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# 1 Introduction

This is to continue discussion of the proposals in R2-2100407 and R2-2101950. The goal of this discussion [AT113-e][608] is:

* converge to an agreeable TP for latency enhancements
* recommendations from RAN2 perspective
* [AT113-e][608][POS] Continue discussion of latency enhancements (CATT)

 Scope: Discuss the proposals in R2-2100407 and R2-2101950 and converge to an agreeable TP. Additional latency enhancements from the previous email discussion can be captured if they have a clear consensus. Recommendations from RAN2 perspective should be clarified.

 Intended outcome: Endorsable TP

 Deadline: Tuesday 2021-02-02 1200 UTC

Rapporteur would like to have the following schedule for this email discussion to have time for preparing the summary report.

* Phase 1 (**Monday 2021-02-01 10:00 UTC**): Companies are invited to provide inputs and comments.
* Phase 2 (**Tuesday 2021-02-02 8:00 UTC**): Rapporteur will provide draft summary with proposals.

The remainder of this document is organized as the following. Section 2 contains the questionnaire on proposals in R2-2100407 and R2-2101950. The purpose is to collect the views and identify the commonalties and differences in order to converge to an agreeable TP and recommendations from RAN2 perspective.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 RAN2 centric objective proposals in R2-2100407

### 2.1.1 Request and response of positioning assistance data aspect

According to the email discussion results in [Post112-e][617][POS]: 8/11 companies supported request and response of positioning assistance data aspect to be further studied, and 6/10 companies support option 3 in [AT112-e][607].

* Option 3: Specify signalling and procedures for Deferred MT-LR (as proposed in R2-2010096) to support positioning configuration signalling in advance;

The proposal on Request and response of positioning assistance data aspect in the report of [Post112-e][617][POS] included both RAN1 centric and RAN2 centric objectives. However that statement brought confusion to companies because RAN1 centric objective is different from RAN2.

So the proposal on this aspect has been simplified here and focused on the discussion result in RAN2 only.

**Proposal 1: RAN2 to agree Deferred MT-LR for Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data.**

**Q1-1: Do you agree with proposal 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with clarification and modification. | The positioning configuration signaling in advance is not restricted to deferred MT-LR; it is equally applicable to MT-LR, NI-LR, and MO-LR, as described in R2-2010095, R2-2101469 and commented in ED [Post112-e][617][POS]. The Proposal could be:"Latency reduction via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed".This is applicable to Capabilities, Assistance Data, and Location Requests.  |
| Ericsson | Agree with QC |  |
| Intel | Disagree  | In R17, we should cover MO-LR, MT-LR, NI-LR. Deferred MT-LR is just one of special case of MT-LR. Cannot solve the issue on MO-LR, NI-LR. Therefore a general solution is needed for all of them instead of optimization focusing on deferred MT-LR.  |
| CATT | Agree with QC |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | Should be clarified that the current stage3 spec is already in place and only stage2 spec change is required.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | See Comment | The RAN2 scope of ‘positioning configuration signalling in advance’ needs to be agreed on a high level before commencing on detailed solutions which can take place during the normative phase. The need for further RAN2 work on Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data could be perhaps easily agreeable at this stage. We should rather keep this latency reduction enhancement general across MO-LR, MT-LR (incl. Deferred MT-LR) and NI-LR cases. |
| Nokia | Agree with modifications. | Agree to study. The proposal 1 and the modification from QC both do not mention that the RAN2 agreement is to study further during WID phase. QC’s proposal could be modified as follows:“Study latency reduction via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed".This is applicable to Capabilities, Assistance Data, and Location Requests. |
| Apple | Agree  | Agree with Huawei that only stage 2 spec is impacted. |
| ZTE | Agree with QC | The discussion should not be limited in the deferred MT-LR. |
| Samsung  | Agree with comment | We also have the same view with Huawei that this is mainly on the stage 2 matter, and not stage 3. |
| InterDigital | Agree (with modification) | We share similar view with Qualcomm and Intel on not restricting latency reduction solution only to deferred MT-LR.  |
| Xiaomi | Agree  |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree (with modification) | The configuration signalling in advance should cover MO-LR, MT-LR (including, deferred MT-LR), NI-LR. And the detailed solution should be studied during the normative phase. |

**Q1-2: If your answer to Question 1-1 was "Yes", do you agree with the text proposal #1 below? Or do you have any suggestion on the text proposal #1?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #1-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

* + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via Deferred MT-LR)

**----------------------------End of Text Proposal #1-------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:* Latency reduction related to the measurement gap
* Latency reduction related to measurement time
* Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (e.g., via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed, via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure, and/or priority rules)
* Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed, via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure)
 |
| Ericsson | Agree | Other latency reduction such as measurement gap is not part of RAN2 so we should only capture * + - Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via Deferred MT-LR)
 |
| CATT | Agree with modification | Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (e.g., via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed, |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with comments | Should clarify that the recommendation is only for stage2 clarification and current spec is complete from Stage3 perspective |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with comment | This essentially confirms from RAN2 point of view that enhancement solutions are to be worked on during the normative phase. Do not prefer to state Deferred MT-LR as an example. |
| Nokia | Agree with modifications | The TP from QC in response to Q1-2 is fine as it seems to cover also the aspects covered in additional questions further in this email discussion. |
| Apple | Agree with comments | Agree with Huawei and Ericsson |
| ZTE | Agree with comments | Agree with Huawei |
| Samsung  | Agree with comments | Have same view with Ericsson, and Huawei. |
| InterDigital | Agree with modification | Instead of ‘via Deferred MT-LR’, we think the new example listed by Qualcomm, “via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed”, in addition to the existing examples in TR 38.857,can be included in the TP for TR 38.857. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with modification | Agree with interdigital |

**Q1-3: If your answer to Question 1-1 was "Yes", do you agree text proposal # 2 as recommendation from RAN2 perspective?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #2-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are recommended for normative work, including DL and DL+UL positioning methods

* + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- **Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via Deferred MT-LR)**

**----------------------------End of Text Proposal #2-------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | See our response to Q1-2. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are recommended for normative work, including DL and DL+UL positioning methods * + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- **Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via Deferred MT-LR)**

**Recommended for normative work in yellow and is contradictory with “ left for further study in normative work” in green** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with comment | TP#1 is a sub-set of TP#2. We agree that RAN2 can add a ‘recommendation for normative work’ as part of the TP. Similar response as in Q1-2 about the inclusion of the Deferred MT-LR as an example. |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Text Proposal #2. The TP from QC in response to Q1-2 is fine as it seems to cover also the aspects covered in this Q1-3. |
| Apple |  | Same view as Huawei |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree (with modification) | See our response above |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with modification | See our response to Q1-2. |

### 2.1.2 Measurement report optimization aspect

According to the email discussion results in [Post112-e][617][POS]: 11/12 companies agreed to study latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements and one company agreed with condition (depends on the context). However companies had different understanding on detail solutions, e.g. CG-based solution.

RAN2 only discussed the CG-based solution because other RAN1 related solutions are not discussed by RAN2 before.

Some company mentioned that CG-based solution is not clear and there is no consensus during the online meeting. So this email continues to discuss the proposal of CG-based here.

There are only two candidate CG-Based solutions from companies, according to the results in [AT112-e][607].

* Option 1(summarized from five companies’ comments): Using the existed CG-based transmission for a certain logical channel.

It is already supported by the configuration of logical channel in NR Rel-16 which is up to the network implementation to configure CG. However there is NRPPa spec impact. gNB may get the PRS period from LMF via NRPPa.

* Option2: New type or separate CG for positioning which is used to adapt the PRS period and positioning specific configured grant may be introduced in Rel-17.

This can be used as positioning use only uplink resources, so that periodic positioning measurement report could be sent without waiting any L1 signals.

Discussion results in [Post112-e][617][POS] show that: **2 companies**(vivo, InterDigital) support the option2 and 5 companies think option1 has worked now(i.e. using the existing CG-based transmission).

In addition, R2-2101392 has also mentioned the following:

|  |
| --- |
| LMF configures the measurement periodicity; i.e the interval when the UE shall report the measurements. LMF should provide the configuration info to gNB so that gNB can configure the UL grant accordingly. However, this requires RAN3 input as it is over NRPPa. |

From the understanding of rapporteur, the above statement is true. For R15/16 configured grant, they are configured for a certain UE mainly based on the QoS parameter for a certain QoS flow/PDU session. While for sending the measurement report for positioning to the network, it would be impossible for the network to configure CG periodicity based on the periodicity of the deferred MT-LR.

Companies are invited to review the options and answer the questions as below:

**Q2-1: Which option do you prefer?**

**– Option 1: Drop the CG-based solution.**

**– Option 2: Agree the existing CG-based solution for Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements.**

**– Option 3: Keep CG-based solution for Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company name** | **Option1/ 2/ 3** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | To us, it is still unclear what a "CG-based solution" includes and what latency gains can be achieved. However, it does not have to be ruled-out if proponents can show an end-to-end solution and corresponding latency gains. It has been mentioned that additional NRPPa signalling may be required, which would add additional latency. We think CG would be more appropriate for the "idle/inactive positioning" objective. |
| Ericsson | Option 2/3 | CG solution allows gNB to provide the UL grant in advance so UE can report the measurement timely (without delay). We can explore both Option2/3. We should anyway prioritize the legacy existing framework. But if any minor update etc needed then we should also consider those. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | Existing CG-based solution could solve the problem. FFS how the gNB get the PRS period information, from UE or LMF. |
| Intel |  | CG today is only possible for connected mode UEs. SDT is also discussing a CG based SDT that could help for INACTIVE UEs. We would like to see how CG could help on the latency reduction. .  |
| CATT | Option 2 | If UE report periodic measurement, it makes sense to introduce existing CG mechanism to reduce the latency.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | First of all, What is the difference between Option2/3?Option2 means nothing is needed and current CG can be reused? What is the relation between CG and request of measurements in Option3? UE requests the measurements?From our understanding, some assistance information needs to be sent from the UE to the network on the CG periodicity for PRS measurement report if the UE wants to send measurement report or location estimate to the network. Disagree that this is only for IDLE/INACTIVE positioning. For small data, there is no support of CG for IDLE, and also, this should be applicable for CONNECTED as well |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2/ Prefer Option 3 | The specification impact between the two CG-based options (existing CG-based or new CG-based with enhancements) can be compared and discussed during the normative phase. The CG-based solution can potentially lower the response times set by the LMF for a measurement report. Further discussion on these aspects are necessary and we prefer the general Option 3. Also agree that it should it be applicable to both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_INACTIVE states. |
| Nokia | See comments | Don’t understand what is the difference between Option 2 and Option 3, Agree vs Keep? What does keep mean? Also, the proposal is phrased with the assumption that all solutions have been discussed in detail before or papers describing the solutions exists and hence it is fine to agree on the solutions! We think that the TP from QC under Q1-2 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for measurements and measurement reporting. Either go with the QC TP for Q1-2 or leave it all open for further study. |
| Apple | Option 2 with comments | We assume opitoin 2 means existing CG based solution already allows gNB to configure UL CG for periodic measurement reporting. The CG can be restricted to a specific logical channel(s) dedicated for LPP messages. . |
| ZTE | Option2 | We should clarify that, based on our understanding, option2 means using the existed CG-based transmission for a certain logical channel. And it is already supported in Rel-16. |
| Samsung  | Option 2/ option 3 | Even we also have not clear understanding on option 2/3, we also have the view that option 2 (using existing CG) and option 3 (CG with enhancement) needs to be compared and further discussed in normative phase. |
| InterDigital | At least Option 2 | We are unclear how Options 2 and 3 differ. From the description, we think CG-based solution achieves latency reduction based on i) UE uses preconfigured CG and somehow aligns the periodicity of CG with reporting occasions or ii) gNB configures CG with appropriate periodicity upon receiving configuration info from LMF.  |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 |  |
| vivo | Option 2/3 | Same views as Lenovo and agree that it should be applicable to both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_INACTIVE states.We can found different companies that have different opinions, but the majority company don’t want to drop it, as this is the last meeting for SI, we propose CG-solution can be further discussed in WID and specified if needed |
| Spreadtrum | At least Option2 | Existing CG-based solution could solve the problem. And the enhancement can be discussed in normative phase.  |

**Q2-2: If your answer to Question 2-1 was "Option2", do you agree with the text proposal #3 below? Or do you have any comments on the text proposal #3?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #3-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency can be studied and specified, if needed

* + Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (existing CG-based transmission)

**----------------------------End of Text Proposal #3-------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | As commented in our response to Q1-1:Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (e.g., via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed, existing CG-based transmission, via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure, and/or priority rules) |
| Ericsson | Agree with Modification | * + Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (CG-based transmission)

We should anyway prioritize the legacy existing framework. We will not introduce completely new CG for positioning only. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree with modification | “via” should be added , i.e.* + Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (via existing CG-based transmission)
 |
| CATT | Agree with Intel |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Ok to continue the study in WI phase |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree | Share Intel’s view. |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Text Proposal #3. We think that the TP from QC under Q1-2 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for measurements and measurement reporting. Either go with that or leave it all open for further study. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree (with modification) | Ok with modification proposed by Qualcomm. We are ok to include the existing CG based transmission in the existing text in TR 38.857 to be considered as one of the potential enhancements for latency reduction. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree with modification | Agree with Intel |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |

**Q2-3: If your answer to Question 2-1 was "Option2", do you agree to recommend text proposal#4 from RAN2 perspective?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #4-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are recommended for normative work, including DL and DL+UL positioning methods

* + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- Latency reduction with existing CG-based scheme by aligning the CG periodicity with PRS measurement report periodicity

**----------------------------End of Text Proposal #4 -------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | This requires more studies before a recommendation on this specific proposal can be made. |
| Ericsson | Agree with modification | * + - Latency reduction with CG-based scheme by aligning the CG periodicity with PRS measurement report periodicity
 |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Intel | Disagree | The recommendation in Q2-2 is sufficient. The details can be discussed in WI phase. The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:* + Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (via existing CG-based transmission)
 |
| CATT | Disagree | CG-based can be further studied in WI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Same comment as above. Better clean up the wording. it should be either “recommended for normative work” or “recommended for further study” |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Disagree | No need at this stage to set specific details of this enhancement.  |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Text Proposal #4. We think that the TP from QC under Q1-2 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for measurements and measurement reporting. Either go with that or leave it all open for further study. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | Agree  |  |
| InterDigital | Agree  |  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | The CG based details can be studied in WI phase. For TP, we think Text Proposal #3 is enough since it already includes CG based solution.  |
| vivo | Disagree | CG-based can be further studied in WI. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |

### 2.1.3 Capability procedure aspect

According to the email discussion results in [Post112-e][617][POS]: **9/12 companies** agree with the capability procedure aspect for latency reduction, 1/12 company disagree and 2/12 companies share the concern and issues to be investigated. In R2-2101392 has proposed detailed solution for latency reduction with AMF storing the positioning capability.

There are mainly two solutions:

Solution1: UE provide the UE positioning capability to the AMF in an un-solicited manner



**Solution2**: the AMF request the UE positioning capability and UE sends it to the AMFin a solicited manner



However, as we discussed in [Post112-e][617][POS], this solution mainly involves the work from CT1/CT4 and SA2. There is little work RAN2 can do for normative work, and mainly the request discussion. Therefore we only captured the baseline, and details can be further studied and LS will be sent to SA2 in WI phase.

**Proposal 2:** **RAN2 to agree capture capability procedure for latency reduction and SA2 will be involved in WI.**

**Q3-1: Do you agree with proposal 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with clarification and modification | As mentioned in our response to Q1-1, the "Latency reduction via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed" is applicable to Capabilities, Assistance Data, and Location Requests. As long as this is within the scope, we agree with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Not sure if we understand QC comments. These are two different things; positioning application which require periodic reporting and thus once Capabilities have been provided; the location server will not have to re-fetch for the next periodicity. But this is not applicable to all positioning application for e.g. a snapshot of location info requiring applications |
| OPPO | Agree | We agree that capability procedure aspect should be considered for latency reduction. FFS further details, e.g., if positioning capability should be reported to AMF |
| Intel | Agree | We also think there are two cases:Case 1: the network obtains the capability in the same positioning procedure, e.g. for deferred MT-LR, and Case 2: the network obtains the capability in advance and store the capability in AMF or LMF, and then the network does not need to obtain capability again in next positioning procedure. Then case 2 should be our main focus.  |
| CATT | Agree | Positioning capabilities of UE may be reported to AMF/LMF directly before there is a location request, instead of to LMF in LPP session, in order to reduce the positioning latency which was calculated in End-to-end latency analysis.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | There is not much for RAN2 to do and SA2 can continue to look at it if they think it is beneficial. We don’t need to make the conclusion for SA2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree | Support the proposal if the intention is to reduce latency of repeating the capability procedure in different LPP sessions. |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Proposal 2 because it is already endorsing a solution. However, we are fine to study this solution.We think that the TP from QC under Q1-1 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for capability handling. Either go with that or add a capability enhancement related bullet under the TP from QC in response to Q1-2. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree | We agree with the proposal for positioning capability to be requested proactively and stored in LMF/AMF ahead of receiving the location request. The details of which (static) capability information can be requested/stored, and validity of the stored information can be discussed in WI phase in coordination with SA2.  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
|  Spreadtrum | Agree | We agree that capability procedure aspect should be considered for latency reduction. FFS further details |

**Q3-2: If your answer to Question 3-1 was "Yes", do you agree with the text proposal #5 below? Or do you have any comments on the text proposal #5?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #5-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are considered as beneficial:

* + **Latency reduction related to storing UEcapability in AMF procedure. It is proposed thatSA2 should study whether this should be recommended for normative work in SA/CT.**

**-------------------------------- End of Text Proposal #5 -------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | * Latency reduction related to capability procedure (e.g., via location scheduling in advance of the time of when the location is needed, storing capabilities at LMF and/or AMF, etc.)
* SA/CT will be involved during WI.
 |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Agree with modification | “**It is proposed thatSA2 should study whether this should be recommended for normative work in SA/CT.**”Could be modified as * + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- Latency reduction related to storing UE capability in AMF procedure.
		- SA/CT will be involved during WI.
 |
| CATT | Agree with Intel |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with modification | We don’t need the wording “as beneficial” and the decision should be totally left for SA2. I think QC’s comment is also hinting at this |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Text Proposal #5 because it is already endorsing a solution. However, it is fine to study this solution.We think that the TP from QC under Q1-1 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for capability handling. Either go with that or add a capability enhancement related bullet under the TP from QC under Q1-2. Alternatively, the TP from QC under Q1-1 can be updated to cover the additional text that QC proposed under Q3-2 viz. “storing capabilities at LMF and/or AMF, etc. SA/CT WGs will be involved during WI” |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | Agree  |  |
| InterDigital | Agree (with modification) | We are ok with the modification proposed by Qualcomm |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |

**Q3-3: If your answer to Question 3-1 was "Yes", do you agree to recommend text proposal #6 from RAN2 perspective?**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #6-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are recommended for normative work, including DL and DL+UL positioning methods

* + The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- **Latency reduction related to storing UEcapability in AMF procedure. It is proposed thatSA2 should study whether this should be recommended for normative work in SA/CT.**

**----------------------------End of Text Proposal #6 -------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | See our response to Q3-2. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel |  | See above. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | There is no normative work in this for RAN2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree | RAN2 scope needs to be clarified (if any). |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t agree to Text Proposal #6 because it is already endorsing a solution. However, it is fine to study this solution.We think that the TP from QC under Q1-1 already covers the latency reduction enhancements for capability handling. Either go with that or add a capability enhancement related bullet under the TP from QC under Q1-2. Alternatively, the TP from QC under Q1-1 can be updated to cover the additional text that QC proposed under Q3-2 viz. “storing capabilities at LMF and/or AMF, etc. SA/CT WGs will be involved during WI” |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung  | Agree  |  |
| InterDigital | Agree (with modification) | See our response above |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |

### 3.2.3 Architecture enhancement aspect

According to the email discussion results in [Post112-e][617][POS]: **2/9companies**(InterDigital, Qualcomm) agree with the aspect, **4/9 companies**(Intel, Nokia, Apple, Convida) suggest other groups involved (e.g. SA2 and RAN3 should be involved for the architecture enhancement) and **3/9 companies**(Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Ericsson) disagree it.

It seems there is no clear consensus on if architecture enhancement aspect for latency reduction will be further studied in RAN2.

Companies think RAN3 and SA2/SA3 may be involved address architecture and security aspects whenever that may be. Therefore rapporteur suggests there is no proposal on architecture enhancement aspect for latency reduction.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | It seems rather obvious that other groups need to be involved, which applies to almost all objectives being discussed here, incl. e.g., capability procedure aspects, etc.It should be clarified how the e.g., latency reduction via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure is supposed to work without any architecture enhancements. Those studies seem clearly under RAN2 scope (including the related architectural aspects). Similar to Proposal 2 by the rapporteur, SA2 and others can be involved during WI phase. |
| Ericsson | Agree with rapporteur | We do not think we can get consensus on this. Already RAN3 has captured the details in their Rel-16 TR.  |
| OPPO |  | Architecture enhancement discussion should be triggered in RAN3 firstly.  |
| Intel | Agree with Rapporteur | We had long discussion in Rel-16 in RAN2, and finally left the decision to RAN3. And then RAN3 spent lots of time on this, and left the decision to SA2. No progress in Rel-16. The situation seems not changed. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Agree with rapporteur | RAN2 can only be responsible for latency reduction techniques without architecture change. SA2 and RAN3 are the owner of the issues on [positioning] architecture and conclusion can only be made by them. Both SA2 and RAN3 have studied this and concluded that no agreement can be made. We cannot see how this can change with further discussion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Disagree | This local LMF topic has been going back forth among RAN3, RAN and SA2 WGs. The latest status seems to be the reply LS sent by SA2 (S2-2003341) to RAN#86 (RP-193203) where SA2 could not agree on how to quantitively evaluate the latency. Overall, it seems RAN3 (based on the conclusion of TR 38.856) and SA2 did not yet perform a latency evaluation for potential positioning latency reduction enhancements, even though these WGs were Cced in RAN1’s (R1-2007264) latency evaluation request and it is a Rel-17 target requirement for reducing end-to-end positioning latency. Similar to the capability procedure aspect in Q3-1, RAN2 can at least trigger RAN3 and SA2 for a latency analysis to finally determine if there are any potential architectural enhancements. RAN3 and SA2 can be directly involved in the WI phase given that studies on local LMF architectural enhancements have already been made as mentioned by most companies. |
| Nokia | Disagree | First, we agree with the comments from QC above. Next, when it comes to architecture related aspects the question is not even phrased right. In fact, there is no proposal at all. The question should be “Does RAN2 agree to evaluate latency related to any architectural change proposals”. If this is the question then our answer is, Yes.Our proposal is to update the QC TP in Q1-2 to include another bullet as follows:“Latency reduction related to any architecture change proposals already studied in SA2/RAN3 (RAN2 to only focus on the latency analysis/evaluation but final architecture change decision is left to SA2/RAN3)” |
| Apple | Agree | We assume the architecture enahcenments is needed to support ., “latency reduction via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure”. However, such changes will need involve other groups and pose a bigger challenge to complete in WI. We are fine to not introduce architecture changes for the purpose of latency reduction in R17.  |
| ZTE | Agree with rapporteur | We share the similar view with Huawei. RAN2 can only be responsible for latency reduction without network architecture change. |
| Samsung  | Disagree  | We have the same view with QC. |
| InterDigital | Disagree | While the involvement of SA2 and RAN3 for architectural enhancement is clear, the analysis (as discussed in Qualcomm’s contribution as a starting point) showing latency reduction benefits when supporting certain location server functionalities in RAN, can be used to motivate the discussion in SA2/RAN3. As such, we think the signalling enhancements and analysis related to latency reduction when supporting LMC in RAN can be captured in the TR. We are also fine to capture the change suggested by Nokia to the TP  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with rapporteur | We have the same view with Intel. |
| vivo | Agree | It should be decided by RAN3 and SA2. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with rapporteur | Architecture enhancement also involves RAN3/SA2 expect for RAN2. It is hard to get consensus at this stage in RAN2 |

## 2.2 RAN1 centric objective proposals in R2-2100407

There is no any agreement on latency in RAN #90-e and no relative objective is added in new WID of ePOS [2] because RAN1 is waiting for the progress of RAN2 on latency.

Measurement gap and priority rules for the reception of DL PRS were discussed in [Post112-e][617][POS]. However they are RAN1 centric objective. Now there is agreement on measurement gaps optimizations and priority rules for the reception of DL PRS from RAN1 as below:

* **The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:**
	+ **Latency reduction related to the measurement gap**
* **The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency can be studied and specified, if needed**
	+ **Latency reduction related to the reception of DL PRS (e.g., priority rules for the reception of DL PRS)**

It seemed that the RAN1 centric objectives proposals in R2-2100407 had brought confusion to companies according to the online meeting #113-e. Because some of them were discussed in RAN2 while others not. Therefore these RAN1 centric objective proposals are not discussed again in this email discussion because RAN1 have reached the agreement and captured them into TR.

Only the agreements which are in the email discussion scope are listed above just for your information.

## 2.3 New proposals in R2-2101950

### 2.3.1 Broadcast delay optimization aspect

According to R2-2101392, broadcast delays for positioning are substantial and cannot be ignored.i.e. the total delay would be Periodicty\*NumberOfSegments + NumberOfSegments\*SI\_WindowLenghth. Currently SI-windows with same length for all SI messages is configured. By introducing a separate SI window length for the SI messages carrying positioning SIBs, it is possible to configure this window short enough, without consideration of any legacy SIB impact. The short SI window has the advantage of shortening the acquisition time of multiple segments and also of all positioning SIBs that is of interest for the UE.

R2-2101392 **Proposal 2:** Adjustable and Short SI Window length of 1 slot is considered in Rel-17 for posSIBs.

Additionally, in order to reduce broadcast delays, it should be made possible that each posSIB segment are sent in a separate back to back SI messages. Considering 3 segments of a posSIB; if each segment is scheduled back to back in different SI messages, it will reduce the latency.

R2-2101392 **Proposal 3:** Flexible SI scheduling allowing back to back delivery of posSIB segments is considered to reduce broadcast delays.

**Rapporteur’s comments:** There is a new posSIBs broadcast mechanism(proposal 2&3 below) which is quite different from the legacy broadcast mechanism as summarized in R2-2101950. The broadcast delay optimization is not in the scope of latecy analysis[3][4] for Rel-17 SI. On the other hand, it is observerd that the proposals 2&3 may reduce the latency of braodcast AD.

So RAN2 will discuss at first if the broadcast delay optimization is in the scope of latecy reduction, and then evaluate the candidate solutions within both implementation effort and the gains.

**Q4-1: Do you agree broadcast delay optimization aspect should be a part of latency reduction?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | The main benefit of broadcast is that a UE could always have valid assistance data stored. This already implies a latency reduction. The available broadcast periodicities can already be very small, therefore, we do not see a need for System Information enhancements. However, if any System Information enhancements are going to be studied (e.g., for other purposes than latency reduction), it should not be specific to positioning.  |
| Ericsson | Agree | RRC Broadcast is part of end to end delay. It should be captured. Even QC comment confirms that it should be then atleast be part of TTFF; i.e a UE coming to a new cell (wity new systemInfoAreaID) will have to reacquire some of the posSIBs before starting the positioning session.It is considered that the positioning application would be even more widely used in coming few years. Broadcast would play a key role in providing mass scale positioning solutions. Resources need to be scheduled in a fair proportional way. Hence, the standard should allow flexibility in how NW can deliver the posSIBs along with serving the data communication; e.g providing resources for other NR SI scheduling.Positioning WI has in past added 40 new posSIBs. So, it should be the responsible group at least to motivate the need of flexibility in SI scheduling so that all these posSIBs can be broadcasted timely; i.e without much delay. At least RAN2 should acknowledge that delays in broadcast would incur latency in positioning TTFF and even after TTFF. |
| OPPO | Disagree | Agree with Qualcomm. Besides, it is not in the scope of latency analysis for Rel-17 SI, as already mentioned by rapporteur. |
| Intel | Disagree | Agree Rapporteur’s view that it is not in the scope, or it is not the main part we should focus on. The enhancement on dedicated signaling approach should be the main target in R17. |
| CATT | Disagree | The broadcast delay optimization is not in the scope of latecy for Rel-17 SI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | This would need RAN1 study and RAN2 cannot decide to change the SI periodicity or scheduling different SI messages by itself.  |
| Nokia | Disagree | Any enhancements to the current assistance data broadcast mechanism impacts SI broadcast in general. If this is to be studied further, then it must NOT be done as part of positioning enhancements. It must be a separate study on SI enhancements. |
| Apple | Disagree | We do not support to change any generic/common SI parameters (e.g., SI window) in RRC for the specific purpose of positioning. The impact to non-Positioning UE and legacy SI cannot be ignored. |
| ZTE | Disagree | This is not the scope of latency reduction in Rel-17 SI. |
| Samsung  | Disagree  | We think the dominant part of the delay incurred by posSIB acquisition is periodicity not SI window length. And as commented by rapporteur, this is quite different from legacy broadcast mechanism. We wonder if there is no problem in the old version UE when this is introduced. |
| InterDigital | Disagree | We share similar understanding with Qualcomm regarding optimization for reducing broadcast delay and that further motivation for reducing the window length only for positioning SI is somewhat unclear. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | It is out of the scope. |
| vivo | Disagree | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | This is not in the scope of latency reduction for Rel-17 SI. |

**Q4-2: If your answer to Question 4-1 was "Yes", please provide your views: e.g. performance evaluation of the solutions above, or specifying the solutions above in detail.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Analysis and solution have been provided in R2-2101392. Even considering a modest posSI scheduling; * shortest SI window length with 15KhZ numerology would give 5ms SI window length.
* The SI periodicity can be any value (rf8, rf16, rf32, rf64, rf128, rf256, rf512). Considering NW uses a moderate periodicity of rf128 for GNSS Almanac which has 3 segments

The total delay would be Periodicty\*NumberOfSegments + NumberOfSegments\*SI\_WindowLenghth = 1280\*3 + 3\*5 = 3885ms. Broadcast delays are also substantial and cannot be ignored. Broadcast latency is based upon the configured SI Window length and periodicity, number of posSIB segments and number of posSI that UE has to acquire. Some posSIBs can be considered as part of TTFF whereas some are updated frequently, and thus broadcast delays impacts latency during TTFF and also after TTFF i.e also during positioning estimation. Latency will incur if NW is unable to provide small periodicity (interval) and SI Window.Flexibility in NW on posSI scheduling may reduce latency such as configuring positioning specific SI Window or scheduling different segments of posSIB back to back.For above example the total delay would be:NumberOfSegments\*SI\_WindowLenghth = 3\*1 = 3ms; (Considering posSI Window of 1ms) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q4-3: If your answer to Question 4-1 was "Yes", do you recommend broadcast delay optimization aspect from RAN2 perspective?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree | At least RAN2 should acknowledge that the positioning procedure can be delayed when UE has to acquire several posIS and posSIBs which have several segments and when the periodicity and SI Window configured values are large. Even if we do not capture min/max that was captured for end to end delay; we should note the factors that can influence the delay such as SI Window, Periodicy, posSIB segments, number of posSI that UE has to acquire. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.3.2 The additional delay incurred by Beam Failure and NLOS

This new proposal on beam failure and NLOS effects is highly related with RAN1. But considering this is the last meeting for Rel-17 SI, RAN2 may discuss it here.

Based on R2-2100933, single or multiple beam/TRP failures that involve DL-PRS transmissions can impact the overall positioning performance and incur additional latency, including RAT-dependent positioning techniques that rely on DL and UL positioning measurements. In addition, the latency evaluations performed by RAN1 and RAN2, did not consider the additional delays incurred through retransmissions of the measurement report, which can affect the overall end-to-end latency.

**Observation 6:** Beam failure events and measurement report retransmissions can introduce additional delays, which may affect the end-to-end latency of determining a UE’s location estimate.

Also, for Rel-17 IIoT positioning, other non-ideal positioning radio events may occur such as the effect of multiple NLOS beams/multipath components or a lack of suitable LOS beams will impact the quality of the DL-PRS measurements performed at UE and thus decrease the computed positioning accuracy at the LMF (UE-assisted positioning) or at the UE (UE-based positioning). This is an additional concern since it has been established that certain indoor factory setting have a high probability of NLOS components.

**Observation 7:** NLOS TRPs/links can incur additional latency in terms of beam reselection procedures, request of PRS configuration and thus affect the accuracy of a location estimate.

Below is the proposal from Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:

R2-2100933 **Proposal 7:** RAN2 to study mechanisms for mitigating the effects of beam failure and NLOS effects, which can impact the end-to-end positioning latency.

**Rapporteur’s comments:** It seems that there is no clear evaluation on latency and clear candidate latency reduction sultion in the contribution.

**Q5-1: Do you agree mechanisms for mitigating the effects of beam failure and NLOS effects as one of aspects of latency reduction?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | We understand this is related to the reliability of the communication link? If so, it has generally an impact on latency, but seems out of scope of the positioning WI. |
| OPPO |  | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Intel |  | Agree with QC. In addition, it is RAN1 centric topic, and should be discussed in RAN1.  |
| CATT |  | Agree with QC. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree | Although the intention of the proposal may be RAN1-centric, the proposal aims to raise a RAN2 issue relating to the reacquisition delay of the positioning assistance data from the LMF in the event that a PRS resource of a particular beam cannot be measured due to beam failure which may translate to a cause event transmitted by the UE via the *TargetDeviceErrorCauses* IE. For NLOS beam identification, this may reduce the accuracy of the measured PRS resources and subsequent location estimate. This reacquisition latency can be counted on top of the overall end-to-end delay as already evaluated in RAN2 for the different positioning methods.Note that RAN1 concluded that “Evaluations show that high probability of NLOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario”. Although this may affect the accuracy of the reported measurements, we feel that it has additional end-to-end latency impacts relating to the way in which an updated PRS configuration can be obtained/re-acquired due to unexpected radio failure events as noted in Q5-2. |
| Nokia | Disagree | It is stated above that “This new proposal on beam failure and NLOS effects is highly related with RAN1. But considering this is the last meeting for Rel-17 SI, RAN2 may discuss it here”. We, however, disagree with this. Just because there is not much time to finish the study item, we cannot discuss a RAN1 issue in RAN2. If RAN1 endorses such an enhancement, then RAN2 can look in to signalling support for it. |
| Apple | No | Agree with QC. This is more related to accuracy rather than latency. |
| ZTE |  | Agree with QC. |
| Samsung  | Disagree  | We think this is not positioning specific issue but the general issue for the beam based communication system.  |
| InterDigital |  | While we agree that mitigating beam failures/NLOS for improving positioning accuracy can result in higher latency, it is unclear what solutions are considered, particularly to latency reduction, which are not already considered in the on-demand PRS discussion |
| Xiaomi |  | Agree with QC. |
| vivo | Disagree | These proposals should be discussed in RAN1. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Agree with QC |

**Q5-2: If your answer to Question 5-1 was "Yes", please provide your views: e.g. performance evaluation of the solutions above, or specifying the solutions above in detail.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We acknowledge that this issue can be solved based on the ongoing discussion related to the on-demand PRS framework (with RAN2 impacts) where an updated PRS configuration can be initiated by the UE (UE-based) /LMF (UE-assisted) via an indication to the serving gNB, the possible addition/removal/switching of TRP(s) upon beam failure or upon detection of NLOS beams. The LMF may also configure prioritized PRS resources for UE measurement via switching to an appropriate TRP (beam reselection with scheduled PRS resources) as part of the measurement report.The affected latency components due to reacquisition latency of assistance data (mainly related to LPP Provide Assistance Data) are highlighted in bold using the RAN2 analysis in R2-2010872 as baseline:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Label | Latency [ms] | Description |
|  Processing Latencies |
| TUEProc-RRCReconf | 10 | RRC Reconfiguration processing |
| **TUEProc-RRCDLInfo** | **5** | **RRC DL information transfer**  |
| TUEProc-RRCULInfo | 2-5 | RRC UL information transfer |
| TUEProc-RRCLocationMeas | 2-5 | RRC Location Measurement Indication |
| TUEProc-LPPCapab | 10-20 | LPP Provide Capabilities |
| **TUEProc-LPPAssi** | **10** | **LPP Provide Assistance Data** |
| TUEProc-LPPLocationRe | 5 | LPP Request/Provide Location Information |
| TUEProc-MAC-SRSAct | 1-3 | MAC-CE SRS Activation/Deactivation |
| TgNBProc-RRC | 3 | RRC Processing |
| TgNBProc-NRPPa | 3 | NRPPa Processing |
| **TgNBProc-NAS/LPP** | **3** | **NAS/LPP Processing** |
| **TAMFProc** | **3** | **AMF Processing** |
| **TLMFProc** | **3** | **LMF Processing** |
| Signalling Propagation Delays between Nodes |
| **TUE-gNB** | **0-0.5** |  |
| **TgNB-AMF** | **3-10** |  |
| **TAMF-LMF** | **1-10** |  |
| TAMF-GMLC | 3-10 |  |
| Positioning Measurement Latencies |
| TLMF-Calc | 2-30 | Position Calculation latency |
| TDL-Meas | Wait for RAN1 | PHY DL-PRS measurement time; best possible case  |
| TUL-Meas | Wait for RAN1 | PHY UL-PRS measurement time; assume the same value as for DL-PRS. |

Taking “Step 3 - LPP Provide Assistance Data” for DL-TDOA/DL-AoD as an example from the RAN2 evaluation, the reacquisition delay can be potentially doubled from 28-44.5 ms to 56-89 ms in the event of beam failure due to the retransmission of the LPP Provide Assistance Data message by the LMF. This delay component may be then considered non-negligible in the overall end-to-end latency analysis. Furthermore, the LMF is not aware of any dynamic radio issues affecting the TRPs apart from a UE indication, reporting that a particular measurement cannot be performed/ has an error cause. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Text Proposals for high layer latency analysis for NR positioning enhancements

This section is text proposals for the TR 38.857 clause 8.2 Performance analysis of studied NR positioning enhancements. Observations from companies are captured here based on the contributions. Companies are invited to review these text proposals here.

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #6-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

# 2 References

[26] 3GPP TS 38.901 Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz (Release 16)

[X1] R2-2010096 NR Positioning Latency Analysis and Enhancements, Qualcomm Incorporated

[X2] R2-2009023 Solution directions to reduce end-to-end latency, Intel Corporation

[X3] R2-2009039 Discussion on positioning enhancement, vivo[X4] R2-2009897 Considerations on potential positioning enhancements, Sony

[X5] R2-2101392 Discussion on Latency Aspects Ericsson

[X6] R2-2008810 Further discussion on enhancements for commercial use cases, CATT

**--------------------------------End of Text Proposal #6-------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**--------------------------------Text Proposal #7-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

## 8.2 Performance analysis of studied NR positioning enhancements

*¨*This clause presents the observations made by sources regarding the studied NR positioning enhancements. Detailed results can be found in annex C.2.

### 8.2.3 High layer analysis for NR positioning enhancements

#### 8.2.3.1 Observations from Source [x1]

Observations on end-to-end latency for Deferred MT-LR Event Reporting are provided in Table 8.2.3.x-1.

Table 8.2.3.x-1: Latencies for Deferred MT-LR Event Reporting [8].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | End-to-End Latency [ms] |
| LMF only | LMF and LSS |
| Baseline | Configuration Signalling in Advance | Configuration Signalling in Advance for DL-only Positioning | Configuration Signalling in Advance and LSS | Configuration Signalling in Advance and LSS for DL-only Positioning | LSS with Positioning and Event Reporting in RRC\_INACTIVE state |
| UL+DL Positioning | 284-535.5 | 164-320 | NA | 100-150 | NA | 61-98.5 |
| UL-only Positioning | 221-448 | 139-287.5 | NA | 76-120.5 | NA | 55-91 |
| DL-only Positioning | 218-402.5 | 124-229.5 | 72-135.5 | 92-137.5 | 54-89.5 | 53-86.5 |
| NOTE: The latency values are end-to-end latencies, including a PHY measurement time assumption of 22 ms. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### 8.2.3.2 Observations from source [X2]

Based on latency analysis table, we could see:

1 LPP capability exchange (step 1, 2): 33-88.5 ms

2 SRS configuration+activation (step 3-8): 66- 133ms

3 SRS measurement request (step 9): 13-29 ms

* Processing delays: 9 ms
	+ gNB: TgNBProc-NRPPa= 3ms
	+ AMF: TAMFProc= 3ms
	+ LMF: TLMFProc= 3ms
* Signalling delay:4-20ms
	+ gNB-AMF: TgNB-AMF= 3-10ms
	+ AMF-LMF: TAMF-LMF= 1-10ms

4 LPP assistance data (step 11): 28-44.5 ms

The following solutions can be considered for latency reduction of NR positioning solutions from RAN2 perspective:

Pre-configuration and minimization of DL/UL transactions (can reduce the latency caused by 2, 4 as above)

DL PRS assistance information can be pre-configured to UE. Multiple DL PRS configurations can be associated with DL PRS configuration ID and activated when necessary

SRS for positioning configuration information can be pre-configured to UE. Multiple configurations of SRS for positioning can be associated with SRS for positioning configuration ID and activated when necessary

#### 8.2.3.3 Observations from source [X3,X5]

Grant Free UL Transmission enables reduce UL transmission delays and achieve URLLC Reliability targets. For low latency and reliability requirements, it is required to support UL GF transmission with multiple repetitions (i.e. UL data transmission without scheduling request).

If this procedure can be used for PRS period reporting, then signals and multiple configuration latency can be saved. And this pre-allocated grant should adapt to the PRS period, so the best latency result is performed.

LMF configures the measurement periodicity; i.e the interval when the UE shall report the measurements. LMF should provide the configuration info to gNB so that gNB can configure the UL grant accordingly. However, this requires RAN3 input as it is over NRPPa.

#### 8.2.3.4 Observations from source [X4]

We consider to introduce a positioning measurement report, with configured grant (CG) mechanism. The gNB can allocate resources for the UE that has been requested to perform positioning procedure. The configured grant resources are used by the UE to transmit the positioning measurement results. Note: configured grant mechanism has been part of the NR URLLC. Hence, the specification impact can be kept minimum.

In case configured grant is not deployed, we can also consider the UE to skip scheduling request (SR) transmission. In addition, as the process in the legacy approach, it is not guaranteed that the gNB receives or immediately allocate the uplink resources (PUSCH). This will further increase the latency. A method to reduce the latency is to configure the UE to monitor downlink control channel (PDCCH) containing uplink grant after the measurement gap.

#### 8.2.3.5 Observations from source [X2]

|  |
| --- |
| **Positioning technique [Multi-RTT] [UE-A] Figure 3** |
| **Latency Component** | **Value Range (ms)** | **Description of Latency Component** |
| Step 1 LPP Request capabilities | 18-34 | TLMFProc+ TAMF-LMF+ TAMFProc +TgNB-AMF + TgNBProc-NAS/LPP +TUE-gNB+ TUEProc-RRCDLInfoProcessing delays: 14ms- UE: TUEProc-RRCDLInfo= 5ms- gNB: TgNBProc-NAS/LPP= 3ms- AMF: TAMFProc= 3ms- LMF: TLMFProc= 3msSignalling delay:4-20.5ms- UE-gNB: TUE-gNB= 0-0.5ms- gNB-AMF: TgNB-AMF= 3-10ms- AMF-LMF: TAMF-LMF= 1-10msNote, the LPP capability processing delay is counted together in response message.  |
| Step 2 LPP Provide Capabilities | 25-54.5 | TLMFProc+ TAMF-LMF+ TAMFProc +TgNB-AMF + TgNBProc-NAS/LPP +TUE-gNB+ TUEProc-RRCULInfo+ TUEProc-LPPCapabProcessing delays: 21-34ms- UE:  TUEProc-RRCULInfo= 2-5ms TUEProc-LPPCapab= 10-20ms- gNB: TgNBProc-NAS/LPP= 3ms- AMF: TAMFProc= 3ms- LMF: TLMFProc= 3msSignalling delay:4-20.5ms- UE-gNB: TUE-gNB= 0-0.5ms- gNB-AMF: TgNB-AMF= 3-10ms- AMF-LMF: TAMF-LMF= 1-10ms |

1 LPP capability exchange (step 1, 2): 33-88.5 ms

The following solutions can be considered for latency reduction of NR positioning solutions from RAN2 perspective:

1. Skip the capability procedure (can reduce the latency caused by 1 as above)

#### 8.2.3.6 Observations from source [X5]

Observation 1 Time to first fix should be considered in latency studies and any improvements in this area can be studied. Considering TTFF in latency may relax the other core latency requirements for performing measurements and reporting to the location server for positioning computation.

Potential improvement during TTFF can be storage of UE positioning capabilities by AMF. UE provide the UE positioning capability to the AMF in an un-solicited manner



Additionally, AMF may fetch it from UE. An example illustrating MO-LR case; the highlighted in red would be new steps.



#### 8.2.3.7 Observations from source [X6]

The capabilities of UEs may be reported to core network before the location request. The process related with capabilities can be removed for all Positioning scenarios, so the latency of these processes will be reduced.

Positioning capabilities of UE may be reported to AMF directly before there is a location request, instead of to LMF via LPP session, in order to reduce the positioning latency. This solution also works for the positioning in Idle/Inactive mode. AMF can store these capabilities before UE steps into RRC\_CONNECTED mode.

When LMF needs the location capabilities of UE, AMF may forward the capabilities of this UE to LMF after step 10 LMF Selection, before step 12 UE positioning in Figure 6.1.2-1: 5GC-MT-LR Procedure for the commercial location services.



#### 8.2.3.8 Observations from source [?]

Even considering a modest posSI scheduling;

* shortest SI window length with 15KhZ numerology would give 5ms SI window length.
* The SI periodicity can be any value (rf8, rf16, rf32, rf64, rf128, rf256, rf512). Considering NW uses a moderate periodicity of rf128 for GNSS Almanac which has 3 segments

The total delay would be Periodicty\*NumberOfSegments + NumberOfSegments\*SI\_WindowLenghth = 1280\*3 + 3\*5 = 3885ms.

Broadcast delays are also substantial and cannot be ignored. Broadcast latency is based upon the configured SI Window length and periodicity, number of posSIB segments and number of posSI that UE has to acquire. Some posSIBs can be considered as part of TTFF whereas some are updated frequently, and thus broadcast delays impacts latency during TTFF and also after TTFF i.e also during positioning estimation. Latency will incur if NW is unable to provide small periodicity (interval) and SI Window.

Flexibility in NW on posSI scheduling may reduce latency such as configuring positioning specific SI Window or scheduling different segments of posSIB back to back.

For above example the total delay would be:

NumberOfSegments\*SI\_WindowLenghth = 3\*1 = 3ms; (Considering posSI Window of 1ms)

Note: Enhancements for Broadcast SI Scheduling should not be part of Positioning WID and needs to be handled separately.

**--------------------------------End of Text Proposal #7-------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

Text proposal#6 and #7 are captured from contributions of companies. These text proposals will be submitted in clause 8.2 Performance analysis of studied NR positioning enhancements in TR 38.857.

**Please Note: Only when the text proposals in section 2.1 agreed, the relative aspect in text proposals#6&7 will be captured accordingly in clause 8.2.**

**Q6-1: Do you agree with the text proposals#6&7 if your answer of Q1-1, Q2-1, Q3-1 is/are yes accordingly? Please provide your comments/suggestion on these texts.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | With respect to the Qualcomm Observations in 8.2.3.1, rapporteur shall not extract a portion of our contribution and put it into missleading context. We have not analyzed "Request and response of positioning assistance data aspect". We have analyzed end-to-end latency using various possible enhancement options, and this should be captured in the TR (if individual company observations are going to be captured). Modified section 8.2.3.1.1. |
| Intel | Agree | We can capture the analysis from companies even if the text proposals in section 2.1 is not agreed.  |
| CATT | Agree | Also agree with QC(proponent)’s modification on 8.2.3.1 Observations from Source. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | This is not the result of the study for RAN2 |
| Nokia | Disagree | These evaluations in Text Proposal #7 proposed to be captured in Section 8.2 of the TR 38.857 have not been discussed thoroughly in RAN2. All email discussions so far were focused on what solutions can be carried forward to the WID without discussing the merits of the solution or accuracy of the evaluations. We do not agree to capture these results without proper discussion in RAN2 (for which we did not have sufficient time). We can agree to capture only the baseline results that we endorsed earlier this week (Intel led discussion on TP for latency analysis). As an outcome of this current email discussion, we can capture the TP proposed by QC in Q1-1 and Q1-2 with other modifications suggested under other questions. Overall, we see the study need to be continued as part of the normative work (and proper time units allocated to do a thorough study). |
| Samsung  | Disagree  | We also have the same view with Nokia. |
| InterDigital | Disagree | We are ok only for capturing certain analysis and general aspects in TPs #6&7 that have been previously discussed in RAN2 if the TPs in section 2.1 are agreed |
| vivo | Disagree | Agree with Qualcomm. |

# 3 Conclusion

Based on company feedback, the following is observed and proposed:

**TBD**
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# 6 Annex

The agreement on latency in potential positioning enhancements after RAN1 #103-e meeting is below:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Capture the following in the TR:* The enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency are recommended for normative work, including DL and DL+UL positioning methods
	+ The details of the solutions are left for further discussion in normative work, which may include the following aspects:
		- Latency reduction related to the measurement gap
		- Latency reduction related to the reporting and request of the measurements (e.g., via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure, and/or priority rules)
		- Latency reduction related to measurement time
* The following enhancements of signaling & procedures for reducing NR positioning latency can be studied and specified, if needed
	+ Latency reduction related to the request and response of positioning assistance data (e.g., via RRC signaling, MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure)
	+ Latency reduction related to the reception of DL PRS (e.g., priority rules for the reception of DL PRS)
* No assumptions are made on whether the LCS architecture specified in TS 23.273 is enhanced or not.
 |

There is no any agreement on latency in RAN #90-e and no relative objective is added in new WID of ePOS [2].