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# Introduction

The below papers have been submitted to legacy Rel-16 Positioning AI which requires input from companies to identify the support for the corrections.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2204694, R2-2204695 | Correction on the description of deferred MT-LR | CATT |
| R2-2205801, R2-2205802, R2-2205803 | Clarification on LPP Segmentation | Ericsson |

* [AT118-e][629][POS] Rel-16 positioning CRs (Ericsson)

      Scope: Discuss the following contributions under agenda item 5.3 and determine handling: R2-2204694, R2-2204695, R2-2205801, R2-2205802, R2-2205803.

      Intended outcome: Agreed CRs (without CB)

      Deadline:  Tuesday 2022-05-17 1800 UTC

#  Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| vivo | Xiang Pan (panxiang@vivo.com) |
| huawei, hisilicon | yinghao Guo (yinghaoguo@huawei.com) |
| Intel | Yi Guo(yi.guo@intel.com) |
| Ericsson | Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com |
| Apple | Zhibin\_wu@apple.com |
| ZTE | pan.yu24@zte.com.cn |
| Xiaomi | lixialong1@xiaomi.com |
| CATT | lijianxiang@catt.cn |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

Rel-16 correction CR and shadow CR for Rel-17 have been provided for below items in sub section 3.1 and 3.2.

## Correction on the description of deferred MT-LR

The CR is to correct the description of deferred MT-LR procedure. One more step (step 2) indicating an optional signaling of Event Report Acknowledgement is provided from LMF to UE.

1st change: One more step (step 2) indicating an optional signaling of Event Report Acknowledgement is provided from LMF to UE.

2nd change: Correct the referred steps in the procedure description of step 4/5

Question 1: Do Companies Agree with the CR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Change is fine Yes/No | Comments |
| vivo | No for the new step, yes for the referred step number. | No need to add a new step of event report acknowledgment. This step is copied from SA2 state2 spec and is not relevant to the RAN side procedure.But the referred steps in the procedure description are wrong and should be fixed. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | No | Not essential for RAN to capture. there is no further UE action after the Event report ACK |
| Intel | No | Agree with Huawei and Vivo. |
| Apple | No | Not essential, event report acknowledgement is already mentioned in 24.571. |
| ZTE | Yes | Ok with the change to capture the complete UE-LMF interaction in 38.305.  |
| Xiaomi | No for the first change | Agree with vivo.  |
| CATT | Yes as proponent | To HW and intel, the current procedure seems not a workable procedure, since if there is not any response, UE will determine that the event report procedure is failed. To vivo and Intel, the whole procedure of deferred MT-LR is all copied from SA2, and since we already to add the procedure in RAN2 specification, why not make it correct?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarification on LPP Segmentation

The CR provides the reference as why LPP segmentation was introduced. A discussion paper has been provided to motivate that at least the reference should be added for LPP segmentation.

Question 2: Do Companies Agree with the CR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Change is fine Yes/No | Comments |
| vivo | No | We share the same understanding that the UE is not expected to report the incorrect data volume to meet the DVT of SDT. But we think it’s up to UE implementation and a smart UE will not perform such a complex procedure while introducing more power consumption.Besides, the DVT is not the maximum message size supported by the lower layer as the UE can enter RRC\_CONNECTED to transmit the message. That is, the current spec is clear that the LPP segmentation is performed when the LPP message size exceeds the maximum message size supported by lower layers.In conclusion, the reference is not essential. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | No | This has already been discussed in the last meeting and the conclusion is not needed.  |
| Intel | No | Agree with Huawei |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | The spec should be clear. Even for RRC segmentation one can see the reason for segmentation..10 Segmentation of RRC messagesAn RRC message may be segmented in case the size of the encoded RRC message PDU exceeds the maximum PDCP SDU size.To vivo: Not all UEs will be smart. It is good to clarify the specifiaction and adding a reference can avoid any potential misinterpretations.To Huawei: As compared to last meeting; the difference is that the change now is to add the reference only. |
| Apple | No | Agree with Huawei and vivo |
| ZTE | No | Not sure whether ‘the maximum message size supported by the lower layer’ is the same with ‘the maximum size of a NAS message for NR connected to 5GCN’ in 24.501, 7.2.2.  |
| Xiaomi | No | Agree with Huawei. |
| CATT |  | We could understand Ericsson’s intension, but we don’t think it needs to modify from Rel-16 since SDT is not used for LPP transmission in Rel-16. But it is ok for us to have a Rel-17 CR or nothing. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion in section 2 we propose the following:
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