rel-18 IoT UE can camped under or served by a legacy cell, so it is necessary to make it clear the UE behaviour when the Rel-18 IoT NTN UE is not triggered to perform GNSS measurement, and the exiting GNSS position becoming out-of-date, considering the compatibility. And for UE triggering connected GNSS measurement, more RAN1 input is needed. So moderator suggests:

**Proposal 5: By default, Rel-18 IoT NTN UE (supporting the improved GNSS operations) will leave RRC\_CONNECTED state when current GNSS position becoming out-of-date, unless configured by network to perform GNSS measurement (e.g. eNB aperiodically triggers UE to perform GNSS measurement or UE re-acquires GNSS autonomously based on network configuration).**

**Q6: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 5 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes, but… | We only agree the first-half part of Proposal 5, and think the network is expected to provide the UE with the gap before the GNSS validity duration expires. In case the GNSS validity duration expires before the arrival of a GNSS measurement gap, the UE shall follow the R-17 behaviour and leave RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| InterDigital | Yes | In other words, if R18 feature is not configured then UE follows Rel-17 behaviour. |
| Lenovo |  | We wonder how to handle the case when UE is performing GNSS measurement configured by network but the current GNSS position becoming out-of-date. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Nokia |  | Support that the Rel-18 IoT NTN UE leaves RRC Connected when the GNSS position is out-of-date. The UE behaviour, when a GNSS measurement is happening at/after the expiry of the GNSS validity duration needs further discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Normally we think by implementation, the NW should prevent the UE’s GNSS information from being out-of-date. But in case this actually happens, we can reuse the legacy R17 behaviour. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Based on our assumption for the MAC CE trigger, we also think if UE hasn’t received any trigger after it enters connected mode, UE and eNB would follow same understanding that this UE will not perform GNSS reacquisition during connected mode. So we are high level fine with the proposal 5. But we think the current text say some details which haven’t been agreed. So our suggestion is :**Proposal 5: By default, Rel-18 IoT NTN UE (supporting the improved GNSS operations) will leave RRC\_CONNECTED state when current GNSS position becoming out-of-date, unless it has been indicated by network to perform GNSS measurement.** |
| Apple |  | Same view as Nokia.  |
| Turkcell |  | Agree with Nokia |
| Nordic | yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | We do not see the need to force a UE moving into RRC\_IDLE upon GNSS validity expiration. There is no technical limitation for a UE to continue listening to PDCCH after GNSS expiry. If UL data comes, it can then re-acquire GNSS fix. In any case, a UE may move to RRC\_IDLE after a period of inactivity. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their views on this question. 12 companies support the proposal, and 5 companies support part of the proposal and suggest further discussion on the UE behaviour when a GNSS measurement is happening at/after the expiry of the GNSS validity duration needs further discussion. One company thinks there no need to force UE moving to RRC\_IDLE upon GNSS validity expiration.

**(1617) Proposal 6: By default, Rel-18 IoT NTN UE (supporting the improved GNSS operations) will leave RRC\_CONNECTED state when current GNSS position becoming out-of-date, unless it has been indicated by network to perform GNSS measurement.**

* + **FFS for the case of a GNSS measurement is happening at/after the expiry of the GNSS validity duration**

### UE/Network capability indication of supporting GNSS operation enhancement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Observation 1: UE should confirm whether the network supports improved GNSS operations or not, before the UE reports GNSS position fix time duration for measurement to the network during the initial access, to avoid potential resource waste.** **Observation 2: Network needs to know whether the UE supports improved GNSS operations or not, to avoid invalid configuration to UE.** **Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss whether indication is needed to indicate whether the network/UE supporting the improved GNSS operations.****Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss how to deliver the indication of whether the UE/network supporting the improved GNSS operations is needed.** | CATT |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss whether the GNSS assistance information MAC CE is configured:****1. in SIB** **2. dynamically based on Msg3 grant size in RAR (if both Msg3 and Msg5 are supported)****3. based on an indication in Msg4 (if only Msg5 is supported)** | Interdigital, Inc. |

Generally, for a new feature, some capability negotiation is needed, to avoid unnecessary resource waste or invalid configuration. Otherwise, for example, the UE may report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement to network during the initial access stage, even the network does not support GNSS operation enhancement; the network may trigger a connected UE to perform GNSS measurement, even the UE does not support GNSS operation enhancement. However, it should also some evaluation whether the Rel-18 IoT NTN UE/Network always support the GNSS operation enhancement, considering the little complexity or cost increase. So the moderator thinks it is valuable for RAN2 to discuss whether UE/Network capability indication of supporting GNSS operation enhancement is needed or not.

**Proposal 6: RAN2 to discuss whether UE/Network capability indication of supporting GNSS operation enhancement is needed.**

**Q7: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 6 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | FFS | Capability could be introduced later once the method is finalized. |
| Google | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | UE capability is needed. Normally we do not specify NW capability, NW can configure/not configure. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | But it can also be discussed later. |
| Nokia | No, but | We don’t think a network capability indication need to be defined. Whether UE capability is needed can be further discussed. In our understanding, to support long data connections, Rel-18 IoT NTN shall support GNSS operation enhancement by default and that a capability is not needed.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | It is a little early to discuss UE capability for now.However, an enabler in SIB is beneficial to control whether the UE should report position fix time duration. We wouldn’t call this NW capability though. |
| Samsung | No | If the question is whether to discuss it, we see no reasonable reason why we should discuss the capabilities of a feature before we have barely started discussing the feature.  |
| ZTE | FFS for UE but no for NW | The MAC CE trigger already can be used as the implicit indication of NW capability. UE capability seems needed but can be discussed later. |
| Apple | Yes | Agree that the capability issue can be discussed later.  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | Yes | On the same thoughts as Huawei. However, a flag in a SIB for network indicating whether a report in Msg5 can be sent and a Msg5 report as an implicit indication of the UE support.  |
| Ericsson | FFS | The UE capability discussion can be postponed, no need to discuss the network capability aspect. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Both UE and network capability indications are needed. On one hand, network needs to indicate whether it supports GNSS operation enhancement so that UEs supporting this feature could decide whether to report its GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access. On the other hand, UE needs to report its capability of supporting GNSS operation enhancement to network so that network could configure/trigger GNSS measurement gap for the UE.  |
| Intel | Yes | Ok to discuss later |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their views on this question. 15 companies support the discussion on UE/network capability, but 8 of them thin we can delay the discussion. 4 companies think no network capability indication needed to be defined, but two of them think an indication is needed to indicate UE whether UE should report position fix time duration. One company thinks Rel-18 IoT NTN shall support GNSS operation enhancement by default and that a capability is not needed.

**(15/17) Proposal 7: RAN2 postpone the discussion of the UE capability indication of supporting GNSS operation enhancement.**

**Q8: if the answer of Q7 is yes, Companies are further invited to indicate whether you support UE capability indication or network capability indication?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No for UE capability indication**  | **Yes or No for network capability indication** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | FFS | FFS |  |
| Google | Yes | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | No | As above, NW configures or does not configure, no need to indicate capability |
| Lenovo | FFS | FFS |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | No | Agree with InterDigital |
| Nokia | FFS | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | No | See comments above. |
| Samsung | Yes | No |  |
| Apple | Yes | No | Agree with InterDigital.  |
| Turkcell | FFS | No |  |
| Nordic | Yes | Yes | See Q7 comment.  |
| CMCC | No | Yes | **Case 1: The UE supports GNSS operation but the network doesn’t support**In this case, the UE can report the GNSS position fix time, but the network cannot configure a GNSS measurement gap to the UE. So the UE cannot re-acquire the GNSS position in connected mode and will enter into idle mode when the GNSS validity duration is expired. If the UE expects to stay in connected mode for a long transmission, it’s better to introduce a network capability indication (e.g. via SIB) so that the UE can select a network which supports GNSS operation.**Case 2: The UE doesn’t support GNSS operation but the network supports**In this case, the UE cannot report the GNSS position fix time, and we understand the network will not trigger a UE to perform GNSS measurement. So a UE capability indication is not needed. |
| OPPO | Yes | Yes | See our comments on Q7 |
| Intel | yes | no |  |
| Xiaomi | FFS | no |  |

Summary: 15 companies have shared their views on this question,

For UE capability indication:

* Support: 8
* Not support: 1
* FFS: 6

For network, the name of “network capability indication” may lead some misunderstanding. Most of the companies think an explicit indication may be needed to indicate whether the network supports the GNSS operation enhancement, or think the network can indicate this implicitly by configuring or not configuring the UE performing GNSS measurement.

So if RAN2 to discuss this issue, for example, in the future according to the conclusion of proposal 6 above, the following proposal can be considered:

**Proposal 8: For GNSS operation enhancement:**

* **UE capability indication is needed to indicate whether the UE supports GNSS operation enhancement**
* **Network indication（explicit/implicit）is needed to indicate whether the network supports GNSS operation enhancement**

### Other issue of GNSS measurement trigger and GNSS position fix time duration for measurement report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2300175 | **Proposal 3 UE should go back to IDLE mode if it cannot acquire its GNSS location for eNB-triggered and/or UE-autonomous GNSS measurement.** | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss whether UE reports to network the assistance information about UE preference on long connection.****Proposal 8: The UE should try another one or several attempts of GNSS measurement in duration, e.g., configured by network.** | CATT |
| [5] R2-2300739 | **Proposal 6: When GNSS measurement is completed, UE sends the response message (i.e. GNSS valid duration MAC CE) to NW.****Proposal 7: When NW receives the GNSS valid duration MAC CE, NW can assume the triggered GNSS measurement is completed.** | Apple |
| [7] R2-2300979 | **Observation 1: For a long GNSS position fix gap with a length of seconds or tens of seconds, a UE in RRC\_CONNECTED may not be able to maintain or resume the RRC connection during or after the gap.****Observation 2: When a GNSS position fix gap is configured, a T310 value not long enough will lead UE to RLF, and a T301 value not long enough will lead UE to RRC\_IDLE.****Observation 3: When a GNSS position fix gap is configured, ephemeris data and common TA at UE may become invalid during the gap and UE has to re-acquire ephemeris data and common TA after the gap.****Observation 4: When a GNSS position fix gap is configured, unnecessary neighbour cell measurement in RRC\_CONNECTED could be triggered after the gap starts.****Proposal 1: RAN2 to consider signalling enhancements, e.g., RLF handling, ephemeris update and neighbour cell measurement, to support GNSS position fix in RRC\_CONNECTED with a long gap configured.** | Lenovo |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 5: UE is supported to autonomously reacquire GNSS during inactive state of C-DRX.****Proposal 6: UE may need to report kind of indication to inform eNB about a “temporarily” GNSS reacquisition which is performed during an inactive state of C-DRX.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 9: RAN2 to discuss handling a GNSS measurement during a long period of downlink/uplink repetitions.****Proposal 10: RAN2 to postpone the discussion on whether the UE can reacquire the GNSS position fix outside the Connected DRX Active Time.** | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |

Two companies ([1], [2]) have discussed the UE behaviour if the UE cannot re-acquire the GNSS position, but have different view, going to IDLE or trying another several attempts. Two companies ([5], [7]) have discussed the UE behaviour when the UE finish the GNSS measurement. Three companies ([2], [9], and [13]) have discussed the case of UE triggered GNSS measurement. For these issues, moderator thinks more information from RAN1 is needed, or RAN1 is discussing some of these issues. For example, RAN1 has been discussing the issue of whether UL re-synchronization is always needed before UL transmission, after the GNSS measurement. And RAN1 has also been discussing the UE triggered GNSS measurement. So moderator suggests postponing the discussion on these issues.

**Proposal 7: Postpone the discussion on the following issues:**

* **UE behaviour when the UE completes GNSS measurement**
* **UE behaviour when the UE can’t re-acquire GNSS position according to the configuration**
* **UE triggered GNSS measurement**

**Q9: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 7 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes | We can wait for further RAN1 progress on these aspects. |
| InterDigital | FFS | We are OK to wait a bit longer for RAN1, but since at least 3 companies support UE triggered GNSS measurement it would be better to capture these points as FFS rather than postponed. |
| Lenovo | Yes and | For UE triggered GNSS measurement we can wait for RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | Ok |  |
| Nokia | Yes | We are fine to wait more progress from RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | We have enough proposals in this discussion anyhow. But we think UE-triggered GNSS measurements should be discussed soon as RAN1 has made agreements on it.  |
| ZTE | No | Since it has benefit of avoiding or reducing the possible service transmission interruption, we think it can be prioritized to discuss whether and how to support UE to autonomously reacquire GNSS during inactive state of C-DRX.Moreover, since C-DRX is also defined in MAC spec, we think RAN2 would be the suitable place to discuss this feature.For other two issues, they can be discussed along with the discussion on GNSS reacquisition procedure. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | yes | However, agree with Interdigital not postponing all topics. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Wait for the progress in RAN1 |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their views on this question. 14 companies agree to postpone the discussion on the list topic, three companies think the topic of UE triggered GNSS measurement can be discussed, one company think the topic of UE autonomously reacquiring GNSS during inactive state of C-DRX can be discussed.

The moderator wants clarify that, the proposal just suggests to postponing the discussion of these topics in the meeting, because we have so many proposal on this section.

**(14/17) Proposal 9: Postpone the discussion on the following issues:**

* ** UE behaviour when the UE completes GNSS measurement**
* ** UE behaviour when the UE can’t re-acquire GNSS position according to the configuration**
* ** UE triggered GNSS measurement (can be discussed if time is allowed )**

## GNSS validity duration report

For GNSS validity duration report by the connected UE, the following agreements have been achieved:

In RAN1#110 meeting:

**Agreement**

GNSS assistance information that UE reports to eNB at least consists of:

* GNSS position fix time duration for measurement
* GNSS validity duration

In RAN1#111 meeting:

**Agreement**

In connected mode, UE may report GNSS validation duration with MAC CE.

Several issues have been discussed in companies’ contributions.

### Trigger of GNSS validity duration report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2300175 | **Proposal 2 Reporting GNSS validity duration can be triggered after GNSS measurement is done.** | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Proposal 5：GNSS validation duration MAC CE should be triggered after each successful GNSS measurement.** | CATT |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 8: A new UL MAC CE is used to report remaining GNSS validity duration after GNSS measurement in connected mode.****Proposal 9: UE can choose not to report the remaining GNSS validity duration if the new value is identical to the previously reported value and does not cause any misinterpretation.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 4: GNSS assistance information MAC CE is reported when the UE detects that the GNSS validity duration changes by a configured threshold.** | Interdigital, Inc. |
| [5] R2-2300739 | **Proposal 3: UE informs the GNSS validity duration via new MAC CE in the following two cases:****• Case 1: When performing the GNSS fix operation****• Case 2: When the UE mobility state is changed or when the GNSS validity duration is changed greatly (e.g. duration change > configured threshold).** | Apple |
| [6] R2-2300892 | **Proposal 6 After GNSS fix, if the GNSS validity duration changes compared to previous, the UE triggers new remaining GNSS validity duration report.** | Qualcomm |
| [8] R2-2301895  | **Proposal 1 If GNSS position fix is re-acquired, GNSS validity duration MAC CE is triggered.** | Xiaomi |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 8c: It’s no need for eNB to request UE to report updated GNSS validity duration in connected mode.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 4: When UE is in RRC Connected mode, the UE should report GNSS validity duration to eNB if the variation between current GNSS validity duration and the previously reported value is larger than a threshold.** | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [14] R2-2301880 |  | Ericsson |

For the trigger of GNSS validity duration report, [1], [2] , [8] (maybe [5])think the UE should report GNSS validation duration after each successful GNSS measurement, [3] thinks the UE can choose not to report the remaining GNSS validity duration if the new value is identical to the previously reported value, [4], [6] , [13] and [14] (maybe [5]) think the UE can report GNSS validation duration if the GNSS validity duration has changed, for example, the variation between current GNSS validity duration and the previously reported value is larger than a threshold. One company [9] thinks there is no need for connected UE to report GNSS validity duration. The moderator suggests RAN2 discussing the several option on this issue.

**Proposal 8: RAN2 to discuss the following options for connected UE GNSS validity duration report：**

* **Option 1: UE reports GNSS validity duration after each time of GNSS measurement**
* **Option 2: UE reports GNSS validity duration only the GNSS validity duration has changed, e.g. larger than a configured threshold**
* **Option 3: UE will not report GNSS validity duration**
* **Option 4: Waiting for RAN1 progress**

**Q10: Companies are invited to indicate which option in proposal 8 you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option**  | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 2 |  |
| Google | Option 2 | However, we think option 1 and option 2 can be enabled together, and hence would like to suggest replacing the word “only” with “when” in option 2.  |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option1+Option2 | For Option 2, there would still be some indication is needed to let network know it is back from the GNSS fix and new GNSS validity duration can be started. Option 1 would be simple solution. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | It is beneficial to only report the GNSS validity duration when the value has changed. However, it is also important for the UE and eNB to have a synchronized understanding of the outcome of the GNSS measurement. Therefore, we suggest the UE shall still provide an indication of a successfully completed GNSS measurement even if the GNSS validity duration has not changed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised Option2 | The e.g. part should be removed. **Option 2: UE reports GNSS validity duration when the GNSS validity duration has changed.** |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Option 1 is the only way to go as we cannot see any gains using Option 2, just added complexity – then you would need to configure a threshold etc. RAN1 agreements rules out Option 3.  |
| ZTE | Option 2 | We think Option 2 is mainly for GNSS validity duration report during connected mode. Furthermore, we assume UE also needs to report the whole GNSS validity duration during initial random access. |
| Apple | Option 1, Option 2 | GNSS validity duration will be updated/changed after each time of GNSS measurement, so we can assume Option 2 can cover Option 1. If Option 2 is supported, we can agree Option 1 together.  |
| Turkcell | Option 2 | Huawei’s TP is ok. |
| Nordic | Option 1 | Would be simple way forward. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| CMCC | Option1+Option2 | We think that the network needs to know that the UE performs GNSS measurement successfully. For option 1, some further enhancements can be considered, e.g. how to report when the new GNSS validity duration is the same as previous value.For option 2, we think the network would be confused whether the GNSS validity duration is not changed or the GNSS measurement is not performed successfully by UE, when there is no GNSS validity duration reported. Some indication may be needed for option 2. |
| OPPO | Option1+Option2 |  |
| Intel | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | The main reason to report this after GNSS acquistion is that it will let network knows that it has successfully completed the GNSS measurement and come back to network. |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their view on this question, 10 companies support Option 2 (or updated Option 2), 4 companies support Option 1+ Option 2(or updated Option 2), and three companies support Option 1.

As discussed in the comments, companies may think the GNSS validity duration can be an implicit of UE has performed the GNSS measurement successfully, so Option 1 may be a simple way. And for Option 2, if the network does not receive the UE report of GNSS validity duration, it is not sure the reason. The moderator thinks that, how the network to confirm the UE has performed the GNSS measurement successfully is a different and separate issue, which has been discussed in RAN1, for example, can be realized by CFRA. So we can just discuss the issue of GNSS validity duration report, independently.

**(14/17) Proposal 10: UE at least reports GNSS validity duration when the GNSS validity duration has changed.**

* **FFS UE reports GNSS validity duration after each time of GNSS measurement**

### Report of GNSS validity duration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 1a: Introduce a single new GNSS assistance information MAC CE, which contains at least GNSS position fix time and validity duration.** | Interdigital, Inc. |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 8a: It’s suggested to introduce a whole GNSS validity duration in the following Msg5 messages: RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete, RRCreestablishmentComplete, RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCreestablishmentComplete-NB.** **Proposal 8b: RAN2 also confirms to introduce a new UL MAC CE for UE to report the updated** **GNSS validity duration in connected mode.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [11] R2-2301252 | **Proposal 2: A new MAC CE should be introduced to report GNSS validity duration.** | CMCC |
| [14] R2-2301880 |  | Ericsson |

Almost all the companies propose to introduce a new MAC CE for GNSS validity duration, which is aligned with the RAN1 agreement. One company suggests introducing single new GNSS assistance information MAC CE, which contains at least GNSS position fix time and validity duration. The moderator thinks maybe a separate MAC CE is better, because GNSS position fix time and validity duration many not always be reported together, but we can leave this issue open, including the name of the new defined MAC CE mentioned by one company [14]. GNSS validity duration via Msg5 has been supported in Rel-17, now this issue is focusing on GNSS validity duration report by connected UE.

**Proposal 9: new MAC CE should be defined for connected UE reporting GNSS validity duration.**

**Q11: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 9 above??**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No**  | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | No | With similar reasons mentioned in Q2, we prefer to use the RRC message for the connected UE to report the GNSS validity duration.  |
| InterDigital | - | The above doesn’t add anything to what RAN1 already agreed |
| Lenovo | FFS | Same concern for security |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | We wonder why MAC CE is needed to report GNSS validity duration. We prefer to use RRC messages which is aligned with the design in Rel-17.The value granularity for GNSS validity duration is seconds or minutes (as listed in proposal 10). We think it is not that time-critical to justify MAC CE instead of RRC for the reporting. If we go with MAC CE, there are many additional aspects which need to be addressed (e.g., MAC CE priority, how to handle the case of lack of UL resource for MAC CE transmission, transmission reliability in HARQ Mode-B etc). We would like to keep it simple to use RRC based solution.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | We prefer to have the command to perform GNSS measurements in RRC, so we think there is no need for a MAC CE to report it. We introduced this in RRC in the GNSS validity duration in Rel-17 in RRC and feel that it would be unneccesary to have it in a MAC CE as well. Nokia has some good points as well.  |
| ZTE | Msg5 and MAC CE | In R17 IoT NTN, the GNSS remaining time has been introduced and UE needs to report this information to the network in Msg5. In our assumption, for R18 UE, after the first time UE reacquires the GNSS, UE will restart the counting of validate duration with the length of the whole GNSS validity duration. However, the eNB has no idea of this whole GNSS validity duration and then eNB and UE cannot be aligned anymore. In order to address this issue, we think anyway UE needs to report the whole GNSS validity duration during initial random access.Furthermore, we have sympathy with the view that GNSS validity duration may change when there is a big change of UE velocity, so we can agree to support update of GNSS validity duration during connected mode. And an UL MAC CE can be used for this purpose. |
| Apple | Yes | It’s RAN1 agreement. |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | In Release 17, it was discussed and agreed to be reported in RRC. We don’t see any reason for change |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Fine to follow RAN1 agreement. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their view on this question. 12 companies support the proposal, with one company has doubt on the necessity of the proposal. 5 companies think RRC signalling should be used, considering the security risk, or reusing the similar mechanism adopted in Rel-17.

The moderator thinks that, RAN1 has achieved an agreement on this issue, and in Rel-17 the remaining GNSS validity duration is allowed to report in Msg5 including RRCConnectionSetupComplete which has no security protection either. So maybe security issue is not so serious.

**(12/17) Proposal 11: New MAC CE should be defined for connected UE reporting GNSS validity duration.**

### The value of GNSS validation duration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2300204 | **Proposal 6: The value range {10s, 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, 5 min, 10 min, 15 min, 20 min, 25 min, 30 min, 60 min, 90 min, 120 min, infinity} introduced for R17, can be reused for GNSS validation duration MAC CE unless modified by RAN1.** | CATT |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 10: The content of the GNSS validity duration in MAC CE reuse the enumeration in Rel-17.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [6] R2-2300892 | **Proposal 1 Introduce GNSS-ValidityDurationAdd-r18 such that more granular value of remaining GNSS validity duration can be reported, i.e., GNSS-ValidityDuration-r17 (unit S or min) + GNSS-ValidityDurationAdd-r18 (unit-less).** | Qualcomm |

The actual value of remaining GNSS validity duration has been discussed in Rel-17 widely, two companies ([2], [3]) suggest reusing the value of remaining GNSS validity duration has been discussed in Rel-17, for Rel-18 connected UE reporting GNSS validity duration, one company [6] suggests more granular value for Rel-18 remaining GNSS validity duration report. So the moderator suggests at least the value of remaining GNSS validity duration defined in Rel-17 can be reused, and we can leave the issue of more granular value open, and can revise this if required by RAN1.

**Proposal 10: The value range {10s, 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, 5 min, 10 min, 15 min, 20 min, 25 min, 30 min, 60 min, 90 min, 120 min, infinity} introduced in R17 is reused for connected UE GNSS validation duration report, unless modified by RAN1.**

* **FFS if more granular value is needed**

**Q12: Companies are invited to indicate whether you support proposal 10 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No**  | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | See comments | To take the benefit of ongoing GNSS enhancement, more granular value can be considered.  “**unless modified by RAN1”** is not needed in the proposal. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | FFS | We can give it some more time to see if RAN1 will come up with some values – it has at least not been stated to leave it up to the RAN2.  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Nordic | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |

Summary: 17 companies have shared their views on this question. 16 companies support the proposal, and one company thinks we can wait if RAN1 will come up with some values. The moderator thinks that, for the value of GNSS validity duration, there is no obvious difference for IDLE UE report (Rel-17) and CONNECTED UE report (in Rel-18). Anyway, we can revise this if RAN1 updates the values defined in Rel-17, or we can send LS to check with RAN1 if they have concern on the proposal, if indeed needed. So the original proposal is used.

**(16/17) Proposal 12: The value range {10s, 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, 5 min, 10 min, 15 min, 20 min, 25 min, 30 min, 60 min, 90 min, 120 min, infinity} introduced in R17 is reused for connected UE GNSS validation duration report, unless modified by RAN1.**

## 3.3 Other

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2300263 | **Proposal 7: Network can config UE to delay a certain time after the end of the validity duration.** | MediaTek Inc. |
| [4] R2-2300580 | **Proposal 5: Introduce a prohibit timer to prevent excessive acquisition and reporting of GNSS information.** | Interdigital, Inc. |
| [5] R2-2300739 | **Proposal 5: Upon receiving the GNSS measurement MAC CE, UE may skip the measurement if UE’s GNSS info is still valid for a long time.**  | Apple |
| [6] R2-2300892 | **Proposal 2 When GNSS measurement is triggered, the UE considers the timeAlignmentTimer expired and starts a new timer T3xx (T318-like timer).****Proposal 3 When GNSS is fixed, the UE stops timer T3xx and triggers PRACH to synchronize with the network. FFS in msg3, new validation time MAC CE can be sent.****Proposal 4 While the timer T3xx is running, the UE does not monitor PDCCH. Discuss whether to send LS to RAN4 now or later.****Proposal 5 After expiry of T3xx, the UE triggers RRC-Reestablishment procedure.** | Qualcomm |
| [8] R2-2301895  | **Proposal 2 When GNSS validity duration MAC CE is triggered, if there is no UL resources available, SR should be triggered. The SR resource can be separately configured for GNSS validity duration MAC CE.****Proposal 3 GNSS validity duration MAC CE has lower priority than Timing Advance report MAC CE but higher priority than BSR.****Proposal 4 When GNSS validity duration is included in the RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete message, all triggered GNSS validity duration MAC CE should be canceled.** **Proposal 5 After GNSS validity duration MAC CE is included in the MAC PDU for transmission, all triggered GNSS validity duration MAC CE should be canceled.** **Proposal 6 When MAC resets, all triggered GNSS validity duration MAC CE should be canceled.** | Xiaomi |
| [9] R2-2301053 | **Proposal 3: Expiration of GNSS validity duration can be used as implicit start time of GNSS measurement. It’s no need for NW to explicitly configure the start time of GNSS measurement or the parameters for calculating start time of GNSS measurement in the trigger MAC CE.****Proposal 4: For R18 IoT NTN, if the out-of-sync evaluation period is longer than the GNSS position fix time duration, UE could reacquire GNSS position fix within GNSS position fix time duration. Otherwise, UE can firstly trigger RLF and re-acquires GNSS position fix during RLF procedure.** | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| [10] R2-2301209 | **Proposal 2: The configuration of the timer for autonomous GNSS re-acquiring can be used as an implicit enabler for the autonomous GNSS re-acquiring.****Proposal 3: RAN2 to further study how to solve the issue caused due to the unavailability of measurement and communication with NW during the UE performing GNSS measurement.** | Huawei, Turkcell, HiSilicon |
| [12] R2-2301493 | **Proposal 3: RAN2 to consider LPP for IoT NTN to deliver GNSS assistance data.** | Samsung Electronics Benelux BV |
| [13] R2-2301660 | **Proposal 3: During handover procedure, UE should report either the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement or whether GNSS re-acquisition is to be performed.****Observation 7: UE and eNB must have a common understanding of when the UE is performing the autonomous GNSS measurement.****Proposal 6: Postpone the discussion in RAN2 on the configuration for autonomously GNSS measurement.****Proposal 7: RAN2 to discuss whether GNSS reacquisition is always needed before each RRC establishment for UE requiring long data transmission duration.** **Proposal 8: RAN2 to discuss how to handle interruptions of the RLF procedure by GNSS measurements.**  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [14] R2-2301880 | **Proposal 4 Wait for further RAN1 progress before deciding the value range for “GNSS position fix time duration for measurement” in gnss-fixDuration.** | Ericsson |

These contributions and proposals have given very valuable discussion on some aspects of GNSS operation enhancement, but maybe it is better we discuss these proposals after the discussion of the proposals listed in section 3.1 and 3.2, considering the limited online time, and some proposals may need more progress of other issue.

**Proposal 11: Postpone the discussion of the proposals listed in this section.**

**Q13: Companies are invited to indicate whether you have concern on proposal 11 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No**  | **Comments** |
| Google | No | We can discuss these proposals in the next meetings. |
| InterDigital | No | If time allows we can discuss but agree it’s unlikely. |
| Lenovo | No | No need to restrict for nnow. |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Samsung | Ok | Can be discussed in upcoming meetings |
| ZTE | - | We think we need to discuss whether expiration of GNSS validity duration should be the start time of GNSS reacquisition. This is part of the previous main discussion.  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Turkcell | No |  |
| Nordic | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | Discussion will be more efficient after further RAN1 progress |
| CMCC | - | We can discuss if time allows. |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |

**(14/15) Proposal 13: Postpone the discussion of the proposals listed in section 3.3**

# 3. Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, following proposals are given:

**For email agreement:**

**(16/17) Proposal 1: For UE to report GNSS position fix time duration for measurement during the initial access, at least the following Msg5 message can be used: *RRCConnectionResumeComplete,RRCConnectionSetupComplete, RRCConnectionResumeComplete-NB, RRCConnectionSetupComplete-NB***

* **FFS for *RRCreestablishmentComplete and RRCConnectionReconfigurationComplete.***
* **FFS for Msg3**

**(1617) Proposal 6: By default, Rel-18 IoT NTN UE (supporting the improved GNSS operations) will leave RRC\_CONNECTED state when current GNSS position becoming out-of-date, unless it has been indicated by network to perform GNSS measurement.**

* + **FFS for the case of a GNSS measurement is happening at/after the expiry of the GNSS validity duration**

**(16/17) Proposal 12: The value range {10s, 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, 5 min, 10 min, 15 min, 20 min, 25 min, 30 min, 60 min, 90 min, 120 min, infinity} introduced in R17 is reused for connected UE GNSS validation duration report, unless modified by RAN1.**

**(14/17) Proposal 10: UE at least reports GNSS validity duration when the GNSS validity duration has changed.**

* **FFS UE reports GNSS validity duration after each time of GNSS measurement**

**(12/17) Proposal 11: New MAC CE should be defined for connected UE reporting GNSS validity duration.**

**For further discussion:**

 **(10/17) Proposal 2: Woking assumption: at least for eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement, new MAC CE is used.**

* **FFS for the security issue**

**(4/13) Proposal 3: Send LS to RAN1 and/or SA3 to inform/check security concern on using MAC CE for eNB to aperiodically UE to make GNSS measurement, unless RAN2 agrees to follow the RAN1 agreement on eNB aperiodically triggering UE to make GNSS measurement using MAC CE.**

**Postpone:**

**(13/17) Proposal 5: wait for progress of RAN1 on the issue of whether the GNSS position fix time duration for measurement may be changed during the long data connection.**

**(15/17) Proposal 7: RAN2 postpone the discussion of the UE capability indication of supporting GNSS operation enhancement.**

**Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss the following options for GNSS measurement gap transmission:**

* + **RRC signalling**
	+ **MAC CE triggering GNSS measurement**
	+ **No explicit GNSS measurement gap configuration**
	+ **Postpone the discussion**

**Proposal 8: For GNSS operation enhancement:**

* + **UE capability indication is needed to indicate whether the UE supports GNSS operation enhancement**
	+ **Network indication（explicit/implicit）is needed to indicate whether the network supports GNSS operation enhancement**

**(14/17) Proposal 9: Postpone the discussion on the following issues:**

* + ** UE behaviour when the UE completes GNSS measurement**
	+ ** UE behaviour when the UE can’t re-acquire GNSS position according to the configuration**
	+ ** UE triggered GNSS measurement (can be discussed if time is allowed )**

**(14/15) Proposal 13: Postpone the discussion of the proposals listed in section 3.3**
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