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# 1 Introduction

This is to discuss the following:

* [POST121][314][UAV] Flight path reporting (Intel)

Scope: Discuss the flight path reporting related details such as: the trigger for reporting the flight path information in UAI, whether there is a need to differentiate initial and updated flight path plan, flight path report signalling in HO preparation and in CN to RAN signalling, the maximum number of waypoints, etc.

Intended outcome: set of agreeable proposals

Deadline: Long (TBD: tentative April 5)

**Agreements so far related to flightpath reporting:**

*Meeting 119e:*

3 As in LTE, flight path plan reporting will be introduced. Location list of waypoints (3D location information) and timestamp is adopted as the basic content of flight path report. FFS if timestamp is mandatory or optional for NR. FFS if further enhancements are needed

*Meeting 120:*

Agreements:

1. A waypoint is a planned location for the UE along the flight path and is described via the existing parameter type LocationCoordinates defined in TS 37.355.
2. A timestamp provides the UTC time associated with estimated time of arrival to a waypoint as baseline. FFS on granularity
3. No requirements are placed on spatial distribution of waypoints
4. A UE indicates whether flight plan information is available within the RRCReconfigurationComplete, RRCReestablishmentComplete, RRCResumeComplete, or RRCSetupComplete message. Flight path reporting uses at the UE Information request/response procedure as baseline.
5. UE indicates to the network a new flight path is available in the UE (whether it is initial or update). Then, reuse the normal request/response procedure of flight path report.
6. UAI message can also be used to indicate the UE has flight path availability.
7. FFS whether and what triggering conditions are specified for flight update. FFS The maximum number of waypoints within flight path plan is left FFS.

*Meeting 121:*

**Agreements**:

1. The granularity of flightpath timestamp is 1s.
2. Timestamp in flightpath is encoded using AbsoluteTimeInfo-r16 IE

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Flight path triggering

During meeting #120, flightpath update indication is agreed via UAI message. This section is to discuss how the UE triggers this indication (if any). From companies’ contributions, there are few options proposed to trigger flightpath update indication as summarized below. There are also concerns about having too many triggering from the UAV if no trigger condition is defined and the network may not care the updated flightpath. Therefore, summary of proposed options is provided below. Please indicate your preference, as well as all acceptable options.

* Option 1: Network configures one or more threshold(s). FFS on the kind of threshold(s) (e.g. time, distance, number of waypoints) that triggers the flightpath update indication in UAI. [2,5,14,15,19]
* Option 2: Prohibit timer applies to flightpath update indication [6]
* Option 3: Any change compared to last reported flightpath (i.e. as long as it is difference from last reported flightpath) will trigger flight path update indication in UAI [13]
* Option 4: Up to UE implementation to trigger [6,8,18]

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1: Which of the option(s) to trigger flightpath update indication in UAI is/are your preference/ acceptable?*** **Option 1: Network configures one or more threshold(s). FFS on the kind of threshold(s) (e.g. time, distance, number of waypoints) that triggers the flightpath update indication in UAI. [2,5,14,15,19,11]**
* **Option 2: Prohibit timer applies to flightpath update indication [6]**
* **Option 3: Any change compared to last reported flightpath (i.e. as long as it is difference from last reported flightpath) will trigger flight path update indication in UAI [13]**
* **Option 4: Up to UE implementation to trigger [6,8,18]**
 |
| **Company** | **All acceptable options** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option-1 | Network can configure the change in terms of a threshold. FFS if absolute or relative. For example, provide an absolute number of changed waypoints or a difference (relative) in the number of changed waypoints as the trigger. Option-3 at least from the description looks like it is up to UE to decide and can be merged with UE implementation i.e., Option-4.In our view network should be in control on any signaling of flightpath from UE to network as only network can know whether it has any use for the flight path information or not.  |
| CATT | Option-4 | The motivation to introduce limitation should be clarified firstly. From the current understanding, there may be two aspects: uplink signalling load and malicious attack. If the intention is to limit the uplink signalling load, it is not convinced since there is no any limitation had been introduced to limit UAI message before. If the intention is to avoid malicious attack, this issue should be handled by CN instead of AS solution in the current 5G system. To step back, the UAI message in 5.7.4 of 38.331 is already under the control of gNB (Before the UAI message, the *RRCReconfiguration* can be used to achieve this point).  |
| ZTE | Option 2 and option 4 | From network point of view, we need a mechanism to prevent frequent flight path update indication. We believe prohibit timer can prevent UAV UE from doing this. On option 1, we think it is difficulty for network to determine what kind of update is necessary and what is not. E.g. it is hard to say 3 waypoints change is more significant than 1 waypoint change (it depends on the actual flight path). So we prefer to leave to UE implementation. With the help of prohibit timer, we believe UE vendor will be careful on the update indication. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1  | For option 1, whether and when UE report the flightpath update indication is in the control of network.For option 2, flight path information cannot be updated as soon as possible. In effect, both option 3 and option 4 is the method which is up to UE implementation. For flight path reporting, it may be better that it is in the control of network. |
| Samsung | Option 1, 2 | Support option 1 and 2. First, if we leave the triggering of flightpath update indication to UE implementation, it can be triggered too frequently, which leads to unnecessary overhead on both UE and network. Thus, there should be some method to prevent too frequent update.Second, from the gNB perspective, the update of flight path information can be useful only when it is relevant to mobility support for that UE. Thus, it seems reasonable to allow the gNB to configure the triggering condition (e.g, time/distance/number thresholds) of the update indication. Thus, we support option 1.Also, we believe that the prohibit timer can be used together to prevent too frequent UAI transmission as in the legacy operation.  |
| Lenovo | Option 3 | Currently in UAI message, most of reports are initiated upon the change of the content or preference or status etc., for example* delay budget report
* IDC assistance information
* preference on DRX parameters
* preference on the maximum aggregated bandwidth
* preference on the maximum number of secondary component carriers
* preference on the maximum number of MIMO layers
* assistance information to transition out of RRC\_CONNECTED state
* configured grant assistance information
* indication of its preference in being provisioned with reference time information
* MUSIM assistance information for gap preference
* indication of fulfilment of the RRM measurement relaxation criterion
* relaxing its RLM measurements
* relaxing its BFD measurements in serving cells
* service link propagation delay difference

We think upon change to initiate flight path reporting is totally reuse the legacy mechanism, which is simple and enough. We have not observed threshold mechanism to restrict initiation of the report in current UAI message. And we do not think flight path reporting is frequently changed. So we do not prefer option 1.For option 2, we are open if it is necessary. |
| vivo  | Option 4/3 | From our understanding, the UAV may not change its flight path frequently. Basically, they may change their flight path plan when an obstacle appears. And UAV itself can decide whether the changed flight plan needs to be sent to the network. So, we think it is sufficient to left it to UE implementation. For option 1, the benefit is unclear but the complexity is obvious. Besides, from spec point of view, we don’t see the difference between option 3 and option 4.  |
| LGE | Option 4 | Flight path indiciation mechanisms(option 1,2, and 3) seem to be kind of optimization for invalid UE behaviours like continuous UAI. But the UAI message can be controlled by the network. We can leave it to UE implementation.  |
| NEC | Option 4 | Determination of triggering flight path update indication is out of RAN2’s scope. |
| Sharp | Option 1 with comments | The flight path update can be controlled by the network in some cases. We think some indications from network are useful. For example, the network can indicate whether the flightpath update is triggered when only time information is changed since the time information is optional. Option 1 can be changed to more generic: “Network configures one or more threshold(s)/indications” |
| Apple | Option 4 | We suppose the intention to let network control the trigger condition for reporting the updated flight path is to reduce signaling overhead. From our understanding, the whole procedure is already under network control thus there is no need to introduce extra control merely for updated reporting. In addition, it would be a complex discussion on the trigger condition, to cover all possible updates. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | To avoid the frequent flight path update, the NW needs to configure the triggering condition for flight update on the UE to limit the flight path update. We think the time and distance are needed to be considered as the triggering condition due to the location and the arrival time being the main concerns for the NW, because the NW may need to configure UAV-specific configuration according to these parameters in advance. Besides, we think that not all of the waypoints and the corresponding timestamp are interesting for the NW, especially for each gNB, because the coverage of each gNB is different and the waypoints and the corresponding timestamp outside of the gNB’s coverage do not have any influence on the gNB. Thus, instead of configuring the number of waypoints, we think the gNB should indicate a specific waypoint and/or the corresponding timestamp, which is of interest to the gNB, to the UE. For example, the gNB can indicate that the third and fourth waypoints and corresponding timestamps are the interested waypoints or timestamps, and the distance and time thresholds are e.g. x meters and y minutes. Then, the UAV updates the flight path if it deviates from the planned third and fourth waypoints by more than x meters or y minutes. In a word, the NW should configure the distance and time threshold for the interested waypoint to the UE. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 | With regard to options 3 and 4: these options could result in excessive updates that may not be useful to the network. Regarding options 1: option 1 is a superset of option 2 (not quite the same as a prohibit timer but achieves a similar effect) and option 3 (if the different threshold types are sufficient). Thresholds or triggers for option 1 should be discussed, including a time trigger, nearing the end of the reported waypoints, deviation of a certain distance from the flight path, change in velocity, or change in direction. |
| CMCC | Option 1 | Agree for above comments that both option 3 and option 4 are solutions up to UE implement. And considering the timeliness and effectiveness, option 1 is better than option 2. |
| InterDigital | Option 1, 2 | Agree with others that Options 3,4 are UE implementation, and the network should have some control over when the update can be triggered to avoid frequent flight path update. Preference is Option 1, but also okay for Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | 1 (see comment), 3, 4 | In option 1, time and distance are ok, but we don’t think ‘number of waypoints’ needs to be a trigger for the update. Re Option 2: we don’t think prohibit timer is needed. It should be up to UE and based on availability of UL grants to report the flight path. There can be situations where the UE realizes change in FP (e.g. based on thresholds from option 1) quickly after sending a FP, then a timer should not prohibit reporting in such (genuinely needed) case.Re Option 3: if ‘any change’ triggers FP report, that is same as option 4, and if the ‘change’ is configurable, then we are back to option 1. |
| DOCOMO | Option1, 2, 4 | Flight path reporting is up to UE implementation. Frequent flight path reporting can be controlled by a prohibit timer. |
| DENSO | Option 1 | Other options are also OK but we prefer option 1 so that network could control UE behavior. |

Summary: TBD

## 2.2 Flight path available indication (configuration, initial and updated)

Some companies discuss whether flightpath update indication should be configured by the network before UE can send the indication in UAI. Please provide your view below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2: Do you prefer flightpath update indication in UAI is configurable by the network?*** **Option 1: configurable by the network**
* **Option 2: not configurable [8]**
 |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option-1 |  |
| CATT | Option 1 | If we are on the same page of the wording “configurable” in the question, since the legacy UE Assistance Information procedure is under control of gNB(See 5.7.4.2 in 38.331 h30 version). Option 2 seems to change the legacy UAI procedure which the motivation is not clear to us right now. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | Network should be able to determine whether an UAV UE is allowed to indicate flight path update, as the legacy UAI mechanism.  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 | See our comment to Question 1 above. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | Network should be able to configure whether an UAV UE can report the flight path update indication |
| vivo | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1  |  |
| NEC | Option 1 | This should be under NW control. |
| Sharp | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | See comments | The reason why we proposed no further control from network is this UAV message carries a mere indication for update, but not a real report on updated information. If the updated flight info is carried in UAI, it’s natural to have corresponding network configuration for it. But the actual report uses UEInformationRequest/UEInformationResponse procedure, it seems cumbersome to have double control here (one for update indication and one for real report).Anyway seeing the responses above, we are fine to go with majority view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | We think the flight path update indication in UAI should be configurable by the network because the NW may not need the updated flight path. For example, there is no UAV-specific configuration that can be performed by the NW when the NW receives the initial flight path. Then the network can indicate that the UE does not need to report the flight path update indication. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Flight path update indication in UAI should be supported. But there is no need of a separate configuration to indicate whether it is supported or not.(Similar comment as Apple: sending the flight path in the 2nd step is based on the network requesting the flight path, which is already agreed. So, there is no need to further control the initial flag for the indication of availability itself.) |
| DOCOMO | Option1 |  |
| DENSO | Option 1 |  |

Summary: TBD

How is the “flightpath update indication” implemented via the *UEAssistanceInformation* message? Summary of companies’ proposals is provided below. Please indicate all acceptable options:

* Option 1: Single indication is used for both initial and updated flightpath available (i.e. same flag is used for initial and updated flight path indication) [5,8]
* Option 2: Different indications are used to provide initial or future reporting of the flightpath information, (i.e.one flag is used for initial, and one flag is used to indicate the flightpath update available indication)
* Option 3: Different indications are used to report when flight path info is available and the reason that cause the reporting, i.e. one flag for flight path available, one flag for update cause (e.g. initial, available of new flightpath) [15]
* Option 4: UE can also report when flightpath is unavailable. FFS if this is done via same or different IE as the flight path related information discussed in previous options [7]

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3: How is the “flightpath update indication” implemented via the *UEAssistanceInformation* message?*** **Option 1: Single indication is used for both initial and updated flightpath available (i.e. same flag is used for initial and updated flight path indication) [5,8]**
* **Option 2: Different indications are used to provide initial or future reporting of the flightpath information, (i.e.one flag is used for initial, and one flag is used to indicate the flightpath update available indication)**
* **Option 3: Different indications are used to report when flight path info is available and the reason that cause the reporting, i.e. one flag for flight path available, one flag for update cause (e.g. initial, available of new flightpath) [15, 11]**
* **Option 4: UE can also report when flightpath is unavailable. FFS if this is done via same or different IE as the flight path related information discussed in previous options [7]**
 |
| **Company** | **Preference/ acceptable options** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option-3  | There is an opportunity to improve the LTE design by providing the network with more information. The update need not be limited to initial/availability of a new fight path. Information on the validity of previously reported waypoints should also be considered i.e., either invalid or still valid and updated. For Option-4, if no update is available, the UE need not report. It is redundant to send a report with something being unavailable.  |
| CATT | Option1 | Since the report is from UE to gNB, and the gNB implement is not captured in the spec, it is doubt that the necessary to distinguish the initial and updated flightpath available. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | First of all, we think these options are related to the answer to question 5 (whether delta flightpath reporting is supported). If delta reporting is not supported, there is no need to have separate flags for initial and update, because the NW anyway will retrieve a complete flight path and replace previous one.Further, It is hard for network to determine whether an update is necessary only according to an simple indicator. And it may be difficult to define “initial flightpath” and “updated flightpath”. Without a clear definition, an UAV UE implementation may always indicate “initial flightpath” to network. Thus it is useless to have different indications in UAI.  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 and Option 4 | When initial and updated flight path available, different indications/flags are not needed. A single indication (same flag) is used to inform the network that a new flight path is available and the old flight path is unavailable, if any.When flightpath is unavailable, UE should report to network to indicate the old flight path is unavailable. The same indication in option 1 can be used. If network requests UE to report flight path, UE will not report the flight path to network when flight path is unavailable in UE. |
| Samsung | Option 1, 4  | Support option 1. If there is any previously reported flight path, the network can regard the flag as update flag. No need to have different flags for initial and update separately. For option 3, we can’t see the need to introduce additional indicators to indicate the reason of the FPP update. Prefer to stick to previous agreement i.e. single bit seems sufficient and if NW provides some triggering conditions, then UE can indicate it via UAI if conditions are fulfilled.Support option 4. It seems reasonable for the UE to report when flightpath becomes unavailable. We are open to discuss the details on how to indicate it. E.g., implicit indication (absence of *flightpathInfoAvailable* flag) or explicit indication (a new indicator for unavailability). |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | We think gNB can determine whether it is update flight path report by gNB implementation |
| vivo | Option 1 | One common indication is enough as the network can distinguish. |
| LGE | Option 1 | We don’t think a separate indication is necessary. Subsequent actions on the network do not depend on whether the indication is availability or update. That is, the network needs to retrieve the flight path information for whatever the indication is. |
| NEC | Option 1 | In our understanding, the updated flightpath plan is based on the initial one. Network is able to know whether the available flightpath plan is an initial one or not (the network may have retrieved flightpath before, using UE information request/response), so we don’t see the need to have different indications. |
| Sharp | Option 1 | We are also open to discuss Option 3 if network would like to know more information to decide whether to request the updated flightpath. |
| Apple | Option 1 | For unavailable flight path report, there are two alternatives to enable it.* Alt 1: UE indicates an explicit “cancel” indication in UAI message
* Alt 2: Absence of the flight path info in UEInformationResponse message

We actually think both alternatives are feasible but Alt 2 a little bit. Going with Option 1, the indication of flight path availability can cover the “flight cancel” case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | We think different indications for initial and update are needed. We know that the UE sends the initial flight path if the flight path is available, which is a 0 to 1 procedure, but the flight path update indication is sent when the flight path is changed compared to the previous flight path. However, the NW may not be interested in the updated flight path. Thus, the UE should include the update information, e.g., which waypoint is changed, in the flight path update indication to avoid the NW requesting the useless flight path. Therefore, we think different indications for the initial and updated flight path are needed. Specifically, the initial flight path indication can be a one-bit indication, but the flight path update indication should include flight path update information, including which waypoint is changed, instead of a one-bit indication. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 | Option 1 covers option 2 because the network would already know whether the UE has ever sent a flight path. Therefore, the first flight path sent will be considered initial, and any further flightpaths will be considered updates. The cause values in option 3 are the same as the two options in option 2, and the need for additional cause values is unclear, e.g., what would the network do with additional information to choose to accept a new flight path. We are open to option 4 to indicate that there is no update to the flight path, i.e., the current flight path is still valid. |
| CMCC | Option 1 | To differentiate between initial and updated flightpath available is unnecessary, a single indication is enough. |
| InterDigital | Option 3 with comment | How and to what degree a flight path has changed can vary significantly and can impact how the update notification is treated by the network. For example, an extra waypoint appended to the end of the existing flight path may be considered with lower priority than a significant course correction to a previously reported flight path.The UE should include additional assistance information (number of waypoints changed, whether only time is changed or time and location etc. details FFS) in the update notification to support NW prioritization. This is also necessary to support delta signalling (Question 5). |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | We need different indications, but no need of more granular cause values (option 3).Note that this is related to the next questions on delta and transfer of FP during HO.Additionally, it should be noted that network could ask for full flight path even though a UE indicates the availability of ‘updated flightpath’. |
| DOCOMO | Option1 | A common indication is enough to differentiate initial flight path and updated flight path. |
| DENSO | Option 1 | Single indication is enough since network should know if there is previously reported flight path information. |

Summary: TBD

Regarding maximum number of waypoints that can be reported by the UAV, in LTE, maximum number is 20. Some companies suggested to make this number configurable by the network. Other companies indicate that there may be some need to extend the maximum number of waypoints if flightpath information is forward to target gNB during handover. Please indicate all acceptable options.

* Option 1: maximum number of waypoints is configurable by network [7,15]
* Option 2: maximum number of waypoints is set to 20 same as in LTE [4,6,17,18]
* Option 3: suggest a different maximum number of waypoints

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4: What is the maximum number of waypoints should flight path reporting support?*** **Option 1: maximum number of waypoints is configurable by network [7,15]**
* **Option 2: maximum number of waypoints is set to 20 same as in LTE [4,6,17,18, 13]**
* **Option 3: suggest a different maximum number of waypoints (please specify)**
 |
| **Company** | **Preference/ acceptable options** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option-1/2 | A maximum value should be captured in the RRC specification. The network, however, can configure how many at most can be reported by the UE. LTE maximum 20 can be taken as baseline. |
| CATT | Option2 | The maximum number of waypoints depends on the need for NR UAV. Since the performance requirement (e.g. accuracy) for NR UAV is the same as LTE UAV. It is nature to follow the LTE in the current release. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | We prefer follow LTE. |
| Xiaomi | Option-1/2 | We also prefer follow LTE.In 36.331, for each flight path reporting, the maximum number of way points UE can include in the flight path information report (i.e. *maxWayPointNumber-r15*) is configured by network via *FlightPathInfoReportConfig*. And the maximum value of *maxWayPointNumber-r15* (i.e *maxWayPoint-r15*) is 20.**We wonder know whether the question applies to *maxWayPointNumber* or *maxWayPoint.*****If it applies to *maxWayPointNumber*, we support option1. If it applies to *maxWayPoint*, we support option 2.** |
| Samsung | Option 2 | We prefer to keep the maximum number of waypoints as in LTE (i.e., 20). |
| Lenovo | Option 2 | We prefer to keep the maximum number of waypoints as in LTE (i.e., 20). |
| vivo | Option 2 | The maximum number of waypoints in LTE can be the baseline. If we support flight path transfer during HO in NR, we can further discuss whether to extend the number.  |
| LGE | Option 2 | Prefer to follow LTE |
| NEC | Option 2 | We prefer to align with LTE. Anyway an updated plan can be send further. |
| Sharp | Option 2 | LTE method can be reused.  |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | We believe that 20 waypoints are sufficient for NR UAV because there is no additional requirement for NR UAV compared to LTE UAV.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1/2 | There should be a maximum number of waypoints defined in RRC (*maxWayPoint* in LTE), which could be 20 as in LTE. The network can configure the UE to transmit up to a configurable number (*maxWayPointNumber* in LTE) of waypoints, which could be as many as or less than that maximum number of waypoints. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | Prefer to keep LTE mechanism as baseline. And whether extend the maximum of number of waypoints needs further discussion taking some necessary enhancements for some common cases into account. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 with comment | Fine to keep LTE as baseline, however open to discussion to increase if information can be forwarded to target gNBs (maybe captured as FFS based on outcome of Q6?) |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | Ok to increase the maximum number to say 32 or 64 as 20 in LTE was also taken arbitrarily. |
| DOCOMO | Option2 |  |
| DENSO | Option 1 | Maximum number could be increased, but it should be network configurable anyway. |

Summary: TBD

## 2.3 Delta support of flight path reporting

In [2,7,15,29,20], it is proposed to support delta flightpath reporting. The main argument is that there is no need to report the entire flightpath if only part of it has changed. On the other hand, other papers [5,8] propose not to support delta flight path reporting. The argument is when flightpath changes, it most likely changes the entire path. For example, UAV starts the flight path at a later time. Please indicate your preference and supporting comments below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5: Do you support delta flightpath reporting?**  |
| **Company** | **Support/ not support** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Support | There is an opportunity to improve the LTE design by providing the network with more relevant information for e.g., UE only reports new information. The update need not be limited to initial/availability of a new fight path. Information on the validity of previously reported waypoints would be important.  |
| CATT | Not support | Share the same view as rapp. The requirement to save uplink reporting load for NR UAV is not convinced to us right now. |
| ZTE | Not support | We agree that when flight path changes, it is most likely the whole path is changed. Thus it is unnecessary to introduce such complexity in flight path update reporting. And currently, there is no delta reporting mechanism in uplink reporting in NR. |
| Xiaomi | Support | To reduce signaling overhead, delta flight path information can be supported for flight path update and the new flight path information is the delta of the flight path information reported in last time.  |
| Samsung | See our comments | The entire path report can be the baseline, but we are open to discuss the partial update to reduce signalling overhead.In some cases (e.g., removing passed waypoints, change only in time stamp …), we can reduce the signalling overhead quite a lot without having complex delta-configuration mechanism. For examples:In case of ‘removing passed waypoint’, the UE can just indicate the number of waypoints to remove ‘N’. Then, the network can remove ‘N’ waypoints from the front of the previously reported list.In case of ‘change only in time stamp’, we can just allow the location information of waypoints to be optional only for the update case. |
| Lenovo | Not support | Agree with Rapp, CATT and ZTE |
| vivo | Not support | Agree with Rapp.  |
| LGE | Not support | Agree with ZTE. It is also more complicated to compare the delta flight path with the previous report in the network side. |
| NEC | Not support. | We think it’s too complicated to distinguish partial update and entirely update. |
| Sharp | Not support | Delta signalling is complex. |
| Apple | Not support | For UL message, normally there is no delta reporting in NR. In UAI discussion, it was explicitly agreed that inside a feature, there is no delta reporting. This principle should also apply to UEInformationResponse message. That is to say, when UE creates the UEInformationResponse, it would be a message with full content. With this logic, network does not need to know if it is an update or initial one as network would directly make use of the newly reported info and discard the previous one if any. This actually simplifies the network implementation, i.e., avoiding the composing action when receiving a UL message with delta info. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | We think delta flight path reporting is needed, especially when the NW is interested in part of the whole flight path. Even if the entire flight path is changed, the UE does not need to report it to the NW at this time. It can save radio resources. For example, the UE could report the third and fourth waypoints to the NW if the NW is interested in the third and fourth waypoints. Compared to reporting the entire flight path (20 waypoints), it saves radio resources significantly. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not Support | We prefer the option to send an entire new flight path instead of a delta flight path. It isn’t clear that the potential reduction in overhead is worth the complexity of implementing delta configuration for the flight path. |
| CMCC | We are ok to go for majority views | To be starting point, entire updated flight path report could be supported firstly. And further enhancements with delta reporting could also be discussed considering the overhead reduction. |
| InterDigital | Support | We do not agree when a flight path changes it is likely the entire flight path. For example, the UAV may encounter a delay (e.g., turbulence, collision avoidance etc.), where the waypoints remain the same and only the timestamp information has changed. In another example, the existing flight path may remain valid and one or more additional waypoints may be known to the UE and can be appended to the previously reported flight path. Sending an entire flight path report is inefficient if only a subset of the reported information has changed/is new. We also disagree with describing delta signalling as overly complex without discussing design details and scenarios. Samsung has provided two such examples where this would be a relatively simple addition to baseline.We are okay to agree that full flightpath reporting is the baseline, however at the very least should keep delta signalling as FFS and further discuss scenarios where it would be applicable. Companies which support delta signalling should also be provided an opportunity to demonstrate reductions in signalling overhead. |
| Qualcomm | Support | There is no need to report the entire flightpath if only part of it has changed.It should be noted that network could ask for full flight path even though a UE indicates the availability of ‘updated flightpath’. So, whether only delta is provided or full path is provided is under network control. |
| DOCOMO | No strong view  |  |
| DENSO | Support | We suppose there is case where UE have delay or route change due to external factor such as weather condition. In such case, there would be partial change in flight path information. Therefore, delta reporting could improve radio resource efficiency. |

Summary: TBD

## 2.4 Flightpath information forwarding during handover

There are also some discussions regarding if flightpath information should be forwarded from source gNB to target gNB. Papers [17,20] suggest the support of flightpath information forwarding so network can perform mobility optimization for UAV as well as interference control. In addition, contribution [20] proposes to support UAV UE connected to 5GC (current LTE only supports UAV UE connected to EPC) to indicate *flightPathInfoAvailable.* There are 2 following proposals, please indicate your supporting proposal below:

* P1: flightpath information should be forwarded from source gNB to target gNB during handover.
* P2: *flightPathInfoAvailable* is added for UAV UE connected to 5GC (this change is in LTE)

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6: Which of the following proposal(s) do you support?*** **P1: flightpath information should be forwarded from source gNB to target gNB during handover.**
* **P2: *flightPathInfoAvailable* is added for UAV UE connected to 5GC (this change is in LTE)**
 |
| **Company** | **Supporting proposal(s)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Supportive  | Should check with RAN3 on feasibility. |
| CATT | See comments | From technical point of view, both proposals are reasonable and acceptable. But there is no RAN2 spec impacts from our points of view till now (e.g., for P1 in RAN3 and P2 in SA). |
| ZTE | P1: supportP2: see comments | On P1: The traffic and delay used for reporting flightpath in target cell can be saved.On P2: We may need to firstly clarify whether LTE/5GC is within the scope of UAV WID? If yes, we also agree with P2. |
| Xiaomi | P1 is ok | For P1, it should be checked with RAN3. For P2, agree with ZTE. |
| Samsung | Only P1 | Support P1. Flight path information is likely not to change after handover. Thus, the flightpath forwarding between source gNB and target gNB is useful to help mobility optimization.For P2, it seems out of scope this WI.  |
| Lenovo | Both proposals are ok | We support both proposals technically. But may need to confirm with RAN3 |
| vivo | Support P1.  | If flightpath information can be forwarded from source gNB to target gNB during handover, the target gNB does not need to request flight path reporting from the UE, which can save the signalling overhead. Therefore, from signalling overhead perspective, we support proposal 1. The flight path information can be added in the inter-node message, so maybe it can be done in RAN2. For P2, we think it is reasonable, but it seems not in the WID.  |
| LGE | P1 is ok | Need to check with RAN3. |
| NEC | Support P1. | For the candidate cell selection by the target gNB, the flight path information will be useful. For example, if some candidate cells are overlapped, the target NB may select candidate cell(s) which is more suitable for the expected flight path (i.e., way point).  |
| Sharp | P1 | And maybe check with RAN3. |
| Apple | Support P1 | Good to have P1. For P2, we are open for discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1 | We think the flight path should be transferred from the source gNB to the target gNB during handover. First, it can save radio resources because the UE does not need to report it again when handover is complete. Second, the target gNB can use the flight path to configure UAV-specific configuration, e.g., access control, as soon as possible. Furthermore, we believe that the flight path indication should be forwarded to the target gNB in cases where the source gNB does not have the most recent flight path. For example, the source gNB does not request the UAV to report the updated flight path when it receives the flight path update indication (maybe the source gNB is not interested in the updated flight path). At this moment, the source gNB has the old flight path and the flight path update indication. Obviously, it is not reasonable to forward the old flight path to the target gNB. Thus, the source gNB should forward the flight path indication (initial or updated) to the target gNB rather than flight path (because the latter is old and may lead the target gNB make a wrong decision) in this case.We do not have a strong view on P2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | P1 | P2 is not in scope since it pertains to LTE changes. If P1 is agreed, we should also include this forwarding for Xn and N2 handover, for which we may need to send an LS to RAN3. |
| CMCC | Support P1P2 needs to clarify whether in the R18 scope | P1 needs RAN3 check. |
| InterDigital | Support P1 | Agree with others, LS to RAN3 would be a good idea. Open to discuss P2. |
| Qualcomm | Support P1 and P2 | For P1: It is beneficial if the target knows about the flight path. Otherwise, every time cell changes, UE needs to provide FP again.For P2: It was an oversight during the eLTE (Rel-16) work that the FP flag was pushed within the ‘if the UE is connected to EPC’ branch, which made it not applicable for the case of LTE connected to 5GC. So, we think this should be corrected. There is no impact to any other groups like SA2 or RAN3.Of course, one could argue about the ‘WI scope’, which is valid. The alternative is to bring an LTE RRC CR as correction, which would anyhow need to be discussed by UAV expects. The change would be very simple for LTE RRC (moving the statement out of EPC only branch to make it common to both EPC and 5GC). Something like below in 5.3.3.4:2>  if the UE is connected to EPC:3>  except for NB-IoT:4>  include the *mobilityState* and set it to the mobility state (as specified in TS 36.304 [4]) of the UE just prior to entering RRC\_CONNECTED state;3>  for NB-IoT:4>  if the UE has radio link failure information available in *VarRLF-Report-NB* and if the RPLMN is included in*plmn-IdentityList*stored in*VarRLF-Report-NB*:5> include *rlf-InfoAvailable*;4>  if the UE has ANR measurements information available in *VarANR-MeasReport-NB* and if the RPLMN is included in*plmn-IdentityList* stored in *VarANR-MeasReport-NB*:5> include *anr-InfoAvailable*;3>  include *dcn-ID* if a DCN-ID value (see TS 23.401 [41]) is received from upper layers;2>  else (i.e. the UE is connected to 5GC):3>  if the UE is a BL UE:4>  include *lte-M*;2>  except for NB-IoT:3>  if the UE has flight path information available:4> include *flightPathInfoAvailable*;3>  if the UE has radio link failure or handover failure information available in *VarRLF-Report* and if the RPLMN is included in *plmn-IdentityList* stored in *VarRLF-Report*:4>  include *rlf-InfoAvailable*;So, if the common understanding is that the change is needed and beneficial, then we can bring a LTE CR.  |
| DOCOMO | Support P1 | Agree to check with RAN3. |
| DENSO | P1 | Agree to check with RAN3. |

Summary: TBD

## 2.5 Other proposals

Please indicate if you have any other proposals related to flightpath update but not addressed in above questions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Additionally, in our view [11], some other critical information related to the flight path can also be reported, either in the flight path report or in a separate UE report. For example, we believe that information about default/emergency landing spots is important. Therefore, we propose RAN2 to discuss such enhancements |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It needs to be decided whether the initial flight path indication it is sent to the NW via the RRCReconfigurationComplete, RRCReestablishmentComplete, RRCResumeComplete, or RRCSetupComplete only and the flight path update indication sent to the NW via the UAI message only. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Consider that an FPP could come from the UTM via the CN to the gNodeB instead of from the UE itself. The FPP from the UTM would be associated with a UE the same way as if the UE had sent the FPP itself. This option would eliminate the FPP-related signalling overhead related to the legacy FPP reporting method. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Nokia’s comment. |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD
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